Spencer Lavan

The Aḥmadīyah Movement: Its Nature and its Role in Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Century India

Comparative Religion

Doctor of Philosophy

SUMMARY

This dissertation is a study of the origins, nature and role of the Aḥmadīyah movement among the spectrum of Islamic movements in late nineteenth and early twentieth century India. The purpose of the dissertation is to examine in detail the life and work of the founder of the movement, Mīrzā Ghulām Aḥmad and to study especially the polemics and controversies in which he engaged with fellow-Muslims, Āryā Samāj Hindūs and Christian missionaires. The second half of the dissertation will study events which divided the Aḥmadīyah movement during the decade after Aḥmad's death, and will also examine the intensive controversy between the Aḥmadīyah and the Aḥrār in the 1930's. Several appendices will include the texts of letters, speeches and articles of significance to the study but too lengthy to appear in the text itself. Most of the materials which are the resources of the dissertation have not been examined critically before. Thus, this presentation of the early history of the Aḥmadīyah movement presents many new facets of the movement which have not been discussed in other studies.

THE AHMADIYAH MOVEMENT IN INDIA

LAVAN

THE AḤMADĪYAH MOVEMENT: ITS NATURE AND ITS ROLE IN NINETEENTH AND EARLY TWENTIETH CENTURY INDIA

by

Spencer Lavan

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Comparative Religion

McGill University

Montreal

1970

© Spencer Lavan 1971

PREFACE

This dissertation explores the early history of the Aḥmadīyah movement and its inter-relationship with the religious and political life of late nineteenth and early twentieth century India. It is the first study of the Aḥmadīyah movement based almost entirely on original source material. The only other major study of the early history of the movement, that of H. A. Walter, written in 1917, was polemical in its orientation and based, factually, on limited sources of information. This study is far from a complete study of the Aḥmadīyah movement, even in its earliest period. We have deliberately neglected to consider a detailed analysis of Ghulām Aḥmad's theological arguments and have centered only on his principal ideas and works. Similarly, we have not explored deeply the sociological makeup of the early community. Rather, we have dwelt upon Aḥmadīyah in relation to other religious groups, and at certain points, crucial political and historic events.

The dissertation is original in several respects. First, it has explored Aḥmadīyah through a combination of Aḥmadī sources, both Urdū and English, non-Aḥmadī sources primarily in English, archives of the Government of India, and native newspaper reports. The archival material and the newspaper reports are both a relatively new source available

to scholars. In the case of the former, this study utilizes materials not previously made public. With regard to the latter, very few scholars have yet fully utilized the remarkable summaries of the Panjāb Press prepared by the British Government between 1867-1924. Although included as part of the bibliographic references, this dissertation has tended to ignore previous work, usually brief, done on the movement, as this material has generally been based on limited sources.

By using appendices, we have attempted to present some of the material uncovered in the study at first hand, as a way of showing directly how various of the figures in this history expressed themselves in detail on certain occasions. Bibliographically, this study should have the most complete set of references related to the Aḥmadīyah movement yet available.

The problem of transliteration has been a major one. In the text, we have followed the transliteration table prepared by the Institute of Islamic Studies at McGill. Where a name or title exists in both an Arabic form and an Urdu form, we have used the Arabic form throughout. There are occasional exceptions to this.

Quoted material appears exactly as quoted. The transliteration in this material is varied and inconsistent. In the Bibliography we have spelled all names, titles and places of publication exactly

as they appear in the English materials while again following the McGill system in the Urdū bibliography.

The completion of this work would not have been possible without the assistance of many persons. I am grateful to the staff and faculty of the Institute of Islamic Studies, McGill University, and to its director, Dr. Charles Adams, for six years of guidance in graduate study and in this particular project. As well, I express gratitude to the library personnel who allowed me to borrow large amounts of material for several years.

Apart from the staff at McGill, two persons deserve primary credit for their assistance: Mr. ʿAbīd Ullāh Ghāzī, graduate student at the Harvard Center for the Study of World Religions, aided in providing the accurate translation of numerous Urdū works. We expect to work jointly on future monographs. Associate Professor of History at the University of Missouri, N. Gerald Barrier, who was able to use the Government of India Archives in Dehlī during 1968-69, made available materials which I could never otherwise have obtained, as the archives were closed again in July, 1969. Professor Barrier's guidance and hospitality during a visit to Missouri, December, 1969, and that of his associate, Professor Paul Wallace, helped to answer many previously unanswered questions.

For their assistance with interviews, letters and books, I wish to thank Professor Khalīl Naṣir, Sayyid Jawād ʿAlī, imām of the American Fazl Mosque in Washington, D. C.,

and Sir Ẓafar Ullāh Khān, who kindly granted permission for me to read his unpublished "Reminiscences". Dr. W. C. Smith of Harvard, Dr. Daʿūd Raḥbar of Boston University, and Professor Stanley Brush of the University of Bridgeport also granted helpful interviews. I wish to add my thanks as well to Professor Kenneth Jones of Kansas State University, who also supplied me with a tract not previously available. Finally, I should express my thanks to the librarians of the Meadville Theological School in Chicago and the Hartford Theological Seminary who also made available books on long-term loan. Fortunate to find myself teaching at Tufts University under a wonderfully supportive chairman, Dr. Howard Hunter, the current academic year at Tufts, which included a January period of independent study and the end of classes on May 1, allowed me to spend an extraordinary amount of time at home working to complete the dissertation.

In a more personal vein, I could not conclude this preface without remembering my wife, Susan, and my three sons, Jonathan, Daniel and Timothy, whose joy and love have helped to keep life in its true perspective during the long task of research and writing.

May the contribution we have attempted here towards unravelling the complexities and tensions of modern Indian religious history be useful to those who wish to examine it.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		Page
1	THE AḤMADĪYAH MOVEMENT AND THE INDIAN ISLAMIC EXPERIENCE OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.....	1
2	THE PANJĀB DURING THE LIFETIME OF MĪRZĀ GHULĀM AḤMAD.....	47
3	POLEMICS AND CONTROVERSY: (I) 'ULAMĀ', MISSIONARIES AND GOVERNMENT.....	117
4	POLEMICS AND CONTROVERSY: (II) THE ĀRYĀ SAMĀJ AND THE ASSASSINATION OF LĒKH RĀM.	168
5	DECADE OF DEVELOPMENTS: ORGANIZATION, MISSIONS, PERSONALITIES AND THE SPLIT (1908-1918).....	239
6	POLEMICS AND CONTROVERSY: (III) AḤMADĪYAH IN THE PERSPECTIVE OF INDIAN HISTORY IN THE 1930's--THE COLLISION WITH THE MAJLIS-I-AḤRĀR-I-ISLĀM.....	304
7	THE AḤMADĪYAH: PERSPECTIVE AND CONCLUSION.....	381
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....		392
APPENDIX		
"A"	"MEMORIAL FROM THE PUNJAB WAHABI COMMUNITY".....	412
"B"	"LIST OF WORKS CONTAINING PROHIBITION OF JEHAD AND SUPPORTING THE GOVERNMENT" BY MĪRZĀ GHULĀM AḤMAD.....	420
"C"	"ISTIFTĀ'" BY MĪRZĀ GHULĀM AḤMAD (1897) TRANSLATED BY 'ABDULLAH GHAZĪ AND SPENCER LAVAN.....	426

		Page
"D"	CORRESPONDENCE IN THE CONTROVERSY BETWEEN MUḤAMMAD ʿALĪ AND BASHĪR-UD-DĪN MAḤMŪD AḤMAD.....	443
"E"	"THE TURKISH PEACE AND THE MUSLIM'S DUTY" BY MĪRZĀ BASHĪR-UD-DĪN MAḤMŪD AḤMAD.....	450
"F"	ORGANIZATION OF THE AHMADĪYAH COMMUNITY DURING THE 1920's AND 1930's (FROM A TRACT BY SIR ẒAFAR ULLĀH KHAN).....	471
"G"	EXACT COPY OF A LETTER FROM T. M. SIAL, QADIYĀN, PANJAB TO "CHIEF SECRETARY, GOVERNMENT OF THE PUNJAB, LAHORE, NO. 661-G, JANUARY 25, 1935".....	478
"H"	"NOTE ON A CONVERSATION BETWEEN COMMISSIONER OF LAHORE AND KHAN SAHIB MAULVI FARZAND ʿALI," JANUARY 21, 1935..	498
"I"	"TRANSLATION OF A SPEECH DELIVERED BY PIR FAIZ-UL-HASSAN...PATHANKOTE, GURDASPUR DISTRICT, MAY 3, 1936".....	508
"J"	"TRANSLATION OF VERBATIM NOTES TAKEN DOWN BY AN URDU STENOGRAPHER OF SPEECH MADE BY KHALIL-UR-RAHMAN...QADIAN, JULY 3, 1936".....	516

CHAPTER 1

THE AHMADIYAH MOVEMENT AND THE INDIAN ISLAMIC EXPERIENCE OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

This dissertation seeks to analyze and study the origins, nature and role of the Aḥmadīyah movement[1] during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century in India. Its objective is to examine first the general condition of the north Indian Islamic community during the latter half of the nineteenth century in order to see the background--religious, political and social--out of which the movement and its founder, Mīrzā Ghulām Aḥmad of Qādiyān, arose. Part of this examination will be a more detailed survey of the history and conditions of the Panjāb and, more specifically, of Gurdāspūr district where Qādiyān was located. With this background available, we can begin to see Aḥmad's life, work and thought juxtaposed against the religious situation and political conditions in which he grew up. It will then be possible to raise questions about how and why his teachings differed from those of Sunnī Islām, how his activities differed from those of a ṣūfī ṭarīqah, and to just what kind of audience his writing and lecturing in Urdū could appeal.

While an examination of the origins and early history of the Aḥmadīyah movement is directly related to both Panjābī and Indian history in a broad sense, it has also been related

to the specific history of Muslims, Hindūs,[2] Sikhs, Christian missionaries and the British Government of India. As such, the study of the Aḥmadīyah movement is fitting research for the field of comparative religious history in its most direct sense, for here we are studying not only Islām or Islamic doctrine in isolation as phenomena, but an Islamic response developed in an historic situation of religious confrontation, inter-action and conflict.

Much has been written by western scholars about the Aḥmadīyah movement and with two exceptions, the material has been brief and has appeared within a larger study of Islām or else has been written by a Christian missionary whose perspective on the movement was limited by his own predisposition towards it.[3] The perspective of this dissertation goes beyond the concern of most previous examinations of the Aḥmadīyah for these have discussed the theological dimension of the movement almost exclusively. This study will examine the movement in detail on the basis of the writings of Ghulām Aḥmad and his followers, newspaper reports of the period, and records of the Governments of India and the Panjāb. We shall discuss the specifics of Aḥmad's conflicts and controversies with Ahl-i-Ḥadīth and Ḥanafī Muslims, native elements among the Christian missionaries and the Āryā Samāj. These have not been examined before.

Ghulām Aḥmad's relations to the British Government, what he said about the Government and what Government thought

about him are of crucial importance to the study. Aḥmadīs were often accused of being the "mouthpiece" of the Government during the British period. It is clear that during the lifetime of Ghulām Aḥmad, he was an ardent supporter of the Government. His reasons were, however, religiously motivated. As we will see, Aḥmad believed that India was in the best possible situation under British rule. As his own family had been deprived of their estates during the Sikh period in the Panjāb, Aḥmad and his Muslim followers looked upon that earlier period as one of despotism and cruelty.

Aḥmad was in his early twenties when the "Mutiny" occurred in 1857. When he died in 1908, the Muslim League had only been in existence two years. His life was one of relative quiet as far as political activity within the Muslim community was concerned. His personal interests and experiences were religious. What he wanted to communicate was a message of religious renewal for a new Islamic century, a century in which he declared that he was the Promised Messiah and mahdī for whom the Muslims were waiting. Aḥmad completely repudiated the doctrine of the ghāzī mahdī and the doctrine of jihād which still had traditional implications for many sunnī 'ulamā'. His programme was one dependent upon missionary persuasion as a way of winning people over to his teachings. As such it was forced to repudiate any notion of an Islamic uprising against a foreign power or the claim that the sultān of Turkey acting as khalīfah had any authority with respect

to Indian Muslims.

Because Ghulām Aḥmad claimed the role of Promised Messiah and mahdī for himself and in so doing often referred to himself as nabī, his repudiation of any traditional kind of khilāfat implied clearly that he was himself to be the new leader of Muslims. While Aḥmad stated clearly later in his life that the use of the term "nabī" was not meant to imply his rejection of Muḥammad as khatm al-nabūwat or the the seal of the prophets, his use of the term was one of the reasons that there was so much opposition to him among Muslims. Ghulām Aḥmad has been included in a recent study of more than forty messianic movements among Indian religious groups. Thus, while his claims may have been controversial among Muslims, they were not unusual for India. Another contemporary scholar of the Indian Muslim scene has suggested the possibility that some Indian Muslims, being so far removed from the homeland of the Arabian prophet, may have yearned for a prophet of their own and thus responded positively to a figure such as Aḥmad. While these theories will not be pursued here, our discussion of Aḥmad's life and writings will take the matter of his claims into serious account.[4]

Part of this study will deal with the origins and early history of the Āryā Samāj which first became significant among the Hindūs of the Panjāb after the visit of Swāmī Dayānand after 1877.[5] The pattern of development on an intellectual level, that is, the use of arguments to prove the

truth of the scriptures by rational methods while basically orienting itself around a reform program in social and educational matters were points at which the Āryā Samāj and Aḥmadīyah movements were very similar within their own traditions. The strong appeal of the Āryā Samāj to low caste persons and its growing anti-government militancy even in the 1890's indicates two levels at which it was significantly different from the Aḥmadīyah during Aḥmad's lifetime, however.

From the controversy between Aḥmad and the Āryā Samāj and the communal crisis which arose in Lāhōr after the murder of the militantly anti-Muslim Samājī Lākh Rām in March, 1897, we shall turn to the internal and organizational developments of Aḥmadīyah and the changes which took place after the death of Ghulām Aḥmad. The period from 1908-1914 found the organization with an internal crisis between two groups of its members. There were those who wanted Aḥmadīyah to look upon its founder only as a mujaddid or renewer and by so doing, emphasize what Aḥmadīyah had in common with Sunnī Islām. A larger group wanted to recognize the unique role of Ghulam Aḥmad as Promised Messiah and mahdī and wanted to place the leadership of the movement in the hands of an authoritarian khalīfah figure. While a clash of personalities had much to do with creating the crisis and split of 1914, the growing sense of "nationalism" in the Indian Muslim community following the formation of the Muslim League and illustrated in Muslim solidarity over the partition of Bengāl and the

Kānpūr mosque incident of 1913 also played a role in shaping the attitudes of the more intellectual, worldly and urban group which finally left Qādiyān for Lāhōr.

Finally, we will take into consideration the growing activism of the Qādiyānī Aḥmadīyah in such political issues of the twenties and thirties as the khilāfat movement, Gandhi's "swarāj" programme, the Simon Commission Report and the Kashmīr agitation of the early 1930's in which they were not always fully in agreement with the Government position. We shall also explore the controversy which emerged between the Aḥmadīyah and the Aḥrār, a new and articulate militant Muslim group which also attacked with the "sword" as well as the "pen". The complexity of this controversy, which attained its height between September, 1934 and April, 1936, was further widened by what the Qādiyānīs believed to be a change of attitude towards them by both the Government of the Panjāb and the Government of India. The extent to which this may or may not have been true we shall illustrate through a detailed examination of reports and correspondence covering the work of various government agencies involved in trying to understand the situation as it emerged and in attempting to keep the peace without showing favouritism.

We argue as our thesis, then, that the creation of the Aḥmadīyah movement came about because of the ideas, inspiration and religious reforming zeal of one man, Ghulām Aḥmad. The development of the movement in future years, while taking

its initial cue from the inspiration of its founder, developed in great part because of the situation in which it found itself--a situation of confrontation, polemics and controversy which came from many quarters of the Panjābī Indian religious and political situation developing between the years 1890-1936. Our argument assumes that the Aḥmadīyah movement had a role cast upon it as it responded to the situation in which it fought to maintain its existence, as much as it may have created a role for itself. Thus, many aspects of the movement changed from the first days of Aḥmad's "ministry" to the days of the Aḥrār encounter in the 1930's.

The total framework of the dissertation, then, is one which will examine the Aḥmadīyah movement with respect to events during the lifetime of Ghulām Aḥmad, in the years immediately after, and as a contrast during the specific years, 1934-1936. It is important to note here that the study leaves out many aspects and events. We have not examined in detail the lives and backgrounds of many of the early members of the movement, nor have we inquired in detail as to why certain Muslims joined the movement and others did not. We have not made a detailed study of all of Ghulām Aḥmad's theological arguments, but rather have surveyed some of his principal writings in Urdū and English in order to set down his important ideas. Our bibliography lists as many translations of his works as were available to us and as complete a list of his Urdū writings, many often without date or place of publication,

as we were able to uncover. It is with these considerations in mind that we set the framework of this study.

II

While the data presented in this study of the Aḥmadīyah movement has been made by a strict juxtaposition of events and statements as they developed in specific chronological sequence, the total work should be considered as a study in comparative religions, or, the history of religions. In attempting a summary of the diverse materials we will examine, it might be well first to theorize about our subject from the field of religious sociology. When Ernst Troeltsch developed his typology of Protestantism in 1911, he did not appear to have realized the close resemblance between his theories about Christianity and their possible application to Islām.[6]

Joachim Wach and Max Weber, sociologists of religion of great stature, developed typologies which have barely considered Islām,[7] while phenomenologists describing types of religious experience and processes often centered in the "primitive" understanding of what is sacred and profane have generally been unable to relate the three central <u>foci</u> of Islamic religious experience cited by Troeltsch in his Christian study. Troeltsch's tri-partite typology was one which distinguished the "church", the "sect" and "mysticism". The "church" which could be likened to the mainstream

institutions of Sunnī Islām--the religious establishment co-terminous with the whole society--he described as "able to receive the masses and to adjust itself to the world, because to a certain extent it can afford to ignore the need of subjective holiness for the objective treasures of grace and of redemption."[8] Islām would talk neither of "grace" nor of "redemption" as such. It would not be concerned with churchly distinctions of "in-the-world" as against "of-the-world". This would be so because the Sunnī, broadly speaking, would understand that the state was administered under God's sharī'ah for the masses of people.

While the mystical dimension of Islām is traceable to the first century A.H., the strongly pietistic sūfī movement became more broadly operable in Islām after Sunnī Islām became institutionalized and legalized by a class of 'ulamā'. Troeltsch's definition of "mysticism" might well have applied to a definition of "sufism" when he wrote:

> Mysticism means that the world of ideas which had hardened into formal worship and doctrine is transformed into a purely personal and inward experience; this leads to the formation of groups on a purely personal basis, with no permanent form, which also tend to weaken the significance of forms of worship, doctrine and the historical element.[9]

While exception may be taken to the latter statements about "permanent form", for, in fact, the individual sūfī experience took permanent form in the tarīqah which developed its own worship, doctrine and in some cases, sense of history, the

general assertion that mysticism began as a transformation from hardened formal worship and doctrine to the purely personal may again be described as valid.

Troeltsch's definition of the middle category between "church" and "mystic"--that of the "sect", he defined as

> ...a voluntary society, composed of strict and definite Christian believers bound to each other by the fact that all have experienced "the new birth." These "believers" live apart from the world, are limited to small groups, emphasise the law instead of grace, and in varying degrees within their own circle set up the Christian order.[10]

One might again find deviations between this definition and the historic experience of the Shī'ah or the Khawarij who, although "composed of strict and definite...believers" living apart from the mainstream of "church" Islām, did not exist as a voluntary association beyond the first generation of members. This "sect" typology fits the Aḥmadīyah experience well, however, with the substitution of the word "Islamic" for "Christian". The Troeltschian typology is useful in a broad sense, then, for placing the Aḥmadīyah movement in a sociological Islamic context if not in an historic one. That Ghulām Aḥmad saw himself as distinct from Sunnī Islām and that he recognized India to be flourishing under the rule of a non-Islamic power is clear. We shall also prove in our discussion that he and his followers stated strongly that they were not in any way part of a ṣūfī movement in spite of language or practices which Aḥmad may have used. In the

experience in which Aḥmad and the Aḥmadīyah movement became alienated from the mainstream of Islām and with the centering of Aḥmadīyah activities at Qādīan after the split in 1914, it is valid, we would argue, to consider the Aḥmadīyah movement sociologically as "sectarian". Again, it is important to add that the fact that Aḥmadīyah became a "sect" of Islām resulted both from actions within the movement as well as from reactions to events and activities outside which profoundly affected the life and attitudes of those within.

III

The events of 1857 mark a turning point for the history of Muslims in modern India. The suppression of the "uprising" that year ended any hopes that Muslims might have entertained of reestablishing the Mughal Empire while at the same time alienating the Muslim community almost totally from their British rulers. For several decades after 1857, the British closed the doors on all opportunities for Muslims and showed distinct favouritism towards Hindus.

> The Muslims were hounded out of employment and opportunities. The landed gentry was disinherited through large scale confiscations. Muslim education had been ruined...Persian had been ousted as the official language...Muslim qadis had lost employment....[11]

In what was an otherwise bleak period for Muslims in India, there emerged one figure of considerable importance. Sir

Sayyīd Aḥmad Khān. Aḥmad Khān was born on October 17, 1817 in Delhī, a descendent on his mother's side of Khawājah Farīd, a man "reputed for learning and moral qualities."[12] Farīd had served as a wazīr of the Mughal emperor and was best remembered for his attempts to economize at court, attempts which were criticized to the point that they forced him to retire from his position. Thus, Sir Sayyid was born into a prominent Muslim family, one which had settled in Dehlī during the reign of ʿAlamgīr I, Aurangzēb.

Prior to his return to Dehlī from a stay in Agra at the age of 28 and in the year 1846, Aḥmad Khān's life was rather uneventful. Dehlī in this year was politically stagnant, from an Islamic viewpoint, but culturally thriving. Aḥmad took advantage of the situation in Dehlī to study Qur'ān, ḥadīth, and fiqh and to acquaint himself deeply with the Islamic heritage. Likewise, he became aware of the growing misrepresentation of that heritage, among Christian missionaries and scholars. During the "Mutiny" of 1857, Aḥmad Khān stood firmly with the British; however, this did not mean he was not deeply aware of the plight and condition of his fellow Muslims.

Sayyid Aḥmad felt strongly that the contribution that the British were making to India was positive and valuable. He believed that they would undoubtedly continue to rule India for generations to come. At the same time, he could not accept the idea that Muslims should express their dismay or

their desire to revive an Islamic state by means of armed uprising. Although the controversy over the significance of the "Mutiny" is still going on and its meaning is still exploited by historians of varying viewpoints, Sir Sayyīd's view of the events of 1857 in two particular works seem to describe the situation as well as any other works on the subject.

The books, Asbāb-i-baghāwat-i Hind (Causes of the Indian Mutiny), written in 1858, and Loyal Mohammadans of India, written in 1860, came about as a result of his growing concern that Muslims would always be discriminated against by the British because of their role in the "Mutiny". Whether all the charges against them were true or not, in the minds of the British the Muslims had attempted to restore the Mughal king of Dehlī to his throne, had raised the cry of jihād, had sought fatwās supporting the call, and may have attempted to get aid from outside of India.[13] In the Asbāb, Sayyid Aḥmad began by comprehensively defining the term "rebellion". His views on the origins of the "rebellion", however, were reflective of his own upper class background and defended the role of the feudal classes of Muslim society who had far more reason to be dissatisfied than did the Hindūs with British rule. In spite of this, he noted that a proportionately large number of Hindūs were found among the mutineers.[14] Sayyid Aḥmad went on to refute all the British claims about the Muslims seeking aid from Shīʿah Persia, trying to reinstate

the Mughal king or calling for a jihād against the British. He strongly denied that the Mutiny had anything to do with national or religious hatred of the British.[15]

In Loyal Mohammadans, he discussed more fully the question of the non-legality of Muslims waging jihād against the British. Jihād, he argued, required two preceding conditions: the absence of protection and the absence of a treaty between the parties. Since Indian Muslims were living under the protection of the British, no jihād was possible. It would be an even greater injustice to assume that the atrocities committed by Muslims during the "Mutiny" were in any way to be considered part of a jihād. While these statements of 1860 hardly put the matter to rest in the minds of both Englishmen and Muslims, the statements of Sir Sayyid both about jihād and whether or not India was dār al-ḥarb seem to have affected the thinking of both Ghulam Ahmad and the Ahl-i-Ḥadīth in their statements twenty-five years later. Sayyid Aḥmad's arguments were essentially the same as theirs: that in British India Muslims enjoyed every form of freedom and religious liberty even though the country was not ruled by Muslims. Whether this was an accurate legal definition of dār al-ḥarb is open to serious question. The point is, however, that what Sir Sayyid was saying in these books and in the pages of the ʿAlīgarh Journal in later years was addressed both to the Muslims whom he wished to direct more into the mainstream of what he saw as the coming modern age,

and to the British whom he wished to convince concerning the loyalty of the Muslim community.[16]

Sayyid Aḥmad Khān's contribution in the field of education and religious knowledge in general must also be considered in a survey of the Islamic situation in the nineteenth century. A visit to England impressed him greatly. There he became acquainted with Western scholarship on Islām some of which, notably Sir William Muir's, Life of Mohamet, disturbed him deeply. At the same time, he began to study the Bible and even wrote a commentary on it which never went beyond the book of Genesis. Sir Sayyid seems to have been striving for a revivification of the religious life of Islām which would follow much of the methodology which scientific study was employing in the 1870's and 80's. His critique of the religious situation was expressed thusly:

> It is strange that to use one's effort to enable the Muslims to progress as a people, to maintain the study of religion, to make provision for education in those worldly sciences which are beneficial and useful, to ensure economic security, to open avenues of honest employment, to remove blemishes in social life and eradicate those evil customs and bad habits because of which people professing other religions look down upon the Muslims, to remove those prejudices and superstitions which are opposed to the sharī'ah and a hindrance to every kind of progress--it is strange that this should not be attributed to religiousness and to love of the Muslims but to absorption in worldliness. I do not see how this attitude could be justified in the eyes of God.[17]

The problem of stagnation in Islām was the problem of the blindness of the 'ulamā' to the principle of ijtihād

or the right of re-interpretation in matters of faith and law. Further, he asserted, the 'ulamā' also neglected the possibility that a mujtahid may come in our own time to bring us to an awareness of our needs. In saying this, Sir Sayyid was himself reinterpreting the meaning of ijtihād for his own time.

It is beyond the scope of this study to examine Sir Sayyid's theological thought in great detail. This was, however, only one dimension in which he sought to express himself as a reformer. At a more practical level, his work in education and politics also affected the Muslim life. The founding of the Anglo-Oriental College at 'Alīgaṛh in 1875 opened up a new kind of higher education for middle-class Muslims. The college, modeled after Cambridge,

> aimed at the liberalization of ideas, broad humanism, a scientific world view, and a pragmatic approach to politics. It strove for a steady increase of educated Muslims in the government services. It smoothed the transition of the younger generation from almost medieval conservatism to at least superficial modernism.[18]

This latter point is certainly crucial to understanding the importance of Aḥmad Khān's contribution to Islamic India. In attempting to bridge the gap between medievalism in Islamic education and modern Western education, he did for Indian Islam what Muḥammad 'Abduh and others attempted in the Arab world at almost the same time. One result of Sir Sayyid's work was that the school at 'Alīgaṛh was able to produce leadership for both the Muslim political separatist and more

moderate nationalist movements in India.

The existence of a college, however, was hardly adequate to solve the numerous problems faced in educating Muslims. Realizing this, Sir Sayyid decided to set up, in 1886, the "Mohammadan Educational Congress." The purpose of this Congress was to bring together Muslims from all over the sub-continent in order to help them solve varied educational problems and to promote the publication of works on Islam. The organization attempted to combine Western educational approaches with those of the maktabs or traditional Islamic schools. Sir Sayyid remained secretary of the Congress until his death in 1898 and was the guiding force behind it.[19]

Sir Sayyid entered political life in 1878 when he was appointed to the Imperial Council by Viceroy Lord Lytton. Although he did not speak English and hence could not participate directly in the debates, he often wrote speeches in Urdu and had them translated. His most significant effort during this period seems to have been his speech in favour of the Ilbert Bill which sought to remove distinctions between Europeans and Indians in the trial courts, a situation which did not allow Indian magistrates to conduct the trials of Europeans in most of India.

The ʿAlīgaṛh movement itself strove to call attention to the problems Indian Muslims faced as a minority people. Sir Sayyid saw grave problems if democratic parliamentary government were to come to India. He believed that such a

system would find Hindūs politically in opposition to Muslims while Muslims would be outnumbered four to one. It was partly because of this and partly because he believed strongly in the contribution which the British were making to India that Sayyid Aḥmad Khān sought to postpone any idea of parliamentary democracy for India.[20]

When the Indian National Congress was formed in 1885 Sayyid Aḥmad asked Muslims not to join it and few Muslims did. In 1888 he said,

> It is my deliberate belief that should the resolutions of the native Congress be carried into effect, it would be impossible for the British Government to preserve the peace, or control in any degree, the violence and civil wars which would ensue.[21]

Whether Sir Sayyid, whom many thought was an advocate of Hindū-Muslim unity, can be accused of fostering Muslim "communalism" because of his opposition to the Indian National Congress and his opposition to legislation which might favour Hindūs over Muslims in attaining civil service positions is a matter still being debated. It would seem that Sayyid Aḥmad, considered in the perspective of the times in which he was living, should neither be labeled a "communalist" nor a "mouthpiece of the British," who were themselves accused of following a "divide and rule" policy in India.

Since "communalism",[22] in its strictest sense, can not really be identified in India before the early part of the twentieth century, nor can one argue that the British were in need of a "mouthpiece" in face of nationalist threats

from the Congress as early as the 1880's, one can only see the role of Sir Sayyid in defending Muslim concerns as resulting from his analysis of their plight in the years after the Mutiny. In this regard, it is important to note the political quiescence of the land-owning and middle-class Muslim communities after 1857 and up to the founding of the Muslim League in 1906. As we shall see in our study of Ghulām Aḥmad, he, too, reflected a similar, although far less sophisticated, religious defense of Islām strictly segregated from any desire to be involved in political questions which would threaten the position of British rule in India, even if his successors did take "political" positions later on.

Sayyid Aḥmad's position was not totally sympathetic with that of the British. His reaction to W. W. Hunter's book, The Indian Mussalmans, brought out strong feelings he had about the way in which some Europeans misrepresented both India and Islām in their writings. Sir Sayyid's review, written to disprove the claims that "Muslims could not in keeping with the teachings of their religion be loyal subjects of the British Government," described Hunter's book as

> politically a grave, and in minor degree, an historical mistake...I could not in justice to my co-religionists have kept silent when such erroneous statements were thrown broadcast over the land. I have striven as much as in me lay to refute the errors published by Dr. Hunter and although my efforts may have been in vain, I feel that I have done my duty.[23]

As a further means for explaining Muslim interests

to the Government, Sayyid Aḥmad was also instrumental in organizing at ʿAlīgaṛh in 1893 the Muḥammadan Anglo-Oriental Defense Association whose stated objects were:

> (1) to promote the political interests of the Muhammadans by representing their views before the English people and the Indian government;
> (2) to discourage popular and political agitation among the Muhammadans;
> (3) to lend support to measures calculated to increase the stability of the British government and the security of the empire;
> (4) to strive to preserve peace in India and to encourage sentiments of loyalty in the population.[24]

Related to this position was Sayyid Aḥmad's attitude towards the khilāfat question and the pan-Islām movement as it was understood in those times. He took the position, and in this Ghulām Aḥmad strongly agreed with him, that the sulṭān of Turkey should in no sense be considered khalīfa by the Muslims of India. He was neither an Arab nor a descendent of the Quraysh nor of any member of the family of the prophet. We shall explore further dimensions of his attitude below with respect to Ghulām Aḥmad's similar position on the question of the khilāfat.

What remains to be said of the contribution of Sir Sayyid Aḥmad Khān to the nineteenth century condition of Islām is that while it was certainly a controversial contribution both in the eyes of Muslims and non-Muslims, his work represents the most significant milestone among Muslim attempts to find a role and identity for their community in the decades

after 1857. For a study of Aḥmadīyah, there is much in what Sir Sayyid did which, we will see, is both relevant and related.

IV

On a spectrum of late nineteenth century Islamic responses, there were two others of an educational and theological nature. Muḥammad Qāsim Nanōtāwī and Rashīd Aḥmad Gangōhī were disciples of the eighteenth century Islamic theologian Shāh Walīullāh and founders of the traditionalist seminary, the Dar al-ʿUlūm at Dē'ōband, a small town near Dehlī. While the venture at Dē'ōband began ten years after the Mutiny, the attempt was in sharp contrast to that of 1857. The founders of Dē'ōband were concerned with the issues of political, religious and cultural freedom for Indian Muslims. Their approach was educational rather than military. The emphasis in reasserting the position of Islām meant, however, that the ʿulamā' followed the Ashʿarī and Māturīdī schools in kalām and the Ḥanafī school in fiqh.[25]

The objectives of the Dē'ōband seminary, according to one historian, "were to reestablish contact between the ʿalim and the average Muslim, and to reorientate the Muslim community to its 'original' culture and religious identity."[26] A recent work on the Dē'ōband school has detailed the curriculum and further objectives of the school.[27] In general, one can say that the program was "traditional" and not inclusive

of the sciences. The sciences were not rejected as unimportant in the modern world, but, rather, as unfit for a place in the Islamic curriculum. Sciences could be studied at government colleges. The medieval rational sciences did have a place in this traditional education, however, and may perhaps have been seen as the bridge that would cover the gap between a Western or even an ʿAlīgarh approach as against a totally traditional one. It has been suggested that Dēʾōband may be seen as "preliminary to a modern westernized school" but not really as antithetical to it. On a scale of liberal-rational to reactionary, Dēʾōband would have to fall in the middle as "conservative"--accepting neither the rational scientific approach of Aḥmad Khān, nor the more fundamentalist approach of the Ahl-i-Ḥadīth who minimized the place of post-ḥadīth ʿulamāʾ.

The Dār al-ʿUlūm seems to be, in part, the successor of the Walīullāh tradition, taken in a more sophisticated form. In as much as it wanted to reestablish contact between the ʿulamāʾ and the masses, it did not go to the puritanical extremes of Sayyid Aḥmad Shahīd, who, in the "Wahhābī" tradition, rejected saint worship and belief in the power of saints to intercede.[28]

Of the various events in the early history of the Dēʾōband seminary that would seem particularly relevant to this study, the polemical discussions and public controversies carried on by Nanōtāwī against both the Christians and the

Āryā Samāj missionaries are significant. In 1876, he debated the Rev. Tārā Chand, a Hindū convert to Christianity, and sent challenges to Swāmī Dayānand Saraswatī to debate.[29]

On the matter of belief in the "physical survival of prophets and saints after their death and in the immortality of their bodies as well as their souls," the Dē'ōband school followed the Farangī Maḥal in accepting such doctrines as against the Wahhābī approach. On the question of the finality of prophethood, they asserted that it was triple in nature: "in rank, in chronology, and in space."[30] One historian has gone so far as to speculate that this assertion was pronounced particularly in face of the claims set forth by Ghulām Aḥmad that he was the new Messiah and mahdī as the founder of Aḥmadīyah. Since Nanōtāwī died in April 1880, his disputations with the Āryā Samāj clearly did not range into the period in which Ghulām Aḥmad debated with them. These debates occurred in the following two decades. Thus, the position on khatm al-nabūwat would most likely have preceded any threat that appeared from the Qādiyānīs. In fact, it is worth noting that the principal historian of Dē'ōband does not mention such an issue at all.[31]

Another view of Dē'ōband describes its practical approach as one of puritanical strictness where the emphasis is one which "works assiduously to overcome and destroy backslidings, superstitions, saint worship, and all the paraphernalia of ignorance, poverty and fear in a depressed and decadent

agrarian society."[32] The Dē'ōband approach can best be labeled a true conservatism, a middle road between a liberalism which sought to bring Islām into accord with reason and science and the more rigid or fundamentalistic approach of the Wahhabis and their followers.

Maḥmūd al-Ḥasan (1850-1921) was the follower of Nanōtāwī and Gangōhī at Dē'ōband and brought the school an international reputation among Muslims and students from many parts of the Islamic world. Although under his leadership there was rapprochement with ʿAlīgaṛh, there also remained significant differences in approach and concern.

In the meantime, another seminary, the Nadwah al-ʿUlamā' was founded at Lucknow in 1894, representative of a theological position somewhere between those ordinarily attributed to ʿAlīgaṛh and Dē'ōband. The Nadwah was founded by Shiblī Nuʿmānī along with some other ʿulamā' who had "responded more sensitively and positively to the stimulus and challenge of western sciences."[33] Shiblī expressed the position that the role of the ʿulamā' in the Muslim community had changed radically in the past century. With the functions of religion and politics separated in the British state, he suggested that they might better be involved in setting the moral tone for Indian Islām than in concerning themselves with theological minutiae. The growth of secularism in Europe and India, he argued, was creating an increased response in terms of atheism or agnosticism. One would not meet the chal-

lenge of this by simply standing firm on old ground. Nu'mānī thus suggested that the Indian 'ulamā' should join together, minimizing doctrinal discord and combining efforts on such issues as the reorganization of Arabic and Persian studies in government schools, exerting pressure on the government to revise its legal policy, reviving the Anglo-Muhammadan law followed in the early days of the British East India Company, thereby giving up British common law then in effect in India. The call to the 'ulamā' was one for a reasoned approach to the religious problems of the day, an approach strongly in opposition to religious fanaticism and blind conservatism.

These views found great sympathy and cooperation from 'Aligarh in the matter of balancing a western scientific education with a rational approach to the study of theology. The two joined together in stressing a national approach to the problems of Islamic education as well as the need for gatherings of 'ulamā', representing all points of view in Indian Islām, in order "to discuss with full freedom of expression the challenges they faced in common in relation to the new problems of their community."[34]

The goal of the Nadwah's sponsors was, then, to revise completely the structure of Islamic theological studies in India in order to meet the challenges of the times. To the extent that this restructuring, this new 'ilm al-kalām, harked back to the medieval philosophic challenges of such men as

al-Rāzī, al-Ghazālī, and Ibn Rushd, it did not meet with the total accord of the ʿAligarh school. In the latter, the position was that nothing should bow before science, not even medieval philosophic rationalism which had so influenced the founders of the Nadwahaʾl-ʿUlamāʾ.

In the context of the varied nineteenth century Indian Islamic developments, the Farangī Mahal was also founded in Lucknow. This was the oldest of the institutions we have considered in this section but is also of least relevance to our study in that its purpose, at least until the founding of the Jamʿīyat-i-ʿUlamāʾ-i-Hind, a political organization, in 1919, was purely theological. Up to that time, it seemed to be barely aware of the intellectual and theological disputes going on between modernists and conservatives. Rather, it "combined a medieval rationalistic heritage with a proclivity towards Sufism...."[35] The Jamʿīyat, of which it was a part, was also made up of ʿulamāʾ from Dāʾūband, the Nadwah and other institutions. In this organization these ʿulamāʾ were able to play a role in the Indian nationalist movement generally and in the Khilāfat and Muslim League movements as well.

V

Another Islamic response, the study of which has been virtually neglected in the West, was that of the mid- and late nineteenth century followers of Sayyid Aḥmad Shahīd,

known by the British of those times as "the Wahhābīs of India."[36] After the British took over the Panjāb in 1849, militant remnants of Sayyid Aḥmad's early nineteenth century movement for jihād continued to harass the British along the Northwest frontier of India, especially in what has been described as the "Ambala campaign."[37] To bring the matter under control, the British decided to suppress thoroughly and destroy the oragnization, believing that peace could not come to India until a movement favouring jihād was no longer present to stir up the populace to militant action.

The suppression of this militant reform movement was not a simple matter, however, for the ideas and organization of the reforming founders had spread throughout the country both as a religious and political struggle "against the alien people from distant lands and traders and vendors of goods."[38] After 1826, the center of the movement shifted eastward to Paṭnā where it remained until the latter part of the century. The working structure of the organization did not simply center around the Paṭnā headquarters and its khalīfahs, who included Muḥammad Ḥusayn, Wilāyat ʿAlī and Maẓhar ʿAlī, all of whom had been authorized as leaders by Sayyid Aḥmad himself, and each of whom had the authority to appoint others to the central committee structure of the organization. Itinerant preachers of jihād were also sent out around the countryside, district centers were established in various areas of North India and the collection of funds including zakāt, alms and

muthī or rice levy from the supporters of the movement from the Panjāb to Bengāl was begun. These funds were then passed on by a system of secret agents who operated with codes and cyphers. By this method they transmitted information from one area to another. Such a system was undoubtedly necessary as the Wahhābīs were under close scrutiny by the British Government.

The most effective tactic used against the Wahhābīs was the Paṭnā and Ambala leadership trials during the 1860's and 70's. William Tayler, Commissioner for Paṭnā in the years after the Mutiny, particularly suspicious of Wahhābī leaders Muḥammad Ḥusayn, Mawlawī Aḥmadullāh and Mawlawī Wā'iz al-Ḥaqq, brought them to trial on the grounds that they were intriguing with one Luṭf 'Alī Khān, a rich banker of the city suspected of disloyalty.[39] Because Tayler believed that the Waḥḥābīs were entirely dependent for their effectiveness on their leaders and, as he believed, could not carry on without these leaders, he began a systematic persecution of men such as Muḥammad Ḥusayn and Aḥmadullāh, both of rather distinguished Muslim families.[40] The details of the trials and their impact have been adequately discussed elsewhere.[41] Of greater concern for our study are the effects of those trials and detentions which finally terminated about 1885.

The British attitude towards the Waḥḥābīs did not change noticeably until the movement favouring jihād had declined. Even twenty years after the political trials and persecutions,

the Wahhābīs experienced the continual British attempt to create ill-will between them and Muslims of a less militant orientation.[42] This practice included the stressing of the term "Wahhābī" in the most negative way possible, both in the frontier area where a large number of Wahhābīs moved after the Ambala uprising of 1863 and throughout India in general.[43] The Government also managed to secure fatwās against jihād and statements concerning the questionable status of Wahhābīs. These the British welcomed as a sign of Muslim loyalty and an answer to Sir William Hunter's assertion that "Our Indian Mussalmans are...bound in Conscience to rebel against the Queen."[44]

It was at this point--in the mid-1870's--that one section of the followers of Sayyid Aḥmad Shahīd who held extreme Wahhabi views, particularly on the matter of taqlīd, organized themselves into a sect known as the Ahl-i- Ḥadīth. While Sayyid Aḥmad had not taken an uncompromising attitude about taqlīd and had urged that his followers not become sectarian to the point of creating ill-will with other Muslims, the Aḥl-i-Ḥadīth as his descendants became involved in petty theological controversies. From the outset, they put pressure on the Government to discontinue the use of the term "Wahhābī" in referring to them in official correspondence. In urging this, the Ahl-i-Ḥadīth wished to disassociate themselves from the more militant Arab reform movement of the eighteenth century as well as from the more militant programme carried

out by Aḥmad Shahīd. They succeeded in doing so in 1883.[45]

Theologically speaking, the Ahl-i-Ḥadīth and their ʿulamāʾ rejected all schools of law and theology in favour of

> Belief in God, His books, His prophets, and His angels as enjoined in the Qurʾan. The belief in God was an indivisible totality embracing all His attributes mentioned in the Qurʾan and the hadis "without modification, selection, suspension, symbolization, or intellectualization."[46]

Although they rejected the speculative excesses of Sufism, they accepted the ṣūfī doctrine of mystical illumination. In law, they accepted the entire body of prophetic Ḥadīth while rejecting any attempt by modernist scholars of ʿAlīgarh to reevaluate the genuineness of the material. Only al-Bukhārī or Muslim were capable of making such judgments properly. Rational theological and legal studies after the manner of the Muʿtazilah were considered as bidʿah and the opposite of acceptable sunnah.

Ethically speaking, the life of a pious Muslim in the eyes of these ʿulamāʾ is one of conforming obedience (ittibāʾ) to the life of the Prophet "to the point of absolute self-identification with it." The three ways to deeper understanding of one's religious life come through Islām, īmān and iḥsān, a growth in religiousness which can come only when one follows the ḥadīth of the prophet and studies it closely after committing himself to the Qurʾān and the Sunnah. One result of this orientation, as well as the Ahl-i-Ḥadīth opposition to modernism, was an emphasis

on determinism, pessimism, and a sensitivity to pain and evil in this life and a looking forward to the retribution of the life to come.[47]

One spokesman for the movement, Ṣiddīq Ḥaṣan Khān, read into the history of Islām a continuous series of anarchic upheavals each of which had taken Islām farther and farther away "from the perfections of the days when the Prophet lived on this earth, the golden age of humanity...."[48] Only a final and inevitable annihilation on the Day of Judgment was left for the bulk of unpious Muslims among whom Ṣiddīq numbered the Mahdī of the Sudan, Mīrzā Ghulām Aḥmad of Qādiyān, Shiblī, Amīr ʿAlī, Sir Sayyīd Aḥmad Khān and the poet, Ḥalī.[49]

Despite their horror of anarchy and their attachment to piety and peace, the Ahl-i-Ḥadīth continued to uphold the doctrine of jihād particularly as an act of piety and without modern rationalizations or justifications. According to Ṣiddīq

> It cannot be waged against a Muslim ruler. It is beneficent only when it is intended to propagate Islam,....It can only be waged in absolute obedience to the reigning caliph.[50]

The role of Mawlawī Abū Saʿīd Muḥammad Ḥusayn of Batāla, Gūrdāspūr, Panjāb, as a polemicist and spokesman for the Ahl-i-Ḥadīth is also significant for our study. A neighbor to Ghulām Aḥmad at Qādiyān, Batāla being only some eleven miles away, Ḥusayn was an early supporter of Aḥmad as reformer, but a violent opponent of Aḥmad as Messiah and mahdī. Similarly,

he used the pages of his irregular publication, Ishā ʿat-i-Sunnah,[51] to speak out in opposition to the Ahl-i-Qurʾān, another breakaway Islamic sect, and, of course, the Āryā Samāj. The Mawlawī's "Treatise on Jihād" published at Lāhōr in 1887 is a valuable document for the study of polemics and communal tensions over the jihād issue during the decades that followed its composition.[52]

One other aspect of the Ahl-i-Ḥadīth was their conflicts and trials over the issue of their right to worship in Ḥanafī mosques. The issues raised in these trials were over such matters as whether or not "āmīn" should be said in a low voice or a loud one during prayers and their insistence on the use of "rafāʾ-yadayn, the raising of hands to one's ears on the occasion of going into ruku in the course of prayers."[53] The text transcript of one of the trials held in Allāhabād in 1893 traces through the arguments upholding the right of the Ahl-i-Ḥadith to worship in "Sunnī" mosques in spite of "deviations" from standardized forms of worship. This judicial decision, clearly the result of British justice with its emphasis on religious freedom and toleration, was significant in its implications for later conflicts between the Aḥmadīyah and the Sunnī ʿulamāʾ, and in more recent times in the Pākistānī Court of Inquiry decision of Mr. Justice Muḥammad Munīr upholding the rights of Aḥmadīs to be Muslims in spite of the demands of the Majlis-i-Aḥrār-i-Islām that they be declared a non-Muslim minority in Pākistān.

VI

In the midst of these responses Mirzā Ghulām Aḥmad and the Aḥmadīyah movement emerged. Contrasted to them, we find Aḥmadīyah a rural, middle-class movement not primarily concerned with education or social reform. While the movement was aimed towards a literate, land-owning class, in its earliest years it was centered in Gūrdāspūr District whose largest town, Batāla, had a population of only 10,000. Its founder, Ghulām Aḥmad, though he travelled to Dehli and Lāhōr on a few occasions, seldom visited cities larger than Siālkōṭ, Ludhiāna or Amritsar. During his life Aḥmad was not related to well-known religious teachers, sūfīs or any major Islamic university.

Aḥmadīyah was significantly different from the responses of Sir Sayyid Aḥmad Khān, the founders of Dē'ōband and the founders of the Faraṇghi Maḥal at Lucknow. While each of these responded to the Islamic condition and the British presence in a somewhat different manner, each chose the route of establishing new religious educational institutions. In this sense, they were educating men to perform established Islamic functions whether in a liberal or conservative context for the existing Islamic community. While Aḥmadīyah did establish schools as it became more and more of a separated sect within Islām, its goal, especially after the death of Aḥmad, was that of missionary outreach to non-Muslims through

a combination of reasoned arguments and dogmatic claims based on their own interpretation of Qur'ān and Ḥadīth.

Among the varied Islamic responses of the late nineteenth century, Aḥmadīyah seems most closely to resemble the Ahl-i-Ḥadīth. Although the latter had its origins in the jihād-oriented Waḥhābī movement, by the mid-1880's the Ahl-i-Ḥadīth had eschewed its past, disclaiming the name "Wahhābī" as being as distasteful as "Mīrzāī" was to Aḥmadīs. Muḥammad Ḥusayn's "Treatise on Jihād" made the Ahl-i-Ḥadīth position on jihād almost identical to that of Ghulām Aḥmad. As schoolmates and later as fellow reformers of Islām, Muḥammad Ḥusayn and Ghulām Aḥmad at first appeared to be supporting similar goals. The favourable reviews of Barāhīn-i-Aḥmadīyah which had appeared in Ishā'at-i-Sunnah indicated a rapprochement between the two men and their followers (to the extent that Aḥmad had a movement before 1890) at least until 1884. After Aḥmad declared that he had received revelations, claimed to be masīḥ mawʿūd, and began making prophecies as well as deviating from accepted Islamic doctrine, Muḥammad Ḥusayn and the Ahl-i-Ḥadīth opposed Aḥmad, identifying themselves more and more with Sunnī Islām. After 1891, and especially after 1896, Ahmadis found themselves further isolated from the mainstream of Islam. The Ahl-i-Ḥadīth may have agreed with them on the issues of jihād, loyalty and the question of Indian Muslim allegiance to the Turkish sulṭān, as did Sir Sayyid Aḥmad Khān, but there was no agreement on or support of

the other issues.

A summary or further analysis of Aḥmad's voluminous writings over and above what will be examined in the context of the major events of his life and ministry would go beyond the scope of this study. While each of his books centers on different issues and represents variant phases of Aḥmad's life and thought, his style can only be considered repetitious and argumentative when analysed by an outside observer. By selecting a representative sampling of Aḥmad's Urdū works--theological, pro-governmental, anti-Āryā Samājī, arguing against the Sikhs--one should be able to see adequately the kind of approach Aḥmad was using both in his own justification for defending Islām and in attacking the "enemies" of the faith.

It may be of greater significance for this study to attempt to draw out the reasons why, over and above the claims and teachings of Aḥmad, Aḥmadīyah found itself, whether in 1898, 1913 or 1934, forced to engage in polemics and controversy adding to the already tense situation in the Panjāb. There is ample evidence to indicate, first of all, that British rule in the Panjāb, first under the Lawrences but also throughout the life of Aḥmad, was generally insensitive to the situation of both the individual religious communities and of the interaction among the communities. There also can be little doubt that the Panjāb Government showed at least tacit favouritism to Christian missionaries spreading their faith and activities

throughout the province during the late nineteenth century. Although Press Statements show that the Government sometimes found such missionary publications as Nūr-al-Afshān of Ludhiāna[54] to be printing objectionable materials, the very existence of such a paper offering continual insults to Muslims and Hindūs alike was guaranteed to create a poor climate of opinion throughout the Panjāb. Similarly the activities of converted Indians generally created special tensions. Henry Martyn Clark, adopted son of an English missionary, ʿAbd-allāh ʿAṣim and Imād al-Dīn "black sheep" cousin of Ghulām Aḥmad were prime examples of those missionaries who, having seen the true light, now went out of their way to dispute, debate and take to court Aḥmad and others who dared stand up in opposition.

If we compound these factors with the obvious discrimination against Muslims by the Government both in education and employment, as compared with Hindūs, in a province whose Muslim population surpassed the Hindūs, and read the Census and Provincial reports dealing with religious breakdown, we have proof enough not only of a general governmental prejudice against Indians but of a particular one against Muslims.

The growing frustration of Hindūs in the late nineteenth century existed not only with the decadent religious structure of the community but also because of the increasing sensitivity of Hindūs to interference by Government in satī and caste practices. This had come despite professions that

they would not interfere with the religious practices of Indians. Certainly pressures for reform of satī and caste had occurred in the early nineteenth century by such intellectual Hindūs as Rammohun Roy and Debendrenath Tagore, but these were hardly representative of the masses of the people. A broad based religious reform movement did not begin until almost fifty years after Roy's death when Swāmī Dayānand organized the Āryā Samāj as the first major Hindū reform movement to succeed in the Panjāb. By its bold theological claims and programme for social reform, the Āryā Samāj stood up against the growing influence of Christian missionaries, the teachings of Islām, and the "idolatrious" practices of Vaisnava and Saivite Hindūs. The first generation of Āryās went way beyond the aspirations of Dayānand in founding many schools and colleges for the propagation of the Vedic and Hindī traditions and by entering the arena of controversy with Muslims over the issue of cow slaughter. Less than twenty years after Dayānand's death, Samājīs had entered politics also, but had split into two factions as well. It was from the more radical of these that Lēkh Rām emerged as a leader, using every opportunity to bait Muslims in general and Aḥmad in particular over his claims to prophecy.

The death of Lēkh Rām in March, 1897, and the subsequent reaction throughout the Muslim, Hindū, Sikh and Christian communities as reflected in the press reports was perhaps the all-time high point of Aḥmadī involvement in communal tensions.

Direct Aḥmadī involvement in the violent disturbances of later years would have run contrary to professions of loyalty and claims to participate only in "verbal jihād." Although concerned about the state of communal relations in 1897, tensions of which subsided by a combination of positive Indian leadership and Government intervention, the Government attitude towards these interrelations was far more laissez-faire in 1897 than it would be during the Aḥrār controversy of 1934-36.

The level at which Aḥmad had attacked Āryā Samāj teachings in his early work, Barāhīn-i-Aḥmadīyah, could be described as rational and intellectual in its approach. When Lēkh Rām began his ad hominem attacks on Aḥmad during his visit to Qādiyān in 1885 and again in 1893, while publishing books which could only lead to insulting the feelings of Muslims, Aḥmad's attack on the doctrine of niyog in 1895 also could only have been written to appeal to a much more emotional level of Hindū sensibility even if he may have attempted rational arguments to prove the superiority of the Islamic position on marital relations over the Āryā one. Similarly, Aḥmad's critical comments on the activities of the Samāj at Qādiyān as late as 1907 indicated clearly that the level of counter-activities was not the least rational or reasonable.

In return, Aḥmad's constant professions of loyalty to the Government endeared him neither to the more militant Āryās, Sikhs, Muslims nor members of the Indian National Congress. Such professions, both by Aḥmad himself, and by his

successors, not only pointed continuously to the oft-cited record of family service but as well to the non-involvement of the movement in political matters. Thus they claimed that Aḥmadīyah was solely a religious movement bringing a renewed religious truth in the person and message of Ghulām Aḥmad. Aḥmad himself rejected the idea that Government should interfere in such inter-religious strife as had occurred in the publication of the Christian tract "Ummahāt al-Mu'minīn," and asserted that Muslims should stand strong in defense of their faith, through arguments and the publication of counter tracts instead. Such was not the attitude of the Qādiyānīs in 1934 when the pamphlet warfare waged by the Aḥrār and their allies villified Aḥmad and his successors. Although the Aḥmadīs answered and further charged the atmosphere with tracts of their own, they were certainly supportive of Government attempts to suppress Aḥrār speeches, tracts, and meetings which threatened the security of the community at Qādiyān.

VII

In his "Introductory Essay on Communalism" written in the early 1940's, W. C. Smith strongly indicted the British India Office policy for creating the communal situation in India.[55] Stressing economic and social factors as predominating causes in the communal tensions throughout north India from

1860-1940, he placed the blame on the British for seeking to keep the Muslim middle-class from gaining too much power vis à vis the Hindūs. He wrote,

> It is commonplace now to recognize that the communal antagonisms of India's middle class are due to the British imperial policy of "divide and rule"...again we must insist that that policy could not have been so successful had not the economic conditions been conducive to its success. In fact, they were remarkably conducive to division, antagonism, and friction; for they were capitalist conditions.[56]

While such an analysis contained clearly Marxist overtones, and while it did not want to de-emphasise the importance of religious passion as an element in communal disturbances, it saw the economic factors as most important and coupled these with a "paranoid" view of the British operating in a calculated manner in order to maintain success in their rule.

VIII

It was in the midst of this frame of reference that we will locate the Aḥmadīyah movement in this study. Neither the founder of the movement, Ghulām Aḥmad, nor his son, the second Khalīfah, should be labeled as militant communalists, for they were not. Both must be seen as having taken a middle position. They represented the interests of Islām and of their own sectarian version of Islām in their life efforts. In doing so, they often stood firm against Āryā Samājīs and other Hindū militants. But, on the other side, they stood

firm against anti-Government Muslims such as the Aḥrār or against Christian missionaries whom they believed were offending Muslim feelings.

Our study, then, will begin by examining the life and work of Ghulām Aḥmad in the context of his times and will then proceed to a more detailed examination of specific events within the context of his life and later during two crucial periods of Aḥmadīyah history, 1908-1914 and 1934-1936. Where we touch upon other events or other years, we will do so only in a cursory manner for the copious materials which have been the research resources of the study go well beyond what we can discuss in detail.

NOTES

[1]We note here that the question of whether or not the Aḥmadīyah movement is truly Islamic has been a matter of great debate. From an historical perspective as well as an Aḥmadī one, however, the movement is clearly Indian and Islamic. Aspects of this controversy will be discussed below in Chapters 3 and 6.

[2]The term "Hindū", which is often applied to all Indian religious phenomena not Buddhist, Jain, Islamic, Parsee, etc., is misleading in that it tends to imply, to the Westerner at least, one specific, unitary religious movement. As has been particularly noted by Professor Wilfred Cantwell Smith, the term was probably first coined by the militant Maratha, Shivājī about the year 1645 to apply to a process of crystallization going on in the "Islamic", "Sikh" and "Hindū" communities during the seventeenth century. The full sense of the term "Hindū" did not become developed until such nineteenth century movements as the Āryā Samāj and the Ramakrishna Mission. For further discussion of this "crystallization" during the Mughal period see three unpublished papers prepared for the seminar in History of Religions held December 2, 1968 at the Center for the Study of World Religions, Harvard University. These are: W. C. Smith, "The Crystallization of Religious Communities in Mughal India"; William A. Graham, Jr., "The Devotional Movement and the Subsequent Crystallization of Religious Communities in Mughal India: Some Considerations"; Spencer Lavan, "The Crystallization Process in the Religious Life of Mughal India: Some Reflections on the Islamic Dimension."

[3]The most significant are: James T. Addison, "The Ahmadiya Movement and Its Western Propaganda," Harvard Theological Review, Vol. XXII, 1929, pp. 1-32; L. Bouvat, "Chronique et Notes Bibliographique: Les Ahmadiyya de Qadian," Journal Asiatique, CCXIII, 1928, pp. 159-181; S. E. Brush, "Ahmadiyyat in Pakistan," Muslim World, XLV, April, 1955, pp. 145-171; Humphrey Fisher, "The Concept of Evolution in Ahmadiyyah Thought," Muslim World, XLIX, October, 1959, pp. 275-286; W. R. W. Gardner, "The Ahmadiya Movement," Muslim World, X, 1920, pp. 59-64; H. D. Griswold, "Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, the Mehdi Messiah of Qadian," Ludhiana, 1902; H. D. Griswold, "The Ahmadiya Movement," Muslim World, II, October, 1912, pp. 373-379; H. T. Houtsma, "Ahmadiya," Revue du Monde Musulman, I, 1907, pp. 533-534, 535-576; W. C. Smith, "Ahmadiyya," E. I., 2, Leiden, 1960, H. V. W. Stanton, "The

Ahmadiya Movement," Muslim World, XV, January, 1925, pp. 10-20; H. A. Walter, "Qadiani," E. R. E., X, J. Hastings (ed.), pp. 530-531; H. A. Walter, "The Ahmadiyah Movement Today," Muslim World, VI, London, 1916, pp. 66-78.

Among the books discussing the movement one would include Kenneth Cragg, Contemporary Counsels in Islam, Edinburgh, 1965, with a chapter on "Ahmadiyya"; J. N. Farquhar, Modern Religious Movements in India, Munshiram Manchorlal, Delhi reprint, 1969, pp. 137-148; H. J. Fisher, Ahmadiyyah: A Study in Contemporary Islam on the West African Coast, Oxford University Press, 1963; Stephen Fuchs, Rebellious Prophets, Asia Publishing House, London, 1965, with sections on the nature of Indian prophets and Ahmadiyah; L. Bevan Jones, The People of the Mosque, Association Press, Calcutta, 1959; pp. 218-238; Hendrik Kraemer, World Cultures and World Religions: The Coming Dialogue, Lutterworth Press, London, 1960, pp. 266-268; M. Mujeeb, The Indian Muslims, McGill University Press, 1967, pp. 543-544; W. C. Smith, Modern Islam in India, Ashraf Press, Lahore, first edition, 1943 (1963), pp. 339-344; Murray J. Titus, Islam in India and Pakistan, Y. M. C. A. Publishing House, Calcutta, first edition, 1930, revised edition, 1959, pp. 256-271; H. A. Walter, The Ahmadiya Movement, Association Press, Calcutta, 1918.

Relevant background has recently been provided by Norman Gerald Barrier, Punjab Politics and the Disturbances of 1907, unpublished dissertation, Duke University, Ph.D., Durham, N. C., 1966; J. Reid Graham, The Arya Samaj as a Reformation in Hinduism with Special Reference to Caste, Ph.D. dissertation, unpublished, Yale University, New Haven, Conn., 1942; and, Kenneth W. Jones, The Arya Samaj in the Punjab: A Study of Social Reform and Religious Revivalism, 1877-1902, Ph.D. dissertation, unpublished, University of California, Berkeley, Calif., 1966.

[4]See Stephen Fuchs, Rebellious Prophets, op. cit. The possible theory about an Indian prophet which has found no support in either Ahmadī or non-Ahmadī sources was raised by Professor Da'ūd Rahbar of Boston University in a discussion during September, 1968.

[5]Although Dayānand Saraswatī, founder of the Āryā Samāj movement, was originally from Gujarat and first started his movement in Bombay, the first really successful chapter of his group was founded in Lāhōr in 1875. See below, Chapter 4, for more detail.

[6]Ernst Troeltsch, The Social Teachings of the Christian Church, Vol. II, Harper Torchbook edition, New York, 1960.

[7]Joachim Wach, The Sociology of Religion, University of Chicago Press, 1944; and Max Weber, The Sociology of Religion, translated by E. Fischoff, Beacon Press, Boston, 1963.

[8]Troeltsch, op. cit., p. 993.

[9]Ibid.

[10]Ibid.

[11]I. H. Qureshi, The Struggle for Pakistan, University of Karachi, 1965, pp. 18-19.

[12]S. Moinul Haq, "Syed Ahmad Khan," in History of the Freedom Movement, II:2, p. 451ff. ʿAzīz Aḥmad, in his Islamic Modernism in India and Pakistan, Oxford University Press, 1967, uses the term "loyalism" in describing Sayyid Ahmad; W. C. Smith, op. cit., speaks of "The Movement in Favour of Contemporary British Culture"; J. N. Farquhar, op. cit., places him under the heading "Movements Favouring Vigorous Reform"; Titus, op. cit., p. 207, refers to "The Dawn of a New Day."

[13]M. S. Jain, The Aligarh Movement, Sri Ram Mehra and Co., Agra, 1965, p. 10.

[14]Ibid., p. 11.

[15]Ibid., pp. 11-12, from the Asbāb, p. 4.

[16]Ibid., p. 17.

[17]Tahdhīb al-Akhlāq, Fadluddin, Lahore, 1313 A.H., p. 163, quoted in Mujeeb, p. 448.

[18]A. Aḥmad, Islamic Modernism, p. 37.

[19]S. M. Haq, "The Aligarh Movement" (Educational), in History of the Freedom Movement, II:2, pp. 499-501.

[20]Jain, op. cit., pp. 111-113.

[21]The Times, London, November 12, 1888, quoted in Qureshi, p. 25.

[22]For a definition and discussion of the concept "communalism", see W. C. Smith, Modern Islam in India, p. 173ff. For a fuller discussion of the concept, see below p.

[23]S. M. Haq, op. cit., p. 475.

[24]Jain, pp. 127-128.

[25]Aḥmad, pp. 103-104; see also Z. Faruqi, The Deoband School and the Demand for Pakistan, Asia Publishing House, Bombay, 1963, p. 22ff.

[26]Aḥmad, p. 104.

[27]Faruqi, p. 22ff.

[28]Aḥmad, p. 107.

[29]Ibid. The text of the debate and disputation is in "Guft-o gūyi mazhabī," the commentary on Nanōtāwī's disputations with Hindū and Christian missionaries held in 1871.

[30]Aḥmad, pp. 107-108.

[31]Ibid., p. 108. cf. Z. Faruqi, op. cit.

[32]W. C. Smith, p. 336.

[33]Aḥmad, p. 109.

[34]Ibid., p. 111.

[35]Ibid., p. 113.

[36]The sources available in English include Muhammad Husain, "The Successors of Sayyid Ahmad Shahid," in History of the Freedom Movement, Vol. 2, part 2, pp. 366-389; Qeyamuddin Ahmad, The Wahabi Movement in India, Firma K. L. Mukhopadhyay, Calcutta, 1966; 'Azīz Aḥmad, op. cit., pp. 113-122; and W. C. Smith, op. cit., pp. 177-180.

[37]M. Ḥusain, p. 366.

[38]Q. Aḥmad, The Wahabi Movement, p. 139.

[39]Ḥusain, pp. 367-368.

[40]Q. Aḥmad, p. 221.

[41]In M. Husain's article and Q. Ahmad. See also Muin-ud-Din Ahmad Khan, Selections from Bengal Government Records on Wahhabi Trials (1863-1870), Asiatic Society of Pakistan, Dacca, 1961.

[42]Ḥusain, p. 386.

[43]Q. Aḥmad, pp. 309-310.

[44]Sir William Hunter, Our Indian Mussalmans.

[45]Ḥusain, p. 386. See also the fascinating document, Home Department, Judicial Proceedings, December, 1886 on the "Discontinuance of the use of the term 'Wahabi' in official correspondence," items no. 35-37, which indicates that the use of the term was discontinued after December 3, 1886.

[46]Azīz Aḥmad, p. 115.

[47]Ibid., pp. 116-117.

[48]Ibid., p. 118.

[49]Ibid., pp. 118-119.

[50]Ibid., p. 119.

[51]The name of this publication sometimes appears as Ashaatu-i-Sunnat during the period 1881-1887 with a continuing circulation during that period of 350 copies. The original edition was published "in answer to the Honorable Saiyid Ahmad Khan's Tahzibu-i-Akhlaq." The period from 1899-1905 is referred to as "Ishat-ul-Sunnah, published at Islamia Press, Lahore" with a circulation of 400. Muhammad Husain of Batala is editor and publisher for both although the latter version is described as concerned with "religious and social news."

[52]Azīz Aḥmad, p. 120; see also Mawlawī Abū Sa'īd Muḥammad Ḥusain, "Iqtisād fī Masā'il al-jihād" ("Treatise on Jihād"), Victoria Press, Lahore, 1887; discussed further in Chapter 3.

[53]M. Ḥusain, p. 387 in History of Freedom Movement.

[54]For more details, see discussion in Chapter 3.

[55]W. C. Smith, op. cit., pp. 173-216.

[56]Ibid., p. 197.

CHAPTER 2

THE PANJĀB DURING THE LIFETIME OF MĪRZĀ GHULĀM AḤMAD

Mīrzā Ghulām Aḥmad was probably born on February 13, 1835 in the village of Qādiyān, Gūrdāspūr district, Panjāb, India.[1] He was the son of Mīrzā Ghulām Murtāḍā and his wife, Charāgh Bībī who had given birth to one daughter, Murād Bībī and one son, Ghulām Qādir (who died in 1883 at the age of 55) as well as several children who died in their infancy.[2] Ghulām Aḥmad was a second twin, who was born shortly after a sister who died a few days later.[3]

All Aḥmadīyah sources emphasize the ancestry of Ghulām Aḥmad. Dard has particularly traced this lineage out in great detail depicting Aḥmad's as "a very distinguished family."[4] Ghulām Aḥmad was a descendent of Ḥājjī Barlas, an uncle of Taymūr. This would make Aḥmad a Turk by race although in India he was considered to be of the Mughal line. One member of the family, Mīrzā Hadī Bēg, was the first to come to India in the time of Bābar, "or perhaps slightly later, on account of domestic dissensions, or an affliction."[5] Coming with an entourage from Samarqānd, he was accorded his rightful place in Mughal society, was given a jagīr over which he was appointed Qādī but was also permitted to found a village of his own. He called this place, about seventy miles from Lāhōr and nine miles north east of the River Bēas, Islāmpūr.

Over time, the name became Islāmpūr Qāḍī because of Haḍī Bēg's position as Qāḍī, hence it eventually was called Qādiyān.[6]

The descendents of Haḍī Bēg remained in control of the area until the time of Ghulām Aḥmad's grandfather, Mīrzā ʿAṭā Muḥammad. Between 1800-1802 the Sikhs of the neighboring areas joined together to take over the jagīr leaving only the village in the hands of ʿAṭā Muḥammad. In 1802, the Sikhs of Ramgarh under Jassa Singh took over the village, damaging it considerably and forcing the leading Muslims to leave. Although the generation of ʿAṭā Muḥammad (while dispossessed of their holdings) remained in hostile relations with the Sikhs of the area, Mīrzā Ghulām Murtāḍā, the father of Ghulām Aḥmad was able to return to Qādiyān in 1818 where he and his brothers joined the army of Ranjīt Singh. During this period they participated in the capture of towns along the border of Kashmīr as well as the city of Peshāwar in 1823.[7]

During the next decade Ghulām Murtāḍā served in various capacities at the court of Ranjīt Singh. The latter became so impressed with the service rendered that in 1834 or 1835, Ghulām Murtāḍā had five villages of his ancestral estate restored to him. Dard, in a style typical of the early chapters of his biography, reports that

> This was about the time of the birth of the future prophet. Thus the very birth of Ahmad, the illustrious reformer of the world, blessed his parents and his family in a wonderful manner. Light came and darkness vanished. The days of adversity were turned into peace and prosperity. They had a two-fold reason for gratification: they were

restored to peace and they came to enjoy religious freedom.[8]

The death of Ranjīt Singh in 1839 brought an end to Sikh power in a major part of the Panjāb. "During the next ten years British rule was extended to the whole of the country, ushering in the most peaceful and prosperous era in the history of India."[9]

This sentence, written more than a century later, is typical of the Aḥmadīyah attitude towards the British rule in India which will often be illustrated in this study. At the same time Aḥmadī writers have been negative about the previous Sikh period generally considered oppressive and destructive to the Muslims of the Panjāb as well as the period in which Muslims participated in political action against the British--both 1857 and after 1912. One example often cited by such Aḥmadī writers as Dard to prove the high esteem that the British held for the family of Ghulām Aḥmad are passages from the book The Punjab Chiefs by Sir Lepel Griffin and Colonel Massy which discussed Aḥmad's family ancestry and its loyalty to the British.[10]

II

Before turning to the details of Ghulām Aḥmad's biography, it may be useful to examine something of the background of the Panjāb during the formative and largely unknown years of

his early life. The British annexed the Panjāb in 1848; and although a formal census was not taken there before 1881, the population make-up may have been virtually the same at that time. Statistics for 1881 indicate that there were 10,336,150 Muslims (52% of a total population of 18,850,437), 7,130,528 Hindūs (38.2%), and 1,121,004 Sikhs (6%).[11] The census also pointed out that the Muslim population of the Panjāb was by far the largest Muslim population of any Indian province, by percentage, although the numerical population of Muslims in Bengāl in 1881 exceeded 22,000,000. In the descriptive essay about "The Religions of the People" on the previous page, the author of the census published for the official record these comments about the Muslims of the Panjāb reflective of a bureaucratic British attitude of the post-1857 period:

> It is curious how markedly for evil is the influence which conversion to even the most impure form of Mohomedanism has upon the character of the Panjāb villager; how invariably it fills him with false pride and conceit, disinclines him for honest toil and renders him more extravagant, less thrifty, and less well-to-do than his Hindu neighbor.... The Musalman seems to think that his duty is completely performed when he has proclaimed his belief in one God, and that it is the business of Providence to see to the rest; and when he has his stomach empty he has a strong tendency to blame the Government, and to be exceedingly discontented with everybody but himself. His Hindu brother asks little either of his gods or his governors save that they should let him alone, but he rises early and late takes rest, and contentedly eats the bread of carefulness. I speak of those parts of the Province where the two religions are to be found side by side among the peasantry. Where either prevails to the exclusion

> of the other, the characteristics of the people may be, and probably are, tribal rather than due to any difference of religion.[12]

If such a statement appeared as an "official" British attitude in 1883, what, then, can we say of British rule in the Panjāb and the place of Muslims in that rule during Ghulam Aḥmad's early life?

The Sikhs, who had been the principal ruling power before the advent of the British, represented a small minority of the provincial population, centered principally at Lāhōr and Amritsar. In East Panjāb, the Hindūs tended to dominate, while in the West, the Muslims were a strong majority.[13] The period from 1846 to 1853 was one in which the British consolidated their power in the Panjāb. The leadership was in the hands of John and Henry Lawrence whose crucial role began at the signing of the Treaty of Lāhōr, March 9, 1846.[14] Each brother had served Her Majesty for some years in various posts in India and both

> before taking service in the Punjab, had come in close contact with the peasants and people of India. Both had dived deep into their indigenous institutions and administrative needs....John would never care to fathom the feelings of the inhabitants, (however,) while "Henry would never ride rough-shod over native prejudices even for the good of the natives themselves."[15] John fervently believed that good government was an ample substitute for self-government.[16]

Many Panjāb historians and officers retired from Panjāb service have described the philosophy and functioning of the "Lawrence system" or the "Panjāb school" of administration.[17]

> The most important principles during the years following annexation were three: patriarchal rule by an all-powerful district officer, strict religious impartiality, and self-conscious defense of the village community, the landed aristocracy and the peasant cultivators as the base of continued British rule.[18]

The maintenance of public order was foremost in the mind of the ruling body. The zamīndārs and aristocracy could generally be counted on, while village communities whose structure had remained intact generally proved no problem. Thus, it was the possibility of religious disturbances that posed the most widespread danger to public order.

> Information on earlier Hindu-Muslim relations is unfortunately sketchy, but apparently Sikh rule in the central and north-eastern Punjab and Muslim rule in the south-east Punjab had created suspicion and conflict between the two Punjab communities. The communal discord lay just below the surface of everyday life and erupted sporadically in the form of rioting and economic boycott.[19]

The concept of "religious impartiality" did not mean that the Panjāb government refused to intervene in communal quarrels. It meant, rather, that in its open policies, it refused to show preference to any one of the indigenous religious communities. In an effort to prevent bloodshed, district officers would often intervene as referees but "while the government preferred the former, officers were never reluctant to call in the police or the army to control and stamp out religious unrest."[20]

The retirement of John Lawrence as Lieutenant Governor in 1859 found the so-called "Lawrence system" of administration

firmly entrenched in the Panjāb. Although this administration and its successors had attempted a rule "based upon simple rugged justice and protection of the zamindar," events in the years after 1860 tended "to support and accentuate the patriarchal aspects of Punjab administration."[21] The famous 1872 incident when 49 fanatical members of the Kūkā sect of the Sikhs were executed by being shot from a cannon without orders from Lāhōr was an extreme but not untypical example of a show of force in response to lawlessness. Although there was a delay in bringing the responsible officer to justice, a change in governmental attitude from the early days of the Lawrences was ardent when the officer responsible was dismissed from his post.[22] While the Government of India sought to standardize administration and justice throughout the sub-continent and separate executive from judicial functions in order to clarify roles and responsibilities, the Government of the Panjāb "resisted the changes, and in doing so acquired a reputation for fighting the Indian government over the smallest issues." The Panjāb authorities frequently won, so that the province in 1900 had many judicial and revenue features different from the rest of India.[23]

Another major aspect of British rule during the second half of the nineteenth century which must be accounted for in examining the background of the Panjāb was the introduction of European education. A primary purpose for this was, of course, the great need for native assistance in subsidiary

government posts. The British could not continually import a total staff from England. In the race for education and employment in the new governmental structure, "the Hindu commercial castes and the Brāhmins far out-paced the Muslims" during the decade of the 1860's.[24] The whole Muslim process of education throughout the Panjāb had remained virtually unchanged for centuries, oriented primarily towards classical and Islamic studies, with education beyond the village school directed and conducted in the disciplines of Persian and classical literature rather than western subjects and English.

In the decades that followed the dominance of Hindū commercial castes and Brāhmins grew greater with respect to their success in higher education, particularly those areas requiring English such as law, medicine or engineering.

> The tables of the 1891 census also indicate that they monopolized literacy (89%) and English literacy (82%) among Punjabi Hindus...although (they) numbered only 10% of all males, they contained in their ranks 57% of all literate Punjabis and 55% of all English-speaking Punjabis.[25]

The disadvantageous situation of the Panjābī Muslims in an age of educational revolution is patently clear.

A third factor which played an important role in the background of this study was the arrival of substantial numbers of Christian missionaries to the Panjāb. This factor added to the increase of an upper caste Hindū and, to a lesser extent, Muslim intelligentsia became a major source of tension among these newly emancipated Panjābīs. While we have indicated

above[26] the numerous Islamic responses to the British and Christian presence in various parts of India, we have not yet examined the effects of the missionary thrust on the Panjāb. There, the Church Missionary Society took the lead in establishing educational and evangelical programs. "By 1870, Christian street preachers and newspapers were energetically trying to convert the 'heathen' by destroying their faith in the old religious and traditional social values."[27]

Although there were many Hindū responses to all of the factors present in the late nineteenth century Panjāb, the two major organized ones were the Brahmo Samāj and the Āryā Samāj. The former, open and positive in its response to British and Christian contributions to Indian life had originated in Calcutta under the leadership of Rammohun Roy and Debendranath Tagore during the 1820's and was not transplanted to the Panjāb until 1863.[28] For various reasons, the Bengālī Brahmo Samāj did not transplant well in Panjābī soil. "The Brahmo Samaj failed to influence the vast majority of educated Punjabis and the student in Lahore colleges. These turned increasingly to a second reform association, the Arya Samaj."[29]

Because the Āryā Samāj had such a major role to play in the Christian-Muslim-Hindū polemics of the 1890's and early twentieth century, and as such is deserving of detailed attention, we will leave consideration of the movement to a later chapter. It was not organized in Lāhōr, however, until

1875, and did not enter militantly onto the political scene until 1894. The Āryās primary emphasis was on a reformed Hinduism, monotheistic, founded on the authority of the Vedas, simplified in ritual and openly rejecting traditional caste structures. Its appeal to the Panjābī Hindū intelligentsia was well stated in Prakash Tandon's autobiography, Punjabi Century where he wrote that

> To our new professional class it provided a western social reorientation combined with a simple Vedic belief and ritual. Its opposition to orthodoxy and idol worship, and its revival of Vedic ritual in modern form, without temple and priest, made a direct appeal to the Punjab intelligentsia.[30]

Although the Āryā Samājīs became outspoken opponents of Mīrzā Ghulām Aḥmad during his years of leadership at Qādiyān, they clearly had no role to play in his thought or life prior to the mid-1880's.

What few Muslim reform organizations came into existence in the Panjāb before the emergence of Ghulām Aḥmad were generally restricted to the upper class aristocracy. The most influential of these groups was the Lāhōr Anjumān-i-Islāmīah which was originally founded to protect Muslim religious endowments but when taken over by Barkat ʿAlī, a retired government servant in 1877, its emphasis shifted towards reform in the spirit of Sir Sayyid Aḥmad Khān.[31] In 1886, a more activist segment of the Anjumān-i-Islāmīah broke off to form the Anjumān-i-Himāyat-i-Islām (Society for the Defense of Islām). This group organized its own schools, emphasised

learning of English, opened education to women and also stressed the reform ideas of Sir Sayyīd.[32]

To go into much more detail on the Panjābī background during the early years of the life of Ghulām Aḥmad would be to take us too far afield. But, these background observations are surely not irrelevant to the emergence of a religious figure whose personality, writings and organizational talents were most active between the years 1880 and 1908; for Ghulām Aḥmad cannot be seen as something separate from the context in which he and his movement emerged.

III

What do we know of the immediate surroundings in which Ghulām Aḥmad grew up? The Gūrdāspūr district within the Lāhōr division of undivided Panjāb had an area of some 1889 square miles, bounded on the north by Jammū, on the west by the Siālkōṭ district, on the south-west by Amritsar, and on the south, southeast by the Bēas river.[33] The district had eleven towns and some 2244 villages. The population of the district in 1881 was 823,695 while by 1901, it was 943,922. As such it placed sixth in population among the districts of the Panjāb while placing 26th in area. Thus, we find a fairly large population crowded into a relatively small area during the principal years of Ghulām Aḥmad's leadership at Qādiyān. In 1884, the largest town of the district

was Batāla with a population of 24,281, and the only town of more than 10,000. Batāla was only eleven miles from Qādiyān.[34]

American Presbyterian missionaries organized themselves in Siālkōṭ in 1874 under a Rev. Gordon, while closer by in Batāla, the Batāla Church Mission and the more important Church Missionary Society established a high school in 1878. In 1901, 4,198 native Christians were registered throughout Gūrdāspūr as against a Muslim population of 463,371 (49%), 380,636 Hindūs (40%) and 91,756 Sikhs (10%). The significance and threat of the Christian missionaries in the district was far in excess of actual strength in numbers of converts.[35]

Although this data is more relevant to the later years of Ghulām Aḥmad than to those of his childhood, it gives us some picture of the religious and population make-up of the immediate area in which he lived, giving further evidence of the potential for communal conflict which was to flare up in later years.

IV

The predominance of piety in the personality and life of Ghulām Aḥmad is evident both from the biography of Dard and that of his son, Mīrzā Bashīr al-Dīn, Maḥmūd Aḥmad, from the earliest days of his life. Dard presents childhood stories about Aḥmad as an open comparison to those told about the childhood of Jesus.[36] An example of this kind of hagiography

may be seen in the anecdote,

> While he was a mere child he once requested a girl playmate of the same age as himself, to whom he was afterwards affianced, to pray for him that he might 'be granted the grace of prayer.' This yearning for the grace of prayer in his childhood, in a home devoted to worldliness, proved him to possess a heart pure in a wonderful measure and destined to work a mighty change in the world.[37]

In dealing with the issue of the "worldliness" of Ghulām Aḥmad's home, Dard emphasizes the unhappy life of Ghulām Aḥmad's father Ghulām Murtāḍā. The latter spent most of his life and wealth in litigation attempting to recover the lands his father had lost to the Sikhs. Although Ghulām Murtāḍā was unsuccessful in this effort, Aḥmad wrote,

> The disappointment with its consequent sorrow and grief made a malestrom of the life of my father and the sight of the same helped me to work a holy change in my own life, because the misery of his life reminded me of that immaculate life which was free from all worldly turmoils. He still remained master of a few villages and received an amount from the British Government in reward of good services, besides the pension of a certain post he had held....(He) often gave vent to his regret saying, that the pains he had taken for vile worldly preferment, would have served, if the same had been taken for the sake of religion, to make him an eminent saint.[38]

These depressing events of family life which added to the pressure of Aḥmad's father to direct him towards the law courts, may well have provided the impetus already evident in Ghulām Aḥmad's personality to move him in the direction of a life devoted to religious study and leadership. The sources agree that Muslim education even among those of noble

standing was at a lowpoint during the Sikh period. But being of a noble family, he had a tutor engaged for him when he was about seven years old. This tutor was named Faḍl Ilāhī, a resident of Qādiyān, and a Ḥanafī, whose task it was to teach Ghulām Aḥmad the Qur'ān and a few elementary books in Persian.[39] In 1845, a tutor named Faḍl Aḥmad was employed. He came to Qādiyān from Fērōzwālā and was a member of the Ahl-i-Ḥadīth school. "He was a good and pious man and worked hard with his pupil,"[40] especially on Arabic grammar.

At the age of seventeen Aḥmad began his studies with a Shī'ī tutor Gul 'Alī Shāh of Batāla, sometimes at home, sometimes in Batāla. It is interesting to note, according to Dard, that one of Ghulām Aḥmad's Islamic adversaries in later years, Muḥammad Ḥusayn, was a fellow pupil during this period. The year before this period of study, Ghulām Aḥmad had been married to the daughter of his maternal uncle, Ḥurmat Bībī, in a simple ceremony "strictly in accordance with the teachings of Islam." This event stands in sharp contrast to the marriage of his older brother sometime earlier which "had been celebrated in the same house with great pomp and ceremony; and it is said that there were provided twenty-two dancing girls to entertain the guests on that occasion."[41] Whether this latter fact be true or not is again uncertain and not particularly relevant except to indicate the author's desire to demonstrate piety in the early life of the Promised Messiah, Ghulām Aḥmad.

The various biographical sources stress Aḥmad's interest in reading, study and meditation. From these earliest days, he seems to have felt the conflict between a desire to engage himself in a life devoted to piety and a life of worldly engagement urged on him by his father until the latter's death in 1876 when Ghulām Aḥmad was 41. Although he did not abandon religious studies in the least during about a twenty year hiatus, we must take note of the fact that Ghulām Aḥmad's religious education as a Muslim of noble birth was that of a personal, tutored and intellectual study of religion and Islamic languages. A logical question to raise at this point is one concerning whether or not Ghulām Aḥmad ever entered a ṣūfī order or received any specialized spiritual training common to almost all Muslim religious teachers of the times. This would seem all the more important as Ghulām Aḥmad claimed to have received revelations indicating his status as masīḥ mawʿūd (Promised Messiah) and mahdī as well as revelations on many other subjects. Although a discussion of this matter is lacking from Dard's biography, an explanatory passage appears in the Muḥammad ʿAlī biographical sketch of 1906.

> There is one important consideration. Many schools of Muslim Sufis require their votaries to undergo various forms of devotional exercises, of which no trace is found in the practice of the Holy Prophet. Ahmad belonged to none of these schools and he never practiced such innovations. He hated from his early life the practice of chilla and other ascetic practices opposed to the word and spirit of the Holy Quran. His only devotional exercise was the study of the Holy Quran in solitude. On one occasion he saw a vision in

> which an old man appeared to him saying that according to the law of prophethood, fasting was necessary in order to get prepared for receiving Divine lights. On the basis of this vision he kept fasts for a period of about eight or nine months reducing his food during this time to nearly two or three morsels. But he did so privately as to keep the fact concealed from his nearest relatives, making special arrangements for the disposal of the food which he received regularly. But this long fasting had no injurious effect upon his health. During this time he saw many wonderful visions, some of which were later on published in the Barahin-i-Ahmadiyya, whose fulfillment years after showed that they were actual revelations from God and not the hallucinations of a mad man.[42]

The years of Aḥmad's encounter with worldly affairs included those of the Mutiny. Ghulām Murtāḍā enlisted many men from his villages including his older son Ghulām Qādir in the service of the Queen. Dard reports that

> (these) were acknowledged and commended by British officers, and promises were made for the restoration of the family property "when a favourable opportunity occurs." But that opportunity never occurred. Perhaps the British authorities could not forget the revolt of Delhi in 1857, during which the city mob had proclaimed a revival of the Mughal Empire.[43]

For the Aḥmadīyah movement and its founder the transference of power to her Majesty's government on August 2, 1858 and the royal proclamation of November 1 of that year explaining the policy of political justice and religious toleration that the Government intended to pursue was "really a preparation for the advent of the 'Prince of Peace'."[44]

V

The first years of Aḥmad's adult life were directly in the service of his father at Qādiyān. When this did not prove satisfactory to either, Ghulām Murtaḍā decided to send his son to be a reader in the law court at Siālkōṭ. He remained at this post from 1863 to 1867 but devoted most of his free time to reading, study and religious discussion. Although he briefly undertook the study of English to facilitate his work in the court, Ghulām Aḥmad never succeeded in this study the way he had in Persian and Arabic.[45] It was here that he first came into contact with Christian missionaries and held his first debates with a Rev. Mr. Butler. The Aḥmadīyah attitude towards the Christian missionaries which stood in sharp contrast to their attitude towards the benefits of British rule was reflected in this statement of background to Aḥmad's first debating experience.

> ....the occurrence happened at a time when the recent victory of the British arms was considered by the missionaries as a prelude to their own victory, and they were simple enough to think that within a short time the British Government would, perhaps, force the Mussalmans to accept Christianity at the point of the sword, as can be seen from a perusal of the books published by them at that time against Islam. They felt no hesitation in using the strongest terms against Islam and its holy Founder....(this) continued until the missionaries were convinced that the Government of India belonged to the British crown and not to the missionaries....and (Government) would not countenance the undue wounding of the feelings of any religious community.[46]

It was in the course of these first debates that Ghulām Aḥmad became aware of the Biblical commentaries written by Sir Sayyid Aḥmad Khān in 1862. Dard has used this occasion to indicate Aḥmad's later reading and criticism of Sir Sayyid's Tafsīr published in 1880. According to Aḥmad, it "adopted an apologetic attitude, as if there were anything in Islam that could not hold its own in the face of modern knowledge and science."[47]

In 1868, Aḥmad returned home coincidentally with the death of his mother. At the same time, he began the job of looking after his father's estates. This was not an interesting task for him and soon he found himself urged by a fellow Muslim to join in a debate against Muḥammad Ḥusayn, now the new mawlawī at Batāla and a member of the Ahl-i-Ḥadīth. If the debates in the press and in person in future years were to be militant, this first encounter was not. Ḥusayn began. Aḥmad responded that he could disagree with nothing the former had said. Even though this position subjected Ghulām Aḥmad to the ridicule of the friend who had instigated the debate, "such was Ahmad's love of truth and honesty that he did not care for anything that friends or foes might say."[48]

Biographical information on the years from 1868 until the death of Ghulām Murtaḍā in 1876 is scanty. Dard uses what little he has to say of this period to stress the increasing number of dreams and visions which Ghulām Aḥmad was experiencing. The climax of these "visions" came one day at Lāhōr when

> I was informed (in Arabic) that my father was to die after sunset, the news caused me the pang of grief instinctive to humanity, and since some of the important sources of our family incomes were bound up with his life....the thought passed through my mind as to what was to happen after his death....that perhaps there would now come days of poverty and pain....Immediately there came over me a trance and a second revelation came اليس الله بكاف عبده ؟
>
> 'Is not God all sufficient for his servant?'[49]

The data concerning Aḥmad's first encounters with the Āryā and Brahmo Samājīs are not entirely clear. Swāmī Dayānand, at first unsuccessful in starting the Āryā Samāj in Bombay, came to the Panjāb in 1877. In this whirlwind trip to some dozen cities, he lectured and debated while establishing chapters of the Samāj in Lāhōr, Amritsar and Rāwalpindī that year.[50] Although a chapter was not founded at Qādiyān until 1887, Dard tells us in the paragraph following his discussion of Swāmī Dayānand's visits to the Panjāb that one Sharampat Rāē (1855-1932) was secretary of the Samāj at Qādiyān, of which there were fifteen members. Although we cannot be certain of when these events took place, Dard then goes on to report that

> Mirza Ghulam Qadir had taken over entire charge of the home affairs after the death of Mirza Ghulam Murtaza. Ahmad was, therefore, now free to devote his time wholly to the service of God. Sharampat Rai often met Ahmad and discussed religious matters with him. But the time had now come when Ahmad should come out in public and expose the errors of this newly established cult.[51]

Following this statement we then learn of Aḥmad's first statements in the press but the first of these takes

us back to 1872 when in an article in the Manshūr-i-Muḥammadī, No. 33, Vol. 6 published at Bangalore Aḥmad had stressed two points: (1) that "the truthfulness in all human relationships was the foundation of all other virtues and that we could judge the true worth of a religion by the measure of emphasis which it laid upon truthfulness"; and (2) that after twenty years of research he had come to the conclusion that no religion stressed the importance of truth to the extent that Islām did. He offered 500 rupees to anyone who might prepare a list of quotations from a Scripture which might exceed, or even reach half or one third the number he might cite from Qurʾān on this subject. "But no one took up the challenge."[52]

The purpose of introducing this early article through Aḥmad's biography is clear enough in light of Dard's approach. First, he indicates the high ethical level on which Aḥmad intended to operate by placing "truth" above all other values. Secondly, he indicates Aḥmad's desire to bring renewed vigour to Islām by defending it in such a manner against the challenges posed both by the Āryā Samāj and the Christians.

Preparing an exact chronology of these events continues to be difficult. Aḥmad then reacted against a statement published by the Āryās in Vakīl on December 7, 1877 that

> The souls that exist are infinite and so many in number that even God does not know their number; therefore they will continue attaining salvation for ever and will never cease to exist.[53]

In response to this offense to the glory of God, Aḥmad wrote

two articles in Safīr Hind, Amritsar, opposing the position of Dayānand on this issue. His arguments were "so powerful" that L. Jivān Dās, Secretary of the Central Samāj for the whole of Panjāb, was forced to repudiate this doctrine and declare that it was not an essential part of Samāj teachings. To these challenges Dayānand gave no answer; but, it is clear from evidence available that the statements which appeared in Vakīl were not part of the ten accepted Principles of the Āryā Samāj as founded at Lāhōr in 1877.[54]

Standing with Aḥmad on this issue was the militant Brahmo Samājī Shīv Nārāi'n Agnīhōtrī. Through the pages of his Lāhōrī journal, the Brother Hind, he also attacked Swāmī Dayānand in July 1878, on the issue in which Aḥmad accepted the challenge of the Āryās to a new debate. Pandit Kharak Singh came to Qādiyān that same year to debate the issue of transmigration and the relative truths of the Qur'ān and the Vedas. According to Dard, Kharak Singh was embarrassed by the public debate in which Aḥmad was besting him, and suggested it be continued in the columns of a newspaper. Aḥmad responded by suggesting that Safīr Hind, Brother Hind or the Āryā Darpan of Shāhjahānpūr might be used for this purpose. Additionally, he suggested that Rajab ʿAlī a Christian missionary and Pandit Agnīhōtrī of the Brahmo Samāj act as judges of "the debate so that it might draw the attention of the public and make it more interesting, useful and authoritative."[55]

In the meantime, however, Pandit Kharak Singh decided to repudiate Āryā teachings, and later to become a Christian. This action, following his encounter with Aḥmad in Qādiyān lent further proof of Aḥmad's strength as an exponent of the truths of Islām as aginst the weaknesses of the Āryā Samāj faith. In 1879, Aḥmad had a lengthy debate with the same Pandit Agnīhōtrī, leader of the Lāhōr Brahmo Samāj, on the subject of revelation. Again, Aḥmad was victorious! But Dard's description of the events is overly simplified in view of the facts of Pandit Agnīhōtrī's career, however.

> What a mighty spiritual power Ahmad must have possessed! Agnihotri had denied the very possibility of divine revelation and studied Ahmad's writings only to refute them; but a time came when he not only severed his connection with the Brahm Samaj but also claimed that he himself was the recipient of divine revelation and as such he founded a new church called the Dev Samaj.[56]

VI

The year 1880 marked a turning point in the career of Ghulām Aḥmad. In that year he began publication of his four volume magnum opus, Barāhīn-i-Aḥmadīyah, "whose like is not to be found in any other human production."[57] The completion of this work in 1884, as described by Dard, was the fulfillment of a vision which Aḥmad had in 1864 or 1865 in which he met the Holy Prophet who took a book from Aḥmad's hand. "The Holy Prophet took it from him, and as soon as

his hand touched the book, it turned into a beautiful fruit."[58] Thus the Barāhīn-i-Aḥmadīyah was, in the eyes of Aḥmad's biographer, meant to serve Islām by fully rejuvenating it. A first notice of the work appeared in Muḥammad Ḥusayn's journal, Ishāat-i-Sunnah, Vol. 2, No. 4, pp. 3-4, issued in May 1879. In this announcement, Aḥmad indicated that his chief motivation for writing the work was the teachings of the Āryā Samāj who were heaping abuse on Moses, Jesus and Muḥammad.[59] The original edition was published at the Safīr Hind Press in Amritsar with a fifth part, under the same title but scarcely related in its contents, published in 1905 at Qādiyān.[60]

The favourite review of the book quoted in several Aḥmadīyah sources is that of Muḥammad Ḥusayn which appeared in Ishāat-i-Sunnah and extended over six issues.[61]

> In our opinion, from the viewpoint of the modern age, this book stands unique in the history of Islam. No book has ever been published like it in the past, and we cannot say anything about the future, which is known only to God. The perseverance of the author in the service of Islam, through his life, his energy, pen, tongue and every form of activity is almost unprecedented amongst Muslims. This should not be taken as an Asiatic exaggeration. We challenge anyone to show us the like of this book.[62]

Ḥusayn was pleased with a book which set forth the principles of Islām so clearly against the growing threats posed by the Āryās, Brahmos and Christians of the area. What he did not expect was that a decade later Ghulām Aḥmad would conceive of himself as far more than a mujaddid and that he would declare himself masīh mawʿūd and mahdī.[63]

The manner of presentation of ideas in the Barāhīn-i-Aḥmadīyah seemed to reflect the nature of the times in which Ghulām Aḥmad was writing. The format, to a point, was rational, logical and systematic. Aḥmad's purpose in writing was to communicate with those who did not agree with him in matters of religious belief, yet at the same time, he said, "...it is not our aim...that we should injure the religious susceptibilities of any person, or stir up and commence any controversy unnecessarily."[64]

At the same time Aḥmad stressed that he would establish the proofs of Islām, the truths of which could be known "without error, exertion, and embarrassment of doubts, (in) the Holy Quran only..."[65] Because of this,

> it becomes incumbent on us, in all fairness, to disprove and overthrow the wrong beliefs of the Arya Samaj, a sect of the Hindus, who refuse to acknowledge Him as such; and when we offer arguments on the imperative need of the Divine Revelation, it will be obligatory upon us to remove the doubts which beset and perplex the people of the Brahmo Samaj.[66]

In making these contradictory statements, Aḥmad was reflecting the opening stages of the increasing religious tensions which were to dominate India for the next seventy-five years, tensions emerging as a response to the "benefits" of British rule, Christian missionaries, and the European educational opportunities and the variety of Indian responses to them. In 1874, Swāmī Dayānand had dictated the Satyārth Prakāsh or Light of Truth in which he set forth the principles

of a true Vedic faith. Two of the late chapters of the work involved a vociferous repudiation of the teachings of Islām and Christianity. Although the real issues of such a three-way conflict were already well below the surface, one could argue that the appearance of Dayānand's book and the organization of his movement was the opening shot in a war of words which was to dominate the rest of Ghulām Aḥmad's life.

Aḥmad's Barāhīn stood out as the first Islamic response to the kind of polemic set forth by Swāmī Dayānand. It was certainly not the first response in the chain reaction set off by the Western Christian presence in India, as we have noted in some detail in our first chapter. It indicated, however, a new kind of response--a response in polemic, debating fashion in which the pen had clearly become mightier than the sword. Another factor which deserves recognition as part of this new development was the growing division within and among the major Indian traditions which arose more clearly after 1880. Aḥmad felt compelled, for example, to challenge both the Āryā Samāj and the Brahmo Samāj, two entirely different kinds of "Hindū" responses to the Indian situation during the nineteenth century. Similarly, as we shall see, he was challenged by both Ḥanafī and Ahl-i-Ḥadīth Muslims and he found good reason to argue with Sir Sayyīd and the Anjumān-i-Himayāt-i-Islām at different times. But beyond this, the situation was made more complex by the controversial involvement of Aḥmad with Sikhs, Christian missionaries and all shades

of the emerging Panjāb press.

The technique of the polemic was not only to set up one's own criteria for the truth--the Holy Qurʾān in Aḥmad's case--but additionally, to challenge his reader to write a reply in which the opponent would overthrow the arguments of the Qurʾān and adduce arguments from his own Scripture to prove the superiority of his own faith. Two other ground rules set down by Aḥmad in his introductory section included the use of arguments from Scripture (i.e., a Revealed Book) and that the presentations should be made in "decent and decorous language..."[67]

The remainder of the introductory section was a repudiation of Swāmī Dayānand's assertion that all religious prophets claimed by other religions were but fabrications. In answering this charge, Aḥmad went to some length to demonstrate the outstanding qualities of the "Holy Prophet" of Islām.[68] Closing the introductory section, Aḥmad set forth "Some Advantages of the Book." The first of these was that the reader would gain "a complete mastery over the essentials of religion," (i.e., Islām) because (2) "it contains three hundred strong, unshakeable arguments on the essentials and principles of Islam..."[69] The third point clearly indicated that Aḥmad believed himself to be on the offensive against all possible opponents for

> This book contains not only crushing replies to the objections of all our opponents--the Jews, the Christians, the Magians, the Arya Samaj,

> the Brahmo Samaj, the idolaters, the atheists, the naturalists, the agnostics, etc.--, but also proves that whatever the indiscreet opponent thought to be the ground for objection, was in reality a matter which establishes the superiority of the Holy Qur'ān over other scriptures; and this superiority has been proved by such evident arguments that the witling has been caught in his own net.[70]

The first major section of the Barāhīn in a rational format presented arguments in support of Islām. There are perhaps two points worthy of note within this quite standard presentation of Islām. The first of these is the attack on the "Morbid Muslims of Modern Age,"

> those imprudent and indiscreet Muslims of this age who have, under the perverting influence of the Western education, become so proud and perverse as to turn away from and denounce the firm fact of the matchlessness of the Holy Qur'ān....[71]

The second point, which may be of some significance to this study was Aḥmad's assertion that all the arguments adduced to prove the unparalleled quality of the Holy Qur'ān did not rely for their support on a knowledge of Arabic. Aḥmad's point here was that the arguments were so evident and simple that knowledge of the language was only necessary for those who were seeking additional proofs. There may be further significance to this statement with respect to Aḥmad's later declaration that he was the masīḥ mawʿūd and mahdī who received revelations in Urdū far more often than he did in Arabic and who, as well, wrote far more often in Urdū than he did in Arabic.[72]

A. R. Dard's description of the events surrounding the publication of this more than 600 page work has stressed particularly the great sacrifices that Ghulām Aḥmad had to make in order to get the work published. As well, Dard points to Aḥmad's first conflict with fellow-Muslims when he tells of a communication that Aḥmad received from the Anjumān Islāmīyah of Lāhōr asking his support in a petition to the Government for the promotion of education among Muslims and the preservation of Urdū. Aḥmad's response to this was both puzzling, yet indicative, even at this early point in his public career, of the direction his activities would take. His answer was that such petitions were useless; rather, that practical steps should be taken to convince the Government that Muslims were loyal. The key issue for Aḥmad was the need for prominent Muslims to go before the British to explain that according to the teachings of Islām jihād was absolutely forbidden now and that Muslims considered it unlawful to fight against the British government. Aḥmad further proposed that such statements be published in book form for circulation around the country. He further emphasised "that the British Government

> was a source of very great and manifold blessings to the people of India; and openly declared that its rule was better than that of all others. This was neither flattery nor expediency. Ahmad was thoroughly sincere. He spoke the truth and spoke it with courage and conviction.[73]

While Ghulām Aḥmad was not the only Muslim advocating such an attitude towards the British at this time, for Sir Sayyid

Aḥmad Khān had already been doing so for several decades and the leaders of the Ahl-i-Ḥadīth were also taking such a position in the mid-1880's, Aḥmadīs have insisted that it was Aḥmad who took the lead among Muslims in support of the benefits of British rule. By his own reference in the 1900 tract, "Jehad and the British Government," Aḥmad indicated that he first dealt with this concern only in 1882 in parts III and IV of Barāhīn.[74]

> The Arya Samaj were in the ascendant in those days and it appeared that their aggressive attitude and vituperations, supported by capitalism, would kill the very sense of decency among men. Christian missionaries, encouraged by the political domination of the British, already claimed that during the previous years (50) the number of Christians in India has increased from 27,000 to 500,000. The impact of the West upon Hinduism during the 19th century had brought forth the Braham Samaj, which declared that the basis of religious faith was supplied by the book of Nature, which was wide open for everyone to read. These ideas were becoming very popular among the educated. The Braheen-i-Ahmadiyya at once checked the advance of all such movements in India and for a time paralysed the activities of all anti-Islamic agencies.[75]

VII

The remainder of this chapter is given over to a brief survey of the principal events and writings during the important last period of Ghulām Aḥmad's life, that is, from 1885-1908.[76] In November of 1884, Aḥmad was married to his second wife, Nuṣrat Jahān Bēgum, daughter of Mīr Naṣīr Nawāb of Dehlī,

who came from "a distinguished Sayad (sic) family."[77] This second wife, who gave birth to Bashīr al-Dīn Maḥmūd, the second khalīfah on January 12, 1889, was apparently the subject of much controversy both within and outside the movement.[78] Dard, by contrast, stresses the blessing of three sons and two daughters that she brought to Aḥmad in his old age.[79]

A major step towards the establishment of Aḥmadīyah as a movement occurred on January 12, 1889 the date of Bashīr al-Dīn's birth. On that day, Aḥmad announced the conditions under which followers could accept bay'ah with him. According to Dard, as early as March 1882, Aḥmad had received divine commands appointing him as a mujaddid. In 1883, he had received requests from "righteous people" for bay'ah but he felt unprepared at that time. During the winter of 1888, "he was commanded by God...to lay the foundations of the Community by inviting people to bay'ah."

> He did not want all and sundry to join the faith and therefore waited for a suitable opportunity which presented itself when, at the death of Bashir I, men of weak and superficial type separated themselves from him.[80]

This latter statement is a reference to the prophecies made by Ghulām Aḥmad on February 20, 1886 that God had addressed him at some length indicating that his wife would give birth to a son whose name would be "Enamuel (Emmanuel?) and also Bashīr. He is given the Holy Spirit. He is free from sin. He is the Light of God. Blessed is he who comes from the heavens."[81] Aḥmad was first ridiculed for this prophecy

by those who claimed the son was already born but had been kept hidden. Again, he was ridiculed when on April 15, his wife gave birth to a daughter. Aḥmad claimed that the full prophecy had been worded vaguely enough so that it still held good. When a son, named Bashīr I Aḥmad was born the following year on August 7, Aḥmad was pressured to declare if this was indeed the promised son. According to Dard, although Aḥmad was tempted to declare this, he did not. But when the infant died on November 4, 1888, "the enemies of Islam tried to raise a commotion...saying that the boy who died was the one who should have lived to become the Promised Reformer."[82] Thus, with the birth of Bashīr al-Dīn Maḥmud on January 12, 1889, Aḥmad believed that the prophecy of 1886 had been fulfilled, that he could now separate those who truly believed in his leadership from those who scorned him. The time was now ripe to seek bay'ah from his followers.

The first nine of the ten points of the bay'ah stressed standard points of Muslim belief, such as abstaining from shirk, performing salāt five times daily, faithfulness to God and his Messenger, obedience to the teaching of the Qur'ān and ethical behaviour. There is no mention in these points of payment of zakāt to the community nor a statement about the ḥajj. In fact, it is significant to note that Aḥmad never made the ḥajj himself nor did he ever leave India. The final point of the bay'ah referred specifically to Ahmad.

Tenthly, that he shall establish a brotherhood

> with me (Ahmad) on condition of obeying me in everything good, and maintain it to the day of his death; and this relationship shall be of such a high order that its example shall not be found in any worldly relationship either of blood relations or of servant and master.[83]

Oddly enough the first ceremony of bay'ah did not take place at Qādiyān but rather at Ludhiāna.[84] The first person to take bay'ah was Mawlawī Nūr al-Dīn, Aḥmad's closest associate and first khalīfah. Others participating that day included Mīr 'Abbās 'Alī, Miān Muḥammad Ḥusayn Moradabādī, and M. 'Abd Allāh Sanauri.[85] The late Muḥammad 'Alī, who did not join the movement until some time between 1896 and 1900, stressed in his Lāhōrī period biography of Ghulām Aḥmad that this ceremony of bay'ah was not to be confused with the sūfī ceremony for "its main purpose was to defend and extend the cause of Islam and to place the service of Islam above all considerations."[86]

Once again, we are presented with a serious problem. While Muḥammad 'Alī repudiated the possibility that a ceremony of bay'ah could have any connection with the sūfī practice, a ceremony of bay'ah had always been connected with the joining of an order and the acceptance of a religious man as one's pīr. What we must distinguish here is the obvious fact that in undertaking a new kind of religious reform movement responding not only to internal decay in Islām but also to new threats from Hindus and Christians, Aḥmad did not wish to identify himself or his movement with those of the past

which, he seems to have felt, had contributed to the current decline of Islām. The use of sūfī terminology in his Lāhōr lecture of 1896 is another case in point which we will discuss below. Likewise, the denial by Aḥmadīs that Aḥmad employed the techniques of Christian missionaries in spreading his message and organizing his movement is a further example of what we have been saying here. Because it was important for Aḥmadīs to believe in the uniqueness of what Aḥmad was saying and doing, the fact that he may have learned organizational approaches from what Christian missionaries were doing or that he decided to explain his position by using sūfī terms familiar to most Muslims, or even by building a following by introducing the practice of bay'ah, had no relevance from an Aḥmadī viewpoint. Since the eclectic nature of Aḥmad's teachings will be increasingly evident as the study progresses, the number of different "influences" on Aḥmad's ideas and actions will also become apparent.

The years 1890 and 1891 saw the publication of three major works by Aḥmad; 1891 was also the year in which Aḥmad claimed to be masīḥ maw'ūd and mahdī. The Fath-i-Islām, the first of the three works, began with a statement of the Divine Promise made to the Muslims

> that at the commencement of every century the Most High God will raise a man who will revive and resuscitate His religion....[87]

Now the Promise of God had been redeemed, for

> I will repeat over and over again, and cannot

> refrain from this declaration, that I am the same man who has been raised in time for a reclamation of the people that faith may afresh be re-instated and re-installed in their minds.[88]

The motif of the general decay of Islamic life and the need for a Messiah or redeemer was continually stressed by Aḥmad in this book. The Scriptural argument was that just as Jesus had appeared 1400 years after the time of Moses, so the Promised Messiah must now appear, "invested with the spirit and power of Jesus son of Mary," in the 14th century after the appearance of the Holy Prophet of Islām. "...and he has descended in an age which was, in all respects, similar to and like the age of Jesus son of Mary so that it may be a sign for those who understand."[89]

Reflecting Aḥmad's foresight of the storm of opposition which would now arise in the Muslim community, he set down in the text of the Fath a revelation to encourage his supporters:

> A great storm of vice and wickedness is raging on the earth. Build an ark at this time of deluge. The person who will get into this ark will be preserved and saved but the one who will persist in denial will perish, and that one who will give his hand into your hand, has not given it in your hand, but in the hand of the Most High God; and the Great God has conferred upon me the glad tidings, saying, I shall cause you to die, and exalt you towards Myself; but your followers and friends will abide unto the Day of Resurrection, and predominate upon your opponents.[90]

In another section of the book, Aḥmad went into some detail about the speeches he had made on behalf of Islām and the literature he had published. At the same time that he minimized religious organization, and even chided the existence of

Anjumāns and modern educational institutions in favour of a return of the individual Muslim to the essence of Islām under his own guidance, he called specific attention to the supportive role of mawlawī Nūr al-Dīn. As Nūr al-Dīn was both the first to make bay'ah and the only supporter of Aḥmad to receive detailed attention in the pages of this 1890 work in which he first declared himself as Promised Messiah, Nūr al-Dīn's important role in the movement should be evident; and his call as first khalīfah would seem from this early time to have been clearly designated by Ghulām Aḥmad.

The arguments by which Aḥmad clarified his understanding of his role as masīh mawʿūd and mahdī, as well as his statements concerning the nature of prophecy in Islām and his relation to it are varied but not entirely clear. Although his taking of such a position certainly depended on Aḥmad's understanding of the death of Jesus which was first referred to in the Fath, it was not umtil his other two works of 1891, the Tauzīh-i-Marām and the Izāla Awhām, that he worked out his position in some detail. Aḥmad began the Tauzīh with the blanket statement that the Muslim belief that Jesus ascended into Heaven in physical form and will return again at a later date is incorrect. Statements in Scripture about the reappearance of Christ should only be taken metaphorically, that is, that a person will come "in the likeness of Christ."[91] According to the revelations which Aḥmad had received, he now asserted, with assurance, that he was that person. Fearing

opposition from the Sunnī mawlawīs, Aḥmad was writing out of a necessity to defend his position and thus began by adducing arguments from the Bible, ḥadīth and works of history, which, he claimed, said that there were two prophets who ascended into Heaven in physical form. One of these was John the Baptist, also known as Elias and Enoch. The other was ʿĪsā, son of Mary. According to Aḥmad, both of these prophets were also to descend from heaven at a later time and would be seen by men as they returned. Such a position is clearly in discrepancy with three Qurʾānic passages which mention the death of the Messiah, the same Messiah whom both Jews and Christians still await.[92]

Aḥmad asked Christians and Muslims seriously to ponder how such a pious servant as Jesus first could enter Paradise after his death and then be turned out of it? How mistaken were those and with what absurd insults did they degrade God by interpreting events in this manner! If Muslims, recognized that God did not intend "the Prophet Muhammad who was the best of all prophets" to perform miracles in contradiction of divine law, how much more inappropriate would it be for men to assume that the Messiah should do so. The best statement of explanation was the statement of al-Bukharī:

كيف انتم اذا انزلا بن مريام فيكم و اما كم منكم ؟

"What will be your condition on the day when the son of Mary will descend in your midst? Who will he be? He will be your spiritual leader and will be from among you."[93] It is thus

incorrect to assert that the term "son of Mary" is meant to refer to Jesus in this context. Rather, it is meant to refer to one from among the Muslims who has the qualities of the son of Mary. To those Muslims who would still stand on the hadīth which said that the coming Messiah would destroy the Cross, abolish the jizyāh, slay pigs and come at a time when the bad characteristics of the Jews and Christians had spread among the Muslims, Aḥmad responded that

> by the destruction of the Cross is meant not a physical war aginst Christianity but a cleansing of the religion of the Cross by spiritual means and by pointing out the falsity of its beliefs. It points to the fact that at that time hearts will be drawn towards truth and reality; there will be no need for religious wars; the trend will develop to enter the fold of Islam in... large numbers...then on whom will it be possible to levy jizyah? All this will not happen suddenly. The foundations for such conditions are being laid now....[94]

The argument that the second Messiah must be a prophet like the first Messiah is equally false. The Prophet did not say that the coming Messiah would have to be a prophet. He will be a Muslim like all others, will live according to the sharī'ah and will claim to be nothing more than an imām. Aḥmad asserted that God had appointed him as a Muḥaddath or "spokesman" for this ummāh. Although a Muḥaddath was in some respects a prophet, this kind of prophecy was a limited one. As such, he did enjoy the privilege of communication with God, and he was the recipient of "hidden secrets." "The essence of shari'a is disclosed to him and he is commissioned exactly like prophets." In this context Aḥmad

believed he had a duty to proclaim himself as a "prophet". He insisted, however, that "neither has prophethood in all its forms been terminated, nor has wahy of every kind ceased to take place."[95]

If being a Muhaddath was one of the ways to be a prophet in the present age, in some sense this meant that he was a nabī, for a "Muhaddath is a nabi by virtue of the fact that the muhaddath receives one of the many forms of nubuwwah" and that is mubashshirāt.[96] To clarify any misunderstanding about the meaning of what he was saying here, Aḥmad wrote a decade later that

> ...my contention is that there is nothing objectionable in my being called nabi and rasul after the Holy Prophet who was Khatamannabiyyin (Seal, of the Prophets) in the true and full sense of the word nor does this fact in any conceivable manner interfere with his status of Khatam-an-nabiyyin.[97]

In order to attain such a position, however, a person such as Aḥmad was required to pursue stages of spiritual progress.

It was in this section of his essay that Aḥmad came close to a sūfī conception of his role, already evident in some of the previous passages about continuing wahy. The "stations of divine love and affinity" were classified by Aḥmad into three groups, according to their spiritual state. First comes the spark of divine love which generates warmth in the human heart leading to a state of tranquility, contentment "and sometimes even an angelic state." The second state is that in which Divine and human love meet, a condition which

creates the brilliance of the "holy spirit." The third level of spiritual love is that in which "a well ignited flame of Divine love falls on human love...influence(ing) every particle, vein and fibre of the human soul and changes it into a perfect and complete manifestation of itself." From this can come the most excellent level of revelation, "that which is beyond comprehension."[98]

Aḥmad made it clear, however, that Muḥammad attained the most exalted form of wahī, a position which "neither the Messiah nor I can reach...." This was a "state of perfect unity with God." His discussion of prophethood ends rather abruptly at this point while the remainder of the Tauzīh goes off into other areas.

The doctrine of the three stages appeared again, however, in a new form in Aḥmad's book Āʾīnah-i-Kamālāt-i-Islām written in 1892 and published as the first book at the Qādiyān press in 1893.[99] Here, he discussed the three important stages of "perfect goodness," fanāʾ (self-annihilation), baqāʾ (regeneration) and liqāʾ (union with God). Fanāʾ is the process by which a Muslim--in life and death--can surrender himself ultimately to God. In this, he commits himself to "complete extinction of his selfish desires and pleasures...." Having died to his first life, he could now be regenerated (baqāʾ) and quickened by the love of God.[100]

> This state of "liqa" is fully realized by the spiritual wayfarer when his humanity is over-coloured by the Divinity and completely concealed

> ...under it...it is at this stage that some seekers after God have stumbled. The apparent had been taken for the real. The auliya who attain to this point and those who get a glimpse of it atfāl allāh....[101]

Perhaps the most complete and yet somewhat different statement of Aḥmad's position on stages of spiritual development came in his major lecture before the Great Religions Conference at Lāhōr in December of 1896.[102] As this Urdū lecture has been translated by the Aḥmadīyah movement and is a principal item circulated by them in their missionary work even today, it seems essential that one take this sūfī-like analysis of Muslim spirituality as stated by Aḥmad quite seriously. Once again, the strong denials by his followers that he was ever involved with sūfī orders seems to be contradicted by his strong use of sūfī terms and conceptions in this literature. One likely answer to this dilemma may be seen by an analysis of what Aḥmad was attempting to do as he saw his role as masīh maw'ūd and mahdī emerging. This was that he found Islām in India to be in a particularly low state; indeed, that this was a time "when the bad characteristics of Jews and Christians have spread among the Muslims."[103] While we have argued previously that Aḥmad and his followers denied any relationship with sūfī thought or orders both because Aḥmad certainly did not study with sūfīs in his earlier years and also because of the importance to the movement of stressing its uniqueness, we have also indicated that he sought, through his interpretation of the revelations he was receiving

and the circumstances in which he was living, to defend and renew Islām. While the sūfī orders of the nineteenth century were not the leaders of renewal or reform, the sūfīs of previous centuries had been the best exponents of a sense of reformation against the old order. Where the doctrine of the three stages could best explain what Aḥmad wanted to say over and above what the Qur'ān or ḥadīth might provide as the basis for his arguments, Aḥmad used sūfī language. While the use of reasoned, philosophical kinds of arguments are not usually identified with sūfī thought, Aḥmad also used this kind of approach to prove many of his points. One might just as easily argue that he had been influenced by Islamic philosophers, or the Shī'ah, or various European schools of thought being introduced into nineteenth century India. What must again be stressed is the eclectic nature of Ghulām Aḥmad's teachings and activities. As we will continue to observe, he utilized revelation and prophecy, reasoned argument, a fundamentalist dependence on Qur'ān and sūfī terminology, all at the same time while also developing his own doctrines about Jesus, the mahdī and jihād. In all of this variation of approach, Ahmad need not specifically be identified with sūfīs any more than he should be identified with Ḥanafīs or the Ahl-i-Ḥadīth. He held ideas in common with each. He diverged significantly from each.[104]

The key point in Aḥmad's argument proving himself to be the masīḥ maw'ūd centered around his assertion that the

Promised Messiah was not the same person as Jesus but a person like Jesus. The corollary to this proposition was, of course, the point that Jesus was not taken up to heaven in his full physical condition, as the Muslims believe, nor that he was ressurected after his death, as Christian doctrine teaches. To prove the point that Jesus did not die on the cross, but rather was rescued, cured of his wounds by an ointment known as the marhām-i-ʿĪsā and then, escaping from Palestine, he journeyed across Asia to Kashmīr where he completed his ministry to the lost tribes of Israel and died at the age of 120, Aḥmad brought together arguments from many sources. The book detailing these arguments, Masīḥ Hindūstān Mēn, did not appear until 1899. This later work united all Aḥmad's arguments against both Muslim and Christian views on the question of Jesus. At the same time, in explaining his role as Mahdī, he combined his arguments about Jesus with those concerned with the fact that he was not a ġhāzī Mahdī which so many of the ʿulamā' were expecting in the last days. This idea, he said, was totally rejected in Qur'ān and ḥadīth and had no place in the thinking of his age.[105]

Demonstrating that by heavenly signs he had been sent to redeem Islām, Aḥmad called those morally fit to join with him against those "who hold false hopes of a bloody Mahdi or Masih."[106] The purpose of this book, he said, was to disprove Christian and Muslim views about Jesus and to prove that Jesus was neither crucified, nor did he ascend into

heaven, nor should it be hoped that he would come again, for it is clear that he died in Srīnagar, Kashmīr at the age of 120 where he was buried in a "Jewish" grave on Khān yār Street.[107] Aḥmad then went on to explain that he would prove this by dividing his study into ten chapters bringing proofs from (1) the gospel, (2) Qur'ān and ḥadīth, (3) books of medicine, (4) history books, (5) oral tradition, (6) miscellaneous materials, (7) logical arguments, (8) new revelations from God, (9) by briefly comparing Islām with Christianity and showing the truth of Islām by various arguments, and (10) by dealing in detail with the things for which God had appointed him.[108]

For reasons that are not clear, this book ends abruptly in the middle of the fourth section of proofs but does include a map which shows the pattern of travel which Jesus followed after he left Palestine.[109]

Closely related to the arguments and proofs concerning Ghulām Aḥmad's role as Masīḥ Mawʿūd and Mahdī which appear throughout Aḥmadīyah literature, is the important issue of Aḥmad's position on jihād. The issue is closely related on the one side to Aḥmad's attitude towards the Government, and on the other to his repudiation of the sunnī doctrine of the ghāzī mahdī who would come at the end of time to lead the believers in bloody revolution against the kafīrs. In adopting such a position on jihād, Aḥmad was required to attack publicly the Mahdī of the Sudan while advocating the

use of tablīgh or missionary persuasion as the new method for propagating the teachings of Islām.[110]

Aḥmad's claim to be Promised Messiah and mahdī plus his use of the word "nabī" to describe himself isolated him from most Sunnī Muslims. He not only denied being a sūfī but at the same time he was denying the authority of the Ḥanafī ʿulamāʾ in matters which they believed essential to Islām: the role of Jesus, the teachings on jihād and the ghāzī mahdī. Whatever parallels we may draw between Aḥmad's teachings, or his decision to accept bayʿah from his followers and those of the sūfī orders, we have no specific evidence linking him with sūfīs. Rather, we have continual denials of any connection. Beyond this, his appeal seems to have been directed towards the middle-class literate though not intellectual rural landowners of his particular area of the Panjāb, and the kind of organization which he set up, beginning in 1891, had a distinctly different tone and purpose to it than would a sūfī tarīqah.

Despite the fact that all the positions Aḥmad took seemed to alienate him from the mainstream of Islām, he still attempted, even up to the day before he died, to explain and repudiate the charges that he was claiming the prophethood for himself and therefore cutting himself off from the Qurʾān, the sharīʿāh and the Holy Prophet himself. In a letter to the Lāhōr paper, Akhbār al-ʿĀmm, published May 26, 1908, he wrote:

> I look upon such a claim as kufr....I lay no claim to such prophethood. The basis on which I call myself nabi is only that I am honoured by the communion of God that he frequently speaks to me and replies to my prayers.
>
> My neck is under the yoke which Islam lays on us and no one has the power to abrogate even a jot or tittle of the Holy Qur'an. So I call myself nabi only because in Arabic and Hebrew nabi means one, who being inspired by God, announces prophecies in a very large number.
>
> In this sense I am both a nabi and ummati, a follower of the Holy Prophet....[111]

VIII

The first Aḥmadīyah Conference, held at Qādiyān, December 27, 1891, was an important event in the life of the community. Eighty[112] members gathered from many places in the Panjāb and Jammū. Aḥmad was already feeling the strong opposition of such 'ulamā' as his old school friends Abū Sa'īd Muḥammad Ḥusayn of Batāla and one Nazīr Ḥusayn of Dehlī. A principal purpose of this gathering was to give Aḥmad an opportunity, through a new publication, "to challenge his opponents" on the question of how "the chosen ones of God could be identified and distinguished from the rest of mankind."[113]

The failure of any to answer this challenge, which Aḥmad had proposed be held in Lāhōr, and the manner in which the events have been treated by Dard, indicate the high degree of tension already present between Aḥmad and other Muslims. Apparently in his journal, Ishā'at, Muḥammad Ḥusayn had pub-

lished a notice saying that a Ṣūfī, ʿAbbās ʿAlī, a former follower of Aḥmad, would meet the challenge. But, this ʿAbbās ʿAlī, "who had already proved to be a simpleton" failed to meet up to the challenge. From the Aḥmadīyah point of view this first gathering, small though it was, was a success for it laid the ground work for an annual gathering at Qādiyān. Dard records that over 500 persons from as far away as Mecca, Dehlī and ʿAlīgaṛh came to the second annual gathering in 1892 (although he does not specify exactly who it was that attended from such great distances). He has given exact figures of those who attended from districts and states within Panjāb, however.[114] In one sense this annual gathering became a kind of hajj for those who supported the claims Aḥmad was making. Additionally, at the 1892 conference the following aims of the movement were established:

> To propagate Islam; to think out ways and means of promoting the welfare of new converts to Islam in Europe and America; to further the cause of righteousness, good will, purity, piety and moral excellence throughout the world; to eradicate evil habits and customs; to appreciate with gratitude the good work of the British Government.[115]

The formal establishment of the Aḥmadīyah community as such, under the name by which it is now known, did not occur until the publication of an Ishtihār by Aḥmad on November 4, 1900. During 1898 and 1899, opposition by Muslim ʿulamāʾ had reached its peak, while at the same time, the numbers of Aḥmad's supporters had grown in various communities even outside of the Panjāb. One other reason for this act of

identification was that Aḥmad wished his followers to be counted separately in the Census of 1901. Prior to this, they had simply been referred to by their opponents as "Qādiyānis" or "Mīrzāīs". Aḥmadī writers stress the point that the name "Aḥmadīyah" was not chosen as a way of honouring Ghulām Aḥmad. It was selected rather because the name Aḥmad was that by which the prophet Muḥammad was called during the Meccan period of career. This was the period of his career when Muḥammad suffered severe persecution not unlike that which Aḥmad and his followers felt that they were now suffering at the hands of fellow Muslims.[116]

The Gazeteer of the Gūrdāspūr district in 1891 while taking cognisance of Ghulām Aḥmad had confused him with a relative of his, Imād al-Dīn, who had become a Christian missionary, when it wrote

> Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, of the Moghal family of Kadian, has also created a great stir of recent years. He is a man of great eloquence and a distinguished preacher. At one time he was a leading maulvi but gave out that he had a special mission to the sweepers, who flocked to him in crowds. This, however, he has got tired of latterly, and is now engaged in an attempt to prove that he is the messiah, or, at any rate, directly inspired by the Almighty, which is arousing considerable excitement amongst the Muhammadans generally throughout the province.[117]

While the Census of India of 1891 reported 1,340 "Ahl-i-Ḥadīth" and 1,220 "Wahābi" for the whole of the Panjāb, it did not mention "Qādiyānīs" at all in spite of the description which had appeared in the Gazeteer. The 1901 Census which basically

repeated the above description of Aḥmad showed a "return" for the "Aḥmadīyas" of 1,113 followers, males over fifteen.[118] For comparative purposes it is worth noting that the 1901 Census reported 4,209 members of the Ahl-i-Ḥadīth for the Panjāb and Northwest Frontier including 389 in Gūrdāspūr district, the largest single district total.[119] The totals for the Āryā Samāj for the same year were 9,105 male members over fifteen in the Panjāb with 512 members in Gūrdāspūr as compared with substantially larger numbers in Lāhōr and Siālkōṭ.[120] The statements about Aḥmad in the Census of 1901 and the Gazeteer of 1891 were fervently repudiated by him in an article appearing in Review of Religions in 1903. In this he said,

> 2. That this statement is altogether false and groundless, and most injurious and harmful to my honour and reputation.
> 4. That the sweeper class is specially associated with crimes, and to represent me as connected with that class when there is not the slightest foundation for such a charge is to represent me as being in a state generally considered disgraceful. The sweepers of this country are looked upon as the most degenerate class of people, and the statement...is calculated to do the greatest harm...and to hurt the feelings...of the thousands of the most loyal and respectable subjects of the Government who follow me as their guide and leader in all religious and spiritual matters.
> 5. That my principles and doctrines, which I have been preaching since the very beginning are morally so sublime and spiritually so exalted that they are not suited to, and accepted by, even Muhammadans of a low type and bad morals, to say nothing of the sweepers, and that they are accepted only by intelligent and noble-minded men who lead pure and angelic lives, and that my followers actually include in their number Ra ises, Jagirdars, respectable government officials, merchants, pleaders, learned Maulvis and highly educated young men.[121]

Aḥmad's defensive reaction to this error in the official reports reflected his desire to show himself a strong supporter of the Government, on the one hand, while fearing on the other that the Christian missionaries with whom he had already been in considerable debate were using these kinds of subtle means to destroy his movement. Thus, while he had succeeded in gaining recognition for his movement in the Census of 1901, the description given was sufficiently inaccurate to upset him. As well, his reaction brings out a side of Aḥmad not usually evident; that is, one showing blatant prejudice against an untouchable caste with no sensitivity to or sense of the need for social reform. Certainly Aḥmad did not consider himself a social or political reformer in any sense. In this, he differed sharply from Sir Sayyid, the Āryā Samāj and many of the Christian missionaries. His response here also indicated the extent to which Aḥmad was appealing to a middle class and literate group of followers at the time, although in distinguishing those who "split" in 1914 and formed the Lāhōr Aḥmadīyah organization, it is significant to note that it was the more intellectual and educated group who left on that occasion while the group remaining with the Qādiyāni leadership was much less urbane and willing to accept the spiritual leadership of a khalīfah rather than that of a democratically run Ṣadr Anjumān organization.

IX

Just as the decade of the 1890's brought Ghulām Aḥmad into severe conflict with the Āryā Samāj, Christian missionaries and fellow Muslims, in a major way Aḥmad's "researches" into the life of Gurū Nānak also brought him into a less significant but, none the less, a controversial encounter with the Panjābī Sikh community. In making this study, Aḥmad's original aim was to answer the charges levelled against Gurū Nānak in the Satyārth Prakāsh of Swāmī Dayānand. Although Aḥmad had not heard of any Sikh replies to Dayānand's statements, he decided to take up "the cudgel against Dayanand to protect the honour of Nanak..." Aḥmad, therefore, began a book on the life of Gurū Nānak, entitled Sat Bachan which was completed in November of 1895. As in the case of his "detailed researches" into the life of Jesus, written up in the book Masīh Hindūstān Mēn, Aḥmad, after refuting Dayānand's errors, set out to separate historical fact from the legendary lore surrounding the life of Gurū Nānak. Aḥmad's aim and end result was to prove that Gurū Nānak was really a Muslim, his purpose being to disassociate the Gurū from the tenth Gurū Arjun who lead the Sikhs into their military society and nationalist movement against which "the British had to wage two wars before they could restore peace and tranquility to the Punjab."[123]

The chief piece of evidence used by Ghulām Aḥmad for his claim that Gurū Nānak was a Muslim was the cholā sāḥib,

a cloak of cotton material which the Sikhs believe Gurū Nānak received directly from God. It was stored at a Sikh shrine in the village of Dera Bābā Nānak not far from Qādiyān. The cloak was used as a head wrapping by the first five Gurūs though later it passed into the hands of a descendent of Nānak who kept it as a relic in Dera Bābā Nānak. Before Aḥmad went to see the cloak on September 30, 1895, he sent a deputation who reported that it was covered with verses from the Qur'ān. When Ghulām Aḥmad went to visit the shrine, he had his followers make an exact copy of the writings, the lead section of which included the "lā āllāh illā āllāh wa muḥammad rasūl āllāh." Adding this to statements of the Janam Sākhīs (biographies of the Gurū) which attested that Nānak went to Mecca dressed as a Muslim saint, called out the adhān, and sat in the mosque for prayers, as well as Aḥmad's "discovery" that Nānak had performed chillas, convinced him further that Nānak was a Muslim. Refuting Dr. Trumpp's view that Nānak did not make the ḥajj,[124] he upheld the view of Chishtī Muslims who said that Nānak went on the ḥajj twice and stayed in Mecca for two years. Aḥmad also refuted any possibility of Gurū Nānak's having been a Hindū since--and using M. A. Macauliffe as his source here--the doctrines set forth in the 'Adī Granth prohibit most traditional Hindū practices such as caste, satī, use of tobacco or alcohol, pilgrimmage to sacred rivers, etc.[125] Aḥmad's conclusion is that it would be a mistake to contend that Nānak was not

a Muslim or even that he intended his teachings as a compromise position between that of the Hindūs and that of the Muslims.[126]

The response of the Sikh newspaper, Khalsa Gazette, even before Aḥmad's book was published, was one in which the editor refuted "the view of the Mirza and quotes some verses from the Guru to show that he was not a follower of the prophet." This was but an indication of even stronger protests that were to come after the publication.[127] The Bharāt Sudhār, a pro-Āryā Samāj journal also published in Lāhōr, was quick to reprint the Khalsa article and commented that "the Mirza (was) endeavouring to sow the seeds of disunion between the Sikhs and the Aryas...." The editor continued by urging that in face of this challenge, he hoped that relations between the Sikhs and Āryās would be more cordial than ever.[128]

The following February the Singh Sahāī of Amritsar specifically answered the claims of Ghulām Aḥmad about the cholā.

> When Guru Nanak took Mardana with him to Mecca and Medina and there performed his miracles and astonished the Maulvis and Kazis, the latter held a counsel and asked Guru Nanak to wear the chola which Muhammad had prepared by witchcraft. The Kazis were under the impression that the wearing of the chola would lead Nanak to embrace Islam. When, however, the chola was brought before Nanak, it produced no effect upon him, whereupon the kazis asked him to accept it as a khillat. The Guru put it on and brought it with him to India. Thus the Guru divested this Chola of the virtues claimed for it, and it is kept as a testimony of his miraculous triumph over the Muhammadans....[129]

In later issues Singh Sahāī attacked Ghulām Aḥmad's Sat Bachon as "the Mirza's Khabasat," urged that he be jailed in Lāhōr, and suggested that the work be totally ignored.[130] The Aḥmadīyah movement continued to press its arguments over the years that Gurū Nānak was a Muslim in spite of these protests from the Sikh community.[131]

At the annual gathering of the community at Qādiyān in 1895, Aḥmad made an elaborate fifteen point proposal for the convening of a conference on religions. This had followed a "memorial" which he had sent to the Government a few months earlier asking for strict regulations to be set up limiting religious controversy. Since Aḥmad, himself, was already at the center of such controversy, his call for a gentlemanly approach to religious debate met with a negative response from his opponents. An independently organized conference was set for Lāhōr at the end of 1896 at which six prominent Indians representing all the major religious groups took charge of the proceedings. It was on this occasion that Aḥmad's famous lecture, The Philosophy of the Teachings of Islam, was delivered.[132]

Although the year 1897 was a traumatic one for Aḥmad in that it was the year of his major struggle with the Āryās climaxed by the Lēkh Rām assassination, it was also a year of growth for the movement. In that year a Middle School was established at Qādiyān and an extension to the mosque proposed. It also marked the beginning of the first Aḥmadīyah

periodical, al-Ḥakam, "in view of the ancient prophecy that the Promised Messiah would judge between all peoples."[133] The editor was Shaykh Yaqūb ʿAlī who had already engaged in publishing a weekly paper in Amritsar. Although the first issue, published on October 8, 1897, was published in Amritsar also, the first number of the second volume, February 20, 1898, was printed at Qādiyān.[134] If Aḥmadīyah views as quoted in the weekly secret British Government reports on the Panjāb press had been known only through the eyes of other newspapers before late 1897, such would be the case no longer.

During Aḥmad's lifetime two other periodicals were started at Qādiyān. The first, Badr, published in Urdū beginning in 1902, was edited and published by two young followers of Aḥmad, Faiḍ ʿAlī and Muḥammad Afzāl of Amritsar. The circulation of this paper, which began in 1902 but which did not survive for many years, was irregular. Far more significant was the undertaking of Review of Religions which began in both Urdū and English simultaneously beginning in 1902. Although Dard dismisses this publication in a few sentences and fails to mention that its first co-editors were Muḥammad ʿAlī and Khawājah Kamāl al-Dīn, both of whom were later to lead the Lāhōrī break away group, Review of Religions in its English format was certainly, for many years, responsible for making the Aḥmadīyah movement known in the non-Muslim world. Set up under a separate corporation, the Anjumān Ishāʿat-i-Islām, its original circulation was 760 copies

per month, a figure which decreased substantially during the 1920's and 30's--after the split.[135]

Considering the times and the context in which it was written and published, Review of Religions in its early years was a remarkable publication. Although it devoted much space to the claims of Aḥmad and the organization of the Aḥmadīyah, it also contained many articles dealing with other religious movements. A series appeared on Bahā'ī, another criticizing various western translations of the Qur'ān, others raising theological issues with Christianity. Walter, certainly no partisan of the movement, wrote most favourably about the wide range of subjects with which it dealt.[136]

During the later years of his life, Aḥmad travelled extensively in North India in spite of poor health. During one of these trips to Siālkōṭ in November of 1904, Aḥmad broadened his conception of his own role in order to universalize the appeal of his message and mission. He now proclaimed himself not only mahdī for the Muslims and Messiah for the Christians but an avatār of Kriṣnā for the Hindūs. In this lecture he stated that

> Rāja Krishnā as revealed to me was so great and perfect a man that his equal is not to be found among the Hindū Rishīs and Avatārs. He was an Avatār, i.e., prophet of his time and he received the Holy Spirit from God....He was a true prophet of his time but many errors were introduced into his teachings afterwards. His heart overflowed with the love of God...(who) had promised to raise a spiritual manifestation of his in the latter ages, and He has now fulfilled this promise through me.[137]

In accordance with a revelation Ghulām Aḥmad received in December, 1905 that the end of his life was near, he published a small pamphlet entitled "al-Wasīyyah" (the Will) in which he formed the anjumān which was later to become the Ṣadr Anjumān Aḥmadīyah, or central branch of the Aḥmadīyah society located at Qādiyān. In April of 1908, while writing what became his last book, Paīghām-i-Ṣulh (The Message of Peace)[138], he travelled to Lāhōr where suddenly he experienced an attack of dysentery and died at 10 A.M. on May 26. The body, certified that death had not occurred from an infectious disease, was returned to Qādiyān for burial.[139]

In the larger perspective of late nineteenth and early twentieth century India, Mīrzā Ghulām Aḥmad and his movement to reform Islām cannot be judged as being of great importance. None the less, the impact of Aḥmad and the Aḥmadīyah upon the Panjāb between 1880-1908 was sufficient to place both the man and the movement in a controversial frame of reference for Muslims and non-Muslims alike. Of Aḥmad, we must say that he was a sincerely religious man who believed he had received revelations and acted to prophesy about many things on the basis of those revelations. It was by revelation that he declared himself to be Masīh Mawʿūd and Mahdī and that he used terms applied by the Qurʾān to the Prophet and Jesus to himself. By doing these things and by repudiating the Islamic doctrines of Jesus, jihād and the mahdī, Aḥmad alienated himself from the Islamic religious authorities. As we have

said previously, Aḥmad was not a sūfī, neither was he a mawlawī in the usual sense. He followed many sūfī teachings and practices but yet specifically he did not identify himself with them. By reinterpreting Islamic religious doctrine, he similarly could not identify himself with Ḥanafīs or the Ahl-i-Ḥadīth. Neither was he a modernist in the sense of a Sir Sayyid Aḥmad Khān or ʿAmīr ʿAlī because he was neither a truly literary figure nor an educational or social reformer. Although Aḥmad wrote scores of books and tracts, the message of these works, while showing a development of ideas over the years, essentially proclaimed the same message: Islām in a new century would need a Promised Messiah to lead it out of its decadent condition. Neither politics nor social reform was the answer to the Muslim condition. For Aḥmad, the whole matter had to be seen in a religious perspective. Thus, his support of the Government was direct and unequivocal at a time when some among the Muslim and many among the Hindū communities were beginning to seek reform which would give Indians more political freedom.

Aḥmad's appeal was to a middle-class literate and essentially rural land-owning group. His followers spread his message through tracts and newspapers in Urdū, Persian, Arabic and English. There is also evidence that he had great personal appeal and spoke well before crowds. His participation in debates and mubāhilas gives evidence of his ability as a religious controversialist not afraid to encounter a

mawlawī, an Āryā Samājī or a Christian missionary. If we can place Aḥmad anywhere on the spectrum of the late nineteenth century Indian religious scene, it must be among people of his own kind--the small town landowning Muslim middle-class who became his supporters in increasing numbers. He must also be seen through his encounters and controversies in defense of Islām which came through pamphlet warfare and the debating platform and which also attracted support for Aḥmad.

While the Panjāb into which Aḥmad was born in 1835 was one falling out of the hands of the Sikhs and into the autocratic hands of the Lawrences, the Panjāb in which Aḥmad died in 1908 was one thoroughly involved in internal turmoil with both religious and political implications to it. The Panjāb in which Aḥmad came to defend Islām was a very different place in its religious and political atmosphere than it was even in 1880 when he began his ministry. While Aḥmad ended his career preaching a "Message of Peace," he seems to have had little sense of the political realities of the Panjāb situation as it had developed by 1907-1908 which, in a realistic sense, made his message appear obsolete even as it was being written. And while Aḥmad wrote his final "Message of Peace," he devoted most of the last fifteen years of his life to participating in the polemics which in part led to the continual religious strife the Panjāb has experienced in the twentieth century. It is to the details of the polemics in which Aḥmad engaged that we will now turn.

NOTES

[1] Although the place of birth is not in question, the date of Ghulām Aḥmad's birth varies from 1835 to 1839 according to the sources used. Aḥmad's principal biographer, A. R. Dard (Life of Ahmad, Part I, Sultan Brothers, Lahore, 1949), writing as a thoroughly devoted follower cites the date we have given above, p. 27; Muḥammad ʿAlī, a close follower and leader of the Lāhōr section in later years, states that it was "probably in the year 1835 C.E....." ("Mirza Ghulam Ahmad: His Life and Mission," translated and edited by S. Muḥammad Tufail, Aḥmadīyyah Anjumān Ishāʿat Islām, Lahore, 1967, with editions dating back to 1951). See, however, a variant version of the same brief biography which appeared as early as 1906 in the journal, Review of Religions, of which Muḥammad ʿAlī was the editor, in which he gives the year 1839 as the year of birth (Vol. V, p. 229). A short biography by Bashīr al-Dīn Maḥmūd Aḥmad, the Son and Second Successor to Ghulām Aḥmad says that he was born "about 1836." (Ahmad, The Messenger of the Latter Days, Book Depot, Talif-o-Isha'at, Quadian (sic), 1924, p. 2.) The 1839 date is supported by another Aḥmadīyah missionary, F. K. Khān Durrānī on page 21 of his tract ("The Ahmadiyya Movement," The Aḥmadīyya Anjumān-i-Ishāʿat-i-Islām, Lahore, 1927). The principal non-Aḥmadi study of the movement is that of H. A. Walter. Walter gives Ghulām Aḥmad's birthdate as June 18, 1839 and mentions in a footnote that most sources he has consulted "place it vaguely sometime in 1836 or 1837" (p. 1). The recent article by Wilfred Cantwell Smith in the Encyclopaedia of Islam, 2nd edition, E. J. Brill, Leiden, 1960, accepts the 1839 date while at the same time recognizing the most recent study of the movement in "academic...significant or comprehensive form..." to be that of L. Bouvat in an issue of Journal Asiatique, 1928 (pp. 159-181) which gives the birthdate as 1836.

Historically, the variation of the four years may not make much difference to this study. When asked to account for the variation in dates, Dr. Khalīl Naṣir, formerly imām of the Faẓl Mosque in Washington, D.C. and a life-long member of the Aḥmadīyah community indicated two possibilities: (1) a discrepancy between the Islamic and Western calendars in addition to no accurate birth records during that period, and (2) a prophecy in the writings of Ghulām Aḥmad cited by Muḥammad ʿAlī in his 1906 article, p. 254, which indicated that he would live to the age of eighty. Since Ghulām Aḥmad died May 25, 1908 at Lāhōr, the fulfillment of this prophecy in line with the fulfillment of so many other prophecies made by Aḥmad as Promised Messiah and Mahdī made it important

for biographers from within the Qādiyānī branch of the movement to assure his living to the age of eighty by placing his birth in 1835. Since this is a matter of faith to those within the community and a matter which cannot now be proven in either direction, we have opted for the earlier date. (From an interview with Dr. Khalīl Naṣir, C. W. Post College, L. I., N. Y., January 10, 1969.)

[2]A. R. Dard, p. 27.

[3]Ibid.; see also Bashīr-ud-Dīn Maḥmūd Aḥmad, p. 2.

[4]Dard, p. 7.

[5]Ibid.

[6]Ibid., pp. 7-8.

[7]Ibid., pp. 10-11.

[8]Ibid., p. 12.

[9]Ibid. A short but detailed history of these events and the earlier history of the Gūrdāspūr District may be found in Chapter 2 of the Gazeteer of the Gurdaspur District, 1883-1884, Compiled and published under the authority of the Panjab Government, Lahore, 1884, pp. 12-24.

[10]Dard, pp. 13-14; Durranī, op. cit., p. 22; Bashīr-ud-Dīn, pp. 4-6. See also L. Griffin and C. F. Massy, The Punjab Chiefs, Civil and Military Gazette, Lahore, 1890, Vol. 2, pp. 49-50.

[11]Census of India, 1881: Report on the Census of the Panjab Taken on the 17th of February 1881 (3 vols.; Lahore, 1883), Vol. II, Table III. These figures are disputed slightly in another edition published at Calcutta but purporting to be an identical report. This latter report would give the Muslims 50.13%, the Hindūs 40.7%, the Sikhs 7.5% and the Christians 1.5%.

[12]Census of India, 1881 (ed. by Denzil C. J. Ibbetson), Vol. I, Supt. of Government Printing, Calcutta, 1883, pp. 103-104.

[13]B. H. Baden-Powell, The Indian Village Community, London, 1896, pp. 244-281.

[14]M. M. Khilnami, The Punjab under the Lawrences, Monograph No. 2, The Punjab Government Record Office Publication, Simla, 1951, pp. 12, 19.

[15]Frederick Gibbon, The Lawrences of the Punjab, London, 1908, p. 151, quoted from Khilnami, p. 23.

[16]Khilnami, p. 23.

[17]Barrier, Punjab Politics and the Disturbances of 1907, p. 4.

[18]Ibid.

[19]Ibid., p. 7.

[20]C. V. Aitchison, Lord Lawrence, Oxford, 1892, pp. 49-50; also Richard Temple, The Story of My Life, 2 vols., London, 1896, I, pp. 103-110, quoted from Barrier, p. 8.

[21]Barrier, p. 8.

[22]The incident is discussed in detail in G. R. G. Hambly, "Unrest in Northern India During the Viceroyalty of Lord Mayo; the Background of Lord Northbrook's Policy of Inactivity," Royal Central Asian Journal, XLVIII, 1961, pp. 48-54. See also Barrier, pp. 8-9.

[23]Barrier, p. 9.

[24]Ibid., p. 14.

[25]Ibid., pp. 16-17.

[26]See Chapter 1 above.

[27]"Missionary Societies in the Punjab," The Arya Magazine, I, 1882, pp. 64-66. The general problem of cultural responses to the West is treated in Bruce T. McCully, English Education and the Origins of Indian Nationalism, New York, 1940, pp. 241-269. For the Hindū response see Charles Heimsath, Indian Nationalism and Hindu Social Reform, Princeton University Press, 1964. Also see Barrier, p. 18.

[28]There are many studies of the Brahmo Samāj. One of the most recent placed in the context of social reform may be found in Chapters 1-2 of Heimsath; see also an earlier article by Farquhar in the Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, James Hastings (ed.), 1909, and also a recent article by Spencer Lavan, "The Brahmo Samaj: A Movement for Indian Nationalism and Hindu Social Reform," Faith and Freedom, Vol. 21, Parts 1 and 2, Autumn, 1967, Spring, 1968, pp. 21-28, 81-90.

[29]Barrier, p. 20.

[30]Prakash Tandon, Punjabi Century (1857-1947), University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1968, p. 33.

[31]Barrier, p. 24.

[32]Ibid.

[33]The Imperial Gazeteer of India, Vol. XII, New Ed., Oxford, 1908, pp. 390-391.

[34]Ibid., p. 395.

[35]Ibid. The issues emerging from this point, and their significance, will be discussed below in Chapter 3.

[36]Dard, p. 28.

[37]Ibid., pp. 28-29. Cf. Mīrzā Bashīr-ud-Dīn, op. cit., pp. 10-11.

[38]Bashīr-ud-Dīn, p. 8.

[39]Dard, p. 29; cf. Bashīr-ud-Dīn, p. 11, who suggests that "since it was the will of Providence that Ahmad should be employed upon an important work, He put it in the mind of his father to educate his son." Cf. also Durranī, who sees Ghulām Murtazā as desireous of "weaning him (Aḥmad) from his studious habits and to see him employed in assisting him (Murtaẓā) in his worldly affairs." (p. 13)

[40]Dard, p. 29.

[41]Dard, p. 31.

[42]Muḥammad ʿAlī, "The Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement," Review of Religions, V, No. 6, June, 1906, pp. 233-234. The point about Aḥmad's not having joined in ṣūfī orders was corroborated by Dr. Khalīl Nasir in the interview cited above (Note 1). See also Bashīr-ud-Dīn, p. 24. It is obvious from such a statement that during his lifetime Ghulām Aḥmad did not want to be identified or associated with ṣūfīs or orders per se. In spite of this, however, we must note here the prevalance of ṣūfī doctrines and practices which were a part of Aḥmad's teachings and organization particularly after 1890. We shall discuss these further, below.

[43]Dard, p. 33.

[44]Ibid.

[45]*Ibid.*, pp. 38-39. Although Aḥmad's major works have been translated into English by several of his followers, there are occasional passages of revelation in some Urdū works where the revelation itself was given in English but written in Urdū script. An example is taken from *Barāhīn-i-Aḥmadīyah*, Vol. V, p. 86:

"آئی لَو یُو - آئی شیل گو یُو اے لارج پارٹی اوف اسلام."

[46]Bashīr-ud-Dīn, pp. 14-15.

[47]Dard, p. 40.

[48]*Ibid.*, pp. 43-44.

[49]*Ibid.*, p. 52; Bashīr-ud-Dīn, p. 21; Muḥammad ʿAlī, "The Founder..." in *RR*, V, *op. cit.*, pp. 232-233; see also *RR*, II, 1903, quoted in ʿAlī Alḥaj Muḥammad (ed.), *The Way to Peace and Happiness*, Secunderabad, n.d. (1930ff), p. 67.

[50]Dard, p. 61. A footnote lists the establishment of other brances as follows: in 1878: Jihlūm, Multān, Ferōzpūr, Gurdāspūr; 1881: Gujrāt and Peshāwar; 1882: Dehlī, Ludhiāna and Batāla; 1883: Rohtāh and Maghiāna; 1884: Sialkōt and Kohāt; 1885: Bhera and Muzaffergarh; 1886: Hoshiāpūr, Shakpūr, Hazāra, Pind-dandan khān, Dera Ismaʿīl Khān; 1887: Qādiyān, Jhang, Deranagār. Kenneth Jones, *The Arya Samaj in the Punjab*, lists 11 branches founded by Swāmī Dayānand himself and adds the following to the above: Jullundār, Gujranwāla and Wazīrabād (p. 72).

[51]Dard, p. 62.

[52]*Ibid.* An original copy of this article was not available to the writer.

[53]*Ibid.*

[54]*Ibid.*, p. 64; see also Jones, pp. 67-68, as quoted from H. B. Sarda, *Life of Dayanand*, p. 180. A full discussion of these principles as well as a more detailed summary of Āryā Samāj early history is in Chapter 4, below. The statement in *Vakīl* is not untypically Hindū in its reflection of a Nyāyā-Vaisesika atomism and a doctrine of karma and reincarnation.

[55]Dard, pp. 66-67.

[56]*Ibid.*, p. 69.

[57]Bashīr-ud-Dīn, p. 26.

[58]Dard, p. 70.

[59]Ibid., pp. 70-71.

[60]An abridged translation of the Introduction and first arguments against the Āryā Samājīs and in support of Islām have been published by the Lāhōrī branch in a pamphlet of 115 pages, translated by Maṣūm Bēg, December, 1955. A much longer section including the above appeared in 41 (?) issues of The Light, published at Lāhōr between May 1, 1955 and November 16, 1958.

[61]Vol. VI, Nos. 6-11; Dard, p. 77; Durranī, p. 27; Bashīr-ud-Dīn, p. 27.

[62]Quoted from Dard, p. 77.

[63]See Chapter 3, below, for details on the polemics between Aḥmad and the more traditional 'ulamā' including Abū Sa'īd Muḥammad Ḥusayn of Batāla.

[64]Barāhīn-i-Aḥmadīyah, translated by Mīrzā Ma'ṣūm Bēg, Aḥmadīyah Anjumān Isha'āt-i-Islām, Lāhore, 1955, p. 1.

[65]Ibid., p. 5.

[66]Ibid., pp. 1-2.

[67]Ibid., pp. 6-13.

[68]Ibid., pp. 14-31.

[69]Ibid., p. 32. Of this latter point, Dard says, "As a matter of fact the book which consisted of 300 arguments and was completed by May, 1879, was not all published. The first four parts, which are printed, contain only one of the original 300 arguments. The author was unable to publish the whole of the manuscript because the events of his life took a different turn altogether." (p. 72) The meaning of this is certainly not clear.

[70]Barāhīn, p. 32.

[71]Ibid., p. 47.

[72]Ibid., p. 51. We will develop this argument concerning Ghulām Aḥmad's claim to the "prophecy" below.

[73]Dard, p. 80.

[74]"Jehad and the British Government," Caxton Printing Works, Lahore, 1900, p. ix.

[75]Dard, pp. 80-81.

[76]This study must necessarily be selective. We seek neither to prove nor disprove many "facts" in the life of Aḥmad nor to discuss in detail his exegesis of Qur'ān or Ḥadīth. Rather, we seek to point out the distinctive teachings and events that will help to place Aḥmad in the context of his times. Chapters 3 and 4 will treat certain periods of controversy over his teachings and public pronouncements in considerable detail.

[77]Dard, pp. 102-103. His first wife, still alive at this time, is not mentioned again in the biographical material.

[78]Dard, p. 104. See references in Chapter 3 to the satire of Muḥammad Bakhsh in Mullā Ja'far Zatallī directed against this second wife. See also Chapter 6 in which proscribed pamphlets of the 1930's, many with unpleasant illusions to Aḥmad's second wife, will be discussed.

[79]Dard, p. 106.

[80]Ibid., p. 151.

[81]Ibid., p. 142.

[82]Ibid., p. 147.

[83]Ibid., pp. 151-153.

[84]Aḥmad went there to take his first wife to visit her parents. Dard sees a divine plan at work here because Ludhiāna was a far more important city than Qādiyān. More likely are the reasons he gives on pp. 158-159 that Ludhiāna was a center of Christian missionary activity and the site of publication for Nūr-i-Afshān which began publication March 6, 1873. As well, Ludhiāna was a place where leaders among the Muslim mawlawīs had taken an active role in the 1857 uprisings.

[85]The total number of persons who received bay'ah on this occasion is not recorded by Dard (p. 156); however, he stresses the small number of persons reported by the Qur'ān to have accepted bay'ah from the Holy Prophet at Mecca, 'Aqaba and later at Ḥudabīya. Bashīr-ud-Dīn reports that 40 persons took the oath that day (p. 30).

[86]Muḥammad ʿAlī, "Mirza Ghulam Ahmad: His Life and Mission," S. Muḥammad Tufail, ed. and trans., p. 4.

[87]Fath-i-Islām, Mīrzā Maṣūm Bēg, trans., in The Light, Lahore, Vol. XXXVII, No. 10, March 24, 1958, p. 6.

[88]Ibid., p. 7.

[89]Ibid. See also Masīh Hindūstān Mēn, Qādiyān, 1912 (written 1899), p. 27; also Tauzīh-i-Marām, Iqbāl Aḥmad, trans., Ahmadiyah Anjumān Ishāʿat-i-Islām, Lahore, 1966 (original Urdū edition 1891), pp. 5-17; see also Mumtaz Aḥmad Faruqī, "Truth Triumphs," Ahmadiyya Anjumān Ishāʿat-i-Islām, Lahore, 1965, p. 9, for a discussion of this point.

[90]Fath-i-Islām, The Light, Vol. XXXVII, No. 15, May 16, 1958, p. 11.

[91]Tauzīh-i-Marām, p. 5.

[92]Qur'ān, 5:117; 4:159; 3:55 (cf. translations of Pickthall and Aḥmad).

[93]Tauzīh, p. 11.

[94]Ibid., p. 13.

[95]Ibid., pp. 16-17. This is certainly a highly controversial point.

[96]Ibid., p. 18; i.e., the ability to receive prophecies and propitious signs revealed to people with certain spiritual ability.

[97]"A Misunderstanding Removed," Qādīan, 1901, republished by The Ahmadiyah Muslim Foreign Missions Office, Rabwah, n.d., p. 13.

[98]Tauzīh, pp. 22-23.

[99]Dard, p. 253.

[100]Dard, p. 261.

[101]Ibid., p. 262.

[102]The Philosophy of the Teachings of Islam, The American Fazl Mosque, Washington, D. C., 1953.

[103]See above, pp. 61-62.

[104]See Chapter 3, below, for a detailed discussion of these controversies. For Aḥmad's strong repudiation of the Mahdī of the Sudan see al-Ḥakam, July 9, 1900.

[105]Masīḥ Hindūstān Mēn, p. 7.

[106]Ibid., p. 11.

[107]Ibid., p. 12. The point about the "Jewish" grave is mentioned on p. 1; see also Walter, p. 93, who attempted to locate this grave unsuccessfully and who denies the veracity of Aḥmad's "proofs."

[108]Masīḥ Hindūstān Mēn, p. 12.

[109]Ibid., p. 66.

[110]For Aḥmad's position on this point with relation to both the Muslim 'ulamā' and British Government, see Chapter 3. For detailed discussion of the arguments about Aḥmad as Promised Messiah, see such works as Nuzūl-i-Masīḥ (published posthumously in 1909), Barāhīn-i-Aḥmadīyah, Part 5, 1905; numerous articles in Review of Religions, Vols. I, II, V; Najm al-Hudā (in Arabic), 1898; "A Misunderstanding Removed," 1901.

[111]Letter to Akhbār al-'Āmm, Lāhōre, May 26, 1908, republished in al-Ḥaj 'Alī Muḥammad (ed.), The Way to Peace and Happiness, pp. 163-165.

[112]Masūm Bēg, "The Prophecies of the Promised Messiah," Aḥmadīyah Anjumān Isha'āt-i-Islām, Lahore, 1947, p. 50, which sets the figure at "75".

[113]Dard, pp. 237-238.

[114]Ibid., pp. 268-271.

[115]Ibid., pp. 270-271.

[116]Ibid., p. 586; Muḥammad 'Alī, "Ghulam Ahmad: His Life and Mission," pp. 17-18, both of which insist that the name "Aḥmad" in "Aḥmadīyah" does not refer to Ghulām Aḥmad but only to the use of the name in reference to the Holy Prophet. The martyrdom of two Aḥmadīs in Afghanistan in 1903 has often been cited as proof that the movement suffered severe persecution from earliest times. See Review of Religions, II, p. 446.

[117]Gazeteer of the Gurdaspur District, 1891, compiled and published under the authority of the Punjab Government,

Lahore, 1891, p. 61. The same information about Aḥmad, in a slightly expanded context, was reprinted in the Census of India, 1901, Vol. XVIII A, "Punjab and Northwest Frontier," compiled by H. A. Rose, Lahore, 1902, p. 143.

[118]Census of India, 1901, p. 143, item 39.

[119]Ibid., p. 186.

[120]Ibid., p. 115.

[121]Review of Religions, Vol. II, No. 2, p. 83, quoted in Walter, The Ahmadiya Movement, p. 98, with the comment: "How different was Jesus' attitude reflected in his saying, now so often quoted in India, 'I came not to call the righteous but the sinners to repentance.' (Luke 5:32)."

[122]Dard, p. 333.

[123]Ibid., pp. 333-334.

[124]A reference to Dr. Ernest Trumpp, a German scholar, who first translated the ʿAdi Granth into English in 1877 at the request of the Panjāb Government and who, also like Aḥmad, offended the Sikhs by some of his personal habits displayed during the translation project.

[125]Dard, pp. 334-338; see also Muḥammad ʿAlī, "Ghulam Ahmad...," pp. 16-17.

[126]Dard, p. 341.

[127]Selections from the Vernacular Newspapers Published in the Punjab, 1895, Vol. VIII (hereafter S.V.N.P.), No. 40, p. 587, from the Khalsa Gazette, September 18, 1895.

[128] Ibid., No. 41, p. 607, Bharāt Sudhār, September 28, 1895.

[129]Ibid., Vol. IX, No. 8, p. 100, Singh Sahāī, February 12, 1896.

[130]Singh Sahāī, April 12, May 5, December 8, 1896.

[131]See Muḥammad ʿAlī, "The Founder of Sikhism," Aḥmadīyah Printing Works, Lahore, 1913, 20 pages which also appeared in Review of Religions, VII, No. 1, January, 1908, pp. 19-39.

[132]Dard, pp. 342-357. Of fascinating significance is a footnote on p. 354 in which Dard tells of the time Aḥmad read the speech to his close followers at Qādiyān before

travelling to Lāhōr and only one, Khawāja Kamāl al-Dīn, later one of the leaders of the Lahōr group, criticised it as ordinary and inadequate. It is "no wonder that the other Ahmadies who realized the full import of the Promised Messiah's claim were amazed at the demonstration of this mentality and the spiritual shallowness which it indicated." "One wonders if feebleness of faith could have sunk lower."

[133]Dard, p. 417.

[134]Ibid; the British record of the Panjāb Press indicates that the weekly circulation of al-Hakam rose from 400 in 1899 to 900 in 1905. Of its editor they wrote: "Yakub Ali passed his Entrance Examination in 1893. His father was a subordinate teacher in the Adampur Vernacular Middle School. The family owns no land. Yakub Ali is a professional news writer and lives in Ludhiana. Has been for some time a translator in the Paisa Akhbar office. Age 38, of satisfactory antecedents. A man of no influence, but given to agitation.

Yakub Ali worked as a candidate for zilladarship in the Irrigation Department. Got an appointment as Patwari in that department but resigned. In 1894 began work as editor in Amritsar of the Riaz-i-Hind, Feroz, Ahluwalia Gazette, Jahan Numa, and Punjab. In 1896 was selected as a special police officer to supervise Muharram arrangements. In 1897 he started the Hakam paper in Amritsar, and in 1898 transferred it to Qadian...."

Of al-Hakam itself they wrote in 1899: "An organ of the Qadian sect and the bulletin of their leader, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. Has no influence on the public at large, but is designed to keep up the interests of the disciples. Its tone is often scurrilous and often more or less openly seditious. During the year 1899, it did not overtly incite to illegal acts but contained a violent and mischievous attack on the Arya Samaj. Writings generally on religious subjects." M. G. Barrier and P. Wallace, The Punjab Press 1885-1905, (forthcoming 1970).

[135]See Barrier and Wallace, op. cit., for the 1905 estimate by the Government. The 1910 Statement of Newspapers and Periodicals Published in the Punjab reports that it is "a very well written magazine devoted to the cause of the late Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. Tone moderate. About 200 copies are sent to Europe and America. Has no connection with politics." A similar report for 1923 indicated that the publication had been "warned" in 1916 for reproducing an abbreviated version of "the objectionable pamphlet Khuru-i-Dajjal which was declared forfeited by the Punjab Government." It was warned again in 1919 for defective imprint.

[136]Walter, p. 17, quoted in Muḥammad ʿAlī, "Mirza Ghulam Ahmad...," p. 22.

[137]"Lecture on Islam" delivered at Siālkōṭ, November 2, 1904, p. 20, quoted by Muḥammad ʿAlī, op. cit., pp. 22-23. The response of the Hindū press to this claim, if any, was not reported in the S.V.N.P.

[138]Translated and published in RR, VII, No. 7, July, 1908, pp. 241-271.

[139]Muḥammad ʿAlī, op. cit., p. 24. Cf. the more elaborate description of Aḥmad's last days in Bashīr-ud-Dīn, pp. 79-83. For the official Ahmadīyah eulogy, see RR, VII, No. 6, June, 1908, pp. 222-238.

CHAPTER 3

POLEMICS AND CONTROVERSY: (I) ʿULAMĀʾ, MISSIONARIES AND GOVERNMENT

In 1890, Mīrzā Ghulām Aḥmad declared that he was masīḥ mawʿūd and mahdī of the Muslims. When he also stated his position on the death of Jesus and his reinterpretation of the Qurʾānic doctrine of jihād, Aḥmad stirred up a hornet's nest throughout the Islamic community of the Panjāb. Although he may have made his teachings and claims out of the deepest personal religious motivations, the fact that, at times, his views appeared to be presented arrogantly, led to an increasing alienation between Aḥmad and the religious communities of the Panjāb.

Because polemics and controversy so often turn to distrust and misunderstanding, the nature of the various conflicts in which Ghulām Aḥmad found himself during the 1890's has often been misinterpreted and confused by those who have commented upon them during the past eighty years. While the theological points upon which Aḥmad built his case and against which Muslims, Christians and Āryā Samājīs argued, are fairly simple to understand, the interaction of the people who were defending or propagating particular viewpoints in a particular context during that controversial decade have been neither closely examined nor correctly understood in their details.[1]

The causes of Aḥmad's controversy with Muslim mawlawīs and Christian missionaries and his need to communicate with the Government centered around the three basic issues by which Aḥmad distinguished himself from others: Jesus, jihād, and the mahdī. The interaction of the varying perspectives presents the student of comparative religions with unusual original historical data, which needs sensitive interpretation and presentation. It is the purpose of this chapter to unravel these various strands of inter-action and place them in a perspective both for Aḥmadīyah history and for modern Indian religious history as well.

The earliest reactions against Aḥmad came from fellow Muslims shortly after the publication of the Fath-i-Islām and Tauzīh Marām in 1890 and 1891. His principal opponents in this struggle were ʿAbd al-Jabbar and his disciple, ʿAbd al-Ḥaq Ghaznavī of Amritsar, Naẓīr Ḥusayn of Dehlī, Abū Saʿīd Muḥammad Ḥusayn of Batāla and Aḥmad-allāh also of Amritsar. The debate began when ʿAbd al-Ḥaq Ghaznavī challenged Aḥmad to a "mubāhilla" on the issue of the death of Jesus. Aḥmad's response to this challenge in February, 1891 was to answer by letter, saying that he was prepared to debate but felt that such a debate was unnecessary "to settle minor difference of opinion amongst Muslims."[2] Since Naẓīr Ḥusayn, Muḥammad Ḥusayn and Aḥmad-allāh had signed a fatwā saying that such a debate was quite permissible among Muslims, Aḥmad agreed to go to Amritsar for that purpose and sent a reply which was later published in Riaz-Hind, March 15, 1891. The issue

at once was sidetracked by ʿAbd al-Ḥaq's response to this letter which came in the form of an ishtihār asking Aḥmad to explain why, if he had challenged another ʿalim to a mubāhilla in the text of the Fath, he would not participate in one now. Aḥmad, then, replied to this point, saying that the mawlawī in question had insinuated that Aḥmad was not receiving revelations but was a fraud.

> In such a case Mobahala was permissible....But never in the history of Islam did anyone challenge ...to settle such theological differences through Mobahala. The curse of God is invoked in Mobahala on a liar who deliberately invents a lie, and not on one who simply holds any wrong or erroneous belief.[3]

This first encounter with ʿAbd al-Ḥaq was apparently delayed indefinitely because Aḥmad "had not yet received any divine command in the matter." When this initial challenge did not materialize, the mullahs, according to Aḥmad's principal biographer, turned to Muḥammad Ḥusayn of Batāla and, plotting together against Aḥmad, "instigated him to stand up against Ahmad."[4] Believing that Aḥmad's early success had been in some measure influenced by Muḥammad Ḥusayn's favourable review of the Barāhīn and his friendship with Aḥmad, the ʿulamāʾ may well have believed that an attack on Aḥmad by Ḥusayn would have undercut much of Aḥmad's support.[5] In this moment of crisis, Aḥmad did not accept the advice of men that he should be politic in his relations with the more orthodox ʿulamāʾ. Believing his trust to be "in God and God alone," he wrote to Muḥammad Ḥusayn in mid-February that

> I am not at all concerned with victory or defeat; all I want is to remain a devoted and obedient servant of God...I am not at all sorry or grieved to know that friends like yourself intent to oppose me because I believe that this opposition will be for the sake of truth. I saw in a vision yesterday that I was writing on my arm, that I was alone and God was with me.[6]

Aḥmad sent his two volumes on to Ḥusayn and urged that they get together to discuss the issues that concerned the mawlawī. According to Dard, even though the Batālwī never consented to such a discussion, Aḥmad refused to become upset with him. In the following chapter of his biography of Aḥmad, entitled "The Pharisee of Batala," Dard has traced the events of 1891 which were continued by a bitter correspondence between Muḥammad Ḥusayn and Aḥmad's disciple Nūr al-Dīn. After a number of bitter letters, a proposed private debate took place in Lāhōr in mid-April, 1891, in which Aḥmad seems to have bested Ḥusayn. Throughout these arguments Aḥmad insisted that all religious answers "were in the hands of God," in response to Muḥammad Ḥusayn's frontal attacks on Aḥmad's claims to the Messiahship.[7]

The Mullahs of Ludhiāna already having declared a fatwā against Aḥmad, next joined to oppose him in public debate. The leader of the Ahl-i-Ḥadīth there challenged Aḥmad to debate the "Jesus" issue. Aḥmad asked the man to have Muḥammad Ḥusayn join the debate whereupon Ḥusayn insisted that the debate deal only with Aḥmad's claim to be Promised Messiah. This debate, in which Muḥammad Ḥusayn "never touched the real subject" began on July 20, 1891 and lasted about

12 days. Muḥammad Ḥusayn debated entirely on the value of hadīth while Aḥmad stressed hadīth only in relation to Qur'ān. This debate ended in such an uproar that a magistrate was forced to order Muḥammad Ḥusayn to leave town, while Aḥmad, feeling the wrath of the controversy, went on to Amritsar for a few days while passions cooled off. He then returned to Ludhiāna and finally to Qādiyān.[8] Among the missionaries, Āryā Samājīs, and mullahs, Aḥmad became the center of religious debate at Ludhiāna. It was here that he had made his first real impact outside of Qādiyān.[9]

At the end of September, 1891, Aḥmad travelled to Dehlī where he contacted the leader of the Ahl-i-Ḥadīth, Naẓīr Ḥusayn. After several weeks of correspondence, the two held a debate on October 20 at the Juma' Masjid in the presence of "more than 5000 people."[10] During the meeting, which appeared to be more of a disturbance than a debate, Aḥmad was surrounded by his twelve disciples and, in his biography, is likened to Jesus accompanied by his disciples during the last days in Jerusalem.[11] Although his opponents did all they could to stop Aḥmad in Dehlī, he went on preaching in a Christ-like style:

> God has sent me to deliver the captives, and to comfort those that are heavy-laden and to relieve them of the burdens which men have put upon their backs. I have come to cleanse mankind from the leprosy of sin and to lead them back to God; I have come to remove hatred...and strife and to establish peace, good will and love.

One result of the chaotic encounter at Dehlī was another

debate, this time at Aḥmad's house in Dehlī with Muḥammad Bashīr, a mullah from Bhopāl who had read about the Dehlī controversy. Muḥammad Ḥusayn and ʿAbd al-Majīd were to be prohibited from participating and a limit of five exchanges on the subject of the death of Jesus was set. The debate ran from October 23-28, 1891 until, on the last day, Aḥmad was called away "suddenly as his father-in-law was ill."[12]

There seems little doubt that the growing tensions between Aḥmad and Muḥammad Ḥusayn were more than theologically based. Issues of personality and method were also involved. In a letter dated December 31, 1892, Aḥmad wrote that he had had a dream which was "unfavourable" to Muḥammad Ḥusayn. His friends had had similar dreams and together they sought to warn the Batālwī mullah. Muḥammad Ḥusayn, "too proud to take the threat seriously," published in response a statement in Ishāʿat (January 9, 1893, Vol. XV, No. 1) that Aḥmad was an imposter and fraud.[13]

According to a revelation Aḥmad received on December 10, 1892, he declared that God had now granted him permission to hold a mubāhilla against other Muslims. The decision to hold this kind of debate about Islamic teachings was certainly, in part, the result of the numerous fatwās which were excommunicating Aḥmad and declaring him to be a dajjāl, mulḥīd, zindīq, makkār, etc.[14] Although Aḥmad was prepared, by the text of his statement, to take on all opponents at once, he was answered only by ʿAbd al-Ḥaq Ghaznavī who arranged

the debate for early June, 1893 at Amritsar. Although it is not clear exactly what happened at this mubāhūla, Aḥmad's biographer indicates that God's judgment brought favour to Aḥmad and "oblivion" to ʿAbd al-Ḥaq after this encounter.[15]

By the middle of 1895, after Aḥmad had also engaged in controversies with Christians and Āryās, he urged the Government to set limits on religious polemics. To implement this, he proposed a Memorial to the Government to amend Section 298 of the Indian Penal Code. To build his case, Aḥmad sent the petition to eminent persons throughout North India. While Muḥammad Ḥusayn favoured the idea, he "declared that he would do everything necessary for its enforcement provided Ahmad had nothing to do with it."[16] Aḥmad, himself, in a letter to Ṣadīq al-Akhbār of Bahāwalpūr (October 31, 1895) indicated rather that "Maulwi Muhammad Husain having offered to take up the matter, the Mirza will no longer have anything to do with it."[17]

The height of the controversy with Muḥammad Ḥusayn was reached late in the year 1898 and during 1899. The attack against Ghulām Aḥmad was no longer centered only on the death of Jesus issue or on Aḥmad's claim to be masīḥ mawʿūd and mahdī but now also on his interpretation of the issues of jihād and loyalty to the Government. In a lengthy article published in Ishāʿat-i-Sunnah at the end of August, 1898 Muḥammad Ḥusayn argued that India was not dār al-ḥarb "and that consequently taking interest on money even from

non-Moslems is unlawful."[18] In his "Treatise on Jihād" more than a decade earlier, Ḥusayn had already defined the concept of "dār al-Islām" as referring to any country "so long as all the religious exercises of the Mohammedan religion are not forbidden and stopped." In making this assertion he was following the Ḥanafī position as stated in the Fatawā-i-ʿAlāmgirī of Awrangzēb "that a dar-ul-Islam cannot become Dar-ul-Harab as long as there exists even one performance of the religious acts of Islam...."[19]

A further deduction of Muḥammad Ḥusayn, clear from his dedication of the treatise to James Broadwood Lyall, Lieutenant Governor of the Panjāb, as well as from his direct statement,

> ...this country (India), though under the government of Christians, is a Dar-ul-Islam; and no king...or the Mahdi of Soudan, or the Sultan of Turkey himself, can wage holy war against it,[20]

was his strong loyalty to the British. Believing all three classes of native Muslims in India to be loyal already to the British Government--that is, native chiefs, their subjects, and general Muslims subjects in British ruled areas--he particularly cited the loyalty professed by the Ahl-i-Ḥadīth of the Panjāb in their Memorial to Sir Henry Davies, Lieutenant Governor of the Panjāb in 1876.[21] Of course, the essence of Muḥammad Ḥusayn's desire to prove himself and his followers loyal stemmed from their descent from the Indian "Waḥḥābī" movement. Going on in the treatise to repudiate those

ʿulamāʾ who had declared through a fatwā in 1857 that jihād against the British was lawful, he pointed out that his spiritual forebear Muḥammad Ismāʿīl of Dehlī did not fight the British but rather declared jihād against the Sikhs.[22]

On the surface, the positions of Aḥmad and Muḥammad Ḥusayn on the matter of jihād and loyalty seem identical. Their reasons were, of course, somewhat different in that the Aḥmadīyah did not have a link with past history of militancy in the way that the Wahhābī-Ahl-i-Ḥadīth did. But growing personal distrust between the two men and their followers certainly played a role in the controversies of 1898 and 1899. In the same late August, 1898 issue of Ishāʿat-i-Sunnah, for example, Muḥammad Ḥusayn criticized Aḥmad for "making disparaging remarks regarding the Turkish Government and predicting its downfall." Ḥusayn continued his article by insisting that the positive remarks he had made about Aḥmad's loyalty in his oft-quoted review of Barāhīn he no longer upheld since Aḥmad had declared himself mahdī. Ḥusayn went on to say that he believed the Mīrzā insincere and that his praises of Government could not be trusted. "It is to be hoped," he continued,

> that the Muhammadan public will regard him as the enemy of Islām and its followers owing to the disparaging language used by him regarding the sultān, ...
> The Editor also trusts that the authorities will not allow themselves to be deceived by his disrespectful language towards the sultān and his praises of the British Government, as the man is not sincere, and wishes only to please the authorities by means of flattery.[23]

Blistering answers to these charges came in the pages of al-Hakam on September 27. Muḥammad Ḥusayn, in preparing a fatwā declaring Ghulām Aḥmad to be an infidel, had deceived both the people and "simple ulemas."

> On being apprised of the impropriety of the act done by them, some of the Ulemas expressed their sorrow, while others submitted written apologies to the Khalifa of God for having done so through a mistake. The father of lies (Sheikh Battal) has thereby shown that he does not deserve to be placed on the throne of the enemy of Adam (Satan). Of course he is fit for being relegated to the nation of the Jews....[24]

Such a response was hardly polite or within the bounds that Aḥmad himself was urging the Government to adopt by law.

The same issue of al-Hakam published an open letter from ʿAbd al-Qādir of Ludhiāna proposing a mubāhila between Aḥmad and Muḥammad Ḥusayn at a public meeting at Batāla. The letter further proposed that they should invoke the curses of God upon one another "in order to decide by ordeal which of them is in the right." ʿAbd al-Qādir offered Ḥusayn 200 rupees to meet the challenge. The prize was raised to 2525/8 rupees by the end of October from pledges made by many Aḥmadīs but Muḥammad Ḥusayn still did not answer the challenge.[25] The debate was supposed to center around Ghulam Aḥmad's four qualifications supporting his claims:

(1) that he is a profound Arabic scholar
(2) that his prayers are granted by the Almighty
(3) that he can make prophecies; and
(4) that he is the best commentator of the Koran.[26]

The reply to the challenge came, this time, from a

new opponent, Mullah Muḥammad Bakhsh, editor and proprietor of the Ja'far Zatallī of Lāhōr.[27] In the November 29 issue of al-Ḥakam, Aḥmad cited the remarks made against him in the Ja'far of November 10,[28] and replied by saying that he had prayed to God that if such abuses as Bakhsh and his colleague Abū al-Ḥasan of Thibet had directed against him be true, then God should bring him into disgrace within the thirteen month period extending from December 15, 1898 to January 15, 1900.[29] Listing a series of revelations he had then received, Aḥmad asserted that the judgment of God would then fall on both parties in the dispute; i.e., either on him or on Muḥammad Ḥusayn, Muḥammad Bakhsh or Abū al-Ḥasan.

In the November 10 article, Muḥammad Ḥusayn had apparently indicated his willingness to accept Aḥmad's challenge. His reply stated, however, that he

> does not agree to accept the period of one year as the time during which the wrath of God is to befall the liar, and wishes that the effect of the mubahila should appear at the time of the meeting or at the most within three days.... The Maulvi does not wish to take the reward of Rs. 825 but proposes for the Mirza...that his face should be blackened and he be brought into disgrace; and that instead of receiving Rs. 825, he (the Maulvi) will be content if 825 blows with a dhoe be dealt on the head of the Mirza by his followers and he be made to sit on a donkey and paraded in the streets.[30]

That these issues were disturbing to the Muslim community in general was evident from the comments of the Hindū paper Akhbār al-'Ām which suggested that if the three opponents of Aḥmad did not suffer the prescribed disgrace, "and if they

do not bite their hands, it will not show that the revelation was incorrect, but merely that these men must have repented in their hearts."[31] Paysah Akhbār stood more clearly opposed to Aḥmad. Referring to a recent court case[32] against him in which the public was informed that Aḥmad would have to restrict his prophesying to his own followers and "abstain from creating excitement among the public," the editor appeared annoyed by the fact that Aḥmad could not resist public pronouncements. He continued by suggesting that Aḥmad could be prosecuted for publishing this latest prophecy against Muḥammad Ḥusayn. The article concluded by saying,

> that if Ghulam Ahmad is really a prophet and has been sent into this world with a special mission, he ought to be able to convince his opponents of the truth of his claims without resorting to trickery...it would have been better if he had specified the nature of the calamity which he says is to befall Maulvi Muhammad Husain within thirteen months. It is, moreover, to be hoped that any ordinary sorrow or grief will not be taken to betoken the fulfillment of the prophecy.[33]

In the events that followed, the situation seemed to deteriorate. On December 1, Muḥammad Bakhsh, a deputy inspector of police at Batāla, reported to the Deputy Commissioner of Gūrdāspūr the possibility of a breach of the peace resulting from the tensions between Muḥammad Ḥusayn and Aḥmad. Muḥammad Ḥusayn had applied for permission to carry arms because he had feared for his life since Ghulām Aḥmad had made his prophecy on November 21. At the same time the Gūrdāspūr police confirmed the allegation that Aḥmad was violating the order

of Captain M. W. Douglas not to prophesy in public.[34] Both men were called into court on December 15 to show cause why they should not be compelled to keep the peace. Counsel for Aḥmad was Mawlawī Faḍl al-Dīn while counsel for Ḥusayn was a Shaykh Nabī Bakhsh. Although the case was put off until January 5, 1899, when Muḥammad Ḥusayn telegraphed that he could not appear that day, the hearing was again postponed until it finally began on January 11.[35]

Ahmad had apparently utilized the last days of 1898 to write and publish a new tract entitled the "Kashf-ul-Ghiṭā'" in which he sought to answer the charges "made by his opponents about him and his sect," while calling the attention of the Government to his strong support of its position.[36] Stressing the latter concern particularly, Aḥmad began this essay by quoting four letters received by him, his father and his brother from British Government officials commending the family for its service. The latest of these, however, was dated June 29, 1876, more than twenty years before the events Aḥmad was now concerned about and, of course, none of them pertained to him or his movement.[37] Taking account of this, however, Aḥmad continued by saying that for the past nineteen years he had been publishing books urging Muslims to be loyal to the British Government. The response he had received, however, was that

> some ignorant mullahs are led by my writings to call me a Kafir and attribute them to some secret and private relations of mine with the Government, believing me to be a hired eulogist

> and supporter of it....Now, when they find... my numerous publications in support of Islam, and in refutation of the hostile attacks...and (also) my earnest exhortations to be loyal and faithful subjects of the Government, they have no reason to question the bonafides of my statements and the sincerity of my motives.[38]

Describing, in a second section, the nature of his teachings, Aḥmad did not mention his claims to be masīḥ mawʿūd or mahdī which were at the crux of Muslim confrontation with him, until the third and fourth sections. Of his Mahdīhood he said, "I deny the appearance of the bloody Mehdi so ardently expected by the Mussalmans."[39] The Jews may have persecuted Christ, these "nominal Mussalmans" may want to revenge the wrongs to them by others, even such Christian missionaries as Dr. Clark may want to destroy Aḥmad, but he will hold no enmity against any man no matter how zealously and evilly he may pursue a cause.[40]

He cited the fatwās of Muḥammad Ḥusayn and others declaring him to be kafīr and dajjāl, which had been published in a pamphlet called "Saīf al-Maslūl" ("the Drawn Sword") at Rawalpindī during 1891, which

> went so far as to assert that my murder, the plundering of my and my followers' goods and the seizing and carrying away of our wives were not only lawful but also meritorious.[41]

If this were not bad enough, Aḥmad continued, the following extract from one of four ishtihārs issued by Muḥammad Ḥusayn on June 11, 1897 (with a supplement) and also on August 12 and September 25, 1898 would give an indication of the kind

of language that was being used against him.

> The wife of Mirza has an illicit connection with his disciples....It has been revealed by God that the wife of Mirza shall be married to Mullah Muhammad Bakhsh....It has also been revealed that the Mirza of Qadian shall be involved in a serious case and shall be banished or chained and thrown into prison, and while in imprisonment he shall go mad. He shall suffer from a Fistula, he shall become a leper his body shall be esten up by innumerable worms. He shall become disfigured and deformed. His wife shall contract unlawful connections with his disciples, and breaking loose from all control shall ask for divorce from the Mirza; then Muhammad Bakhsh Jafar Zattalli will marry her and the sermon of marriage shall be pronounced by Maulvi Abu Said Muhammad Hussain of Batala. Eventually the Mirza shall become blind deaf and dumb, and, committing suicide, shall be thrown into hell....The above-mentioned prophecies have all been fulfilled with the exception of one relating to marriage. The Mirza has been seized with the bubonic plague and his corpse has been devoured by dogs.[42]

Next justifying his own ishtihār of November 21 because of the many insults that had been heaped upon him, Aḥmad turned, in Section 5, to Muḥammad Ḥusayn's favourable articles about him published in the Ishā'at in 1884 indicating the extent to which they agreed on the doctrine of jihād. The breach came, Aḥmad believed, when he refuted the doctrine of the "ghāzī mahdī" and challenged Ḥusayn's support of the Turkish sulṭān as Khalifah.[43]

In one of the few instances where Ghulam Aḥmad shows any public affinity for the teachings or opinions of Sir Sayyid Aḥmad Khān, he quoted, at the beginning of the tract, a letter he had received from Sir Sayyid only a few days before his death, in which Sir Sayyid supported Aḥmad in his views

about Muslim loyalty to the sultān.[44] The conclusion of the "Kashf-ul-Ghitā" recapitulated Aḥmad's claims as Messiah and mahdī, his call for loyalty to the Government and his assurance to Government "that Muhammad Husayn is a double-dealer and a sharer in all the opinions of the other Maulvis." Continuing, he wrote:

> But upon the Government he palms off quite a contrary belief. In my opinion the best way of being acquainted with the true state of things is to bring Muhammad Husain face to face with me and then ask both of us, in the presence of all other eminent Maulvis, to declare our beliefs. This will at once expose the hypocrite....[45]

That the feelings of Muslims in the area between Lāhōr and Gurdāspūr had reached a pitch in the days leading up to the hearing is evident from the article in Akhbār al-Ālam on January 4, 1899. The writer referred to the prophecies of Ghulām Aḥmad which previously had not come true. Although only ten days had passed since his prophecy concerning Muḥammad Ḥusayn, Muḥammad Bakhsh and Abū al-Hassan (i.e., December 15 to 25), there had already been two attempts on the life of Muḥammad Bakhsh.

> First on the 17th of December 1898 a poisonous snake...was thrown at night on the roof of his house. The cobra was, however, found dead in the morning owing to the cold. On the morning of the 24th idem a small pot containing a snake was placed on the staircase of his house. This snake was shown to the City Inspector of Police, Lahore, at 10 a.m. and a report recorded in the Police Register. This was evidently done in the hope that the Mulla, when descending the stairs, would be bitten by the snake, (and) he would die and the prophecy of the Mirza would be fulfilled ...The writer trusts that the Almighty will protect the Mulla against the machinations of the Mirza.[46]

The attitude of Akhbār al-ʿĀmm in this commentary appeared just the reverse of its statements against the Mullah in the issue of December 3. One need not attribute this so much to inconsistency by the editor as to his general dismay at this internal-Muslim controversy.

The hearing concerning Muḥammad Ḥusayn and Ghulām Aḥmad continued in Gūrdāspūr until February 24, when both men were asked to sign a declaration prepared by the District Magistrate (Deputy Commissioner), a Mr. Dowie. Akhbār al-ʿĀmm and Paysah Akhbār both reported on February 27 that Mr. Dowie had indicated that while he did not wish to interfere with the religious affairs of anyone, he felt it was his primary duty to maintain peace and order in the district. As such he felt that Muḥammad Ḥusayn would have to agree to cease using abusive language against Aḥmad while Aḥmad, in turn, would have to stop prophesying the death and destruction of his opponents.[47]

This document did not really settle the dispute as much as it placed the limits of the law on what the two men could do to each other. Muḥammad Ḥusayn struck another blow, however, in a letter to Akhbār al-ʿĀmm on March 11 repudiating the article they had published on February 27. In this letter, Ḥusayn insisted that the Mirzā had not been acquitted as the earlier article had implied, but rather "discharged". Since Aḥmad had signed the agreement his career as prophet and religious disputant would be at an end. As for Muḥammad Ḥusayn, he

claimed that he himself was innocent of the acts of which he had been accused and that he had not suffered from the decision. Although he recognized the fact that both he and Aḥmad had to give up "using harsh language," Ḥusayn had claimed he had already indicated his desire to do this in two issues of Ishā'at in 1893 and 1895.[48]

Aḥmad also had many answers, justifications, and claims that he had also earlier asked for a cessation of such vilification. One important statement often repeated by Aḥmad and his biographers was that Aḥmad never prophecied the doom of any opponent "without the express request or consent of the person concerned" and further, that he had made this assertion as early as February 20, 1886. One cannot criticize Aḥmad for the statements protecting himself against the accusation of provocation especially in the more controversial deaths of Lēkh Rām and 'Abd-allāh 'Āṣim which followed his prophecies against them. From a modern perspective, it is difficult to understand how one could both insist on limitations for religious controversy and make prophecies of doom against opponents. Whether Aḥmad realized that his prophecies and the resulting events would lead to the kind of public uproar that they did, or whether, because he so firmly believed that whatever he received in the form of revelation he was compelled to declare publically, no matter what the cost, the impact of the declarations was disturbing in many quarters.

At this point it might be well to ask just why Aḥmad

resorted so heavily to the pamphlet and to polemics as a way of expressing himself. While writing would limit his appeal to the rural masses, his use of the tract and later the several Aḥmadīyah journals did no more than place him among numerous religious and political groups who began to use publishing as the way to make their view known during the late nineteenth century. A certain amount of the credit for this approach must be given to the Christian missionary movement which helped to introduce printing and publishing in the Panjāb as it did in so many other parts of Asia. At the same time, it is important to add that Aḥmad's public debates, speeches and sermons impressed large crowds, many of whom probably could not read his writings.

The context in which Aḥmad and Muḥammad Ḥusayn developed their impasse was one which was not only concerned with an attempt to reform Islām but also one reflecting their personal needs as religious leaders with the added complexity of asserting their roles in a British-dominated society. That neither was the "tool" of the Government should be amply clear from the outcome of the hearing of 1899. In Aḥmad's case, further proof is evident in his numerous publications soliciting the attention of Government to his viewpoint and in the response of Government in documents to be cited below.

II

Aḥmad had had his first debates with Christian missionaries during his early years at Sialkōṭ. When he first accepted bay'ah in 1889 it was at Ludhiāna, a center of missionary activity and the site of the most important Christian missionary Urdū language newspaper, the Nūr-i-Afshān, which was first published in 1873.[49] Several years before the bay'ah ceremony at Ludhiāna, several native Christian missionaries had already warned the Christian community against the growing influence of Aḥmad through the pages of Nūr-i-Afshān. Those particularly anxious to oppose Aḥmad were Imād al-Dīn, Thakar Dās and 'Abd-Allāh 'Aṣim.[50] These men, all natives, were connected both with the American Presbyterian Mission and the Church Missionary Society at Ludhiāna and other centers in the Panjāb.

While at Batāla, where he had taken his son for medical treatment in May of 1888, Aḥmad began a prophesying debate with the Rev. Fatḥ Masīḥ. Raised at Batāla under the tutelage of the German missionary, H. U. Weitbrecht-Stanton, Fatḥ Masīḥ was ordained as a deacon by the Bishop of Lāhōr in 1891.[51] Believing he had bested Fatḥ Masīḥ because the latter could not admit to having received direct revelations, Aḥmad chose to remain in Batāla to follow up the "victory" with the aim of then challenging any European Christian to debate.[52] When such a challenger did not come forward, the Christians

and Āryās of the area turned their attention to petty attacks on Aḥmad through pamphlets and the press,[53] and Aḥmad returned home.

Aḥmad really antagonised the Christians at a small village in Amritsar district known as Jandīyālah, an outstation of the medical mission run at Amritsar by Dr. Henry Martyn Clark and established in 1882. The Christians and Muslims at Jandīyālah had been "pin-pricking" each other. In a letter to a local Muslim, Muḥammad Bakhsh Paḥnda, Dr. Clark proposed a public debate. This Muḥammad Bakhsh wrote to Aḥmad for advice and after some controversy between the local parties at Jandīyālah, the Christians agreed to allow Aḥmad to represent the Muslims while ʿAbd-Allāh ʿAṣim was to debate for the Christians. An agreement was signed on April 24, 1893 setting the debate for May 22-27 and May 29-June 3, 1893. In the first part of the debate Aḥmad would explain his claim that "every religion should prove its truth with living signs" and then would question his opponent about the divinity of Jesus. ʿAṣim, in return, would question Aḥmad during the second half of the debate on the questions of God's mercy, free will and predestination, compulsion in religion, proof of the Qurʾān being the word of God and proof of Muḥammad being a messenger of God.[54]

As the debate progressed, witnessed for fifteen long days by many Muslims as well as Christians, relations between the two principal debaters became more and more acrimonious.

In his concluding statement, Aḥmad told of a sign he had just received from God

> that of the two parties to the debate the one who was deliberately following a falsehood and forsaking the true God...would be thrown into "Haviyah" within fifteen months, each month corresponding to a day of this debate, and that he would be severely disgraced provided he did not turn to the truth; and that the person who ...believed in the true God would be openly honoured....Now, I ask Deputy Sahib (Athim): "If this sign is fulfilled, would you accept it or not as...divine prophecy...? Would it be or not a strong proof that the Holy Prophet (peace be on him), whom you call a Dajjal... is a true prophet?"[55]

An entirely different view of the events at Jandiyālah appeared in the Annual Report of the Church Missionary Society for 1894 where Dr. Clark reported:

> The chosen champion of the Mohammedans was a certain Mirza Ghulam Ahmed, of Qadian, a man of Moghal descent, and deeply imbued, Dr. Clark says, with rationalism; he had, indeed, been excommunicated by the orthodox Moslems. The Christian champion was Mr. Abdullah Athim, one of the earliest converts from Mohammedanism. The controversy took place in Amritsar, in the verandah of Dr. Martyn Clark's house, and lasted two weeks.
>
> The disputants sat facing each other in the middle of the verandah; behind them sat their helpers, and then their friends. The Mirza's disciples came from many different places; a number came daily by train from Lahore, Jullundur, and Batala; others had come from Peshawur, on the one hand, and various parts of the N.-W. Provinces on the other. On the Christian side was a goodly array of converts from Mohammedanism, and it was very delightful to see the keen interest and practical help and steady endurance of the younger members of our Punjab Church. Their sound good sense, as well as zeal, augurs brightly for the future.
>
> In addition to the disciples of the Mirza, there was a very large attendance of orthodox Mohammedans, men mostly of affluence and position,

and, as such, not usually reached by existing methods of work. Herein lay one delightful feature of the controversy. There they were, influential wealthy men, Government servants and what not--men, as a whole, quite beyond ordinary reach--sitting hour after hour for a couple of weeks, listening most attentively to expositions of Scripture, to the claims of Christ, to the eternal verities of His truth and the falsity of all beside for acceptance with God, salvation, and life eternal. Had the controversy achieved nothing else, this in itself would have been a great gain.

The fruits of the Spirit of Christ in His followers have been abundantly manifested, and the Mohammedans present have realised and admitted the difference between us and them. They fought for victory; we, as we told them, had no thought of either victory or defeat: our one desire was that the glory of God should be made evident. Mr. Athim's words have been good, but better far have been his unfailing Christian humility, patience, gentleness, and forbearance. His practical Christianity produced a grand impression. On one occasion, after an irritating and insulting piece of bluster on the Mirza's part, Mr. Athim's kindly Christian dignity and meekness won all hearts. "Allah ho Allah (God He is God). Wonderful people are you Christians. Had this been a discussion between Mohammedans, long ere now we should have been tearing each other's throats."

The Mirza himself, in a speech delivered to some of his admirers after the controversy was over, gave us high praise: "They honoured me, and were never wroth, even when my words were irritating. It is the only discussion I have had in which I have not been insulted." In good sooth he may well say so. He has not been happy in his experiences of discussions with his co-religionists.

During the first portion of the discussion a somewhat amusing incident occurred. As a proof of the divine nature of Mohammedanism and the Quran, the Mirza offered to work miracles. He challenged us, if we were indeed followers of the truth, to do no less. He referred so often and in so many ways to the miracles he was prepared to do, that at last we thought it would be well to answer the fool according to his folly. We found a man whose leg had been amputated, another who is dumb, and one who is totally blind. These three were kept in reserve, and at the proper

time produced in the assembly. We said, "Mirza Sahib, if you really care to perform a miracle, we have no objection to witness it. Cure whichever of these afflicted beings you like--or cure them all. Or tell us what sort of a case you want and we will get it for you"--in fact, we made him welcome to the whole resources of the Amritsar Medical Mission in this particular, and the more so that the controversy was organised and carried on in connexion with this special work. The whole scene was dramatic in the extreme, and the effect indescribable in the assembly and in the city, where the news of the Christian's reply to the Mirza's offers, and his lamentable failure, rapidly spread. The Mirza, though ashamed and confounded, made a gallant fight. He retorted by telling us to cure them ourselves, in conformity with Mark xvi. 17, 18; but the three incurables continually present were too much for him. He could not rally, and at the close he and his followers went off much depressed to the city, where he soon found his prestige very seriously impaired.

The Mirza is a heretic. The vast majority of Mohammedans are ranked against him. Though he has made great stir, his actual followers are extremely few; nevertheless the dispute between them (or rather the Mirza) and the orthodox has been long and exceedingly acrimonious. Things have come to such a pass that both parties finally resolved to resort to a mubahilla. In this each party states its position, commends its cause to God, appeals to Him as against its adversary, and prays that the most withering curses may blast whichever of the parties is in the wrong. It is this imprecation of Divine vengeance which is more particularly technically termed mubahilla.

The Mirza wanted to have a mubahilla with us, but we told him that while the children of darkness might curse each other, we followed the Prince of Peace, and we were commanded to bless and curse not. Our prayer for him and his friends was that they might obtain eternal life--that is, know the only true and wise God, and Jesus Christ His Son, whom He hath sent.[56]

While Ghulam Ahmad and his biographer were concerned chiefly with besting the Christians in the debate, during which the acrimony reached a peak with Ahmad's prophecy about

ʿAbd-Allāh ʿAṣim, the attitude of Martyn Clark in describing the events of the debate was written on a very different level. In his public report of 1894 to the Missionary Society there is not even any mention of Aḥmad's prophecy while there is a long paragraph describing an interruption in the debating which came about through a confrontation between Aḥmad and a mawlawī from Ghaznī, Afghanistān who came with a group of Sunnī Muslims from Amritsar. Of this Clark wrote,

> The Ghazni moulvie delivered a solemn form of imprecation to the magistrate, who handed it to the Mirza. He looked it over, then read it out in a loud voice: "I follow the truth, but, O God, if I am a liar, infidel, faithless, as this man avers, may I--" and then followed a series of imprecations and curses, too horrible to transcribe. As the Mirza read out the curses, a heartrending wail burst from his friends; they covered their faces and sobbed aloud. It was a weird sight, this company of forty strong men, under agony of grief, while the rest of that great congregation stood by, every nerve strained to the utmost. Three times the Mirza read the appeal to heaven, while his friends wept and wailed. The paper was then handed back by the magistrate to the Ghazni moulvie, who read: "I follow the truth. This man, Ghulam Ahmed, of Qadian, is an enemy of the truth of God; a liar, deceiver, faithless: let Thy curses be on him, and if I be wrong then may I--" and he repeated the imprecations and curses which the Mirza had read, making the necessary changes. His friends did not weep. He read the declaration three times, and at the close of each time the people shouted "Amen," as they had also done in the case of the Mirza. The parties then resumed their original places, and the mubahilla entered on its last stage. The rival factions gave themselves up to "prayer," which consisted of the most horrible imprecations on each other. I was standing by the Ghaznavis; I heard them pray with almost incredible intensity of feeling: "Lord, may this man not go hence. Change him into a bear, and a monkey. Blacken his face, destroy him, destroy him. May that happen to him which in Thy most terrible wrath

> has never yet happened to the vilest of sinners"--and so on. The Mirza and his friends were meanwhile not idle; they in turn continued to bann the Ghaznavis root and branch. The scene was intensely interesting, yet withal most painful. It was a striking exemplification of the spirit of Islam, and in keeping with the practice of its apostle.[57]

The marked difference in the Aḥmadīyah and Christian reports of this debate points up, once again, the difficulty of getting to the historical truth or reality of the situation. What each reports of the events is what each found to be most significant for his point of view; for, clearly, neither reporter was in any sense objective. In his report to the Church Missionary Society Annual for 1895, Dr. Clark described the conversion of a former Muslim who had served Aḥmad for several years. Since this same convert led "four others to Christ" including "the Mirza's own brother-in-law," Clark could not help but wax exhuberantly at this Christian victory.[58] Writing of Aḥmad's prophecy before the fifteen month period had expired Clark said:

> It is impossible to express the hold it has taken on the public mind. It is a plain, clear issue; it is no longer a war of words, or a drawing of distinctions--a sign from heaven is to be vouchsafed: "Yea, God Himself shall decide in this controversy." It has been the theme of converse, of close attention during the past year. From Madras to Peshawar through the length and breadth of broad India, thousands upon thousands of men have been watching with thoughts intent on the far northern city where Islam had thrown down the wager of battle, and where God Himself would decide.
>
> As I write, the days are swiftly speeding by, and the crisis is now intense beyond words. A bare month is all that remains, and the heavens

are still as brass. The anxious thought of Mohammedan hearts is, Will the sign come--will Islam be vindicated? In the Mirza's mosque at Qadian, prayer is offered all day long and afr into the night, with crying and tears: "O God, save Islam. It is the hour of darkness. Let not Thy faith be put to shame--let the sign be given."

On the night that Aḥmad's prophecy expired and ʿAbd-Allāh ʿAṣim was still alive, the Punjāb Mission News reported that:

> Great excitement prevailed, and many telegrams flew hither and thither over the Punjab on the night of September 5, when the Mirza of Qadian's prophecy against Mr. Abdullah Athim expired....Seeing that Mr. Athim is an old man, and was at the time in extremely feeble health, this was, to say the least, a very shrewd forecast, with two hot weathers carefully brought into the reckoning. However, we are thankful to say that Mr. Athim is now in better health than he has been for a long time, despite the excitement of the past few months, and the very decided efforts which appear to have been made in certain quarters to aid the prophecy to its fulfilment by measures which savour strongly of the Criminal Courts.
>
> The Nur Afshan states that three attempts were made on Mr. Athim's life during the spring at Amritsar, one at Ludhiana, and four at Ferozepore, where he spent the last couple of months of the allotted period at his daughter's house. Great rejoicings therefore took place at the safe completion of the fifteen months, and Mr. Athim's return to Amritsar on September 6 was quite a regal progress. There a large number of Christians had gathered to welcome him, and to thank God for the non-fulfilment of the prophecy on the very spot in Dr. H. M. Clark's verandah where it was made last year. A touching speech was made on this occasion by Mr. Athim himself. He quoted Moses' warning in Deut. xiii. 1-3 against believing false prophets even though their signs come to pass, and then went on to say how, during these months of danger and suspense, two things had given him calm and comfort--the Holy Spirit's support, and the Blood of Christ.
>
> The joyous throng of Christians then passed

> through the main bazaars of Amritsar to show their hero alive in person, though even so, some sceptics declared that this was not the deputy Sahib Abdullah Athim, but his deputy in the shape of a rubber doll, which bowed to the pressure of Dr. Clark's foot! The main feeling, however, among the crowds seems to have been one of rejoicing with the Christians.[59]

Dard's response to the failure of Aḥmad's prophecy to materialize began by chiding the mullahs and Christian missionaries "who were always anxious to run down Ahmad by every means...." Their jubilation at sunset on September 4, 1894 was not justifiable since on that very day Aḥmad had received the word of God "drawing his attention to the qualifying words of the prophecy and declaring that Athim had turned towards the truth...he had made no speech against Islam and had written no article or book during all these months."[60] To explain this point publically, Aḥmad issued leaflets on September 5 and 9 in which he challenged ʿAṣim to publically state that his attitude towards Islām had changed. If he did not do so, or, if he said that it had not changed, Aḥmad prophesied that ʿAbd-Allāh ʿAṣim would die within a year. If this prophecy did not come true, Aḥmad promised to pay ʿAṣim 1000 rupees as a penalty. According to Dard, ʿAṣim's only response appeared in the Nūr-i-Afshān, September 21 and October 10, 1894, in which the Christian replied that he refused to participate in any way. This participation included Aḥmad's insistence that ʿAṣim declare under solemn oath that he had not had a change of heart about

Islām. When another year had passed and ʿAṣim was still alive, Aḥmad's answer was that the time limit would have applied only if ʿAṣim had taken the oath.[61]

The next stage in the controversy with the Christians occurred in August of 1897 when Henry Martyn Clark brought a charge against Ghulām Aḥmad in the court of the Amritsar district magistrate stating that Aḥmad had sent a youth, ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd, to murder him. The case was transferred to Gūrdāspūr where Captain M. W. Douglas, who later presided over the 1899 hearing with Muḥammad Ḥusayn, served as magistrate. The hearing was held between August 10 and 23 at which time Aḥmad was dismissed. Aḥmad's biographers and supporters make much of Clark's failure to prosecute him, but the Church Missionary Society reports for 1898 do not mention the case at all.[62]

The most fiery issue which involved Aḥmad, the missionaries, and other Muslims and Hindūs, centered around the publication of the tract entitled "Ummahāt al-Muʾminīn" apparently written by a native Christian, Aḥmad Shāh Shaykh, in the style of an earlier pamphlet by a Rev. T. Williams, "Tarīkh-i-Muḥammad-kā-ijmāl," which had been banned by the Panjāb Government in 1892.[63] While al-Ḥakam led the Muslim press in condemning the author for "abusing the Prophet in the filthiest language...and circulating this work among the Muhammadans, without their applying for it...." solely to wound their religious feelings, Nūr-i-Afshān took up the

banner for the tract by informing the Muslims in its issue of April 8, 1898 that so many orders had been received for the pamphlet during the past month that it was now out of stock.[64]

In the issue of May 13, 1898, al-Ḥakam published a "Memorial" criticizing the action of the Anjumān-i-Himāyat-i-Islām asking the Government to stop publication of the "Ummahāt." The argument of al-Ḥakam was that it was too late to stop the damage already done by the pamphlet, but worse than this, such a request showed the Christians that Muslims were too weak to defend themselves. At the same time the editor of al-Ḥakam criticized the Panjāb Observer which had already supported the action of the Anjumān.[65]

On May 27, the Āryā Samājī paper, Sat Dharm Parchārak of Jullundār City, entered the debate. In describing the pamphlet "Ummahāt" the writer said that in it

> the character of the founder of Islām has been criticised on the strength of works of authority. So far as the editor is aware, the writer has dealt with the matter in a dignified way. But the Muhammadans, who are notorious for this impatience and quickness to take offense, have sent memorials asking Government to put a stop to the circulation of the pamphlet....Let them think of the Arya Samāj, which is carrying on its work in spite of the hundreds of pamphlets written in abuse of that religion....[66]

When the Panjāb Government refused to suppress the pamphlet, al-Ḥakam expressed its approval in the issue of June 13 saying that

> there is only one physician who can diagnose

> and cure the diseases of Islam, and that the name of the physician is Jesus, son of Mary, in the world of angels, and Mirza Ghulam Ahmad in this world.

Continuing the report, the editor promised a pamphlet in both Urdū and English in which Aḥmad would give a "crushing reply."[67] Lining up allies in later issues, al-Ḥakam praised Sirāj al-Akhbār for agreeing with its stand on the "Ummahat" and did likewise in the case of Singh Sahā'ī. In the latter case, the editor had implied that Aḥmad wanted to be leader of all Indian Muslims. "If the Mirza had cared for such distinction, he could have easily gained his object by supporting the hasty action of the Anjuman or by joining the party of Sir Syad Ahmad Khan," the editor of al-Ḥakam continued. "The Mirza does not at all care for worldly distinction: he cares only for what is good in the eyes of the Almighty."[68]

During July, Nūr-i-Afshān took the offensive on behalf of the author of "Ummahāt." The July 8th issue published a letter from an Indian "preacher" Kaydār Nath of Fathigarh who said that the "Ummahāt" not only exposed the misdeeds of the Prophet but invited "his followers to seek consolation from Christ." The writer of the pamphlet then went on to prove that Muḥammad had broken the commandments of the Qur'ān by marrying several wives and was especially immoral in marrying the wife of his adopted son. For this, the Rev. Nath felt the pamphlet had provided a great public service. The

issue of Nūr-i-Afshān, the following week, debated a rejoinder to the infamous pamphlet written by Sir Sayyid only a few days before his death and urged that all readers who had copies of the "Ummahāt" in their possession to register their names with the pamphlet's author and join in the answer to Sir Sayyid.[69]

On July 29 Nūr-i-Afshān published the text of its reply to Sir Sayyīd which could hardly be said to be in the "Christian spirit" which it, as a missionary paper, was supposed to profess. Among the comments included was a statement that "the Muhammadans should do nothing but drown themselves, as they are not fit either to live or to show their faces to the world."[70] The editor of Nūr-i-Afshān proposed, the following week, that a second edition of the "Ummahāt al-Mu'minīn" be published by the Panjāb Religious Book Society.[71] At the same time, al-Ḥakam joined this time by Sirāj al-Akhbār of Jihlum continued the attack against the pamphlet and Nūr-i-Afshān. In its issue of July 27, the Ḥakam commented

> that the Nur Afshan is already trembling lest Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, should, in his reply to the Ummahat-i-Mominin, show up Christianity in its true colours...and states that he is writing an "Ilzami" reply (counter attack) and collecting the hostile and false writing of Jews and other European infidels....The Nur Afshan will then find what is meant by a reply based on research and what is the truth of the assertions made by the author of the Ummahat. The Nur Afshan is raising an outcry beforehand because it knows a powerful and learned writer the Mirza is. It is therefore anxious to make the public believe that the Mirza's reply will be a collection of the writings of European infidels....[72]

The response of Nūr-i-Afshān to this frontal attack by Aḥmad and his paper was to publish a notice in the August 19 issue which denied the assertion that "Mirza Ghulam (was) the prince of writers." Christianity had nothing to fear from his pen for it had already withstood the writings of Hume, Gibbon and others. Before them, Aḥmad "is a mere schoolboy."[73]

During August and September, three other Muslim papers took a more active role in the controversy after which time, the issue seems to have died down. Sirāj al-Akhbār which had already indicated its support of Ghulām Aḥmad spoke out more strongly on August 29 suggesting that the Mirzā's answering pamphlet would not only give the public another view on the notorious missionary's pamphlet but "bring to the notice of Government the high handed practices of its Christian subjects." The article ends by criticising the action of the Anjumān in calling for suppression of the tract.[74]

Paysah Akhbār publicised the issue on August 31, September 21 and 29. The chief concern of the editor was Sir Mackworth Young's failure to take note of Aḥmad Shāh's decision to publish a second edition of the "Ummahāt" in English. Although the original was published prior to passage of the new law of sedition, the circulation of it had continued during 1897 and a new edition would, of course, see a further continuation of its propagation. In conclusion, the editor foresaw that a republication would "provoke a number of replies and create bad blood between Muhammadans

and Christians...."[75]

The Chaudhwīn Sadī of Rāwalpindī took decisive action on its own which it reported in its issue of September 23. Feeling that a powerful answer from the Muslim community was in order, it took the lead in circulating a book by one Ṣadīq ʿAlī entitled "Qawl al-Matīn fī Jawāb al-Ummahāt al-Muminīn." As an appendix to the book, the incomplete rebuttal of the pamphlet by Sir Sayyīd would also be included. No mention of Ghulām Aḥmad's plans to reply was made in the article.[76] As this was the time when Ghulām Aḥmad's greatest struggle against Muḥammad Ḥusayn of Batāla and the editor of Mullah Jaffar Zatallī, Muḥammad Bakhsh,was beginning, Aḥmad's attention to the "Ummahāt" issue seems to have relented except for the publication of his pamphlet, "A Cry of Pain," which appeared early in 1899.

In this pamphlet, Ghulam Aḥmad began by decrying those Muslims who, like the Anjumān, would simply memorialize the Government in order to suppress circulation of the "Ummahāt." What is essential, he continued, is the ability to be a "Muslim religious controversialist," for he who would undertake this task must be possessed of ten qualifications. These Aḥmad then enumerated in detail.[77] Repudiating again the stand of the Panjāb Observer in favour of censorship, he wrote,

> That we should now be occupied with thoughts of bringing the offenders to punishment instead of adducing cogent arguments against their writings is a most injurious method for such an age as ours....

> I agree in this that we should approach the Government with a request in general terms that controversies and writings should be placed under some control and that a stop should be put to such license in disputations as may lead to a breach of the public peace.[78]

In this age, Islām is suffering because it has not had spokesmen adequately prepared to defend it against all objections. According to Aḥmad, God had revealed to him the fact that

> the real defense of Islam in this age, lies in eradicating all those objections against Islam ...and thus cut out the root of unjust vilifications, and dazzle the eyes of all nations with the splendour and numerous blessings of our faith so that they may be disgusted with the liars who had so long imposed upon the public by deceitful statements.[79]

In concluding the pamphlet, Ghulām Aḥmad reiterated his stand towards "our benign Government" which "every Muhammadan should obey...with complete sincerity and true loyalty...because its constitution offers no obstacle, even in the least, to the development of our spiritual life and to the propagation of our religion."[80] It should be clear that there was no discrepancy between Aḥmad's position about loyalty to the Government and his insistence that the Christian missionaries should be answered boldly and courageously.

> Thus, if I had not counterbalanced such malicious writings against Islam, there was a serious danger of breach of peace. Even a refutation of hostile writings against Islam is a duty which we owe to our rulers because it materially promotes the aims and objects of the Government.[81]

III

The above quotation, certainly in line with many we have seen previously, leads naturally into a consideration of Aḥmad's communications with the Government about the loyalty of the Aḥmadīyah, as well as a more detailed consideration of his interpretation of the Islamic doctrine of jihād. Although Aḥmad had pledged his loyalty to the Government many times before 1894,[82] the first work he totally devoted to the subject was the short pamphlet, "My Attitude Towards the British Government," published in Lāhōr in 1895 and written specifically to answer charges levelled against him in the Civil and Military Gazette, October 24, 1894. According to the cover page of this tract, copies were sent to

> H. M. the Empress of India, the Secretary of State for India, H. E. the Governor-General of India, Lieutenant-Governors, Chief Commissioners, Commissioners, Deputy Commissioners, etc.[83]

As in the "Kashf-ul-Ghiṭā'" Aḥmad began with a statement about the patriotism of his ancestors and of his sixteen year program teaching "true loyalty and submission, and denounc(ing) jihad in the received sense of the word to be a sacrilege."[84] After asserting the God of the Qur'ān to be a God of peace and love who teaches that "believers" must have full control over their passions, Aḥmad chided "the bigotry of the ignorant Maulvies and...the calumnies of the Christian missionaries" which were responsible for the

misinterpretation of jihād in these times. Having taken this position so many times, Aḥmad inquired, how could the editor of the Civil and Military Gazette call him "a political agitator" and make "such an unjust and untrue remark"?[85]

Probably Aḥmad's most detailed discussion of the issue appeared in the pamphlet, "Jehad and the British Government," published at Lāhōr in 1900. After tracing the concept linguistically and in the early history of Islām, Aḥmad reiterated the points of contemporary misunderstanding which he had already dealt with in detail in the previous tracts, "My Attitude" and "Kashf-ul-Ghiṭā'". In this case, Aḥmad also introduced his own role by saying that "now that the Promised Messiah

> has made his appearance, it is the duty of every true Muslim to hold back from Jehad. Had I not come, the error would, to some extent, have been pardonable. But now that I have come and the promises of old have been fulfilled, those who take up the sword under the pretense of the support of religion, have no excuse for their conduct, and they shall be called to account before their Lord.[86]

After attacking the ignorant mawlawīs who urged the committing of murder in the name of jihād, Aḥmad, in a supplement, discussed his conception of the mahdī. Perhaps the best summary of Aḥmad's viewpoint on the interrelationship of all these issues occurred in this passage:

> It should also be borne in mind that the two names Isā Masih and Muhammad Mahdi which God has given me are found in revelations published in the Barāhin-i-Ahmadiyyah twenty years since. The object of these two names is, as I

have already indicated, that I should deliver the message of the Lord referred to above to the two nations, viz., Muslims and Christians. Had there been in the people any search after truth or any fear of the day of Judgment, they had a most fitting opportunity of obtaining satisfaction. Let them understand clearly that the true religion is that which possesses divine power and reveals the holy face of Almighty God by extraordinary heavenly signs. I bear testimony as an eye-witness that such is the Religion of Unity, the faith of Islam, which does not give to the created the attributes of the Creator. The Christian religion had also a divine origin but to our great regret its adherents do not now follow its original doctrines. Similarly we are sorry for the Muslims of our day who have totally neglected that part of the law which inculcated sympathy and kind-heartedness towards their fellow beings. Notwithstanding their claim to a belief in the Unity of God they are addicted to disgraceful savage habits. I have frequently tried to eradicate the evil but circumstances come into existence which stand in the way of my efforts and rekindle the fire of savage passions. The hinderance is caused by the writings of the Christian missionaries which have a poisonous effect. The works of Imad-ud-Din, Safdar Ali and Thakar Das, the Ummahāt-ul-Mominin and the pamphlet circulated by a missionary at Rewari, all teem with currilous and contemptuous language used of our holy Prophet, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him. Their contents excite a Muslim reader into irrestrainable passion, unless he is of a specially mild and forbearing temper and endowed with patience in an eminent degree. These books are collections of harsh abuses rather than literary productions and the Muslim public cannot bear the scurrility of their tone. It was in reference to such works that a reverend gentleman wrote in a paper which issued from Lucknow that if the recurrence of the Mutiny of 1857 were possible, it would be caused by the writings of Revd. Imad-ud-Din. We can easily imagine the harshness of the writings and the consequent danger to the peace of the society, from this remark of a missionary gentleman of good position. It was in refutation of these bitter attacks upon Islam that I had sometimes recourse to a little harshness of language with the object of throwing cold water upon the excited

passions of the Muslims. This no doubt turned out to be a useful policy and did valuable service to the Muslim community by soothing its excitement, but the difficulty is that the Christian missionaries have not yet softened their tone. Writings are still published by them which contain offensive attacks quite unbearable by Muslims of irritable and easily excitable tempers. They are fraught with much danger to the public and the Government, for while, on the one hand, they bring a false charge against Islam, viz., that the Quran teaches Jehad unconditionally and at all times and bring back forgotten stories to the minds of the ignorant masses, they, on the other, excite them to furious rage by their contumelious writings. They are not aware of the evil they are doing by this double operation. I have repeatedly stated that Islam does not teach Jehad. The truth is that in the early days of Islam, its enemies determined not only to impede its progress but to wipe it off from the face of the earth by physical force and this necessitated the taking of the sword by the Muslims in self-defence. The Divine command that the unbelievers should be deprived of their lives unless they accepted Islam, extended only to these enemies. The order of Jehad was therefore limited in duration, and Islam is not responsible for mistakes committed by Muslim rulers with selfish motives. Now any one who reminds the Muslims of the doctrine of Jehad, and that with no other object than to deceive them as to their faith, kindles the fire of their rage. What a useful step would the missionaries have taken if in accordance with the true historical facts they had stated in their writings that Islam does not teach Jehad or conversion by compulsion. For how can the doctrine of Jehad be ascribed to a Book which teaches in plain words that there should be no compulsion in religion (لا اكراه في الدين la ikrāha fī-ddin). In short, with whatever regret we may look upon the conduct of the Moulvies we are sorry to say that the blame rests as well upon the shoulders of the missionaries for having taken steps opposed equally to truth and to the interests of the Government.[87]

Although Aḥmad's position was reiterated for his English-speaking audience in numerous articles appearing

in Review of Religions after 1902, the crowning statement of his attitude appeared in his final paper, "A Message of Peace" (Paygham-i -Sulh) which was to be read at Lāhōr on May 31, 1908 only a few days after Aḥmad's sudden death. The paper was read on June 21 at University Hall in Lāhōr, "in a gathering of over 5000 men including most of the respectable leaders of Hindu and Muslim society."[88]

The essay was both a strong stand on the principles of Islām and a complex study in comparative religions reflective of many articles which had appeared in the early volumes of Review of Religions as edited by Muḥammad ʿAlī. Although Aḥmad did not fail to criticise the teachings of Jews, Christians and Āryās alike, there really lay a note of peace behind what he was saying, perhaps as if he knew, having suffered considerably from physical pain and disease during his lifetime, that his end was near. Fully aware of the degree to which communal tensions had arisen, he wrote in the essay,

> Dear Countrymen, there is nothing like peace. Let us become one nation and one people by means of this compact. You see how much discord there is in the land and how greatly the country has suffered on account of this mutual refutation. Come and try even now how great are the blessings of mutual approbation. This is the best means of bringing about a reconciliation....[89]

With the last thirty years of his life dominated by deep religious controversy, Aḥmad certainly tried in this last address, controversial as some of its substance may also

have been, to make amends and to pursuade his fellow Indians, of whatever religion, as well as the Government that his intention was one of peace.

If this was so, it is significant to note that in spite of all that Ghulām Aḥmad did to make known his aims to the British Government in India their records of his activities and movement did not reflect such a reciprocal positive concern. Writing in answer to a report for information on the position of the Aḥmadīs in India following difficulties between Aḥmadīs and Muslims in Hong Kong during June of 1912 concerning the use of a Muslim cemetary, C. A. Barron, Chief Secretary to the Government of the Panjāb, reported in a letter from Simla dated September 12, 1912 the following information known to the Government about the Aḥmadīs:

> Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of Kadian, District Gurdaspur, first came to notice in 1883 when he was described as a Wahabi and had already begun to preach and to claim that he was inspired by God.
>
> In 1891, he was well to the fore, challenging all Maulvis to discussion as to his claims. By this time he had the beginnings of a following, although of course he was condemned by all orthodox Muhammadans as an imposter and a heretic.
>
> It was in 1890 that with a view to the Census, the title of "Ahmadi" Muhammadans was adopted by him, and a notice issued to all his followers, enjoining their registration as members of the Ahmadiya sect. In this notice he claimed to have over 30,000 adherents; but according to the returns, which the Census Superintendent considered practically correct, their number in the Punjab was only 1,134.
>
> The Mirza had now advanced a long way beyond his original claim to be an inspired prophet. He was "The Messiah"--desired alike by Muhammadans

and Christians.

Seven years later he set about taking a census for himself of his followers; but no result of this seems to have been published, and it is doubtful if it was ever completed.

It is difficult to say what their numbers are now, but according to the census of last year, there were altogether 18,695 persons over 5 years registered as Ahmadis.

Mirza Ghulam Ahmad died in May 1908 and was succeeded by Mirza Hakim Nur-ud-din, late court physician to His Highness the Maharaja of Kashmir, who is the present head of the sect.

The beliefs of the Ahmadis are briefly summarised in the Mirza's decalogue, which he calls the ten conditions of bai'at (initiation). There is nothing remarkable in them, except that sympathy with all persons, Muslim or non-Muslim, is enjoined, and it is asserted that the conquest of the world to Islam is to be affected by peace and not by war. A jehad of pamphlets rather than the sword is to win over all faiths....

Although, of course the Mirza's speeches and writings led to much ill-feeling and some disturbances he and his followers were considered heretics by the true Muhammadans, yet our records do not disclose a single instance in which his followers have been denied the use of mosques or Muhammadan burying grounds or in any way molested, except in one case at Cuttack where some converts to Ahamadism wished to change the form of worship in the principal mosque in the town--a course to which the rest of the Muhammadan population naturally objected vide paragraph 165 of Bengal S.A. of 1904.[90]

The jihād of pamphlets to which Mr. Barron referred did not remain only a literary jihād in the stormy years after Aḥmad's death. The tracts, meetings, sermons, controversy and polemics, coming as they did from every group, sect and religious leader seem almost to have been a reflection of the Panjābī personality: defence of one's own view of the truth and quickness to take offense at the implications or actions of others, the result of which was an intolerable

situation for the ruling powers. The "Message of Peace" which Aḥmad wrote at the end of his life could not possibly have had the effect he might have wished it to, for Aḥmad himself had contributed to the unpeaceful atmosphere throughout the Panjāb. Even though he had fulfilled the function of an Islamic mujaddid and, in his own eyes and those of his followers, of the masīḥ mawʿūd and mahdī, these latter claims, as we have seen, were never accepted by the mainstream of Indian Islām, especially in the context of a militant native Christian missionary movement and an equally militant Āryā Samāj reforming Hindūism. It is to this latter form of militant faith and its controversy with Aḥmad that we must now turn.

NOTES

[1]The recent studies of N. G. Barrier and Kenneth Jones have described the background from a political and an Āryā Samājī point of view very well. Recent short articles by non-Muslim scholars, (for example, Murray Titus, Islam in India and Pakistan, pp. 256-271; W. C. Smith, Modern Islam in India; K. Cragg, Contemporary Counsels in Islam, pp. 339-344; and Freeland Abbott, Islam and Pakistan, pp. 148-162), while dealing with the Aḥmadiyah in general and with sensitivity, have not unraveled the complex issues and personalities within the polemics. The early studies by Christian missionaries, (such as H. Griswold in the Indian Evangelical Review, Vol. XXIX, No. 113, January, 1903, pp. 322-354; Walter in the E.R.E. or in his short volume, The Ahmadiyah Movement; or Julius Richter's Indische Missionsgeschichte, translated by S. H. Moore as A History of Missions in India, F. H. Revell, New York, 1908, pp. 402-404), are clearly written from a missionary viewpoint, not at all sympathetic with Aḥmad or his movement.

[2]Dard, p. 178.

[3]Ibid., p. 179.

[4]Ibid., p. 181.

[5]Ibid., pp. 181-182. His argument seems quite plausible on this point.

[6]Ibid., p. 182.

[7]Ibid., pp. 184-195. According to a major footnote in Dard, p. 426, the following fatwās were issued against Aḥmad as early as 1890-1891. "In the joint Fatwas issued in 1890 against him by certain Maulvies of the Punjab and other parts of India the following are some of the expressions used: Dajjal--a word taken to mean 'personification of all vices' by the issuers of the fatwa (Fatwa Ulema-i-Punjab wa Hindustan, p. 41); Dhurriyyat-ud-Dajjal, i.e., 'children of dajjal' (Fatwa, p. 41); Kadhahab, i.e., 'a confirmed liar and fabricator' (Fatwa, p. 87); Mulhid wa Zindiq, i.e., 'a faithless infidel and a double dealing heretic' (Fatwa, p. 90); Bad-tareen-i-Khalq, i.e., 'the most wicked of God's creatures' (Fatwa, p. 96); Ashaddul-murtadden, i.e., 'worst of apostates' (Fatwa, p. 119); Uspar khuda kee La'nat, i.e., 'accursed of God' (Fatwa, p. 149); Uska moonh kala ho, i.e.,

'may his face be blackened' (Fatwa, p. 150); Dajajila ka ra's-i-raees, i.e., 'the ring-leader of the dajjals' (Fatwa, p. 155); kaj-rau. baleed....Us shaitan se ziya deh gumrah hai jo is kesath khel raha hai..., i.e., 'perverse, dunce.... even more astray than his playmate the devil...' (Fatwa, p. 101); Is Qadianee ke chooze Hanood-o-Nasara ke mukhannath ian, i.e., 'the chicks of this Qadiani are castrated euniches of Hindus and Christians' (Fatwa, p. 100) etc. etc."

[8] Ibid., pp. 196-204.

[9] Ibid., p. 206.

[10] Ibid., pp. 215-217.

[11] Ibid., p. 220. Ahmad's Muslim opponents are described as "Scribes and Pharisees."

[12] Ibid., pp. 220-222. There is no citation to indicate whether Ahmad really made such a statement on this occasion.

[13] Ibid., p. 274. Of Muhammad Husayn's personal life, Dard offers this footnote on pp. 272-273.

"Muhammad Husain had two wives and seven sons and three daughters. He himself says that they had all turned out to be thoroughly wicked and irreligious. They severed all connection with their father and some of them even conspired to kill him (Ishaatus Sunnah, Vol. 22, No. 8, p. 225, 226).

In 1910 Mohammad Husain complained of his children's wickedness to the editor of Alhakam, Qadian who advised him to send the two younger ones to the Qadian school. He accepted this advice and sent them to Qadian. When his friends came to know of it he had to write in defence in the Ahli-Hadith, Amritsar, dated 25-2-1910 that the boys were well looked after and that their religious beliefs were not being interfered with. But the enemies of Ahmad could not bear it, so they pressed Mohammad Husain to get his sons out of Qadian. At last he yielded and sent them to Rupar where they drifted into ways of profligacy....

Mohammad Husain died a miserable death in the beginning of 1920 at Batala." (See 'Batālwī kā Anjam ' by Mīr Qāsim ʿAlī, 1931.)

[14] Dard, p. 275; see note 7 above.

[15] Ibid., p. 279.

[16] Ibid., p. 343.

[17] S.V.N.P., Vol. VIII, No. 45, from Sadīq al-Akhbār, October 31, 1895. The original Vernacular Press Act IX of

1878 was promulgated during the viceregency of Lord Lytton. For text see Margarita Barns, The Indian Press, London, 1940, pp. 281-288. In 1881, when Lord Ripon replaced Lytton, he abolished the Press commissionership despite a Memorial from most vernacular newspapers urging its retention (pp. 292-293). Instead, acts opposing seditious writings were promulgated and enforced (pp. 305-306). Since the next major Press Act did not become law until 1910, the pleas of Aḥmad to the Government for some kind of enforcement was certainly a relevant request in the 1890's.

[18]S.V.N.P., Vol. XI, No. 39, p. 607 from Ishā'at-i-Sunnah (Lahōr) (received Sept. 8, 1898--probably published during August).

[19]Muḥammad Ḥusayn, "Iqtisād fī masa'īl al-jihād," 1887, p. 10.

[20]Ibid., p. 12.

[21]Ibid., pp. 21-22; for text of the Memorial see Appendix "A". This Memorial and the Government's responses to it were commented on at some length in the Aligarh Institute Gazette of February 2, 1889; see S.V.N.P. (1889), p. 86.

[22]Muḥammad Ḥusayn, "Iqtisād fī masa'īl al-jihād," 1887, pp. 22-23.

[23]S.V.N.P., XI, No. 39, p. 607, op. cit.

[24]Ibid., No. 41, p. 643, al-Hakam, September 27 (misprint indicates August 27), 1898.

[25]Ibid., p. 644; ibid., No. 45, p. 707, al-Hakam, October 29, 1898. Dard claims (p. 448) that the amount was raised to 8000 rupees but there is no evidence for this in the press reports.

[26]S.V.N.P., XI, No. 41, p. 644, op. cit.; see also Dard, p. 448.

[27]Mullah Ja'far Zatallī was published at the Taj-ul-Hind Press but never had a circulation of more than 200 copies. Its editor, Muḥammad Bakhsh, came from Kashmīr, was the son of a baker and was born in 1857. He did not become proprietor of the press until 1903 although he worked as a pressman there since at least 1891. The Panjāb Press Report of 1902 describes the paper as follows: "The paper is religious and especially directed against Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of Qadian; contains bitter attacks on the Mirza, whose prophecies and arguments it undertakes to refute. The name

of the paper meaning Mulla Jafar, the Buffoon, is an appropriate one for it." Barrier and Wallace, op. cit. In March of 1898 it had published an article announcing the death of Aḥmad to which al-Hakam of April 3 responded: "The Alhakm (Kadian) of 3d April 1898, calls the attention of Government to a notice issued by Mullah Muhammad Bakhsh (proprietor of the Jaʿfar Zatalli) in which the latter stated that Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of Kadian had been taken ill with the plague and had died without repeating the Kalima; that he was buried in the jungle, permission for burial in the Muhammadan graveyard, which is close to the village, being prohibited on sanitary grounds; and that a portion of the corpse having been devoured by some wild animal, the followers of the Mirza buried his remains a second time. This false notice which was published on the 1st April, has given great offense to the followers of the Mirza, who form a large community consisting of respectable officials, loyal raises and merchants. As a matter of fact, the Mirza is alive and in good health. The editor is of opinion that the notice in question is a seditious one, and calls upon Government to prosecute its author under the new law of sedition." S.V.N.P., XI, pp. 238-239.

[28]Dard, p. 449.

[29]S.V.N.P., XI, No. 50, p. 773; for full text of the prophecy see Appendix Kashf-ul-Ghitāʾ, pp. 28-33.

[30]S.V.N.P., XI, No. 50, p. 774.

[31]Ibid., from Akhbār al-Āmm, Lahor , December 3, 1898. "Akhbār" was a bi-weekly Urdū paper published by Hindūs which began in 1897 and received warnings from Government as early as 1897 and 1898.

[32]A reference to the case brought against Ahmad by Henry Martyn Clark of C.M.S. in Amritsar in the court at Gurdaspur during August, 1898. For details, see below, p.

[33]S.V.N.P., XI, No. 50, pp. 774-775, from Paysah Akhbār, Lahore, December 1, 1898. Paysah Akhbār was established in 1887 by Mawlawī Maḥbūb ʿAlām, a Rajput Muslim. The paper, often quoted in this study, was described in the Panjāb Press reports of 1905 as follows: "It deals with general questions of the day and contains extracts from other newspapers. It first appeared in January 1887 under the title Himmat, but that name was afterwards changed to Paisa Akhbar (87). One of the most popular papers in Lahore. Its tone and style are excellent; exercises good influence on the public. It is inclined to be seditious in tone and requires watching. In 1896, had to be warned for publishing a seditious article

on the Calcutta riots, and narrowly avoided prosecution. Has lately been well-conducted. Has by far the largest circulation in the Punjab on account of its cheapness...."

[34]Dard, p. 449, says that Muḥammad Ḥusayn "bought a sharp dagger." See also, Paysah Akhbār, December 17, 1898 in S.V.N.P., No. 52, p. 803. For details on the court case, see below in notes p. 166, note 62.

[35]Dard, p. 450; S.V.N.P., No. 52, p. 803.

[36]"Kashf-ul-Ghiṭā'," Victoria Press, Lahore, 1898. Quoted from the cover page. Aḥmad called attention of the public to the tract in al-Ḥakam, Jan. 10, 1899, according to S.W.N.P., XII, No. 2, p. 21.

[37]"Kashf-ul-Ghiṭā'," pp. 1-3.

[38]Ibid., p. 4.

[39]Ibid., p. 12.

[40]Ibid., p. 13.

[41]Ibid., p. 14.

[42]Ibid., p. 15.

[43]Ibid., pp. 17-19.

[44]Ibid., pp. 8-9. Sir Sayyid's letter read as follows:
"Mirza Sahib has written a valuable passage in his notification of 25th January 1897, which shows his high sense of loyalty and well-wishes towards the British Government, and I think that every Muslim, who is a British subject, must hold a similar attitude. I give the very words of the said Mirza Sahib in my paper:--
'It is wicked of you (Maulvis) if you attack me on account of my well-wishing and loyal attitude towards the British Government. The Sultan (of Turkey) may have claims on our respect, but the rights of this Government to our allegience do not admit of doubt. Ungratefulness is impiousness. You ignorant people! my praises of British rule do not proceed from hypocricy like yours, but it is my firm belief that the protection, we enjoy now a days, by the grace of God, is a Divine protection through the agency of the British rule. To my mind, there can be no stronger proof of the peaceful rule of the British Government than this very fact that the holy movement, of which I am the head, has been inaugurated under its auspices. They are extremely disloyal and unfaithful, who fawn upon the English officials in their

presence, but privately call the man a Kafir who expresses gratitude to the Government. Know it for certain, that I am not an hypocrite in my dealings with the Government. I truly believe what I say and may God curse him who is an hypocrite.' Aligarh Institute Gazette, 24th July 1897."

For further arguments by Aḥmad against Muḥammad Ḥusayn's position on the sulṭān, see S.V.N.P., XII, No. 2, pp. 19-20, from al-Ḥakam, January 10, 1899.

[45]"Kashf-ul-Ghiṭā'," p. 43.

[46]S.V.N.P., XII, No. 2, pp. 18-19, Akhbār al-'Āmm, January 4, 1899.

[47]Ibid., No. 10, p. 141, Akhbār al-'Āmm and Paysah Akhbār, February 27, 1899. For full details of the trial and its documents, see Dard, p. 450-488. Dard indicates in a footnote (p. 487) that he saw the text of the agreement at the Gurdāspūr Record Office.

[48]S.V.N.P., XII, No. 11, p. 159, Akhbār al-'Āmm, March 11, 1899. Compare Dard, p. 489, in response. Also see S.V.N.P., XII, No. 42, p. 601 quoting al-Ḥakam, September 23, 1899, which reported the publication of a "new fortnightly paper called Khadim-i-Hind" recently started in Lahor which was abusing "truth-loving and righteous people." One of its correspondents who signed his articles "Mulla Ja'far Zatallī" had attacked Aḥmad viciously. The editor of al-Ḥakam urged the public not to buy this paper and requested Mr. Douie "to ascertain which party violated the agreement" set up between Aḥmad and Muḥammad Ḥusayn. "The editor also requests Government to keep a vigilant eye on persons who by their writings offend the feelings of a community."

[49]Nūr-i-Afshān was the principal organ of the Panjābī Christian missionaries, founded at Ludhiāna in 1873. It consistently attacked both Aḥmadīyah and Sunnī Muslims as well as Ahl-i-Ḥadīth and Āryā Samāj. For details of its operation, see Barrier and Wallace, The Punjab Press.

[50]Dard, p. 125, cites articles dated March 19, April 2, and April 16, 1885.

[51]Proceedings of the Church Missionary Society, 1891-1892, London, p. 115.

[52]Dard, p. 127.

[53]Ibid., pp. 127-135.

[54]Ibid., pp. 287-288.

[55]Ibid., p. 294.

[56]Proceedings of the C.M.S., 1894, pp. 119-122.

[57]Ibid., p. 122.

[58]Ibid., 1895, pp. 167-168.

[59]Ibid., p. 169.

[60]Dard, p. 313.

[61]Ibid., pp. 315-319. ʿĀṣim died nine months later on July 26, 1896 at Ferōzpūr.

[62]Ibid., pp. 402-415. See also Muḥammad ʿAlī, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, His Life and Mission, p. 17, and Bashīr-ud-Dīn, op. cit., pp. 45-48.

[63]S.V.N.P., V, No. 38, pp. 316-317 from Rahbār-i-Hind, Lāhōre, September 5, 1892 and Sahifa-i-Qadā'i, Dehlī, idem. Earliest notice of the new tract appeared in al-Ḥakam, March 13, 1898, S.V.N.P., XI, No. 16, p. 237.

[64]S.V.N.P., XI, No. 16, p. 237, Nūr-i-Afshān, April 8, 1898.

[65]Ibid., No. 23, p. 347, al-Ḥakam, May 13, 1898.

[66]Ibid., No. 24, p. 360, Sat Dharm Prarchārak, May 27, 1898. This paper is significant as it began early (1889) with a circulation that rose to 1900 copies an issue by 1905. Its editor was Lālā Munshī Rām, a radical leader of the Āryā Samāj. The British report of 1901 described it as "generally good" although by 1905 it was "anti-British." (Barrier and Wallace)

[67]S.V.N.P., XI, No. 27, p. 406. No record of the publication of a pamphlet with this title has been discovered during this study. In 1899, Aḥmad did publish "A Cry of Pain" in English as a response to "Ummahāt."

[68]S.V.N.P., XI, No. 29, p. 441, al-Ḥakam, June 27, 1898.

[69]Ibid., No. 30, p. 456, Nūr-i-Afshān, July 8, 15, 1898. See also the issues of August 12 and 19, p. 541, No. 35 and August 26, No. 36, pp. 553-554; September 2, No. 38, p. 585 as well as the issues of September 9, 16, and 23, 1898.

[70]Ibid., No. 31, p. 469, Nūr-i-Afshān, July 29, 1898.

[71]Ibid., No. 34, p. 521, Nūr-i-Afshān, August 5, 1898.

[72]Ibid., al-Hakam, July 27, 1898.

[73]Ibid., No. 35, p. 542, Nūr-i-Afshān, August 19, 1898.

[74]Ibid., No. 37, p. 569, Sirāj-al-Akhbār, August 29, 1898.

[75]Ibid., pp., 569-570, Payeah Akhbār, August 31, 1898.

[76]Ibid., No. 41, p. 643, Chaudhwīn Sadī, September 23, 1898. Sections to the lengthy "reply" to Ṣādiq ʿAlī appeared in S.V.N.P., XII, No. 43, pp. 615-619 as taken from Nūr-i-Afshān, October 6, 1899.

[77]"A Cry of Pain," Lahore, 1899, pp. 2-7. It is significant to note the number of times Aḥmadīs "memorialized" the Government during later years.

[78]Ibid., pp. 9-10.

[79]Ibid., p. 15.

[80]Ibid., p. 22.

[81]Ibid., p. 23.

[82]For complete list of references, see Appendix "B".

[83]"My Attitude Towards the British Government," Lahore, 1895.

[84]Ibid., p. 2.

[85]Ibid., pp. 4-5.

[86]"Jehad and the British Government," Lahore, 1900, p. 5.

[87]Ibid., pp. vi-vii, "Supplement."

[88]First published in Review of Religions, Vol. VII, No. 7, July 1908. The quotation is from an introduction to a reprint on p. 239 of ʿAlī Alhaj, Islām and Its Comparison. The article was also republished in 1947 by the Lāhōrī branch on behalf of its "Promotion of Inter-Communal Peace and Harmony."

[89]Alḥaj (ed.), Islām, p. 259.

[90]Government of India, Home Dept., Political File A, Proceedings of November 1912, Nos. 46-47, pp. 1-2.

CHAPTER 4

POLEMICS AND CONTROVERSY:

(II) THE ĀRYĀ SAMĀJ AND THE ASSASSINATION OF LĒKH RĀM

The importance of the Āryā Samāj movement to the religious spectrum of northern India in the years after 1875 has recently been explored and documented in several places.[1] The role of this Hindū revivalist movement in the life of Aḥmadīyah Islām is certainly worthy of an entire chapter of this study, although from the Āryā point of view, encounters with the Aḥmadīyah have scarcely been mentioned and have been considered, most likely, of little significance.[2] It is therefore not unfair to say that the role of the Āryā Samāj in the Panjāb from 1875 to 1910 loomed far more significant in the eye of the outside observer than did the role of the Aḥmadīyah movement. The reason for this is fairly clear; for while the two movements had a great deal in their common "Hindū" or "Islamic" responses to the age in which they emerged, they had one major difference. Some members of the Āryā Samāj entered public and political life in the Panjāb after 1884 and acted continuously in opposition to the British. Ghulām Aḥmad, throughout his career, professed his loyalty to the crown and urged his followers through such public media as al-Ḥakam to avoid political agitation or anti-British activity.[3]

Swāmī Dayānand, founder of the Āryā Samāj movement, was born in 1824 in the town of Tankārā, in the native state of Morvī in central Kathiāwār.[4] Raised in the Brahman tradition, a member of the Saivite sect, and educated in the traditional Hindū manner, Dayānand reacted strongly against the "idol worship" of his childhood and a marriage which was to be forced on him at the age of 22. In 1846, he broke with his family to become a sanyasī. At this time he adopted the name Dayānand Saraswatī particularly to reduce the possibility of discovery by his relatives in Kathiāwār.[5]

The first fourteen years he spent as a sanyasī were devoted to the traditional Hindū search for mukhtī and oriented in the bhaktī or tradition of personal devotion. His rejection of "idol worship" which plays an important role in most bhaktī may have come about through contact with Jain monks in the area or possibly by two reform movements already active in Kathiāwār one of which stressed the "importance of proper conduct over status-by-birth" even if it did not overtly reject the caste system as such.[6]

In November, 1860, Dayānand went to Mathura where he became a disciple of a blind Panjābī ascetic, Swāmī Virajānand Saraswatī, under whose guidance his thinking was reshaped during a three year period. This was the turning point in Dayānand's thinking about religious and social reform and the period in which he discovered the true Vedic faith, separated out from centuries of accretions of smirtī (non revealed)

literature and commentary.[7] Little is known of the years from 1863 to 1868 when Dayānand's ideas were fully developed and he began his preaching mission throughout India. During this period, however, he had his first encounters with Christian missionaries and even received a copy of the New Testament from one.[8]

Before 1870, Dayānand had had no major encounter with the British government of India or with Western ideas or education. When he arrived in Calcutta in December of 1872, at the invitation of Debendranath Tagore, elder statesman of the Brahmo Samāj there, who had heard of Dayānand's reformist preaching throughout North India, he was able to put his ideas into practice for the first time. During four months in the city he organized a school as well as a group known as the Sanāthan Dharma Rakshinī Sabhā.[9] Although he entered into conversation with both Tagore and Keshub Chandra Sen, Dayānand's insistence on the infallibility and revealed nature of the Vedas as well as in the doctrine of the transmigration of souls, both explicitly rejected by the Brahmo reformists, made any real cooperation impossible. What Dayānand did learn from the Calcutta intellectuals was the technique of speaking relevantly and cogently to the Hindū in emerging British India--the need to preach in Hindī rather than Sanskrit, to dress normally rather than to wander naked about the country side, to relate religious reform to social reform, speaking not only to Brahmins but to all kinds of

people.[10]

Philosophically, Dayānand was developing his ideas in sharp contrast to the neo-Vedanta movements of the late nineteenth century. The Advaitin descendents of Shankara still maintained a monistic viewpoint centered in the Atmān-Brahmān teachings of the Upanishads in which they found the teaching that the only reality was pure consciousness or the union of the soul with God, and similarly these Vedantins asserted strongly that the physical world is mayā or avidyā, the result of man's lack of the true "knowledge" of God. Dayānand's viewpoint, which he traced back to the original four Vedas, was a philosophic dualism of mind and matter in which God and human souls were absolutely separated.[11] Dayānand's break from the religious orthodoxy of the Brahmins came about both because of his change of methods and his dualistic view of the universe.

After leaving Calcutta in the spring of 1872, he moved west through the U.P. lecturing and visiting schools which he had helped to establish earlier. On this visit he met Sir Sayyid Aḥmad Khān at ʿAlīgaṛh, a fact indicating his further contact with pro-Western reformers.[12] While lecturing in ʿAlīgaṛh, Dayanānd met Rājā Jaī Kishan Dās who urged him to compile his lectures, a task which resulted in Dayānand's major work, the Satyārth Prakāsh (The Light of Truth) which, while not only setting down Dayānand's thesis concerning Vedic religion, systematically attacked in its three closing

chapters, the Jains, the Christians and the Muslims.[13]

Using a kind of Socratic dialogue to prove his arguments, Dayānand set out principally to prove that the world we know from sense perception is indeed real, that objects exist as real and independent of our ability to perceive them, and that God created the world as entirely separate from Himself, for if He had not done so, how could one conceive of God as just in His treatment of human souls. These souls, which are different both from God and the world, take on physical form in human beings. In sharp contradiction to the Upanishadic Vedantin notion, Dayānand asserted that "God can never become the soul nor the soul God. They can never be one. They are always distinct from each other."[14]

One important corollary of this teaching was Dayānand's emphasis on personal ethical responsibility. One could not blame his actions on the predetermination of his soul by God through bad karma built up in previous lives. No longer was the ascetic way adequate to bring the Hindū to salvation. Mukhtī could result, according to Dayānand, only from "obedience to the will of God, dissociation from sin, ignorance and bad company...the promotion of public good, even-handed justice and righteousness."[15] As a basis for developing a legal code by which the reformed Hindū could live, Dayānand turned to the Manusmirti which, while neither part of the original Vedas nor specifically revealed literature, was the basis of the ancient Aryan lawcode by which the earliest Vedic

Brahmins had lived.[16]

While rejecting the caste system as practiced in India in his day because of the terrible conditions it had brought to the society, he still held to the validity of the Vedic concept of four varnas or colours: Brahmin, Ksatriyā, Vaisyā and Sudrā. Attaining to one of these levels did not depend on jatī or birth, which as developed in the highly complex caste system of modern India was a later accretion anyhow, but "was to be established after birth according to gun, karma, and svabhav, i.e., individual merit, action and temperament."[17] At the same time that he developed this position about caste, and proposed that each person be placed in his proper varna by a committee following his education--a program which never came to fruition--Dayānand never gave up the traditional concepts of karma and rebirth. This apparent inconsistency went unresolved in his teachings.

More relevant, perhaps, was the new set of rituals and ceremonies which Dayānand promoted in the Satyārth Prakāsh to replace those of degenerated Hindū orthodoxy with its stronger emphasis on bhaktī rather than on karma (the importance of doing the ritual properly for its own sake) which Dayānand seemed to stress. His rituals included

> (1) the Gayatri Mantra which must be taught to each child at the upanayana and repeated daily, (2) Pranayama--a breathing exercise which purified the body, stimulates the mind and aids in meditation, (3) Sandhyapasana, or daily prayers and (4) the Agnihotra (also referred to as homa, or havan), a fire sacrifice beneficial both to

> the individual and to mankind. For the individual this ritual will turn his mind towards God and righteous action, while it also purified the air and is beneficial to others.[18]

Typical of Dayānand's style of argument is his presentation of the good effects of homa:

> Q--What benefit accrues from the performance of homa?
>
> A--All persons know that impure air and impure water causes diseases and diseases give pain to creatures, while scented air and water are conducive to health; and annihilation of diseases and ensures happiness. Behold, wherever homa is performed, its good smell reaches the nose of a person standing at a place remote from it. So is the case with a bad smell. Just calculate thereby that a substance burnt in fire is rarified and expands with the air and removes...the impurities of a distant place.[19]

As Jones has pointed out, Dayānand gave a humanistic justification for performing this ritual along with a quasi-scientific explanation of the benefits to be gained. Dayānand seems to have put aside the magical and supernatural powers invoked in the Atharvaveda and replaced them throughout his work by more reasoned and scientific statements. A Hinduism based on a more rational approach would be welcomed by partially westernized Indians and would give the Hindūs a position of strength from which they could stand up against the threats of Christianity, Islām and decadent orthodox Hinduism.[20]

Even in such a brief presentation of the life and basic teachings of Dayānand as has been made here, we see some

interesting parallels with that of Ghulām Aḥmad. Both were raised in upper class families, both received traditional religious training, both repudiated certain worldly ties which their families sought to thrust upon them, both, in a sense, withdrew from the mainstream of life for a time, yet neither chose to follow the traditional path of the sanyasīn or sūfī. Both Dayānand and Aḥmad saw the degeneration to which their respective religious communities had fallen and each sought to reconstruct his faith in terms that would speak to the modern late nineteenth century Indian while harking back for authority to the original Scriptural source, the Qur'ān or the Vedas. Each wanted to defend his renewed faith against the "threats" of the other and the Christian missionaries. The major differences between the two men were (1) Aḥmad's claim to be Messiah and mahdī, i.e., something more than an ordinary mujaddid, where Dayānand never made such a claim, even if he was held in very high esteem by his followers; (2) Dayānand's repudiation of British and European domination in Indian life which led in the 1890's to the Āryā Samāj's increasing role in the political life of Indian nationalism which contrasted sharply with Aḥmad's view that India had never fared better than it had under British rule, and (3) the fact that Dayānand did not succeed in organizing the Āryā Samāj in his native area but did succeed in transplanting it to the soil of the Panjāb, while Aḥmad, a native Panjābī, did succeed in starting his movement for

Islamic renewal at about the same time in his native province, later spreading it to other parts of India and the world as well.

The Swāmī's attempts to set up chapters of the Āryā Samāj as an organization to promote his teachings in Rajkōt, Ahmēdabād, Bombay and Pūna did not succeed for a variety of reasons. It was not until his arrival in the Panjāb in 1877 that Dayānand reached an area which was ripe for his message and capable of organizing his ideas permanently into a wider provincial area.

Dayanānd certainly seems to have arrived in the Panjāb at the right moment. His lecturing and public discussions met both with strong opposition and strong support from the first. Of those in the latter category, some immediately responded to his call to reform Hinduism by throwing idols into the Ravī River. The combination of these overtly destructive actions and Dayānand's militant preaching against orthodox Hinduism created an uproar in the Hindū community of Lāhōr and forced many Hindus to take a position about Dayānand quite early. Dayānand's appeal to the younger intellectuals of the Panjāb was quite successful although the transplanted Bengālī Brahmo Samāj had succeeded only slightly as has already been mentioned.[21]

The organization of the Lāhōr chapter of the Āryā Samāj took place on July 24, 1877. Among those preparing for this occasion were Lālā Sain Dās, Lālā Jīvān Dās and

Lāl MulRāj who had rewritten the original principles of the Āryā Samāj which had been published when Dayānand attempted to set up a chapter at Bombay a few years earlier. In the Lāhōr statement, creedal points were separated out from purely organizational ones and a set of ten principles which have remained unaltered to the present day were created:

(1) God is the primary source of all true knowledge, and of all that is known by its means.
(2) God is All-truth, All-knowledge, All-Beatitude, Incorporeal, Almighty, Just, Merciful, Unbegotten, Infinite, Changeless, Without a beginning, Incomparable, the Support and Lord of all, All-pervading, Omniscient, Imperishable, Immortal, Exempt from fear, Eternal, Holy and the Maker of the Universe. To Him alone is worship due.
(3) The Vedas are the books of all true knowledge. It is the paramount duty of all Aryas to read them and to instruct others in them, to hear them read, and to recite them to others.
(4) All persons should remain ever ready to accept the Truth and to renounce untruth.
(5) All actions ought to be performed in conformity to virtue, i.e. after due consideration of right and wrong.
(6) The primary aim of the Aryasamaj is to do good to mankind, i.e. to ameliorate the physical, spiritual and social condition of all men.
(7) All ought to be treated with love, justice, and due regard to their merits.
(8) Ignorance ought to be dispelled and knowledge diffused.
(9) No one ought to remain satisfied with his own welfare. The welfare of the individual should be regarded as included in the welfare of all.
(10) In matters which affect the well-being of all, the individual should subordinate his personal likings; in matters that affect him alone, he is to enjoy freedom of action.[22]

Following the successful establishment of a chapter

of at least 300 members in Lāhōr and a Sanskrit school on July 28, only four days after the official founding had taken place, Dayānand left on a whirlwind tour of the Panjāb which resulted in the founding of eleven chapters.[23] After this visit throughout the province, Dayānand continued his travels throughout India, but somehow never managed to return to the Panjāb before his death in Rajpūtāna in 1883. One reason that has been suggested for Dayānand's apparent withdrawal from his supporters in the "westernized classes" after 1881 was his hope of establishing during his lifetime a truly Vedic state, perhaps led by one of the princes of Rajpūtāna.

> Throughout his entire career Dayanand's political vision saw only the ancient states of India, as described in Manu. He seems to have been totally unaware of the new concepts of polity brought into India by the British.[24]

In his desire to appeal to royalty and earlier to the upper educated classes of Indian society, in spite of his desire to reform the caste system, we see in Dayānand's approach many similarities to that of Aḥmad. While Aḥmad did not reject the British system of government, it is not clear that he really understood fully its method of operation. Neither, however, did he wish to create a special Aḥmadīyah state ruled by an Islamic prince, although as we have and shall yet see, the effect of his pronouncements about his role as Promised Messiah and <u>mahdī</u> had the effect of isolating the Aḥmadīyah community from others in a sectarian sense even during his own lifetime.

Among the young Panjābīs who joined and came into the leadership of the Lāhōr Āryā Samāj in the early 1880's were Gurū Dātt, Hans Rāj and Lālā Lajpat Rāē. Although the former two had performed excellently in their higher education, it was the latter, who had not, who played perhaps the most significant role of the three. The arrival of Lālā Munshī Rām to Lāhōr in 1882 is also worthy of note as he too was a major leader of the Samāj until his assassination in 1926. He did not join the Samāj until 1885, although he had met the others earlier. Even when he was highly prominent in the movement, he operated most of his career from his home city of Jullundār.[25]

II

Ghulām Aḥmad's first real encounter with the Āryā Samāj came in his relations with Sharampat Rāē, a Qādiyānī, who was Secretary of the local chapter of the Āryā Samāj which Dard reported had fifteen members.[26] Before the publication of the Barāhīn relations with neighbouring Āryās seem to have been reasonable enough. Although Aḥmad clearly had no face-to-face meeting or even indirect relations with Dayānand, his biographer reports that by a registered letter dated April 20, 1883, Aḥmad offered to send him copies of the Barāhīn and to debate with him the superiority of Islām. Dayānand never answered the letter. During August, 1883,

Aḥmad reportedly had a vision that the end of Dayānand was drawing near. Suddenly the swāmī fell ill at the end of September and died at the end of October.[27]

If Dayānand's writings were offensive to Muslims in general and to Aḥmad in particular during the first few years the Samāj was in existence in the Panjāb, Aḥmad was certainly even more surprised by the blatant attack on Muslim feelings offered by Pandit Lēkh Rām who first wrote to Aḥmad from Amritsar on April 3, 1885 that he would like to come to Qādiyān to see Aḥmad perform Heavenly signs.[28] It was thus that a relationship which started on a note of taunting sarcasm in personal correspondance between two men would end in the murder of one twelve years later leading to the worst communal tensions yet experienced in the Panjāb.

Who was Lēkh Rām and why should he have played such a major part in the early life of the Samāj as well as in the religious controversies in which Aḥmad was engaged? In sharp contrast to the other young leaders of the new Āryā Samāj, Lēkh Rām did not come to Lāhōr to be educated or to take part in the new awakening going on there. He was born in the village of Sayyīdpūr in the Jihlum district of a Brahmin family in the year 1858. Of the five leaders of the Panjābī Samāj--Gurū Dētt, Hans Rāj, Lālā Lajpat Rāē, Munshī Rām and Lēkh Rām--the latter was the only one not of a commercial subcaste. His family were Sarsūt Brahmins, but a group closely tied to the commercial caste to which the others belonged.[29]

Lēkh Rām received his first education at the village madrasah where he studied Urdū. When he was eleven he moved to Peshāwar where his uncle served with the local police force. There he studied Urdū and Persian with Muslim tutors to whom he reacted negatively. He even engaged them in religious debates and may have developed much of his later animosity towards Islām and Muslims from this brief adolescent experience. At the age of fourteen, he returned to his home village where he studied under a Hindū until he terminated his education at the age of seventeen, fluent in Urdū, Persian and Panjābī.[30] Lēkh Rām then returned to Peshāwar where he joined the police force towards the end of 1875. He served nearly four years during which time his increased interest in religious activities continued to conflict with his police duties, the more so because his superior officer was a Muslim. During these years he studied Gurūmukhī and learned of the Bhagavad Gita from a Sikh, he became a devotee of Kriṣna for a time and finally met Kanhaiyalāl Alakhdhārī, one of Dayānand's original Panjābī supporters who introduced him to Āryā Samāj doctrine. When a chapter of the Samāj was founded at Peshāwar in 1880, Lēkh Rām not only used its library but soon travelled to Ajmer to hear the swāmī speak. From this time onwards, Lēkh Rām accepted Dayānand as his personal Gurū although he did not involve himself with the mainstream of the movement at Lāhōr until after Dayānand's death.[31]

Sat Dharm Parachārak, the newspaper of the militant

faction of the Āryā Samāj after the split in 1893, published a short biography of Lēkh Rām two months after his assassination. After covering much of the material mentioned above, the writer described Lēkh Rām's initial involvement with the Samāj.

> He at once sent for his works (Dayanand's) and read them with great zest. These created an insatiable desire to see in person the much belauded Swāmi. At last in 1881 he obtained leave of absence for one month when, after establishing the Arya Samāj at Peshāwar, he set off to see the Swāmi, whom he met at Ajmere....[32]

After returning home, a vigorous supporter of the Samāj but still a Government servant,

> he showed great independence of spirit in discussing religious questions with men of influence and his superiors in rank. At this time he convened a large meeting at which the evils of intemperance were denounced. In this meeting all the District Officials and the Commanding Officer of the Station took part. Pandit Lekh Rām's speech made a great impression on the minds of the European soldiers.[33]

In spite of this glowing description of Lēkh Rām's impression upon men of differing persuasions, "he could never pull with bigoted officials" and finally after several years of conflict, he resigned his police post in November of 1884. It was then that he went to Lāhōr to join with the other new leaders of the Āryā Samāj, still stunned by the death of Dayānand and still discussing what directions the Āryā Samāj should now take. In Lāhōr, Lēkh Rām became editor of the Āryā Gazette, "which was then the only weekly paper published in vernacular," by the Āryā Samāj.[34]

As an editor of the major early Āryā paper, which was

based in Ferōzpūr, Lēkh Rām was most closely allied with Munshī Rām whose closest ties were always with the Jullundār City and Hoshiārpūr chapters in the area southwest of Lāhōr. With this effective control over the chapters in this area removed from Lāhōr, both were able to lead the militant faction which split off after 1893.[35]

During the years after 1883, the Dayanānd Angle-Vedic College was founded at Lāhōr with the following purposes:

> (a) to encourage, improve, and enforce the study of Hindi literature; (b) to encourage and enforce the study of classical Sanskrit and of the Vedas; (c) to encourage and enforce the study of English literature and sciences both theoratical and applied. Second, to provide means for giving technical education in connection with the Dayanand Anglo-Vedic Institution as far as it is not inconsistent with the proper accomplishment of the first object.[36]

With the founding of the college came the creation of its journal the Āryā Patrika.[37] Although the organization of the college was not an easy task, for there were many differences of opinion, considerable sums of money were raised by the end of 1885 and the D.A.V. College Trust and Management Society was legally established in January of 1886. During this period, Gurū Dātt served as Assistant Professor of Science in Government College, Lāhōr and in 1887 was "Officiating Professor" there while J. C. Oman was on leave.[38] Hans Rāj served as headmaster of the new Āryā school without pay. Although he was not at all wealthy, his brother Lālā Mulk Rāj, then earning 80 rupees a year, agreed to divide his

salary in order that Hans Rāj could take on this important task. His dedication to the movement was evident in his undertaking the headmastership during a decade when Indians of his capability could have earned great wealth in Government service or business.[39] Lālā Lajpat Rāē, the last of the five Samāj leaders, worked actively in the fundraising program, speaking and travelling on behalf of the Samāj. He, too, was not wealthy, but, after passing his vakīlat examination, his income increased greatly and his effectiveness as a worker for the movement did also.[40]

The first great controversy to upset the highly successful work of the Āryā Samāj in the Panjāb came in 1888 when Gurū Dātt criticised the separation of meat-eating boarders from vegetarians in the D.A.V. Boarding House. Dātt was outrightly opposed to meat-eating and decided to make an issue of the matter. The decision of the College's Board of Management to oppose a totally unrelated suggestion of Dātt was taken as a sign of their growing opposition to him. In September of 1889, a Vegetarian Society was founded by Lālā Jiwān Dās, Vice President of the Lāhōr Āryā Samāj, and by Durga Prashad, another prominent member, both of whom strongly supported Gurū Dātt.[41] The Management Committee was still in the control of Lālā Sain Dās and Hans Rāj who took the opposing position. Although the deaths of Lālā Sain Dās, on the one side, and Gurū Dātt, on the other, in 1890, lessened the issue for a time,

> the division represented more than a clash of personalities; it represented a clash of ideologies, of interpretations of the nature of Dayanand, and of the proper interpretation of his work. It represented a different commitment to the Samaj and a different concept of its mission.[42]

Gurū Dātt had not only focused on the issue of vegetarianism. He had also, partly as a result of his presence at Swāmī Dayānand's death bed, elevated the swāmī from a religious and social reformer to the level of a rishī (saint), something Dayānand never claimed for himself. Similarly, Satyārth Prakāsh was no longer a guide for Āryās to follow, "but a sacred text immutable and unquestionable."[43] Gurū Dātt also attacked all European scholarship on the Vedas, especially that of Max Mueller or Monier Williams "as incorrect through ignorance, Christian prejudice or deliberate malice arising from a desire to humiliate Hinduism."[44] During the late 1880's the Āryā Samāj had also taken the lead in social reform movements dealing with widow remarriage and female education, thus stirring considerable controversy within the Hindū community at large. Because the need for strong spokesmen grew greater during these years, the emphasis on militant missionary work also grew greater and the attracting of persons who could join in the condemnation of the Samāj's three enemies, "the 'kernanis' (Christians), 'kuranis' (Muslims) and the 'puranis' (orthodox Hindus)" was encouraged.[45] The implications of these programmes would but add to the growing hostility Aḥmad was to experience with the Āryās.

III

Although Ghulām Aḥmad and Lēkh Rām had first conflicted in correspondence during 1885 when Lēkh Rām was at Amritsar and later when he was at Qādiyān, their most serious conflict did not occur until February 20, 1893 when Aḥmad prophecied that Lēkh Rām would die within six years.[46] Before this, however, Aḥmad was engaging in more local controversies with Āryā Samājīs. One of these debates occurred at Hoshiārpūr with an Āryā named Murlīdhar during March of 1886. The Aḥmadīyah report of this debate in which the Āryā began with an attack on the Shaq al-Qamār miracle in the Qur'ān ended in an uproar when Murlīdhar left the debate before Aḥmad finished his final presentation. Disruptions by Murlīdhar took up much of the time of the second meeting when the Aryan

> spent more than an hour, not in explaining and vindicating the position of the Samaj, but in pointing out that Ahmad had raised two questions instead of one. Ahmad removed his misunderstanding, and then took three hours in writing his answer, which was even then not complete...he neither completed his answer nor handed over the written portion to Ahmad for reply; and instead of finishing the debate as previously arranged, he left the meeting, as before, under an excuse that he had to attend another meeting of the Samaj.[47]

In September of 1886, Ahmad published his second major work dealing with the Āryā Samāj, Surma-i-Chashm-i-Āryā, in which a detailed report of the debates at Hoshiārpūr were recorded. Very much in the spirit in which Dayānand and his followers were attempting to employ concepts of reason and science to

validate their otherwise "fundamentalist" approach to the Vedas, so also Aḥmad chose to devote most of this work to show that such a miracle as the rending of the moon in the Qur'ān presented no real conflict with science as "no one has yet exhausted the knowledge of the working of nature."[48] There is no proof or reason to suppose that nature is uniform, Aḥmad went on to argue. Thus miracles may be understood as being of four kinds: (1) intellectual (2) scientific (3) spiritual blessings (4) apparent interference with known laws of nature. The final section of the book was an invitation to the Āryā Samāj to join in the comparative study of the Vedas and Qur'ān. Typically, Aḥmad offered a prize to anyone who would produce a book in the next three months proving the superiority of the Vedas over the Qur'ān. If no one did this and if the Āryā Samāj did not stop vilifying Islām, Aḥmad asserted that he would have to turn to mubahila in defense of Islām.[49]

If the Āryā Samāj responded, it was by the decision of the Gurdāspūr Samāj in 1890, to hire a full time updēshak or preacher whose job it would be to tour the villages and towns of the district, according to a report in the Lāhōr Tribune.[50] During the period from 1886-1890 the Samāj had, in general, been strongly critical of Christianity and orthodox Hinduism. In 1888, Gurū Dātt launched a campaign against the Sikhs. Among those who joined him in attacking both Gurū Nānak and Gurū Gobind Singh was Lēkh Rām. Sikh reaction

was passionate in spite of the later denials which appeared in the press when Aḥmad wrote his Sat Bachon proving that Gurū Nānak was a Muslim. In 1889, the situation was a potentially explosive one in Lāhōr as well as other areas.[51]

It was after 1890 that the Āryā Samāj clash with Islām became more and more significant. The most recent student of Āryā Samāj history cites the rise of the Aḥmadīyah as well as a growing concern among Āryās over the issue of cow slaughter which precipitated this new dimension in Āryā Samāj polemics. Lēkh Rām was the chief spokesman on the issues of cow protection, the promotion of Hindī in Government Schools and in writing propaganda against the Aḥmadīyah. In addition to doing missionary work for the Āryās, Lēkh Rām began writing a series of tracts in which he attacked Islām and especially the anti-Āryā writings of Aḥmad. In response to the Barāhīn, Lēkh Rām wrote Takzīb-i-Barāhīn-i-Aḥmadīyah, i.e., Giving the Lie to the Aḥmadīyah Proofs, the first volume of which he subtitled, "A Gun-Fire to Break the Flanks and Tyranny of Mohammad's Islām." In response to Aḥmad's Surma Chashm Āryā, Lēkh Rām wrote Nushkā-i-Khabṭ-i-Aḥmadīyah, i.e., A Prescription for the Madness of the Aḥmadīyah.[52]

As Lēkh Rām remained editor of the Āryā Gazette until 1890, he was also able to use this as a vehicle for venting his wrath against Islām. His knowledge of Persian and Arabic was probably superior to that of any other Samāj leader, and with this unusual background, he was able to gather around

him other Āryā Samājīs whose knowledge of Islamic theology and philosophy complemented his own.[53] Evidences from his writings, as well as Aḥmad's, indicate that each was certainly well versed in the Scriptures and traditions of the other's faith even if each generally seized on a point which could be subjected to questionable interpretation.

That Lēkh Rām's reputation for militancy was already spreading throughout the Indian Muslim community was apparent from an article appearing in the Dehlī paper, Akmāl al-Akhbār which noted on March 21, 1890 that the mawlawīs of Bombay had requested Lēkh Rām of Amritsar to turn over the copies of a work (not specified) in which "he has wounded the religious feelings of Muhammadans by using disrespectful language in criticizing their religion and its founder." At the same time the Akmāl sought to put the blame on "British liberty" for making people "indifferent in religious matters" and irresponsible as well. The Bombay group even went so far as to threaten a law suit against Lēkh Rām.[54] During the years from 1890 to 1893 the split between the "conservatives" and "radicals" in the Āryā Samāj began to widen. Lēkh Rām, Lālā Munshī Rām, and Lālā Ralla Rām led the radical group, now calling itself the Sanāthan Dharma Sabhā, in an ever wider chain of preaching and press propaganda in areas not before reached by the Āryā Samāj.[55]

Lēkh Rām's pamphlet, written in 1892, Jehad or the Basis of Mohammedi Religion, was especially offensive to

Muslims of all shades.[56] In this tract, he began with a sharp attack against the "naturalists" or followers of Sir Sayyīd Aḥmad Khān who were always

> trying...to prove unnecessarily and wrongly that Islam never indulged in Jehad and the people were never converted to Islam forcibly....Temples were (not) demolished nor were cows ever slaughtered in the temples. Women and children belonging to other religious sects were never forcibly converted to Islam nor did they ever commit any sexual acts with them as could have been done with slaves--males and females both.[57]

Well read in Arabic, Persian and Urdū history as well as in Qur'ān, Lākh Rām brought together every major story of an atrocity committed in the political history of Islām giving special emphasis to the invasion of India by Maḥmūd of Ghaznī and other Muslims.[58]

The closing section of the tract summed up Lākh Rām's charges against Islām (not at all specifically against the Aḥmadīyah) while calling Indian Muslims to accept the doctrines of the Āryā Samāj.

> Our main aim in writing all this is that you people may, considering that God is Omnipresent, study the historical works so that you may study the accounts of the tyranny of Islam over the innocent human beings. So that you may consider about the religion which was the cause of enslavement of lakhs of females and males. Which was responsible for the destruction of crores (10 million) of houses. Which caused insult to the modesty of a large number of human beings. And all the killings, an account of which cannot be given by anyone, but the All Knowing and All Powerful God. Can such a religion ever be given by God who si the Father of all the Beings and Author of all Things? Could such havocs, destructions and tyrannies which were committed with a view to pleasing God and spreading the (so-

> called) true religion, be in accordance with His will? Certainly not! Definitely not![59]

In a closing passage reminiscent of Aḥmad's writings, after a particularly strong attack on an opponent, Lēkh Rām closed his tract with these remarks:

> Dear Brethren! Let us remove hatred and jealousy from our hearts, sit in an atmosphere of love and unity and worship the one God. Let us purify our hearts through the Vedic way of worship. The doors of penance of your return to the fold of your former real faith are wide open to let you in. Shed the burden put on your necks by force and under compulsion. Befriend the truth and help us in spreading the truth, because God helps those who help themselves.[60]

With these remarks, Lēkh Rām did little more than raise the ire of the entire Muslim community--SunnĪ, AḥmadĪ, Aligarh. Even the Christian paper Nūr-i-Afshān, whose editorial policy was not usually calculated to smooth over communal tensions, agreed with Paysah Akhbār that a pamphlet such as Lēkh Rām's was "calculated to intensify the feelings of hostility existing between the members of the two communities." Paysah Akhbār went on to chide several other ĀryĀ publications for similar tactics as well.[61] Issues of the Tribune and Bhārat Sudhār in late August as well as one of the Sirmūr Gazette published September 23, 1892 all threatened civil action against Lēkh Rām if he did not desist from his anti-Muslim crusade.[62]

The development of significant communal riots between Hindūs and Muslims, centering in many instances over the question of cow slaughter, an issue over which the militant

Sanathān Dharm Sabhā had taken a very strong position, especially through the preaching of Lākh Rām and Lālā Munshī Rām, was a continuing source of serious concern to members of both communities during 1893 and 1894. Even in May of 1894, reaction to Lākh Rām's treatise on jihād was still attracting the attention of the Muslim press, all the more so because of the rioting which had occurred. Akhbār-i-Nūr of Ludhiāna likened his writings to those of the Christian missionaries which had also insulted Muslims. In response, the author quoted from European and American writers whose views of Islam showed

> its propagation by the sword is untrue, and that the original leaders of Islam were far more tolerant and generous to those whom they conquered, and who differed from them in their religious beliefs, than were the Christian conquerors in similar circumstances.[63]

IV

The growth of the Āryā Samāj between 1877 and 1891 was significant enough to be encouraging to the Samāj and annoying to the Muslim community. 16,275 members were recorded for the Panjāb in 1891 with almost 2,500 in Lāhōr and more than 2,000 in Derā Ghaẓī Khān districts, the two largest.[64] Growth proved to be a partial source of the conflict the Samāj was experiencing both within and without its organization. The anniversary meeting of the Lāhōr Samāj

reopened the controversy over vegetarianism. Although a motion to require all Āryā Samājīs to become vegetarians was defeated, Hans Rāj, a leader of the "conservative" faction, for reasons that are not clear, resigned his position as president of the Lāhōr Samāj on that occasion. Hans Rāj and his associates recommended Lajpat Rāē, a vegetarian, to succeed to the presidency but Lajpat Rāē was, in turn, opposed by Lālā Durgā Prashād, a radical supporter of Munshī Rām. The radical faction now pushed their insistence that Swāmī Dayānand was a rishī and therefore infallible, while the moderate group still maintained that adherence to the Ten Principles of 1877 were sufficient to make a man a good Āryā. As the internal strife continued, it affected the management of the D.A.V. College and eventually every local chapter of the Samāj was affected.[65]

During this period of internal strife within the Āryā Samāj, relations between Lēkh Rām and Ghulām Aḥmad had also continued to deteriorate. Following their original correspondence in April of 1885 in which Lēkh Rām had asked to come to Qādiyān so that he could see some "heavenly signs," relations grew more acrimonious when Lēkh Rām insisted that Aḥmad should deposit 2400 rupees in an account beforehand. If the heavenly sign should not come true Lēkh Rām would receive the money. Aḥmad, believing Lēkh Rām not to be a leader of the Samāj and to be purposely insulting him, asked Lēkh Rām on July 17, 1885 to deposit a like amount with the pledge that he would

forfeit it if he did not become a Muslim after seeing the "heavenly sign." In answer, Lēkh Rām is reported to have said that by "heavenly sign" he meant that Aḥmad should cause the sun to shine in the East. Aḥmad's only response was to invite Lēkh Rām to Qādiyān for a face to face confrontation.[66]

It appears that Lēkh Rām came to Qādiyān in mid-November of 1885 in an attempt to organize the Hindūs there. Although he remained in Qādiyān at least a month, he and Aḥmad never met. Aḥmad records the details of an exchange of letters between them in his post-mortem Istiftā' whose purpose was both to vindicate Aḥmad from any implication in the murder of Lēkh Rām and also to prove the validity of his 1893 prophecy that Lēkh Rām would die within six years.[67]

During the first visit to Qādiyān, however, Lēkh Rām apparently was in the village several weeks before sending his first communication to Aḥmad. Aḥmad dated the first letter on December 5, 1885, the content of which asked him to set a time and place for a meeting, "so that I may come to you with brothers Kashan Singh, Ḥakīm Dayārām and Pandit Naḥāl Chand to come to an agreement about the heavenly signs and revelations and talk to you about it." Stating that he had exhausted his arguments in trying to disprove Aḥmad, Lēkh Rām ended cryptically, "To turn your face away from kufr is not the way of a seeker of truth."[68]

A second letter pushed the point. "...my only aim in coming from Peshāwar to Qādiyān was in the hope that your

miracles and heavenly signs...I should see and confirm..." It is one thing to perform miracles before one's own disciples [illegible], he went on. All Lēkh Rām desired was a "sign." Again, he ended with a punch, quoting a line from Ṣadī: "The prophets have nothing more to give than a message." A third letter, dated December 13, raised specific conditions for their discussion and again asked Aḥmad why he was delaying the encounter. The theme of the fourth letter from Lēkh Rām was identical and as biting as the fifth in which he wrote,

> Mīrzā ṣāḥib: Alas, you regard yourself as a horse and all others as mules. I have answered objections to the Vedas and you have answered objections to the Qur'ān from Tradition. That is far from reasonable (aql). If you are not free then I too, have much work to do. If you do not want to talk, then at least show some heavenly signs! Ask God to show a heavenly sign about me so that it may be decided.[69]

In the text of the letter Lēkh Rām used the phrase "khayr al-makirīn" to describe God on several occasions. In his Istiftā', Aḥmad digressed into a footnote about Qur'ān 3:53 which he rendered as "God is the best of the deceivers to those who try to deceive God."[70] If Lēkh Rām knew Arabic as well as he says he did, Aḥmad continued, he should have known that

> the word makir is used with God only in a situation where he destroys the guilty with hidden ways. Therefore such words have come out of Lēkh Rām's mouth to prove that he wanted a sign of his death, a subtle sign, It is thus the power of God that he died by the hand of an assassin.[71]

It was in this spirit, that Aḥmad, first in a less precise

way on February 20, 1886, but in a very specific way on February 20, 1893, prophesied "after great contemplation, prayer and humility before God,...that within six years of that date, a great disaster would befall Lēkh Rām and he would meet his death."[72]

Lēkh Rām obviously did not take the prophecy seriously at the time. Ghulām Aḥmad had attracted attention outside of Qādiyān, and even outside of the Muslim community where fatwās had already been issued against him in 1890 and 1891, but he had not attracted the kind of attention he would the day after Lēkh Rām's assassination. If prophecy was one way to strike back at the insults heaped upon Islām by a militant Āryā Samājī such as Lēkh Rām, another approach was to attack the Āryā position on women and sexual relationships, an attack always certain to raise the ire of opponents. As a strict follower of the Code of Manū, Dayanānd had accepted the passages (9:56ff.) which allowed both the possibility of widow remarriage or the practice of niyog as an alternative. In his chapter on family life in the Satyārth Prakāsh, Dayānand spelled out the distinction between remarriage and niyog. In the latter case, the widow was to remain in the home of her deceased husband. Rather than remarrying and complicating the structure of her family, niyog allowed her the possibility of having sexual intercourse and procreating children which would be part of her husband's family rather than that of another man. As well, a husband unable to fertilize his

wife could introduce another male into his home in order to aid his wife to become pregnant. Dayānand made it clear, however, that niyog was to be performed only by widows and widowers but not between "bachelors and virgins."[73] Dayānand distinguished carefully between niyog and adultery. In the former case, a contractual relationship was made which was to be absolutely terminated after two conceptions by the woman. Neither was such a relationship to be considered sinful, "for natural relations of man and woman as constituted by God in his universe cannot be checked except in the case of exceptionally educated and renunciative yogins."[74] As the Vedas had specifically prohibited remarriages, Dayānand developed this more complete doctrine of niyog as an answer to the practice of satī or widow burning in the modern age. As a doctrine, it was clearly one more attempt he was making to place Indian family life in a more modern context.

Aḥmad's response came in one of his strongest tracts, Radd-i-Niyog, or the Rejection of Niyog, published at Qādiyān November, 1895. Beginning the pamphlet by addressing Muḥammad as "khatm nabiya", he described the prophet's marital relations and compared them to the practice of niyog which he had read about in Satyārth Prakāsh. Repudiating Dayānand's answers about niyog, Aḥmad asked, why a childless couple could not simply adopt a child of the same caste? Why should a widow not remarry and bind herself to one man? "If not, then she is loose, living with as many men as she wishes."[75] The

practice of niyog was nothing more than an excuse for transgressing what the Vedas forbid--remarriage. Aḥmad felt it his responsibility via an ishtihār and this tract to urge the Āryās to give up this "shameful practice." Their response to his first ishtihār was to publish anonymous abuses from Jullundār. In response, Aḥmad offered 500 rupees to anyone who could disprove his position on niyog.[76]

What would the Islamic answer to the problem of widow remarriage be, Aḥmad asked? Islamic law required that a widow stay at home for four months after the death of her husband in order to avoid any illicit encounters too soon. In this, he saw a sensible legal approach to the problem, for if a widow was free to have intercourse at once, how could one determine if the child was of the first or second husband. Aḥmad's arguments and proofs were lengthy. Their significance was more in the style and language of Aḥmad's argumentation against this Āryā doctrine and the obvious tensions which it would provoke both in Hindū-Muslim relations and, more specifically, in AḥmadĪyah-Āryā Samāj relations than in any effectiveness Aḥmad might really have had in winning the Āryās over to Islām. Aḥmad did not complete his arguments, however, without again requesting the Government

> which has showered upon us so many blessing and favours...we request them to pass a law regulating controversies and subjecting them to two conditions, (1) that they avoid making criticisms of other traditions which apply to their own tradition, and (2) if one group says that such and such are their Holy Books, the other party should not

> go beyond what is in these books in making criticisms.

If they did, Aḥmad continued, they should be subjected to criminal penalty meted out by the Government.[78] Among those whom Aḥmad cited for the breach of these simple rules for religious debate was, of course, Lēkh Rām.

Lēkh Rām's activities during the years after 1893 were especially notable because he was not only contributing to the growth of communal tensions in the Panjāb as an Āryā, "but because he was by far the most successful."[79] His preaching which was offensive to Muslims was now, also, to Sikhs during the same period in which Aḥmad's claim that Gurū Nānak was a Muslim was also creating a public issue. In late August of 1896, Paysah Akhbār protested against Lēkh Rām's book Takzib-i-Barāhīn as not merely an answer to Ahmad's Barāhīn but a book which

> has used the most offensive and insulting language towards Islam, its leaders, its followers, including the Prophets, and things held sacred by the Muhammadans.

Citing the case of another book suppressed by the authorities in Bombay, the editor calls on the authorities in the Panjāb to do the same with this book. Chaudhwīn Sadī of Rawalpindī, Panjāb of Amritsar and the Paysah Akhbār once again reiterated the same attack against Lēkh Rām and demands on the Government to do something about him.[80] By the end of September, 1896, charges which had been brought against Lēkh Rām at Amritsar by Muslims from Dehlī were dismissed by the Deputy Commissioner

according to an angry Chaudhwīn Ṣadī,

> so as not to intensify the excitement prevailing among the parties, and thus avert serious consequences. Whatever the result of this particular case may be, it is evident that the acts of this short-sighted class of people will some day lead to disastrous consequences.[81]

Such disastrous consequences as Chaudhwīn Ṣadī foresaw were scarcely six months away. During the last months of 1896 and early 1897, the number of communal riots increased significantly, with competition for Government posts becoming more tense and bitter than ever. One commentator has written:

> The activities of reform groups and new religious sects had become intensified and had institutionalized the previously casual points of friction between opposing religious communities. Group consciousness, as it was developing under the impact of western thought, followed already existing lines of division in traditional Panjab society.[82]

In 1897, communal tensions and hatreds in the Panjāb may have reached a point not to be exceeded again until partition in 1947. These destructive communal feelings have been reflected more fully in the newspaper reports of 1897 concerning the murder of Lēkh Rām on March 6, and the role that Ghulām Aḥmad may or may not have played in that event.

V

The tension, confusion, and the expression of feelings pro and con with respect to the murder of Lēkh Rām appeared in more than thirty articles from nineteen different Panjāb

newspapers of all points of view all published within three weeks of the event. Panjāb Samāchār, a Hindū paper, reported the event on the day it happened in the house of Lālā Jiwān Lāl in the Dhāl Moḥallah at 6 P.M., Saturday, March 6. Their view was that

> The murderer was a wicked Muhammadan, who had been living with the Pandit for some days and had expressed a desire to be re-admitted to the Hindu religion. The assassination of the Pandit is the result of a conspiracy.[83]

Continuing in the same vein, the editor expressed his doubts that the local authorities would do much to bring the "conspirators" to justice since the investigation was being directed by a "Muhammadan" and not a European officer.

The militant Hindū paper, Akhbār al-Āmm, began its report with an attack on the British administration for allowing such a thing to happen in Lāhōr. Admitting that both Lākh Rām and Ghulām Aḥmad, because of their writings and speeches, would have probably "come to grief long ago if India had been under any other rule," this editor chose to attack the Āryās for having "hit upon a novel method of abusing other religions...which the Aryas have learned from the Christian missionaries...first resorted to against the Hindu religion." Although the question of responsibility was far from clear in the editor's mind, the tone of his writing certainly indicated his anti-Government bias. He stated that under the British rāj the continuation of murders and the growing need for chaukidārs (watchmen) in many sections

of Lāhōr was increasingly necessary.[84]

It was not long before the prophecy of Ghulām Aḥmad concerning Lēkh Rām came to light in the press. Bhārat Sudhār, in an extraordinary issue on March 13, published the following notice "alleged to have been issued by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of Kadian":

> Ten years ago, in accordance with a revelation made to me by the Almighty, I issued a notice on the 20th February 1886 to the effect that God had resolved upon punishing Pandit Lekh Rām for his blasphemy (Beadbiān aur gustakhian). I offered to reveal the form of punishment and the time within which it would be inflicted if the Pandit agreed (to such a course). The Pandit gave his free consent. I published another notice, dated the 20th February 1893, containing the prophecy in question in detail. This prophecy, which was also published in the Barkat-ul-Duā and other books and notices was to the effect that the death of the Pandit, which would come to him as a punishment, would not result from ordinary fever or other disease, but that he would fall a victim to the wrath of the Almighty within six years of the date of the notice. Now it appears from a notice issued by the Arya Samāj that the Pandit fell a martyr to his religion on the 7th March 1897. As humanitarians we regret the death of the Pandit which has overtaken him as a great and sudden calamity in the prime of life; but on the other hand we thank the Almighty that his prophecy has been fulfilled. We swear by God who can read our hearts, that if the Pandit or any other person had been in danger of his life, and if it had been possible to save him by means of our sympathy, we would not have grudged him such sympathy. The decrees (bāten) of God have their appointed times, but man should under no circumstances abstain from following the laws of morality and humanity. This is the highest standard of morality. But neither we nor any other person can avoid the decrees of God. Our opponents ought to read (the notices)...containing the prophecy, in a dispassionate manner and see how this death had been foreshadowed. See what

> a terrible plague is raging in the country. This is the result of indifference (to the will of God) and hard-heartedness. All nations should try to perform good deeds and give up absurd practices.
>
> ...This is a grand sign which God has manifested as a warning to those who look upon his servant (the Mirza) with contempt, so that they may take pity on their lives and may not die while labouring under a delusion (lit. veil) (i.e., they may not die without repenting). If this business...had been the work of a human being, it would have come to naught long ago. Now the 25th year of this work of revelation has commenced, i.e. this work has extended over a period as long as that of a true Prophet, who left this world after working for 23 years.[85]

In publishing these alleged remarks of Aḥmad, which were certainly in the spirit of his Istiftā' of May, 1897, Bhārat Sudhār was taking the lead, as it were, in setting up Aḥmad as the next victim of the communal warfare. The sarcasm of the editor's comments when he published Aḥmad's statements were evident:

> the Mirza calls upon all to take a lesson from the death of Pandit Lekh Rām and embrace the religion preached by him. Let the Aryas ponder over the notice and see what sort of threat it contains. Will the Government remain quiet about it? Will the authors of such notices, if encouraged, allow the public peace to be maintained?[86]

It is not difficult to see, from one point of view, how the editor could take the remarks Aḥmad had made as a threat to the social order. Aḥmad, himself, clearly did not see his remarks as such a threat. As they did not seem inconsistent with the general pattern of prophecy and revelation which he and his closest followers must have believed in more fervently than ever during the late 1890's, it is possible

to suspect that he came to lack perspective about what was happening in the Panjāb during this period--if, indeed, anyone had perspective on these events. Aḥmad also did not really understand the political significance of what was happening, since he remained aloof from political involvement.

This was not Bhārat Sudhār's only response to the assassination. Reporting on the funeral of Lēkh Rām, it described the speeches made by Lajpat Rāi, Munshī Rām, and the presence of Hans Rāj, who, at the end, embraced the other two symbolizing a reconciliation of the feuding factions of the Samāj. The editor of the Bhārat seems to have taken the lead in calling for a reconciliation which "will constitute a matchless monument for the martyrdom of Pandit Lekh Ram...."[87] Such a reconciliation was to exist precariously for about five years clearly as a result of the trauma of the assassination but this event, in itself, was not an adequate basis for keeping the Samāj together permanently.

Taking a middle-of-the-road position, the anti-Āryā Hindū paper, Akhbār al-Ḥāmm, placed the onus on the Government, to prosecute severely the murderers in order to set an example to others and prevent further folly. This statement was cloaked, however, in the implication that Lēkh Rām had done far more to offend Hindūs than Muslims and that his murderer could easily have been a Hindū fanatic were it not already known that he was a Muslim.[88] Payeah Akhbār, writing one week after the event, indicated the extent to which rumours

were circulating through Lāhōr. It was the first newspaper to make this point that there was no foundation to the accusations being brought against Aḥmad, "seeing that the Muhammadans are not in the habit of avenging themselves in so cowardly a manner." Reporting on a rumour heard about the funeral orations, the editor went on to say that "a certain member of the Arya Samaj...declared that the Aryas should prepare to openly avenge themselves on the Muhammadans by assassinating their chief men."[89] Although there is no evidence that Lajpat Rāē or Munshī Rām said any such thing, the fact of its being reported, even under the guise of rumour, added even more to the increasing tensions at work in the situation.

The Panjāb Samāchār of Lāhōr, published March 13, outspokenly took the side of Lēkh Rām in an article entitled "Murder of Pandit Lekh Ram, the second Gobind Singh." The editor lauded Lēkh Rām for having published his tract on "JeHad"

> in which the Pandit proved that the spread of Islām had been effected by means of the sword ...(the reaction to which was that) the different sections of the Muhammadan community openly declared this "kāfir" should be put to death. Indeed the author of Mauūd-i-Masihi (i.e., Ahmad) went so far as to prophesy in that work that Lekh Rām would die a very painful death within six years on the 'Id day...the Pandit was harrassed in various ways. Cases were instituted against him....But when the Muhammadans, who consider their religion to consist of nothing but the doctrine of "jehād",[90] discovered that they were powerless against the Pandit and that the law could neither stop his pen nor silence his tongue, they set about devising other means for the purpose of getting rid of the courageous Lekh Rām....[91]

Well aware that Lākh Rām, through his practice of shuddī or reconversion of Muslims and Christians back to Hinduism, had done much to alienate himself from the Muslim community, the editor of the Hindū paper sang his praises nonetheless. Deeply concerned about what had happened, he had gone to the scene of the murder to see exactly what was being done. Suspicious that the Muslim Police Inspector would take no significant action to apprehend the murderer still at large, the editor saw in this murder a plot "which has for some time past been discussed in the neighbourhood of Amritsar and Gurdāspur on one side, and that of Delhi and Bombay on the other."[92] The implications of these comments and opinions were, of course, to lead the public to a higher state of tension within the second week after the murder.

In writing to support what Lākh Rām had done, the editor of the Panjāb Samāchār introduced a new dimension to the communal tensions which had not appeared in the Panjāb press since the assassination. When he attempted to compare Lākh Rām to Gurū Gobind Singh, he raised a storm of protest in the Sikh community for which he had to apologize. In so doing, however, he again made the point that Lākh Rām had now done for the Hindūs what Gobind Singh had so valiantly once done for the Sikhs.[93]

The atmosphere of rumour grew as Bhārat Sudhār of March 13 attacked Paysah Akhbār for suggesting that Lākh Rām's murder was tied up with an illicit relationship he

was carrying on with an "un-named" woman.[94] Akhbār al-ʿĀmm took a far more moderate line in indicating how easily one could place a general blame on the Muslim community for the murder because of what Lēkh Rām had done, Ghulām Aḥmad's prophecy and the growing prevalance of ghāzīism in border areas. Particularly critical of Aḥmad's conduct, the editor suggested that since he had prophesied the death of Lēkh Rām on the basis of a revelation, he should now "use his vaunted powers and say who the murderer of the late Pandit is." Taking a middle-of-the-road position, the editor of the Akhbār called upon the Government as well as the Muḥammadans to find the "culprit" in order to alleviate suspicions of a broad plot by Muslims in the assassination.[95]

Rahbār-i-Hind of March 15 was the first to reveal the news that the police had searched the premises of several Muslim groups, including buildings of the Aḥmadīyah at Qādiyān. Puzzled to understand why the police would search the property of both the Aḥmadīyah and the Anjumān i-Himiyāt-i-Islām at Lāhōr, "seeing that a deadly emnity exists between the two," the editor suggested that the Police were trying to unite all Muslims even as the Āryā Samāj had been trying to unite Hindūs and predicted that open warfare would result. Rumours were abroad that the Hindūs were now thinking of murdering both Ghulām Aḥmad and Sir Sayyid Aḥmad Khān in reprisal. Calling for constraint on both sides, the editor of Rahbār seemed to place responsibility for peace-keeping on the Government.[96]

A fourth dimension to the controversy precipitated by the murder emerged in the press with the militant Christian paper Nūr-i-Afshān of Ludhiāna, published March 12, 1897. This report began by remarking that Mirzā Ghulām Aḥmad was a great enemy of Christianity and a man who bore "implacable hatred and malice towards its followers." Without even mentioning the murder about which it should have been clearly aware, it went on to stress the extent to which Aḥmad was insulting and injuring "the Christian public" as a means of gaining notoriety for himself. A week later Nūr-i-Afshān called upon the Government to pass laws punishing those who could prophesy concerning the death of others. Whether people believed a man to be a prophet or not, the editor argued, he was fully responsible for the consequences of his utterances. Such a law was not meant to limit personal freedom nor was it meant to be construed as an attack on any particular religion. Rather it should be understood that it was "the duty of all Governments to provide for the security of life and property...." Driving home his point with extreme vigour, the editor closed his article with the comments,

> if the Almighty wishes to punish any person, he can do so without the aid of assassins and knives. Indeed, the use of the knife does not prove the wrath of God, but the malice and hostility of a black-hearted wretch.[97]

In the meantime, reports in the Muslim press continued to imply that the Āryā Samāj was organizing widespread agitation against the Muslims as a whole and against Ghulām

Aḥmad in particular. As well, they attacked the Hindū papers such as the Tribune and Panjāb Samāchār which had written "that the Ghazīs consider it specially meritorious to kill Kāfirs on the 'Id day" for making such utterly false statements.[98] It was in this spirit that the arguments of the Panjāb press were to continue for some time to come, not alleviating the situation but rather, creating greater tension and uncertainty in the public mind. That the Muslim press was generally displeased with Aḥmad's prophecies and his apparent joy at their fulfillment was amply clear from the comments of Paysah Akhbār which suggested that he do more to unite the Muslim community than to spend his time "claiming the power of working miracles." Vakīl also upset by the growing communal tensions, even from its perspective at Amritsar, suggested that in spite of Aḥmad's prophecy, the Muslim community could in no way be connected with the murder.[99]

Most militant in its opposition to Aḥmad was Mullah Ja'far Zatallī whose editor, Muḥammad Bakhsh, would join Muḥammad Ḥusayn of Batāla in the next two years to make life very difficult for Aḥmad. Publishing a parody of the Mīrzā's prophecy and declaring him an imposter, the paper went on to bait Aḥmad on the issue of prophecy while appearing totally unconcerned for the communal tensions arising out of the Lēkh Rām murder. The more staid Akhbār al-'Āmm "sarcastically remark(ed)" the same week,

> that Government should lose no time in showing

> its appreciation of so great a man. There may be other prophets in India, who possess the power of communicating with the Almighty, but the idea of a man possessed of such powers endeavouring to benefit the world by means of notices is certainly a novel one....Let the Government take advantage of the powers in question. The Mirza states that he is afraid that a conspiracy is on foot for his assassination. This fear is, however, not based on a revelation, but on letters received from friends.[100]

Although it would appear that Ghulām Aḥmad had few friends outside the Aḥmadīyah movement, even within Islām, at this time, Sirāj al-Akhbār was one paper which came to his defense by insisting that since there was a full two years left before the expected fulfillment of his prophecy, there would be no reason why Aḥmad should have been so anxious to see his prophecy fulfilled already.[101]

Other issues besides Aḥmad's questionable role in the Lēkh Rām murder were also helping to increase the tensions. The Panjāb press of late March and April was full of rumours about poisonings, communal conflicts in various provincial cities, and bad words about the opposition press in general. In mockery of Aḥmad, Bhārat Sudhār of March 31 reported a communication from one Kartār Singh who now declared himself to be a prophet who had received a revelation.[102] Akhbār al-Ām still angry both at Aḥmad and at the seeming lack of sensitivity of the Government sought to call Government's attention

> to a lengthy notice issued by Mirza Ghulām Ahmad of Kādian in which he expresses his joy at the murder of Pandit Lekh Rām in fulfilment of his

> prophecy...the Mirza should have been the last man to say anything about the death of Lekh Rām ...it will be a grave mistake on the part of Government to ignore notices of this nature,-- a mistake which may prove a source of danger.[103]

New rumours out of Qādiyān that Aḥmad had asked the Government for protection because he feared an Āryā plot against his life were played up in the Muslim press, if only to ask the inevitable question, why did the Mīrzā not believe that God would protect him. At the same time, these suggestions of a plot against Aḥmad were vehemently denied in the Āryā press. Thus, the worsening of relations between Hindūs and Muslims continued to be reflected in what the latest press reports had to say of the Lēkh Rām incident of 1897.

The March 27 issue of Panjāb Samāchār expressed a particularly violent reaction against both Muslims in general and Aḥmad in particular. The murderer had not yet been apprehended, they argued, because the Muslim policemen were glad at the death of a kāfir, while the argument raised earlier by some Muslim papers that Lēkh Rām had been as obnoxious to Hindūs as he had to Muslims and therefore may well have been assassinated by a Hindū, was debunked by five "proofs". These were

1. The prophecy made by Mirza Ghulām Ahmad of Kādīan regarding the death of the Pandit.
2. The case instituted against the deceased by the Muhammadans at Delhi.
3. The fatwa passed by the Muhammadan community in general in favour of the assassination of Lekh Rām.

4. The finding of telegrams received by Muhammadans from different places inquiring as to the whereabouts of the Pandit.

5. The deceased's last words: "That wretch came (to me) to be purified and has killed me."[104]

Another twist to the accusations and counter-accusations was raised by the Amritsar Sikh paper, Singh Sahāī, which had come to blows with Ahmad two years earlier over the issue of Gurū Nānak. An article in its March 30 issue implied that the murder of Lākh Rām was a "deep laid conspiracy, and that the Muhammadans of Batala believe that Mirza Ghulām Ahmad is concerned in the matter." That Muḥammad Ḥusayn and his followers in the Ahl-i-Ḥadīth, already strongly opposed to Aḥmad, had to turn to a Sikh newspaper in order to press such a charge, gives evidence to the unanimity of the Muslim newspapers in refuting the charge that a Muslim plot was involved. Even though most Muslim papers had little good to say about Aḥmad, they would not have published such a notice at this time. As we have noted above,[105] during the overt collision between Muḥammad Ḥusayn and Aḥmad, the Muslim press generally did not side with either; but then, the communal tensions of 1897 were not as apparent during the period of the internal Muslim conflicts of 1898 and 1899.

While the Sat Dharm Prachārak of Jullundūr, April 1, launched into a lengthy attack against Aḥmad while lauding Lākh Rām as one who had served the Āryās well, Panjāb Samāchār published a letter from one Gaṇgā Bishan, a Drill Instructor

of the Railway Police, addressed to Ghulām Aḥmad which introduced yet another dimension into both the controversy and Aḥmad's role in it. The gist of Bishan's letter was that Lākh Rām's murder had been clearly committed at the bidding of Aḥmad. If he was wrong, Gaṇgā Bishan agreed to invoke the power of God to cause his death within a year. Before taking the oath, however, he asserted that the following conditions would have to be met: (1) That Ghulām Aḥmad should be hanged if Gaṇgā Bishan did not die within the year set; (2) Aḥmad should deposit 10,000 rupees with the Government or in some "safe bank" and that again Gaṇgā Bishan should be paid this sum if he did not die as prescribed; (3) If Bishan was murdered at Qādiyān during a stay there, Aḥmad would be responsible for his death. In conclusion Gaṇgā Bishan asserted that he hoped this would prove Aḥmad's claims once and for all, leading the people of India to believe in him and his revelations if indeed what he maintained was true. Bishan urged Aḥmad to answer the letter quickly and send him enough money for the roundtrip to Qādiyān.[106]

The first weeks of April, 1897 saw the press reflecting the increased communal tensions throughout the Panjāb and especially in Lāhōr. Paysah Akhbār attacked the Tribune when the latter insisted that the police search carried on at the Anjumān-i-Himayāt-i-Islām buildings was in no way connected with the Lākh Rām incident. Rumours that Hindūs and Muslims were poisoning each other and beginning a boycott

of each other's shops were rife. The Wafādār writing on April 1 attempted to cool the situation by asking why the Hindūs felt it necessary to raise Lēkh Rām, an "ordinary man," to such high esteem while also criticizing Ghulām Aḥmad for trying to convince the Muslims of his messianic qualities and that the death of Lēkh Rām was the result of his prophecies. The editor of Wafādār, partial to neither side, called upon Government to "suppress some of these papers which are creating bad blood between the two communities."[107]

Many dimensions of the communal issue continued to appear in the Panjāb press during April. Many of these comments concerned the internal struggles of the Āryā Samāj, attacks by the various papers on each other, accusations concerning plots against the lives of various communal leaders as well as attempts to sabotage the work of the Hindū-Muslim committee attempting to restore peace in Lāhōr. Almost without exception, the press, representing all persuasions and points of view, attacked Aḥmad for his role in the Lēkh Rām affair.

Singh Sahāī of Amritsar, in an article appearing April 15, directly attributed the murder of Lēkh Rām to Aḥmad on the grounds that since his prophecy concerning the death of ʿAbd-Allāh ʿAṣim, the Christian missionary, had not come true, and fearing that his prophecy concerning Lēkh Rām would also not come true, "he caused him to be murdered on the evening of the 6th March last."[108] This Sikh paper already strongly opposed to Aḥmad because of his statement that Gurū

Nānak was a Muslim, called upon Government to arrest Aḥmad at once. The same issue carried a letter from a Hindū at Batāla who stated also and without doubt that Aḥmad was responsible for the murder of Lākh Rām. This Hindū, Daulat Rām, further challenged Aḥmad to predict his own death, stating that Aḥmad would be held fully responsible in the event he too was murdered.

The Bhārat Sudhār of Lāhōr, April 19, mockingly published a letter from a man who said he would gladly become a follower of Aḥmad if

> the latter will, in the presence of a large assembly, plunge his naked hand into boiling oil and keep it there for five minutes. If the Mirza comes unscathed out of this ordeal, the writer as well as his family will not only acknowledge him as the promised Messiah...but will distribute two thousand rupees among beggars as a thanksgiving....[109]

At the same time a number of papers reported that the District Superintendent of Police at Gūrdāspūr had searched Aḥmad's house on April 8, more than a month after the murder. The press was in agreement this time that such a search would prove useless especially as Aḥmad was well aware of the search already held at the Anjumān in Lāhōr. Aḥmad's own Istiftā' of May 1, while referring to the search, only seemed to mention it as one of a series of incidents which he felt the need to report to the public. Since al-Ḥakam, the earliest regular Aḥmadī newspaper, was not yet being published, the brief remarks on page 2 of the Istiftā' are the only statements

available to present the Aḥmadīyah point of view on these events written at the time. Aḥmad's biographer has dismissed the incident saying,

> He was very glad when the Superintendent of Police told him that he had orders to search his house in connection with the murder of Pt. Lekh Ram. Ahmad at once took the officials and others, including some of his enemies, into his house which was surrounded by police. He took them to every room in the house. Bundles of all kinds of papers were opened and read out. By coincedence (sic) the first papers that came to the notice of the autherities...were the writings of Lekh Ram and Ahmad....In short, the police made a thorough enquiry and were perfectly satisfied.[110]

In editions of April 20, 24 and 28 the Ambala Gazette, Paysah Akhbār, and Bhārat Sudhār each attacked Aḥmad as a fraud and imposter. The same week Nūr-i-Afshān, citing Aḥmad's role in the case of ʿAbd-Allāh ʿAṣim, asserted that the Āryās should have been prepared for mischief by Aḥmad in the case of Lēkh Rām. Similarly, Panjāb Samāchār urged the authorities not to neglect their duty in seeking the murderer. "It is to be hoped," the editor wrote,

> that the authorities have not come to believe that the murderer was an angel, as Mirza Ghulām Ahmad has alleged; and that Mr. Temple, who has succeeded Mr. Tomkins, will leave no stone unturned to unravel the mystery. The Government should not lose sight of the fact that the murder was the result of a conspiracy.[111]

The only paper to take note of Aḥmad's continual support of the Government was Victoria Paper of Siālkōṭ, writing on May 1. The gist of their argument was to praise the Lieutenant Governor for not acting precipitously against

Aḥmad, in spite of the numerous complaints of Aḥmad's enemies.[112] Attacks against Aḥmad continued, however, in such papers as Mullah Ja'far Zatallī which published a notice written by Muḥammad Ḥusayn on May 1, 1897, citing two causes of current communal tensions. The first, Ḥusayn asserted, was healthy competition between Hindūs and Muslims which, he hoped, would not be based on differences of religion alone. The second cause of tensions, however, was clearly the death of Lākh Rām which could easily be resolved by a concerted effort to find the culprit. Ghulām Aḥmad, for all his claims, did not really prophesy anything and he should be ignored by both Muslims and Hindūs alike.[113] Taunting attacks appeared in mid-May in both Panjāb Samāchār and Bhārat Sudhār, both of which published new letters from Kartār Singh who again declared himself a new prophet, while the Wafādār also attacked Aḥmad and urged all Muslims to ignore his claims to Messiahship.[114]

Another concerted attack on Aḥmad was undertaken by the Āryā paper, Sat Dharm Prachārak of Jullundār City, which on May 24, declared "the Mirza mad," while on June 11 the same paper criticized Aḥmad for claiming to prove that the Gurū was, without doubt, a Hindū and Āryā Samājī. Meanwhile, the Nazīm-al-Hind of Lāhōr on May 29 published a lengthy article blaming Ghulām Aḥmad "and his bloodthirsty followers" for preaching intense hatred against the British Government ever since the search of his house at Qādiyān on April 8 and

"for secretly predicting the destruction of the British Empire in India." The paper further attacked Aḥmad's claim to be the true mahdī, found him solely responsible for the ill-feeling between Hindūs and Muslims as well as the instigator of ill-feeling between Sikhs and Muslims. This most blatant of all attacks on Aḥmad ended by suggesting that Aḥmad was leading a political movement which the Government should check carefully.[115]

Although the repudiation of Aḥmad that continued throughout the rest of 1897 was primarily the result of his "role" in the Lēkh Rām incident, most of what was written in a derogatory manner was in the Muslim paper Mullah Ja'far Zatallī, which was beginning its campaign against Aḥmad, a campaign which would not terminate until the court case in 1898 involving Aḥmad and Muḥammad Ḥusayn.[116] In the midst of the Lēkh Rām affair, Aḥmad found himself under attack because of his position on the sultanate at Istanbul and the doctrine of the khalīfah in Islām. The issue was raised first by Chaudhwīn Ṣadī on June 15, 1897 in discussing the visit of the Turkish Vice-Counsel Ḥasān Kam Bey to Qādiyān. The article claimed that followers of Aḥmad had convinced the Vice-Counsel to come to Qādiyān so that a prophecy of Aḥmad's would be fulfilled: namely, his claim "that the envoys of kings would wait on him." Apparently during the Turk's visit to Qādiyān both Pioneer and Civil and Military Gazette had written articles claiming the counsel was a spy. These had so upset Aḥmad

that he had at once responded with an article attacking the sultān and praising the British Government. The paper went on to defend the sultān stating "that the sultan shows greater liberality and generosity towards the poor and needy, the widow and the orphan than any other sovereign living." Continuing its article in equal praise of the Queen, the editor of the Chaudhwīn as well as that of Nazīm al-Hind and the Sirāj al-Akhbār attacked Aḥmad for his outrageous remarks. The Sirāj suggested also that

> if Government puts this man down at once, it will give offense to some eight or ten thousand persons only, and as all other classes of the people are opposed to them, they will be powerless to do any mischief. If...Government waits... there will be the danger of a serious disturbance on the part of these fanatics....[117]

In an article appearing on July 8, Chaudhwīn Ṣadī reported that Aḥmad had withdrawn his disparaging remarks against the Turkish sultanate. Continuing his attack on Aḥmad, the author of the article refuted his claims to the prophecy, as well as Aḥmad's insistence "that the Almighty (should) kill him if he was an imposter."[118] The following week, the same paper referred to Aḥmad saying that "doctors and native hakims are agreed that the Mirza is insane," while the Mullah Ja'far, which could always be counted upon to put in a bad word about Aḥmad, spoke of the "lakhs of Muhammadans who regard the Mirza as a false prophet...." having been insulted by Aḥmad and his public claims to Messiahship.[119]

It was ironic that Ghulām Aḥmad's polemics against

the Āryā Samāj which came to a head in the murder of Lākh Rām and the aftermath of that event in which communal tensions reached one of their highest points in nineteenth century Panjāb, should have developed to be a far greater inter-Muslim struggle, in which Aḥmad's claims were to be consistently repudiated by fellow Muslims while being more and more ignored by Āryā Samājīs, Hindūs and Sikhs. In the broad perspective of the events of 1897, one cannot but feel that Aḥmad, although he may have asked for it, received nothing but abuse by all, but especially by other Muslims. It is equally ironic to note that when the first reports of the arrested Muslim murderer appeared in the press of mid-November, 1897, of the five Panjābī papers reporting, each expressed joy that the murderer was finally coming to justice, but not one commented about Ghulām Aḥmad so that he might be vindicated of suspicions once and for all.[120]

With the capture of the assassin of Lākh Rām, the public furor in the press seemed almost to have disappeared. 1898 found Aḥmad's name continually in the news, but now it primarily appeared in relation to his controversies with the Muslim 'ulamā' on the one hand, and because of his strong stand on the anti-Muslim Christian pamphlet "Ummahāt al-Mu'minīn," on the other.[121] Reported references to the Lākh Rām incident appeared only four times during 1898, three of which were in Āryā papers and the fourth in al-Ḥakam, newly available Urdū organ of the Aḥmadīyah. The al-Ḥakam statement

appeared on the anniversary of the assassination.[122]

During the ten year period from 1898 until Aḥmad's death in 1908, AḥmadĪyah attention to the Āryā Samāj continued unabated in both Urdū and English publications. The issue of al-Ḥakam dated December 10, 1899, is a good illustration of how Aḥmad attempted to reconcile his position with fellow Muslims while taking a stand against the Āryās for their continuing abuse of Muslims. Here he began by citing an article which had appeared in the Āryā Gazette which "shows clearly enough in what flagrant

> a manner the religious feelings of the Mohammadans are every now and then offended by the Arya Samajists. Government...should carefully watch the doings of these mischievous people, who seem bent on provoking...into the commission of acts of lawlessness six crores of its loyal Mohammadan subjects by insulting their religion. He (the editor) then praises his co-religionists for displaying extreme patience under such provocation and for not taking the law into their own hands. He also invites those foolish Muhammadans who hold Mirza Ghulam Ahmad responsible for the Arya attacks on Islam to read the article under reference and say if the charge of aggression cannot more properly be laid at the door of the followers of Dayanand.[123]

The reason the "Mirza" had answered charges leveled by the Āryās, the editor had continued, was to keep "ignorant Mussalmans" from reacting violently to statements such as published in the Āryā Gazette. Having made this comment, the editor of al-Ḥakam then commented that the Āryās should be dealt a "crushing reply," which would hardly seem to have encouraged the Āryās to keep the peace. For example, this

article continued,

> ...and it should be pointed out that that dead and accursed language of crows (Sanskrit), not a vestige of which is to be found in the world today, and those untruthful Vedas which cannot be understood on this side of Germany can be placed in opposition to Arabic and the Qur an only by people whose sense of shame and honour is so low that (as if in obedience to the teachings of their sacred Vedas) they very gladly hand over their virtuous...or simple wives to some strong lusty birajdata (donor of semen) in order to get children and refer to the Vedas for a proof of the legitimacy of such offspring! The editor, however, does not wish to pay back the Gazette in its own coin and contents himself by calling upon Government to take immediate steps to muzzle the Arya Samajists.[124]

Aḥmad's sermon on the occasion of ʿId al-Azhā reported in al-Ḥakam of April 17, 1900, while discussing Āryā teaching in considerably more detail, took the same tack in attacking niyog for sexual abuse and degradation. Similar attacks appeared again in al-Ḥakam on May 13, August 31, and November 17. The earliest article was another answer to the Sat Dharm Prachārak of Jullundār for its counter-attack on Aḥmad's sermon against the Āryās, al-Ḥakam summarized the remarks published in the Āryā paper as follows:

> (a) that the Mirza is flattering the Government as he was himself silent under the threats administered to him by the authorities;
> (b) that the murder of Lekh Ram has shown the weakness of the Muhammadan religion;
> (c) that the Mirza has made indecent attacks on the doctrines of Nayog (sic) and the transmigration of souls;
> (d) that the sermon was calculated to produce a bad effect on women.[125]

In response to point "b", the editor wrote that "al-Ḥakam

observes

> that so far from being a sign of the weakness of the Muhammadan religion the murder of Lekh Ram is a strong proof of its truth. On the other hand, the prophecy of Lekh Ram that the Mirza would die of cholera, not having been fulfilled, is a sign of the weakness of the Arya religion.

Such was the nature of the continuing verbal controversy between Aḥmad and his representatives on the one side, and the press of the Āryā Samāj on the other. The general distaste for both sides was reflected in a letter by one Ghulām Rasūl to the Paysah Akhbār of Lāhōr on August 3, 1904, in which the writer concluded that "Mirza Ghulam Ahmad's attitude to other faiths is similar to that of the Aryas and that it is for this reason that Muhammadans look down on the Mirza's writings."[126]

While numerous articles in Review of Religions[127] continued the charges against the Āryās and Vedic religion for English readers, Aḥmad's personal confrontation with the Āryā Samāj of Qādiyān only became public when he published, in 1907, the tract, "Qādiyān ke Āryā aur Hum," in answer to "the very offensive and abusive language" which they had used against him. Aḥmad was writing to refute the continuing disbelief by Āryās in his ability to prophesy and was also writing to respond to the "abuse" and "filthy language" shouted by a Brahmin during Namāz at the Qādiyān mosque. The Muslims of Qādiyān suffered the pain of these insults withholding their anger even though they might have gone

out and violently destroyed the Āryās of the town. Aḥmad spoke to his people in order to pacify them citing how they must keep the faith which he had kept himself for thirty-five years since he first received revelations. At that time he had been informed by God that thousands of people would come from all directions to support his cause even though at that time he had no followers nor any money except his small family pension. How different things were now should be recognized by the Āryās of Qādiyān. The AḥmadIs were spending 1500-2000 rupees a month alone on the "free kitchen." If anyone should know the truth about Aḥmad's career, it should be Lālā Sharampat Rāē and Lālā Muliāwā Mull who had been residents of Qādiyān for many years.[128]

An additional purpose of speaking before his followers that day, Aḥmad asserted, was to declare "that God's grace on the Āryās of Qādiyān has come to an end and in particular this divine grace has come to an end for those men who are witnesses to these divine signs, but they are not afraid even of the omnipotence of God, who can destroy them completely."[129] Because Aḥmad's opponents realized that his prophecies would come true, they had begun a systematic attack on him about 1897. The fact that the AḥmadIyah movement had grown larger financially and in membership "clearly proves that man cannot fight against God."[130] Similarly, Aḥmad continued, the life of Lēkh Rām was wasted in such efforts at refutation of his claims as was the attempt of certain Christian missionaires.

Directing a sharp attack against the Āryās on particular points, Aḥmad remarked,

> I know it for a fact not from today but for a long time past that almost all the Hindūs of Qādīān are the enemies of Islām and they love ignorance. When they see God's light they run to the darkness even more, as if there is no God for them. The God Almighty has shown a great sign in the shape of what happened to Lēkh Rām, but from this they learned no lesson, and how clear was this sign in which it has been foretold that Lēkh Rām would not die on a sick bed but that he would be murdered within six years and that the day of the murder would be the day after ʿId....I had issued a pamphlet in which I had stated that "O, Āryās, if your God has any power then save your Lēkh Rām through prayers to him," but their God was not able to save him. He (Lēkh Rām) had made a forecast that I would die within the next three years and the God Almighty proved his forecast to be incorrect....He died himself and thus put his seal of acceptance that the Āryā religion was not a true religion and that Islām was a true religion....[131]

The blame for Lēkh Rām's death must ultimately fall on the Hindūs of Qādiān for it was they who had instigated him against Aḥmad. Unlike the Muslims, the "unholy" Hindūs used filthy abusive language "against our chosen prophets and regard them as fraudulent and dishonest. Can anybody expect that there can be any peace with such Hindus?"[132]

Turning on page twenty-three of this tract "to my real purpose," Aḥmad began a thorough and systematic attack on Sharampat Rāē for his failure to recognize the truth in divine signs, the contents of which reiterated Aḥmad's strong theological opposition to Āryā views. In closing, Aḥmad remarked that his greatest regret with respect to the Āryās

was that they

> do not pay attention to the shortcomings of their own religion and make most uncalled for remarks against Islam, and the funniest part of it is that none of their objections is such which does not form part of the way of life of some community or other among the followers of their own religion.[133]

The continuing tensions between the Aḥmadīyah and the Āryā Samāj continued right up until the end of Aḥmad's life in 1908. Even in December of 1907, several months after the publication of the tract which had taken the Āryās of Qādiyān so strongly to task, al-Ḥakam, Akhbār-i-ʿĀm and Paysah Akhbār (both of Lāhōr) reported a religious debate sponsored by the "Mahatma section" of the Lāhōr Āryā Samāj in which a Doctor Charanjiv had again injured the feelings of Muslims by attacking and abusing "the great men of Islam." Again, the call went out to the local authorities to take notice of the affair. In conclusion, the editor of al-Ḥakam commented that

> The Aryas have treated Muhammadans in a very scurvy manner, in that they first invited their representatives to the meeting and then proceeded to pour abuse on them, thereby wounding the susceptibilities of the Prophet's followers and causing them mental pain.[134]

By 1907, Hindū-Muslim tensions apparent in the Aḥmadīyah-Āryā Samāj polemics was but one symptom of several causing broad communal tensions throughout the Panjāb. A series of complex reactions within the Hindū, Muslim and Sikh communities as well as among them to such legislation as the Panjāb Land Alienation Act, as well as a positive response among nationalists

to the success of Japan in the war against Russia were additional factors leading to unrest. The role of the Āryā Samāj in this period was far more significant to the total picture in the Panjāb than was that of the Aḥmadīyah. With the growth of patriotic feeling among Hindūs and increasing hostility of the Government towards these Hindūs, Lajpat Rāi, among the leaders of the Āryā Samāj, became concerned that "the complete extinction of political life in the Punjab" would soon take place.[135] Finding the editorial policy of the Tribune to be apathetic to their concerns, the Āryās began an English language newspaper themselves, the Panjabee, in order "to defend the interests of the educated Hindu Community and to criticize the British."[136] Issues of the Panjabee throughout 1904 showed evidence of extreme nationalism, used "virulent language" and described the journal as a "missionary of truth" criticizing the Muslim, English and Christian communities of the Panjāb.

Lajpat Rāē did not stop here, however. He also led a movement of Panjābī Hindūs back into the Indian National Congress and emerged something of a leader of the Congress, following closely the line of the militants, Tilak and Gokhale after the 1904 Bombay sessions.[137] While Lajpat Rāē was away in London during 1905, many organizations in support of "swadeshi" and other militant forms of action suddenly brought many Indians back into Panjābī political life. When he returned to India, Lajpat Rāē was accorded a hero's welcome

while, at the same time, he spoke strongly in favour of a boycott of British goods as the only way to bring the Government to realize how seriously concerned the Indians were.

In all of this activity which eventually led to the Panjāb disturbances of 1907 and the arrest of Lajpat Rāē on May 9, 1907, followed by his deportation to Mandalay, the Muslim intelligensia had only a small role to play. Tending to distrust the Congress in the belief that Muslim nationalism would be swallowed up, the Muslims under Faẓl-i-Ḥusain formed a chapter of the Muslim League in November of 1906.

In the midst of this strife, the Aḥmadīyah movement was placed in a difficult position. On the one hand, their potential for growth and expansion was dependent upon their ability to publish tracts and newspapers which would uphold the views of Aḥmad in defense of Islām. On the other hand, the militancy of the Āryā Samāj and such papers as Bande Mataram, whose aim was in part the assertion of a nationalist position and continued criticism of the Government, a position which the Aḥmadīyah strongly opposed, led the Government to propose amendments to the Press Law in 1908. In reaction to this proposal, al-Ḥakam, recognizing "the extreme necessity for putting down seditious writing in the country," went on to express the opinion that such a rigorous law would only lead to more discontent among the people. The editor

went on to suggest that the Press Association of the province be given the opportunity to set press standards.

> After remarking that natives themselves are to blame for the calamity which is about to befall the Press in India, the editor suggests that special concessions should be made in favour of these newspapers which do not dabble in politics and the object of which is to introduce religious reforms or improve the condition of communities represented by them.[138]

Placing the blame for some of the agitation on "secret societies," the issue of al-Hakam, August 30, 1908, took the position that Aḥmadīs could not tolerate such seditious movements as "their establishment is against the teaching of the Quran."

> Those, it adds, who incited young lads to make and throw bombs and have thereby brought about the arrest and punishment of the latter are deserving of the strongest reprobation....The Ahmadies will show by their conduct that they are extremely disgusted with Secret Societies which can never prove beneficial to the country, the nation and the Muhammadan religion.[139]

By the same token, Nūr al-Dīn on September 1, 1908, only three months after becoming the khalīfa, issued a manifesto enjoining all Aḥmadīs from nationalist activities. "To excite disaffection against the Government," he asserted

> ...and to spread seditious ideas is not only an attempt against the Government established by law in the country, but is really a step directed against the peace and freedom of the country itself. Such people are the enemies of their country though they might pose to be its well-wishers.[140]

The fact that Nūr al-Dīn was compelled to issue this manifesto during the first few months of his leadership in

1908 was an indication that the Aḥmadīyah could no longer side-step the political issues which were to engulf India during the next twenty-five years. While there is no question that the Aḥmadīyah stood firmly with the Government, they did so with a growing awareness of what was happening around them. No longer could a missionary movement which had expanded its horizons from Qādiyān and Gūrdāspūr district to Lāhōr, Delhī, Bombay and areas outside of India remain aloof defending Islām on religious grounds alone. By the very fact that Aḥmad himself had chosen polemics against Christians and Āryā Samājīs and had, through his own interpretation of Islām, come to verbal blows with fellow Muslims, he had attracted the attention of the press and Government to his movement. The internal developments of the Aḥmadīyah within the decade after Aḥmad's death were to turn the tide for the movement over just this issue: should not Aḥmadīs be involved in "political" issues when the future of Islām was at stake?

NOTES

[1]The Ph.D. dissertations of Kenneth Jones and Reid Graham, C. Heimsath and the earlier works of Farquhar, Griswold and H. M. Clark. The Āryā Samāj's own voluminous outpouring but especially Lajpat Rāī's History of the Arya Samaj.

[2]The only study of the Āryā Samāj which pursues this question in any detail is that of Jones. This is done principally in the case of Lēkh Rām who receives detailed but not comprehensive attention with respect to his relations to Ghulām Aḥmad. See Jones, pp. 81-82, 136-137, 164-166, and 228-229.

[3]See al-Hakam in such issues as: March 13, 1898, quoted in S.V.N.P., XI, p. 238; May 17, 1900, ibid., XIII, p. 276; June 10, 1900, ibid., p. 323; July 9, 1900, ibid., p. 391; January 17, 1902, ibid., XV, pp. 67-68; March 10, 1903, ibid., XVI, pp. 63-64; September 18, 1908, ibid., XXI, pp. 588-589, as examples.

[4]Heimsath, p. 114; Lajpat Rāī, p. 8; Jones, p. 52.

[5]Details of Dayānand's youth are discussed by Lajpat Rāī, pp. 8-14.

[6]Graham, p. 22.

[7]Heimsath, p. 115; Jones, pp. 53-54; Lajpat Rāī, pp. 21-25.

[8]Jones, p. 54.

[9]Ibid., p. 55.

[10]Ibid., p. 56; see also Farquhar, Modern Religious Movements, p. 109.

[11]Heimsath, p. 117.

[12]Jones, p. 56; see also Graham, p. 150.

[13]Swami Dayanand Saraswati, Satyarth Prakash, Kala Press, Allahabad, 1960 edition.

[14]Ibid., p. 278, quoted from Heimsath, p. 117.

[15]Ibid., p. 279, quoted from Heimsath, p. 119.

[16]Heimsath, p. 119.

[17]Jones, p. 61.

[18]Ibid., p. 62.

[19]Ibid.

[20]Ibid., p. 63.

[21]See above, Ch. 2, note, p. 108, note 30.

[22]H. B. Sarda, Life of Dayanand Saraswati, Ajmer, 1946, p. 180.

[23]See Ch. 2, above, note, p. 109, note 50.

[24]Jones, p. 73.

[25]Ibid., pp. 77-80.

[26]Dard, p. 62. Since the Qādiyān chapter was not founded until 1887, ten years after the one at Lāhōr, and since Aḥmad was already engaged in serious controversy with the Samāj in 1885 and 1886 following the publication of the Barāhīn-i-Aḥmadīyah, we must assume that Sharampat Rāē joined the original Gurdāspūr branch founded by Dayānand in 1878, or, possibly, the one at Batāla founded in 1882. For a discussion of Aḥmad's early debates against the Āryās, see Chapter 2, above, pp. 67-68 , and notes, p. 109, notes 54-56.

[27]Dard, p. 82. No other Aḥmadīyah source mentions this "revelation" which in the light of future prophecies concerning the death of Lēkh Rām and ʿAbd Allāh ʿĀṣim should have been significant if Aḥmad had really foreseen Dayānand's death and proclaimed it publicly. For details on Dayānand's last days, see H. B. Sarda, op. cit., pp. 311-336.

[28]Dard, p. 84.

[29]Jones, p. 81.

[30]Ram Chandra Javed, Āryā Samāj ke Mahā Purush, University Publishing, Jullundār, 1954, pp. 60-62, cited from Jones, p. 81.

[31]Jambuthanan, Swami Shraddhanand, pp. 14-18.

[32]S.V.N.P., X, No. 24, p. 442, Sat Dharm Prācharak,

May 21, 1897. Since no other available source gives Lākh Rām credit for founding the Peshāwar branch, we may assume this statement to be one of obituary credit to build up his role and person at a time when communal tension was high.

[33] Ibid.

[34] Ibid., p. 443. This statement is also incorrect if taken generally, correct if meant to refer to the Āryā Samāj. According to Javed, the Gazette was published from Ferozpūr, a fact corroborated by S.V.N.P. reports.

[35] Jones, p. 135.

[36] Ibid., pp. 99-100.

[37] Ibid., p. 100. The paper was definitely in operation by 1885.

[38] Ibid., p. 104. See Guru Datt, Guru Datta's Works, pp. 26-27. J. C. Oman wrote sympathetically of the Āryā Samāj in his book, Indian Life: Religious and Social.

[39] Jones, p. 104.

[40] Lajpat Rai , Autobiographical Writings, University Publishers, Jullundar, 1965, pp. 33-34.

[41] Jones, p. 117; from the Tribune, September 14, 1889, p. 5.

[42] Jones, p. 118.

[43] Ibid., p. 129, quoted from Guru Datta's Works, pp. 29, 33; and Jambūthānan, op. cit., p. 94.

[44] See Guru Datt, Wisdom of the Rishis, (Works of Guru Datta) op. cit.

[45] Jones, p. 132.

[46] Dard, pp. 84-85; for details of their relationship based on Ahmad's "Istiftā'" of 1897, see pp. 193-196 below, the full translation of which appears in Appendix "C" below, p. 426.

[47] Dard, pp. 112-113.

[48] Ibid., p. 116.

[49] Ibid., pp. 116-117.

[50]Jones, p. 132, from the Tribune, July 23, 1890; September 6, 1890, p. 4.

[51]Jones, p. 135.

[52]The former of the two works cited was published at Amritsar sometime between 1890-1897. An edited and revised edition was published at Amritsar in 1890, according to N. G. Barrier, The Punjab in Nineteenth Century Tracts: An Introduction to the Pamphlet Collections in the British Museum and India Office, Research Committee on the Punjab, Michigan State University Press, E. Lansing, 1969, pp. 28-29, 75. For details of the Aḥmad-Lākh Rām controversy from an Āryā point of view, see Javed, op. cit., pp. 65-67. Barrier lists ten of Lākh Rām's publications, pp. 28-29, while a complete list of his works can be found on the back cover page of Āryā Musāfir, Vol. 1, No. 3, December, 1898 (after the death of Lākh Rām).

[53]Jones, p. 38.

[54]S.V.N.P., III, No. 14, p. 123, Akmāl-ul-Akhbār, Delhi, March 21, 1890; see also Tribune, May 3, 1890, cited by Jones, p. 163.

[55]Jones, p. 162.

[56]Lekh Ram, Risāla-i-Jihād, Ya'nī Dīn-i-Muḥammadī Kī Bunyād, Lāhōr, 1892.

[57]Ibid., p. 1.

[58]Ibid., pp. 43-46.

[59]Ibid., p. 63.

[60]Ibid., p. 64.

[61]S.V.N.P., V, No. 29, p. 219, from Paysah Akhbār, July 11, 1892.

[62]Tribune, August 24, 1892, p. 4; also S.V.N.P., V, No. 33, p. 296, Bhārat Sudhār, August 27, 1892; also ibid., No. 40, p. 372, September 23, 1892.

[63]S.V.N.P., VII, No. 20, pp. 212-213, Akhbār-i-Nūr-un-Ala Nūr, Ludhiāna, May 14, 1894.

[64]Jones, p. 171.

[65]Ibid., p. 173, 176.

[66]Dard, pp. 84-85.

[67]"Istiftā'," Qādīan, 1897.

[68]Ibid., p. 5.

[69]Ibid., pp. 5-7.

[70]Ibid., p. 7. Muhammad ʿAlī uses "planners" in his translation where Pickthall uses "schemers".

[71]Ibid.

[72]Ibid., p. 9.

[73]Satyārth Prakāsh, pp. 165-166.

[74]Ibid., p. 167.

[75]Radd-i-Niyog, Qādīan (?), 1895, p. 4; see also Dard's brief discussion, pp. 330-332.

[76]Radd-i-Niyog, p. 6.

[77]Ibid., p. 17.

[78]Ibid., p. 73.

[79]Jones, p. 203.

[80]S.V.N.P., IX, No. 37, p. 517, Paysah Akhbār, August 29, 1896; see also, ibid., No. 38, p. 530, Chaudhwīn Sadī, September 1, 1896; ibid., No. 40, p. 560, Panjāb, September 15 and Paysah Akhbār, September 19, 1896.

[81]Ibid., No. 41, p. 574, Chaudhwīn Sadī, September 23, 1896; see also, ibid., Panjāb, September 22, 1896.

[82]Jones, p. 206.

[83]S.V.N.P., X, No. 11, p. 169, Panjāb Samāchār, March 6, 1897.

[84]Ibid., pp. 169-170, Akhbār-i-ʿĀm, March 10, 1897.

[85]Ibid., No. 12, pp. 180-181, Bhārat Sudhār, March 13, 1897. Although Aḥmad may well have issued such an "ishtihār," the text has not been discovered in any other Aḥmadī source.

[86]Ibid., p. 181.

[87]Ibid., p. 182, Bhārat Sudhār, March 10, 1897.

[88]Ibid., p. 183, Akhbār al-'Āmm, March 11, 1897.

[89]Ibid., p. 184, Paysah Akhbār, March 13, 1897.

[90]Italics by the present writer.

[91]S.V.N.P., X, No. 12, p. 184, Panjāb Samāchār, March 13, 1897.

[92]Ibid., p. 185.

[93]Ibid., p. 186. For the Sikh response, see ibid., p. 191, Khalsa Bahādur, March 15, 1897.

[94]Ibid., Bhārat Sudhār, March 13, 1897.

[95]Ibid., pp. 187-188, Akhbār al-'Āmm, March 15, 1897.

[96]Ibid., pp. 189-190, Rahbār-i-Hind, March 15, 1897.

[97]Ibid., No. 13, pp. 200-201, Nūr Afshān, March 12 and 19, 1897.

[98]Ibid., pp. 201-206, Chaudhwīn Ṣadī, Wafādār, Paysah Akhbār.

[99]Ibid., pp. 208-209, Paysah Akhbār, March 20, 1897.

[100]Ibid., No. 14, pp. 222-223, Mulla Ja'far Zatallī and Akhbār al-'Āmm, March 20, 1897.

[101]Ibid., p. 225, Sirāj al-Akhbār, March 22, 1897.

[102]Ibid., No. 15, pp. 240-241, Bhārat Sudhār, March 31, 1897.

[103]Ibid., pp. 241-242, Akhbār al-'Āmm, March 31, 1897.

[104]Ibid., No. 16, pp. 275-276, Panjāb Samāchār, March 27, 1897.

[105]In Chapter 3 above. Citation, ibid., p. 279, Singh Sahāi, March 39, 1897.

[106]Ibid., No. 17, pp. 291-293, Sat Dharm Prācharak, April 1, 1897, and ibid., pp. 293-294, Panjāb Samāchār, April 3, 1897. For the Aḥmadī view, see Dard, pp. 390-391. For further developments, see S.V.N.P., No. 21, pp. 388-389, Hamdārd-i-Hind, May 3 and 10, 1897, and Bhārat Sudhār, May 5, 1897.

[107] S.V.N.P., X, No. 17, pp. 294-297, Paysah Akhbār, April 7, 8 and 15, 1897; Ṣadā-i-Hind, April 5, 12, 1897; Koh-i-Nūr, April 6, 1897; Wafādār, April 1, 1897; Tāj al-Akhbār, April 3, 1897.

[108] Ibid., No. 18, p. 327, Singh Sahāʾī, April 15, 1897.

[109] Ibid., p. 328, Bhārat Sudhār, April 19, 1897.

[110] Dard, pp. 391-392; "Istifitāʾ," p. 2; S.V.N.P., X, No. 18, pp. 328-329.

[111] S.V.N.P., X, No. 19, pp. 339 and 346, Ambala Gazette, April 20; Bhārat Sudhār, April 21; Paysah Akhbār, April 24; Nūr-i-Afshān, April 23; Panjāb Samāchār, April 24, 1897.

[112] Ibid., No. 20, p. 364, Victoria Paper, May 1, 1897.

[113] Ibid., No. 21, p. 390, Mullah Jaʿfar Zatallī, May 1, 1897.

[114] Ibid., No. 22, pp. 404-405, Panjāb Samāchār, May 15, 1897; Bhārat Sudhār, May 19, 1897; Wafādār, May 15, 1897.

[115] Ibid., No. 23, pp. 425-426, Sat Dharm Prachārak, May 21, 1897; ibid., No. 27, p. 496, Sat Dharm Prachārak, June 11, 1897; also ibid., No. 25, p. 458, Nazim-ul-Hind, May 29, 1897.

[116] Discussed above, Chapter 3.

[117] S.V.N.P., X, No. 28, pp. 509-511, Chaudhwīn Sadī, June 15, 1897; Nazīm-ul-Hind, June 19, 1897; Sirāj al-Akhbār, June 21, 1897.

[118] Ibid., No. 31, pp. 596-597, Chaudhwīn Sadī, July 8, 1897.

[119] Ibid., No. 32, pp. 621-622, Chaudhwīn Sadī, July 15, 1897 and Mullah Jaʿfar Zatallī, July 10, 1897.

[120] Ibid., No. 48, p. 1003, Paysah Akhbār, November 22, 1897; Panjāb Samāchār, November 20, 1897; ibid., No. 49, p. 1020, Koh-i-Nūr, November 30, 1897; ibid., No. 50, p. 1033, Chaudhwīn Sadī, December 1, 1897; Tāj al-Akhbār, December 4, 1897. The assassin, a Muslim, had apparently acted on his own and represented no group.

[121] For a detailed discussion, see Chapter 3 above.

[122] S.V.N.P., XI, No. 16, p. 239, al-Hakam, March 13, 1898.

[123]Ibid., XIII, No. 2, p. 19, al-Hakam, December 2, 1899.

[124]Ibid.

[125]Ibid., No. 23, pp. 377-378, al-Hakam, May 17, 1900.

[126]Ibid., XVII, No. 32, p. 193, Paysah Akhbār, August 3, 1909.

[127]For example, the letter of Aḥmad, "Are All Religions from God?," Qadian, June 14, 1903; "The Teaching of Islam in Comparison With Other Religions," Review of Religions, 1904; "The Religion of the Veda," Vol. VI, February 1907, p. 59; "The Feelings of the Arya Samaj Towards Muhammadans," VI, March, 1907, p. 113; Entertained by "The Arya Samaj and Politics," VI, August, 1907, p. 305ff.; "Blasphemy in Sacred Books," VII, March-April, 1908, p. 117ff.

[128]"Qādiyān ke Āryā aur Hum," Qādiyān, 1907, pp. 1-8.

[129]Ibid., p. 10.

[130]Ibid., p. 12.

[131]Ibid., pp. 17-18.

[132]Ibid., pp. 18-20.

[133]Ibid., p. 47.

[134]S.V.N.P., XX, No. 49, p. 581, al-Hakam, December 10, 1907; Akhbār al-Ḥaqq, December 11, 1907; Paysah Akhbār, December 10, 1907.

[135]Lajpat Rai, Autobiography, p. 98.

[136]Barrier, pp. 125-126.

[137]Ibid., p. 131.

[138]S.V.N.P., XXI, No. 7, p. 96, al-Hakam, February 6, 1908.

[139]Ibid., p. 531, al-Hakam, August 30, 1908.

[140]Review of Religions, VII, September, 1908, p. 375, quoted in part in S.V.N.P., XXI, p. 577. Further backing of Nūr al-Dīn's position appeared in an article in al-Hakam, September 8, 1908, recalling Ghulām Aḥmad's position on the Government as well.

CHAPTER 5

DECADE OF DEVELOPMENTS: ORGANIZATION, MISSIONS, PERSONALITIES AND THE SPLIT (1908-1918)

While the death of Ghulām Aḥmad, masīḥ maw'ūd and mahdī of the Aḥmadīyah community in May of 1908, at an age of more than eighty years, should have come as no surprise, the fact of his absence from the leadership came as a shock to his followers. With this personality gone, the movement was without a leader of the quality it had known until this time. 1908 through 1918 were the years when England was fully committed to her involvement in the First World War. This was also the decade of the first concerted efforts towards self-government in India itself, which found, in the Aḥmadīyah movement, a microcosmic reflection of the kinds of issues which were alive in the Indian context at large.

From the evidence available it is clear that the general development of the Aḥmadīyah movement seems to have gone unnoticed in the broader spectrum of Indian political and religious events of the years 1880-1908 when Ghulām Aḥmad was most active. He had become known through the polemics and controversies he engaged in on behalf of Islām. It was at this level that the Sikh, Hindū, Āryā Samāj, Christian and more conventional Muslim press took notice of him and in so doing compelled the Government of India to take notice

also. While declaring himself to be masīḥ mawʿūd and mahdī who had come to defend and restore the true Islām, Aḥmad had also firmly declared his non-involvement in the political life of India and his strong support of the British Government there.

The decade following the death of Aḥmad brought his movement face to face with issues it had previously sought to avoid or with which it had not yet had to come to terms. Within Aḥmadīyah the principal question was one of the khilāfat or the nature of the succession to the leadership and the kind of organization which would accompany that leadership. During the later years of Aḥmad's life, the missionary nature of the movement began to take shape. The implication of this program of missions was to mean that in meeting with the Indian community at large, Aḥmadīyah could no longer avoid the issues that confronted the Muslim community as a whole. An example, which we shall deal with in some detail, is the Kanpūr mosque incident of 1913 about which there was a substantial difference of opinion within the Aḥmadīyah community. Similarly, the khilāfat agitation itself and the whole problem of Muslim loyalty to the British in a war against Turkey also could not be avoided by any Muslim group not totally withdrawn from Indian society during the World War decade.

If the death of Ghulām Aḥmad in May of 1908 had any major effect on the Urdū speaking community of the Panjāb, other events of that tumultuous time seem to have taken

precedence in the press. The Vernacular Press Reports for 1908 do not indicate a single reference to the passing of the Promised Messiah from the Indian Islamic scene. What press notes have been discovered are those quoted in Aḥmadī sources from English newspapers. The Civil and Military Gazette, not entirely correct in its facts, reported:

> Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Khan of Qadian in Gurdaspur District, who died at Lahore last Tuesday at the age of 69 (sic), was a notable Mohammadan preacher and founder of the Qadian Sect said to number twenty thousand adherents. The Mirza who was held in great respect, was many years ago in the service of the Government, but resigned in order to devote himself entirely to religious and educational work. Himself a landowner and Jagirdar, the Mirza exerted his influence with his co-religionists to support law and order. He had come to Lahore on a mission of peace to arrange for the establishment of a society to promote harmony and union between Hindus and Mohammadans....[1]

An obituary of this kind raises many questions both for what it says as well as for what it leaves out. It is difficult to question the Aḥmadī source as misquoting the Gazette and yet leaving in certain incorrect or even unimportant facts about Aḥmad's life, while failing to mention anything about his role as Promised Messiah or the controversies over "prophethood" or Aḥmad's work in defense of Islām. More cognis ant of his work was the obituary of the ʿAlīgarh Institute Gazette. This article was more biographically accurate in its dating. Towards the end it reported,

> ... He claimed to be the appointed Messiah for the 19th Century. In 1889 he began to make disciples, of which he is reported to have had

> 15,000. He often met the learned of other faiths, and was on several occasions denounced a Kafir. He was several times hauled up in law courts, and has left behind fully 80 books written by himself, of which twenty are in Arabic....The deceased was undoubtedly a great champion of Islam.[2]

In the June issue of Review of Religions, 1908, in which the editor Muḥammad ʿAlī himself published two articles memorializing the Promised Messiah, he prefaced the above press notices as well as additional ones from the Pioneer of Allāhabād, The Unity and Minister of Calcutta and the Āryā Patrika of Lāhōr with the comment,

> In reading these notes it should be borne in mind that religious prejudice was strong against the deceased leader in certain quarters. We do not intend to criticize these remarks, but we might be allowed to contradict in the beginning the estimate of the adherents of the movement and the probable date of birth of the founder which may more correctly be placed at 1836 or 1837.[3]

In his memorial, Muḥammad ʿAlī quoted from the document al-Wasīyah, (the Will), which had been published by Ghulām Aḥmad on December 24, 1905 and had been published in an English translation in the January 1906 issue of Review of Religions. Since this document was to be a principal source of Muḥammad ʿAlī's coming controversy with the second khalīfah and son of Ghulām Aḥmad, Bashīr al-Dīn Maḥmūd Aḥmad, it is worthwhile tracing Muḥammad ʿAlī's earlier involvement with the document.

The 1906 publication of the Will, in a fourteen page translation, was concerned mostly with Aḥmad's statement that he had received revelation in 1905 "that the time of my death

is near...."[4] The largest portion of the text was then given over to Aḥmad's explanation of revelations he had received and prophecies he had made strongly emphasizing the role of "Almighty God" and the "Qur'ān" in the life of the faithful. The final revelation dealt with a special graveyard in which Aḥmad would be buried known as "Bahishti Maqbara". Of this place he wrote,

> Almighty God has led me by a kind of secret revelation to impose certain conditions concerning this graveyard, so that only those may enter into it who...fulfil these conditions....[5]

The first of these "conditions" was that all who wished to be buried in this new graveyard, the land for which Aḥmad was setting aside, in Qādiyān, were required to subscribe, according to their means, money to be collected by Mawlawī Nūr al-Dīn. In order to continue the system in the future, "there should be an Anjuman which should be entrusted with the expenditure of the money...in the spread of unity and in making the religion of Islam prevail in the world."

The second condition required that those who wished to be buried in the new graveyard should bequeath ten per cent of their estate to the Anjumān for the purpose of publications and the sending out of preachers. This program was to be carried out by the Anjumān, an organization to be perpetuated by the appointment of successors to fill vacancies on the death of incumbents. The third and fourth "conditions" implied that burial was for Aḥmadīs only ("he should be a true and sincere Muslim"), but that a pious man

destitute of funds for the support of the Anjumān could also be buried there.[6]

Further delineation of the role and function of the Ṣadr Anjumān-i-Aḥmadīyah, as this new central committee was called, did not appear in the pages of Review of Religions. A brief notice in the issue of January, 1908, indicated that the annual meeting of the Ṣadr Anjumān had been held at Qādiyān the last week of December, 1907, presumably along with the usual annual meeting of the Aḥmadīyah as a whole. The closing paragraph of Muḥammad ʿAlī's "In Memoriam" in the June 1908 issue testified to the rapidly growing success of the Anjumān, however.

> The great works of the secular and religious education of the Muslims and the propagation of Islam which he had commenced will now be conducted, as even they were conducted in his lifetime since the publication of his will, by the Sadr Anjuman-i-Ahmadiyya, while Maulvi Hakeem Noor-ud-Din has been selected as the successor of the Promised Messiah in the leadership of the movement.[7]

It seems clear that Muḥammad ʿAlī as editor of Review of Religions, the sole Aḥmadīyah publication in English at this time, was with Khawājah Kamāl al-Dīn, the most intellectual and western-oriented of the Aḥmadīyah leadership. The Promised Messiah, for all his attributes, had never learned or spoken English. Neither did he seem to communicate to local people in Panjābī. Urdū and occasionally Arabic were the medium of his speeches and writings. As such, Ghulām Aḥmad had aimed his ideas towards a literate middle-class audience. In 1902,

he had chosen Muḥammad ʿAlī to edit the Review as well as to translate many of his writings for English publication, an indication of the faith which Aḥmad had placed in ʿAlī. One of the charges levelled against ʿAlī by Maḥmūd Aḥmad, the son of Ghulām Aḥmad and the second khalīfah al-masīḥ, was that, as early as 1905, he and Kamāl al-Dīn were already dominating the Review of Religions with the idea of

> refrain(ing) from making any mention of the Promised Messiah, and devote itself solely to propagating the general principles of Islam, (so that) it would be possible for the general body of Muslims outside the Ahmadiyya community to support and subscribe to The Review.[8]

Although the idea of using Review of Religions solely for this purpose was repudiated by the Aḥmadīyah community and Muḥammad ʿAlī and Khawājah Kamāl al-Dīn were forced to withdraw the proposal, the more universalistic emphasis of the Review was clearly dominant by the October 1908 issue. The conciliatory nature of Aḥmad's last lecture, Paygham-i-Sulh or the Message of Peace,[9] the full text of which had been printed in July, it was noted, was being circulated free of charge by Khawājah Kamāl al-Dīn for the purpose of bringing about "a union between Hindus and Muhammadans." Citing the fact that this tract had been favourably commented upon both in England and India, Muhammad ʿAlī called upon the Āryā Samājīs, in particular, to take note of Aḥmad's last message and transcend the pettiness of "narrow prejudice."[10]

A study of the articles published in Review of Religions

from late 1908 through the termination of Muḥammad ʿAlī's editorship at the end of 1913 indicates a more intellectual and conciliatory tone throughout most of the material with the exception of items answering the continuing offensiveness of the Āryā Samāj. The emphasis was on presenting Islām in its historical and modern dimensions with references to Aḥmad primarily in the context of his role as a religious reformer--though not exclusively so. The re-publication of a paper read before the Convention of Religions held at Calcutta, April 9-11, 1909, and delivered presumably by Muḥammad ʿAlī himself, in the April issue of Review, exemplified this trend most clearly. The piece, entitled, "Islam as Interpreted by the Ahmadiyah Movement" began with a discussion of the attitude of Aḥmadīyah towards "other religions" offering the most liberal and open interpretation possible, in the spirit of Aḥmad's Message of Peace. ʿAlī's discussion of the "Nature of the Movement" likened it to what Christianity had been to Judaism, that is, he saw Aḥmadīyah as a cleansing reform of Islām. The universality of Aḥmad's mission and teachings were the result of his claim not only to be Promised Messiah and mahdī of the Muslims, but also Promised Messiah of the Christians and Promised Avatar of the Hindūs. In further discussing the history and doctrine of the movement, Muḥammad ʿAlī mentioned that the notion that the coming of the Promised Messiah was the work of the Almighty and without specifying further he went on to say, "It is such a prophet of God that the Ahmadiyya movement has found in its leader...."[11]

Explaining other teachings of Islām as interpreted by Aḥmadīyah, Muḥammad ʿAlī strongly emphasized the Aḥmadī doctrine of Jesus and Aḥmad's repudiation of jihād. He also asserted that Aḥmadīyah

> holds that the Holy Prophet is the seal of prophets and no other prophet can appear after him except one who is spiritually his disciple and who receives the gift of prophecy through him. It is only a true Muslim who walks in the footsteps of the Holy Prophet that can become a prophet. It is in this sense that this sect considers its founder to be a prophet.[12]

On the face of it, Muḥammad ʿAlī seems to be advocating a doctrine of the prophecy of Ghulām Aḥmad. Bashīr al-Dīn Maḥmūd Aḥmad has insisted that until 1911, Muḥammad ʿAlī held the doctrine that Aḥmad was nabī. On the other side, one could easily argue that in this particular article of some nineteen pages, one sentence hardly indicates that Muḥammad ʿAlī saw this as the primary factor of importance in describing Aḥmadīyah to the English reading public.

That there was right and wrong on both sides of the growing division between Muḥammad ʿAlī and Khawājah Kamāl al-Dīn on the one side and the incumbent khalīfah Nūr al-Dīn and the family of Ghulām Aḥmad on the other is evident from the differing perspectives with which both sides examine the internal events of Aḥmadīyah from 1908-1915. A further difficulty in getting at the "truth" about the "split" in Aḥmadīyah is that Muḥammad ʿAlī's version was first written in Urdū in 1922 with Maḥmūd's more thorough reply coming as

a rebuttal in English in 1924. Additional material representing the views of both sides appeared, of course, in other sources published by each group--Qādiyān and Lāhōr--but in both cases many years after the events had taken place.

II

The view of Bashīr al-Dīn Maḥmūd Aḥmad concerning the origin of the dissension was that it lay with Khawāja Kamāl al-Dīn. Portrayed in Dard's biography of Aḥmad as the Judas, the doubter, Maḥmūd Aḥmad described him as a Muslim who had at first almost apostasized to Christianity. In the Promised Messiah, however, "he discovered that even within the fold of Islam it was possible for one to plant his feet firmly and to resist the attacks of western learning and science."[13] Although the Khawājah joined the Aḥmadīyah movement in the 1890's, he was criticized for never having committed himself fully to the faith. An early example of this lack of commitment was the event (also cited by Dard) pertaining to the first major paper offered by Ghulām Aḥmad at the Lāhōr Conference of Religions in 1897, a paper which Khawājah Kamāl al-Dīn had criticized as inadequate; the paper which ultimately became the well-known document, The Philosophy of the Teachings of Islam.

The attempt after 1905 to change the nature of Review of Religions so that it would minimize the claims of Aḥmad

and appeal more universally to the Muslim community was the second major criticism offered of the Khawājah and Muḥammad ʿAlī. The proposal for liberalization had come from the paper Watān in connection with which a Doctor ʿAbd al-Ḥakīm had written to Ghulām Aḥmad early in 1906 asking for a liberalization of Aḥmadīyah practices vis à vis Sunnī Islām. These requests included the right of Muslims to pray behind any Muslim imām except one who might have declared Aḥmadīs as kafīrs; liberalization of material published in Review, the assertion that the claims of Aḥmad "should not be allowed to stand in the way of Islam"; and that "undue prominence should not be given to the question of the death of Jesus." The final point in the proposal was

> (9) That this was an age of learning and much good would have accrued from the presentation of philosophical interpretations of the Holy Quran....But unfortunately, Ahmadis chose to follow the path of narrow-mindedness, and while non-Ahmadis offered to break down the barriers, Ahmadis themselves worked to keep them erect.[14]

The resolution to attack the very root of the Promised Messiah's program for Aḥmadīyah was his decision to excommunicate the author of these statements, ʿAbd al-Ḥakīm. "The immediate effect of this sharp and severe chastisement," Maḥmūd Aḥmad reported, was to quash any further such attempts to water down the claims and assertions which Ghulām Aḥmad had put forth as the basis for his renewed Islām. Maḥmūd Aḥmad went on to assert in his version of the "split" story

that Khawājah Kamāl al-Dīn was the man whose faith "had already begun to crumble,"[15] but that Muḥammad ʿAlī himself had no role in the undercutting of Ghulām Aḥmad's position until after the latter died in 1908. Muḥammad ʿAlī, according to this report, which hardly described his personality in glowing terms, resented the election of Nūr al-Dīn as khalīfah, although on realizing that Nūr al-Dīn had the "unanimous support" of the community, ʿAlī entered his bayʿah and signed the statement which said that the new khalīfah had been chosen "in accordance with the terms of al-Wasiyah." Maḥmūd Aḥmad reports a conversation he had at this time with Kamāl al-Dīn in which the latter asked him what his views were regarding the power of the khilāfat to which the son of the Promised Messiah answered that having taken bayʿah one no longer had the right to raise such a question.[16]

Responding to the charges made against him and Khawājah Kamāl al-Dīn up to this point, Muḥammad ʿAlī began by quoting the diary of Ghulām Aḥmad on the issue of the Lāhōr Conference paper of 1897 showing that Aḥmad, himself, had said that he had done an adequate job in preparing the paper and that Khawājah Kamāl al-Dīn had simply agreed with him. Placing this statement side by side with the quotation of Maḥmūd Aḥmad on the subject, he answered the charges against Khawājah Kamāl al-Dīn with the assertion,

> It is obviously clear...that whatever the Khwaja (sic) Sahib said at that time, was not that the paper was senseless and absurd and that

> it would become the cause of mockery and ridicule, but he expected a still better and more superior lecture from the Promised Messiah.[17]

Muḥammad ʿAlī's next response was to ask why Maḥmūd Aḥmad then skipped on to 1905 and the incident of the letters of ʿAbd al-Ḥakīm in which he accused the Khawājah of complicity. What of all the legal work which the Khawājah had done for the Aḥmadīyah movement and especially for Aḥmad during the court hearings at Gūrdāspūr in 1898? Had not the Khawājah relinquished a lucrative practice at Peshāwar to take on this work? The presentation of these two matters, Muḥammad ʿAlī labeled as "scandal mongering" while further taking Maḥmūd Aḥmad to task for making contradictory statements about Muḥammad ʿAlī's own commitment.[18]

The third point raised by Muḥammad ʿAlī against Maḥmūd Aḥmad was his failure to publish the text of a letter which he wrote to the Khalīfah al-masīḥ, Nūr al-Dīn, implying that "the Khwaja Sahib and Maulvi Muhammad Ali mistrust me and say that I misuse and misappropriate the funds of the Jamaʿat."[19]

That the distrust between these two factions went deeper than the issues is apparent from the manner in which they attacked each other. Although the charges and the issues may seem petty more than fifty years later, the details of the growing rift may not be so easily dismissed, for they reflect in microcosm the attitude of those Aḥmadīyah Muslims prepared to commit themselves to more open relationships with fellow Muslims and to a more active concern for political issues

as against those who closely identified with the claims and position of Ghulām Aḥmad as Promised Messiah as a whole.

Reporting on the annual jalsah of 1908, Maḥmūd Aḥmad asserted that Muḥammad ʿAlī and Khawājah Kamāl al-Dīn

> sought one after another to impress upon the Community that the real successor and khalifa appointed by the Promised Messiah was no other than the Sadr Anjuman-i-Ahmadiyya (Central Ahmadiyya Association), of which Maulvi Muhammad Ali and others were the trustees. Obedience to them, therefore, was obligatory upon the whole Community.[20]

Pleading ignorance of what was happening, Maḥmūd Aḥmad suggested that at this meeting Muḥammad ʿAlī, through "intrigue" had managed to become khalīfah himself securing complete control of the affairs of the Ṣadr Anjumān.[21] The Aḥmadīyah movement was splitting into two camps, he argued, and the power of the khalīfah was now reduced to merely accepting bayʿah from those joining the community.

In a lengthy footnote towards the end of the first chapter of his Tahrik-i-Ahmadiyyat, published in English as the tract, "Mirza Ghulam Ahmad: His Life and Mission," Muḥammad ʿAlī discussed Aḥmad's plans for continuing the movement after his death as written in the al-Wasīyah document. On the issue of bayʿah, Muḥammad ʿAlī wrote that Ghulām Aḥmad had entrusted the matter after his death to "the righteous from among his followers." No single individual was designated. Secondly, the management of the movement was to be in the hands of the Ṣadr Anjumān "and the rules and regulations

controlling it were given under Ahmad's own signature." In a dispute which had arisen some twenty months after the original founding of the Anjumān but still during Aḥmad's lifetime, he had ruled on October 27, 1907 that any decision made by majority opinion in the Anjumān "should be the final decision." During his lifetime he asked that all decisions be made in careful consultation with him; "...after that, the decision of this Anjuman in all matters shall be final."[22] Citing five other paragraphs of al-Wasīyah to uphold his view on the power of the Anjumān, Muḥammad ʿAlī went on to indicate that it was really Bashīr al-Dīn Maḥmūd Aḥmad who stood alone on the question of the khalīfah and that Nūr al-Dīn concurred on the matter. According to Muḥammad ʿAlī the rule concerning the power of the Anjumān was changed only after Maḥmūd Aḥmad became khalīfah al-masīḥ II, at which time it was amended to read:

> In every affair of the General Council and the committees under it,...and of the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyyah and all its branches the order of Hadrat Mirza Bashir al-Din Mahmud Ahmad, the Khalīfah al-Masih II, will be absolute and decisive.[23]

While Maḥmūd Aḥmad reported that following the 1908 Jalsah where questions about the nature of the khilāfat were being raised by Muḥammad ʿAlī, a certain Mīr Muḥammad Isḥāq (identified by Muḥammad ʿAlī as an uncle of Maḥmūd Aḥmad) prepared a list of questions on the matter which he submitted to the khalīfah Nūr al-Dīn, who in turn sent them to Muḥammad

ʿAlī. Nūr al-Dīn also made available a large number of copies of these questions to the Aḥmadīyah community at large and announced that on January 31, 1909 representatives of local Aḥmadīyah groups should come to Qādiyān to discuss the matter.[24]

It is in the reports of the events of that meeting that the long-developing animosity between the Lāhōr and Qādiyān Aḥmadīyah is most evident. The version by the khalīfah al-masīḥ II, Maḥmūd Aḥmad, can only be described as emotional or melodramatic.

> The gathering was the most momentous in the history of the Ahmadiyya Movement, and therefore in the history of the peace and progress of the world....The question at issue...was--What was to be the nature of the organization of the Ahmadiyya Movement? Was it to follow the line pursued by modern parliaments and associations or was it to follow in the footsteps of the Companions of the Holy Prophet? That day therefore was to decide the fate and future of the whole of humanity.[25]

Maḥmūd Aḥmad's version of the events of that day indicate that while the arrival of Nūr al-Dīn at the mosque was delayed, the followers of the Khawājah and Muḥammad ʿAlī continued to "poison the minds" of the delegates in favour of the power of the Anjumān. Likewise, he blamed the Khawājah for holding a meeting of the Lāhōr Aḥmadīs at his home, at which time he convinced all but two of that membership to sign a statement against giving the khalīfah full power. It is clear from both reports that the sudden appearance of Nūr al-Dīn at the mosque, his decision to speak from the spot which Ghulām Aḥmad himself had built, as well as his plea that there be

no dissension in the community during his lifetime, was enough to persuade the congregation of some 200 present to take no action on the matter that day. At the end of his speech, Nūr al-Dīn called upon Khawājah Kamāl al-Dīn and Muḥammad ʿAlī to renew their bayʿah with him; but, as well, he insisted that Shaykh Yaqūb ʿAlī, editor of al-Ḥakam, who had collected signatures in support of the khilāfat and had held meetings at his home in Qadiyān, take bayʿah. Concerning this latter point, Maḥmūd Aḥmad wrote only one sentence. Muḥammad ʿAlī, in response, carefully pointed out that the fact that since Yaqūb ʿAlī, even as a supporter of khalīfat power, was required to perform a new bayʿah, this certainly implied that neither side was right and that Nūr al-Dīn was chiding both sides for creating the difficult situation.[26] The Qādiyān version of the story also contained additional material which quoted Muḥammad ʿAlī as having said to Khawājah Kamāl al-Dīn that day, "Today we have been badly insulted. It is something more than I can endure. It is as if we had been beaten with shoes in an open meeting." About this, Maḥmūd Aḥmad commented, "One wonders at the sincerity of this man who to-day poses as the reformer of the Community!"[27]

At this point in the history there is some variation in the importance placed on the next events. Muḥammad ʿAlī continued his version by suggesting that his opponents should have accepted his renewed bayʿah as a sign of his faith. The fact that the Qādiyānīs stirred up new trouble against

him and the Khawājah is evidence that they had other intentions themselves regarding the leadership of the Aḥmadiyah movement. Minor matters such as the question of who would buy the building donated to the community by the late Ḥakīm Faẓl al-Dīn were exploded into major controversies between the "Anjumān" group and the "khalīfah" group. While Maḥmūd Aḥmad refers to the incident by way of indicting the Khawāja with "intrigue", the version related by his biographer is so totally different from that offered by Muḥammad ʿAlī that the facts of the case cannot now be disentangled from these sources. It is Muḥammad ʿAlī's view that the anger of the khalīfah Nūr al-Dīn over this affair gave rise to rumours among the party of Maḥmūd Aḥmad that the khalīfah would soon announce the disestablishment of the Anjumān, thus causing an uproar in certain quarters.[28]

Maḥmūd Aḥmad's view was that he alone stood in the good graces of the khalīfah after this incident while the other members of the Anjumān committee were criticized by Nūr al-Dīn. As for Khawājah Kamāl al-Dīn who was not present, "he preferred to proceed by secret methods."[29] It is interesting to observe that both Maḥmūd and his biographer turn the story from this particular incident to present a strong attack against the Khawājah's lecture tours as well as his attempts to reach out to the broader Muslim community. Muḥammad ʿAlī, however, did not let the matter rest. His review of these incidents then included a lengthy letter written by Maḥmūd Aḥmad, "to set on and incite Hazrat Maulvi Sahib (the

khalīfah) to issue orders expelling some members from the Anjuman."[30]

The first level of Maḥmūd Aḥmad's attack against the Khawājah pertained to the latter's equivocation on the matter of praying behind a non-Aḥmadī imām. Because he frequently lectured to non-Aḥmadī Muslims, the Khawājah was placed in an embarrassing position when prayers were said. Maḥmūd insisted that the Khawājah was arguing that the rule really only pertained to "the common class of Ahmadis" but not "advanced Ahmadis like himself." Sometimes he would say that this rule was only a temporary one and if the Sunnī imāms would see fit to revoke their fatwās of kufr against the Promised Messiah, the Aḥmadīyah would be most happy to pray with a Sunnī imām. Maḥmūd also accused the Khawājah of inciting ʿAbd al-Ḥakīm, who had been expelled because of his letters of 1905, to write articles in Paysah Akhbār and Watān taking the same position.[31]

This had not led, according to Maḥmūd Aḥmad, to better relations between Aḥmadīs and non-Aḥmadīs but to greater tensions. The khalīfah himself was forced to make a pronouncement that the differences between Aḥmadīs and others related to "essential matters of faith" and not merely to "non-essentials". Even worse, however, was the Khawājah's policy of failing to mention the Promised Messiah in his lectures. The problem with this was that as he became better known as a lecturer, and was invited all over India to lecture on

behalf of "Aḥmadiyyat," he was diverging more and more from the distinctive teaching of Aḥmadīyah and was thereby encouraging other Aḥmadīyah speakers to do likewise. From the point of view of the khilāfat supporters, the tablīgh (or missionary thrust) of Aḥmadīyah had come to a halt.[32]

The third issue to be raised in this context was that of the kufr of non-Aḥmadīs. Maḥmūd Aḥmad was so upset by the leadership which he admits was dominated by Khawājah Kamāl al-Dīn and Muḥammad ʿAlī during 1909-1910, that on March 27, 1910 he delivered an address attacking their "liberal" approach, while by April of 1911 he published an article on the subject of the "kufr" of non-Aḥmadīs. The Khawājah wrote an article in answer to Maḥmūd in which he interpreted Maḥmūd's position on kufr "in a manner contrary to its real purport...."[33] Although fatwās of takfīr were common in Muslim India and many had earlier been declared against Ghulām Aḥmad, the raising of the issue of kufr at this time was to open a Pandora's box which may not yet be closed today and which certainly figured prominently in the Aḥrār controversies of 1934-35 and 1953 as well as in the pamphlet warfare of the 1930's.

The tensions between the two factions were heightened again late in 1910 after an accident in which the khalīfah Nūr al-Dīn fell from his horse. During a period when it looked as if he might not survive, the discussion in the community turned to the issue of the succession. Both Muḥammad

ʿAlī and Maḥmūd Aḥmad report a meeting held at the home of Muḥammad ʿAlī early in 1911 at which time Khawājah Kamāl al-Dīn, Muḥammad ʿAlī and others who had come from Lāhōr professed to each other that none of them had ambitions towards the khilāfat. They invited Maḥmūd and one of his associates Mīr Naṣīr Nawāb to join the meeting. At that time they informed Maḥmūd--according to Muḥammad ʿAlī-- that the matter of the khilāfat was being discussed by them because of gossip circulating in Qādiyān. The Lāhōrīs also indicated that they would have no objection to Maḥmūd Aḥmad becoming khalīfah so long as the total community agreed together on the decision and that no hurried decision would be made before the Lāhōrīs or others might arrive in Qādiyān. On this much both sides agree. Muḥammad ʿAlī added to his remarks that the Lāhōrīs took this position before Maḥmūd's April 1911 article declaring all non-Aḥmadīs to be kafīrs. Maḥmūd, on the other hand, has insisted that he rejected their overtures on the matter declaring that it was a sin to discuss the issue of the khilāfat at all prior to the death of the incumbent.[34]

Eager to reestablish the tablīgh of the Aḥmadīyah movement which he believed the work of the Khawājah and Muḥammad ʿAlī had brought to a stand still, Maḥmūd Aḥmad organized, in 1911, the Anjumān Anṣār Allāh (Society of God's Helpers). Maḥmūd claimed that the sole reason for this organization was to reinstate discipline and propogate the faith. The issue of the khilāfat was in no way connected. The establishment

of this new organization, as with so many other things which Bashīr al-Dīn Maḥmūd Aḥmad has referred to in his book, was also attributed to the dreams and visions he claimed to have had concerning the Aḥmadīyah movement and such figures as the Khawājah.[35]

The major events of 1912 center around the departure of both Khawājah Kamāl al-Dīn and Maḥmūd Aḥmad from India. The former, on the death of his wife, decided to travel to Bombay and then on to England where he began the Woking Mission while also looking after the business affairs of a Bombay Aḥmadī there. The publication of this latter fact led to more internal disputes for it was implied by his opponents that the Khawājah was going to England on business rather than as a missionary for Islām.[36] Maḥmūd Aḥmad also left India but instead he went to Egypt and then on the ḥajj, a ḥajj which his father, the Promised Messiah of Aḥmadīyah, had never made. Returning to Qādiyān in 1913, Maḥmūd Aḥmad was at once impressed by the need to strengthen the press there, claiming that the majority of Aḥmadīs were reading al-Hilāl, the paper edited by Abū al-Kalām Azād whose writings he described as "poisonous".[37] Such a description of al-Hilāl says much about Maḥmūd Aḥmad's political sophistication at the time and contrasts greatly with his more activist position twenty years later.

Maḥmūd Aḥmad's answer for Aḥmadīyah was a new newspaper, one which could report both on community news "as well

as general reading."[38] With al-Ḥakam, Badr, Nūr and Review of Religions already emanating from Qādiyān and with a proposal from three Aḥmadīs, Mīrzā Yaqūb Bēg, Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Shāh and Shaykh Raḥmān Ullāh, that a new paper be started at Lāhōr, why should Maḥmūd Aḥmad want yet another paper at Qādiyān? His own answer is clearly reflective of the fact that the "split" in 1913 was more of a "splinter" and that factions possibly representing several points of view were struggling within the movement even though the principal combattants seem to have emerged finally as the "Lāhōr" and "Qādiyān" groups.

III

What was the journalistic situation of the Aḥmadīyah movement in 1913 and how did each of the factions appraise that situation? Maḥmūd Aḥmad wrote that a new paper was needed because

> The columns of The Badr were closed to us on account of the policy pursued by that paper. The Alhakam, in the first place, was practically non-existent, as all that it could manage to do was to come out now and then; secondly, even when it did come out, it had a directness of approach and a way of saying things which made it unpopular with the powers that be. The Review of Religions...was so far removed from us that we could never dream of using it to further our aims.[39]

The facts pertaining to these Aḥmadīyah publications as offered in Government Press Reports of the period do not bear

out this interpretation, however. Badr, which had had a circulation of only 525 copies per issue in 1905, had been described as "devoted principally to religion" and "harmless". In the Vernacular Press Reports for the years 1909-1911 it had been quoted only twice with respect to articles against the Āryā Samāj, while it had once been attacked by the Christian missionary publication Nūr-i-Afshān for practices not conducive to good Christian-Muslim relations.[40]

Since the evidence seems overwhelming that Maḥmūd Aḥmad's great concern was with the internal developments of Aḥmadīyah and its tablīgh, he may well have been put off by even the slightest continuation by al-Ḥakam and Badr in attacking the Āryā Samāj. The Āryā Gazette of January 27, 1910 had reprinted a poem from the Badr which serves as a good example:

> The abusive language of Lekhu (Lekh Ram) brought
> its consequences upon him,
> And yet these foolish persons do not mend their
> ways. Such is their fault!
> How Lekhu has suffered the consequences of his
> doings!
> After all, this is the punishment inflicted on
> evil-doers in the house of God.
> To defame and abuse Prophets.
> And to open one's mouth like dogs--these are
> the seeds of destruction.[41]

Again, there was little evidence that al-Ḥakam had almost ceased publication at this time. Maḥmūd Aḥmad may well have been at odds with its editor, Yaqūb ʿAlī, who had been required by Nūr al-Dīn to take bayʿah at the same time that Khawajah and Muḥammad ʿAlī had, following the dispute over the

khilāfat and the Anjumān. Al-Hakam had also continued its attacks on the Āryā Samāj and had also come out strongly critical of the Press Act of 1910.

Yaqūb ʿAlī in writing of the Press Act had stated:

> There can...be no denying the fact that some mischievous and irresponsible persons have so abused the privilege (of the press) that the sword of Damocles will henceforth hang over the head of all journalists. As a journalist the editor cannot view with pleasure or satisfaction the haste with which the Act has been rushed through the Legislative Council. ... He feels pleased because the law has penalized the promotion of racial hatred, to which subject the late Mirza Ghulam Ahmad intended in 1895 to invite the attention of Government. The Act will undoubtedly make for racial peace, and in this respect at least it is a satisfactory piece of legislation. The fact, however, that the liberty of the press has been considerably curtailed, that some passages in the Act are extremely vague, and that the measure is likely to take away from the influence of journalists, cannot but make him sorry at the conduct of those journalists who are responsible for the passing of the law....In conclusion, he tells Arya newspapers that the time has come when the truth about their religion will be made known, and that, if there are any noble precepts in their faith, they should lay the same before the world.[42]

That Yaqub ʿAlī showed his ambivalence towards the Press Act is clear from this editorial. He blamed those whom he opposed, continued on the assumption that the Āryā Samāj was still at fault and essentially responsible for the Government's action, while it is apparent from the tone of other articles which al-Hakam published during the period, that Yaqūb ʿAlī's attack on the Āryās was far from gentle. It is also important to note here the first glimmerings of

Aḥmadī involvement with broader political and social issues, a practice that was soon to increase considerably.

The journal Nūr, begun at Qādiyān in 1909, which Maḥmūd Aḥmad did not mention at all, was similarly appraised in the 1910 Press Report as "a paper of controversial nature started in 1909 chiefly to oppose the Aryas and other sects who are opposed to the teachings of Islam. Has no connection with politics and no influence on the public."[43]

Several articles which had appeared in the Review of Religions during the years 1909-1913 had given further testimony to the outreach in which Khawājah Kamāl al-Dīn had been engaged. At the Convention of Religions held in Calcutta April 9-11, 1909, a conference held in the spirit and memory of Swāmī Vivikenanda's presence at the World Parliament of Religions in 1893, the Khawājah represented Aḥmadīyah. The Calcutta meeting brought together Christians, Jews, Muslims, Buddhists, Hindus and Zoroastrians. Muḥammad ʿAlī, commenting on the convention, wrote that "with all its defects...(it) was a great success." He then went on to quote a favourable review of the Khawājah's lecture in the April 28 issue of the Observer.[44]

The issue of February, 1911 published the Khawājah's Lecture on Islam, delivered before a similar congress on religions at Allāhabād early in January of that year. As a preface to the lecture, but written as a footnote by the editor, the following remarks were added:

I belong to the Ahmadiyya sect of Islam--a sect

> founded by Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of Qadian in the last decade of the 19th century. The sect does not differ from other Islamic sects in any cardinal principle of Muhammadanism but in one thing. Our Holy Prophet Muhammad promised us a Messiah who was to come to revive religion in days to come, and we accept the fulfillment of these prophetic words in the person of our Master....[45]

If this were not enough to stir the anger of Maḥmūd Aḥmad, who must have seen it clearly as a rejection of all the Aḥmadīyah stood for, Khawājah Kamāl al-Dīn's presence at the Sixth International Congress of Religious Liberals held at Paris in July, 1913, about a year after the start of his mission in England, must surely have been the final straw. The Rev. Charles Wendte of the American Unitarian Association reported in the Christian Register and later in his book, The Wider Fellowship, the presence of the Khawājah,

> a man of massive mold, dark-hued and turbaned his appearance was most impressive, while his words seemed to open up new possibilities of usefulness to our association.[46]

Khawājah Kamāl al-Dīn's brief remarks at the opening session were significant both for their tone and their content.

> ...allow me to congratulate you on the auspicious opening of the Congress, and in anticipation of the time which has been promised me, I should thank you on behalf of a religion which has played a most important part in history and which still rules the destinies of millions of people,--I mean Islam. Among your deliberations, you have kindly put the question, what are your duties to Islam? And I should thank you on behalf of my community and my religion and I shall be even more thankful when a suitable time shall be given me to advocate the cause of my religion.[47]

That the Khawājah's presence as the Muslim representative

to the Congress of Religious Liberals was a success may be seen from Wendte's further remarks indicating that Khawājah Kamāl al-Dīn had presented "a spirited defense of his faith, and pointed out its many excellences and beauties.

> On his return to London, Mr. Kamil printed this address in his journal, together with an appreciative account of the Congress, with which he desires to be hereafter affiliated, welcoming it to closer fellowship with the Muslim world.[48]

These remarks were further supported in a letter sent by Wendte to Muḥammad ʿAlī and republished in the Review of Religions, November, 1913. The letter also contained an invitation for Aḥmadīs to join another "Theistic Conference" to be held in conjunction with a world-wide pilgrimmage being organized for 1914 or 1915. The World War was, of course, to intervene and no further evidence of interaction between the Aḥmadīyah and this group which came to be known as the International Association for Religious Freedom and Liberal Christianity has been uncovered.[49]

With this much background we may see some of the reasons Maḥmud Aḥmad felt compelled to begin a new publication, al-Fazl, at Qadiyān. From the beginning, the purpose of al-Fazl was intended to be different:

> to clarify the position of the Promised Messiah; to impress upon the Community that he alone was its master and guide, the importance of whose mission could not be minimised without depriving Ahmadiyyat and Islam of all that was alive in it.[50]

The first issue of al-Fazl was published on June 18, 1913. The first issue of the new publication from Lāhōr, Paygām-

i-Sulh, issued by close associates of Muḥammad ʿAlī and Khawājah Kamāl al-Dīn had appeared a few weeks earlier. The eight aims which appeared in the issue of July 10, 1913 stressed loyalty to the Government, the creation of unity among Muslims, the removal of misunderstandings relating to the Aḥmadīyah Community and "the position of the Promised Messiah," presenting the world with the model which the Holy Prophet had set up, the discussion of political, social and moral problems "in the light of Islam," and the bringing of Indian and foreign news to its readers.[51]

The aims of this Lāhōr journal were far grander than those of al-Fazl. Since propogation of "Ahmadiyyat" was not even a part of the proposal, the Qadiyānis could see in it nothing more than the bringing "to the surface the poison that had so long been accumulating in the body of the Community."

> Praises were lavished upon the enemies of the Movement. The Sultan of Turkey began to be called Khalifatul-Muslimin. In short, every effort was made to obliterate the distinctiveness of Ahmadiyyat and to make Ahmadis and non-Ahmdis (sic) merge into one common mass.[52]

Muḥammad ʿAlī's view looked upon the establishment of al-Fazl in quite an opposite but not entirely clear light. Maḥmūd Aḥmad's opposition to those at Lāhōr had been the real stimulus for his decision to publish al-Fazl. It should have been opposed by Nūr al-Dīn the khalīfah. Instead "Hazrat Maulvi Sahib was rather too much soft and lenient towards

him." Muḥammad ʿAlī then offered as his proof the text of a letter from the khalīfah to Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn of the Lāhōr party dated May 9, 1913.

> The Mian Sahib is sickly and squeamish, weak of heart and shaky. Small wonder, then if he should fly into passion. You are a medical man. Can't you understand this? A long-suffering sickman becomes irascible and ill-tempered. No reproof on him; it can, however, be on you. May Allah be pleased with you all. Amen.[53]

This letter, Muḥammad ʿAlī felt, offered evidence of Nūr al-Dīn's true feelings towards Maḥmūd Aḥmad and of his leniency as well.

IV

The two competing Aḥmadīyah newspapers had not existed more than two months before they diverged on a major issue which not only had implications for the future direction Aḥmadīyah would take but also for Muslim-British relations as a whole. This was the issue referred to in Muslim sources as the "Kānpūr mosque incident" but technically described in British Government records of the period as "Riot at Cawnpore in connection with the demolition of a mosque in the Machli Bazar."[54] The "riot" over the mosque at Kānpūr occurred on August 3, 1913 following disruptions in the community which had occurred a few weeks before in mid-July. The issue centered around the decision of the Government to build a new road in the area of the mosque in order to

improve sanitary conditions in the city. The building of this particular road meant the taking of a portion of the mosque land which contained the dalan (privy) and small ablution fountain area, both of which extended out from the main rectangle of the mosque and which had been built sometime after the original structure.

It is apparent from the "Minute" written by the Lieutenant Governor of the U.P. that discussion of these changes had been going on as early as 1908.[55] It was the view of Government officials that Muslim objections were raised to the taking of mosque property only after the Lieutenant Governor decided to spare a Hindū temple which in turn had necessitated the taking of the corner of the mosque. In the view of J. H. Du Boulay, the Lieutenant Governor, written in a telegram to the Viceroy on July 24, 1913,

> There was, however, no foundation in this. On the contrary the original line of acquition was altered and drawn somewhat further to the east so as to preserve the entire courtyard of the mosque and cut off nothing but the washing place. I declined to interfere with the final decision of the Municipal Committee for the reason that the washing place is not sacred in the same sense as the mosque proper and that no objection had been offered to the original and more drastic proposals. The dismantled building was a slight projection to the east of the courtyard and consists of a raised platform with a drain running through it and a privy at one end; the whole being roofed over as distinguished from the open courtyard for prayers. When the Chairman visited it there was a pile of shoes lying on the platform and the Muhammadans who were with him wore boots inside.[56]

If such was the "bureaucratic" perspective of the Lieutenant

Governor coupled with the additional statements that he foresaw trouble primarily from outside agitators, especially from Dehlī, it is easy to see how the Muslims, given the communal atmosphere throughout North India, would have reacted. The Lieutenant Governor's plan to visit the mosque personally on August 9 was upset by the mass meeting and riot which occurred there on August 3. Earliest reports showed between twenty and thirty Muslims had been killed and wounded, one policeman killed and several wounded.[57]

The reaction of the more militant and nationalist Muslim press was immediate and outspoken. By August 8, the Government was prepared to move against the Zamīndār edited by Ẓafar ʿAlī, the Comrade edited by the more famous Muḥammad ʿAlī of Calcutta and his Urdū Hamdārd under provisions of the Press Act of 1910. On August 9, an article appeared in Comrade reporting a protest meeting in Dehlī, which, from the Government point of view could hardly be expected to keep the peace. In Muḥammad ʿAlī's article, it was directly suggested that the Deputy Commissioner of Dehlī, a Major Beadon, had told the leaders of the Dehlī protest "that he would himself attend the meeting, bringing with him a cart-load of cartridges to shoot not the mob but the leaders." After defending the Muslim's right to peaceful protest and criticizing Beadon for showing "how very ignorant the official world is of the real feelings of the people," the Comrade concluded its report with the rather strong remarks reflective

of the tensions abroad at the time,

> The feelings of the entire Moslem community without distinction of class have been most deeply stirred by the dreadful events at Cawnpore. "Cart-loads of cartridges" may succeed in repressing them for a while; but then such repression is never without its consequences, and Major Beadon probably knows them as well as any Mussalman who is equally anxious for peace and welfare of his community and country.[59]

A report "on the state of Muhammadan feeling in the Punjab" dated October 11, 1913 indicated that communal tensions among the Muslims had risen not only because of the Kānpūr mosque incident but also because of the Balkan War which was often reported as a struggle of Christians against the Muslim Turks. The effective work of Ẓafar ʿAlī of the Zamīndār in Lāhōr had collected 24,000 rupees for the defense of the Kānpūr rioters on trial.[60] What all this had to do with the new Aḥmadīyah newspapers became apparent in the fifth part of the Barron report of October 11.

> ...while sensible Muhammadans saw and deplored the situation that had so rapidly arisen, they were afraid to take any overt action to dissociate themselves from the small but noisy and vituperative section of extremists. They feared the abuse and invectives of the latter; they were paralysed by the apprehension of being pilloried in the Press as traitors to the faith, and self-seekers trying to curry favour with Government. As usually happens in this country they looked to Government to take the first step and to show that it would no longer tolerate the Press Campaign of misrepresentation and intimidation. Then Government ordered the forfeiture of the security (Rs. 2,000) of the Zamindar on the 15th of September; the security of a second Muhammadan paper (the Paigham-i-Sulah) was forfeited early in the month....[61]

That the Payghām-i-Ṣulḥ was the second Panjābī paper to have its security bond "forfeited" by Government action and thereby be associated in the minds of Government with the radical Zamīndār and the Comrade, Hamdard and Rafīq papers which were also under continuing scrutiny by the Government seems a complete turn-about from any previous Aḥmadī journalistic policy. In his own writings, Muḥammad ʿAlī has barely mentioned the division of opinion over the issue and only did so as a way of answering the charges laid against him by Maḥmūd Aḥmad.[62] Aḥmad's version of the story began by faulting the Payghām for making "common cause with the other public organs in their attack upon the Government."[63] It was Maḥmūd Aḥmad's view that while Muḥammad ʿAlī had sent an assistant to consult the khalīfah on the issue, he had gone ahead taking his stand with the "agitators" and had made out the khalīfah's position to be sympathetic to his when such a view was pure misrepresentation.[64] The Payghām-i-Ṣulḥ certainly justified Aḥmad's criticism by its publication of the statement on August 10, one week after the riot, that

> As for The Paisa Akhbar or Ahl-i-Hadith...they have bitterly opposed the Ahmadiyya Movement all along; but when did they succeed in doing any injury to us that we should be afraid of them now.[65]

Following its censorship by Government in October, 1913, the Payghām-i-Ṣulḥ was principally used, according to Maḥmūd Aḥmad, to attack Aḥmadīs living at Qādiyān and to

refute what was written in al-Fazl. Although still beholden to the khalīfah, Nūr al-Dīn, the Lāhōris began a conscious effort to divide the community. This was further promoted in the publication of two anonymous pamphlets, entitled Izhār-ul-Ḥaq No. 1 and No. 2. Maḥmūd Aḥmad's description of the two tracts described them as a direct attack on the true nature and organization of Aḥmadīyah including the khalīfah. The Lāhōr group was clearly responsible for their dissemination.[66]

Muḥammad ʿAlī vehemently denied these assertions, and wrote, "...whatever knowledge I got of these tracts, it was only when I read them." He, in turn, accussed Maḥmūd Aḥmad of writing the tracts and expressed his views in a lengthy letter to the khalīfah. Towards the end he reiterated his allegiance, writing,

> I swear upon the Most High God and state that we are not conspirators. We have, on the other hand, fallen a prey to conspiracy....We implore you kindly to point us a way out of this atrocious tangle. If the allegation of branding us as hypocrites and faithless kafirs had been confided to the common people, it would not have mattered much. But the evil has gone too far; and now effort is being made that you may also somehow be led to look upon and regard us as such. (November 23, 1911)[67]

As further proof of his innocence, Muḥammad ʿAlī also published the immediate response of Nūr al-Dīn absolving him of any involvement in the matter. By now, however, the dye was fully cast. The arguments between Muḥammad ʿAlī and Maḥmūd Aḥmad continued over the issues of kufr of non-Aḥmadīs and the necessity as well as the nature of a bayʿah which

would have to be pledged to the successor of the continually ill Nūr al-Dīn. His death, which occurred Friday, March 13, 1914, soon made these previously theoretical issues very real ones.

V

As with so many events during this stormy period of Aḥmadīyah history, we may never have an accurate factual basis from which to develop what really happened. According to the view of Maḥmūd Aḥmad, upon the news of Nūr al-Dīn's death, the people gathered at the mosque in Qādiān to offer prayers, following which Maḥmūd Aḥmad spoke briefly urging the guidance of God through the Qur'ān and the undertaking of a fast by those able to do so.[68] Following this, Maḥmūd Aḥmad and Muḥammad ʿAlī met together. Both have reported their differences of opinion in the same vein. Muḥammad ʿAlī took the position that there was an open split in the Aḥmadīyah. Because of this, he felt that the kind of "management" the organization should have in the future should be carefully considered. He also believed it crucial to explore further the implications of the doctrine of kufr, as it had been expressed by Maḥmūd, in the hope that the community would not be further divided by this issue.[69] Maḥmūd Aḥmad's viewpoint was first, that there was no real disagreement, and second, that there should be some who would

be responsible for the community in the event of any difficulties. The entire community would be present in Qādiyān the next day. At that time a new khalīfah should be chosen. Such an act would be in the spirit of early Islām as well as of the recent history of Aḥmadīyah. The question of the khilāfat should not be opened again.[70]

Meeting that evening with his friends, Maḥmūd Aḥmad was confirmed in his belief that any repudiation of the Aḥmadīyah khilāfat would go against the teachings of the Qur'ān, that the matter was one of religious principle regardless of any personalities involved. A second argument used against the Lāhōr group was that they had already taken bay'ah from one khalīfah so why should they now change their position? Later that night, when performing the tahajjud prayers, Maḥmūd Aḥmad was handed a tract which had been written by Muḥammad 'Alī and distributed to Aḥmadīs en route to Qādiyān. In it, Maḥmūd Aḥmad was attacked on the issues of the khilāfat, the kufr of non-Aḥmadīs, and the claim that he himself desired to be khalīfah.[71]

The final blow in the controversy between the two factions was the interpretation of each concerning al-Wasīyah, the Will of the Promised Messiah. Muḥammad 'Alī had taken the document more literally; that is, he wanted to pursue the power of the Ṣadr Anjumān to make decisions and thereby separate the idea of bay'ah to a khalīfah for purposes of joining Aḥmadīyah, from the appointing through the Anjumān

a separate qualified person as manager (Amīr) of the organization. Maḥmūd Aḥmad's interpretation of the purpose of al-Wasīyah differed. He saw it as a document written at a time when all were fully committed to the Promised Messiah and in a situation where no questions of power or leadership were being raised.

Maḥmūd Aḥmad recorded dramatically his final conversation with Muḥammad ʿAlī. His side took the position that there could be no further discussion about the khilāfat but only about who should be khalīfah. Muhammad Ahsan, a supporter of Maḥmūd Aḥmad, also argued against Muḥammad ʿAlī that Promised Messiah was nabī. Maḥmūd Aḥmad continued his description of the events, stating that he attempted to end the argument for the clamour of the crowd outside asking for some decision about the leadership was too important to ignore.

> Upon this, all at once the words escaped him, (Muhammad Ali) "You say so because you know whom the people are going to elect." I said, "Not so, I have already decided to pledge my Bai at to someone of your party." But nevertheless, he persisted in saying, "No, no, you know what they would do," meaning that I knew they would elect me as Khalifa. This made me despair of an agreement....I saw that the other party showed no disposition for unity.[72]

Aḥmad believed that Muḥammad ʿAlī's opposition was not to the khilāfat itself, but to the fact that he was going to be chosen khalīfah. Maḥmūd Aḥmad quoted the statement of allegiance which had been published in the Badr on June 2,

1908, subscribed to by both Muḥammad ʿAlī and Khawājah Kamāl-al-Dīn as proof of their commitment to the institution even after the death of the Promised Messiah. Seeing that Muḥammad ʿAlī had implied he would no longer pledge bayʿah to the new khalīfah, Maḥmūd Aḥmad left to join the congregation, described by him as being of 1500 to 2000 persons. The decision to choose him as khalīfah was immediate. Although the crowd pressed around him asking to confirm their commitment to him, he insisted on holding back for a time from accepting the position. Against the arguments of the Lāhōr group concerning these events, he wrote,

> Out of about 2,000 people who were present at the time, only about 50 withheld their Baiʿat. All the rest took the pledge.[73]

Muḥammad ʿAlī stood fast on the statement of Ghulām Aḥmad, made in 1907, that in all matters concerning the ultimate welfare of the community, after his death, the decision of the Anjumān would be final. While Muḥammad ʿAlī has not given a complete moment by moment description of the final separation, much of the later literature of the Lāhōr movement, in describing its origins, blames Maḥmūd Aḥmad for propagating a concept of Ghulām Aḥmad as nabī only after 1908 because of a book written by one of his followers, Zahīr al-Dīn. Maḥmūd Aḥmad, deeply concerned about the Lāhōrī attack on this point, took great pains to refute it in a sixty page argument in the early part of his book about the "split".[74] Literature emanating from the Lāhōr branch, while seldom

derogatory about Ghulām Aḥmad himself, developed the theory that he was the Islamic mujaddid for the fourteenth century of Islām. At the same time, this literature has often accused Maḥmūd Aḥmad of making claims to the khilāfat which were not justified in light of the Qur'ān or the teachings of the Promised Messiah.[75]

That bitterness between the two branches of Aḥmadīyah has continued during the past fifty years is evidenced by the continual need of each side to keep the issue of Ghulām Aḥmad's role as nabī or mujaddid alive with respect to the events of 1909-1914. As khalīfah al-masīḥ II, Maḥmūd Aḥmad moved at once to institute the ideas he had fought for against the more "liberal" or "democratic" concepts of Muḥammad ʿAlī. The 1914 Review of Religions, for example, no longer edited by Muḥammad ʿAlī, dealt, in its early issues, with rather non-controversial religious matters and apart from an obituary article concerning Nūr al-Dīn did not mention the controversies rending the Aḥmadīyah community. The last page of the April issue contained this short notice, however:

AN IMPORTANT RESOLUTION

> The Majlis-i-Mu'tamadin Sadr Anjuman-i-Ahmadiyya, Qadian, has in a recent meeting adopted the following resolution and sanctioned its inclusion in the articles of the Sadr Anjuman-i-Ahmadiyya:- "In all affairs the orders of Hazrat Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad, second successor to the Promised Messiah, shall be final and conclusive for the Majlis-i-Mu'tamadin and its subordinate committee or committees, if there are any, and the Sadr Anjuman-i-Ahmadiyya and all its branches."[76]

A radical change had quickly taken place in the organizational structure. Reported on in this manner, it seems clear that in the Qādiyānī branch the khilāfat was to have ultimate power and questions of organization would not be allowed to debilitate the effectiveness of the tabligh or the work within the community itself. According to Maḥmūd Aḥmad's biographer this action was voted in an assembly of 200 delegates meeting at Qādiyān on April 12, 1914. The arguments given in favour of this move were that although the Anjumān had received its original authority from the Promised Messiah, this had not been clearly explained in the constitution. It was not until 1918, with further changes made in 1925 and 1935 that a major restructuring of the organization took place.[77]

A report on the 1914 Annual Gathering at Qādiyān indicated that a missionary, one Ḥafīz Ghulām Muḥammad, was about to depart for Ceylon, Mauratius, Madagascar and other islands in the Indian Ocean. A number of missionaries were already working in other parts of India and, of course, the mission to England had begun under Khawājah Kamāl al-Dīn in 1912. The Aḥmadīyah mission to England was now divided into two sections, with one part being allied to Qādiyān, the other to Lāhōr.[78]

A progress report in the April 1915 issue seems to have exaggerated the figures of new Aḥmadīs. This article stated that 1,500 had joined since the death of Nūr al-Dīn the year before, although a January article had only mentioned

600 new members. The April report also indicated the establishment of a "committee for the propagation of Islam," "the Anjuman-i-Taraqqi Islam," whose purpose was

> (1) The establishment of primary schools in various districts of the Punjab.
> (2) The establishment of a Training College for Muslim Missionaries at Qadian.
> (3) Translation of the Holy Quran with copious notes, both in Urdu and English.[79]

Other purposes included the sending out of missionaries and publication of tracts "on the truth of Islam." In addition, Aḥmadīyah undertook its first plans for social service work by submitting to the Government of the Panjāb a plan "for the reclamation of criminal tribes" in the Panjāb.[80]

The growing separation of Aḥmadīyah from the main body of Islām was made clearer by the publication in May, 1915 of the "Conditions of Bai'at." The first ten were identical to those which Aḥmad had used during the first bay'ah at Ludhiāna but these were followed by the Articles of Faith, a statement on the duties of the Aḥmadīyah Community, the management of the community and finally "Some Instructions for the new Ahmadis" which particularly pointed up the distinctions.

> Since the Promised Messiah was a messenger of God and the denying of the Apostles of God is a dangerous boldness and deprives a man of faith hence according to the Quran, the Traditions of the seal of prophets and the sayings of the Promised Messiah, it is the duty of every Ahmadi that he should pray under the leadership of Ahmadi Imams only. But in those places where Ahmadi Imams can not be found, he should offer his prayers alone and should pray to God to give

> him a Jamaat...because a true believe (sic) can never remain alone. Similarly it has been prohibited that Ahmadis should give their daughters in marriage to non-Ahmadis, for wives are generally influenced by their husbands and thus it is making a soul apostate. Likewise, Ahmadis should not attend the funeral service of non-Ahmadis, for it would amount to interceding with God for a man who has proved himself an enemy by denying and opposing the Promised Messiah.[81]

If there had ever been doubt as to the position in which Aḥmadīs wished to place themselves with regard to Sunnī Islām in India, those doubts were now cleared away. The decision of the khalīfah al-masīḥ II, Mīrzā Bashīr al-Dīn Maḥmūd Aḥmad, to inform all new members of Qādiyānī Aḥmadīyah of these requirements was to bring Aḥmadīs in new and greater conflicts with the Muslim community than Ghulām Aḥmad had ever experienced. The persecution of Aḥmadīs seems to have already become a serious problem by 1916 for the Review of Religions of that year published five articles praising the British Government and giving thanks for its assistance in protecting persecuted Aḥmadīs,[82] while reiterating how loyal the movement had been since Ghulām Aḥmad first began his mission in Qādiyān.[83]

The 1915 issue also saw the start of a series of letters to representatives of the Government on behalf of the movement. The first one, addressed to the Viceroy and Governor General of India, Lord Hardinge, again traced the history of Aḥmadī allegiance and gratitude to the Government.[84] The community had already demonstrated its patriotism in

the war effort by a proclamation in November of 1914 in which Maḥmūd Aḥmad as khalīfah had declared with respect to Turkey:

> Perhaps some fools think the Sultan of Turkey to be their master and pontiff, but the Ahmadiyya Community should bear in mind that they should never think so.[85]

Quoting at length the writings of the Promised Messiah which had attacked the Turkish consul during a visit to Qādiyān as early as 1897, Maḥmūd Aḥmad concluded by stressing that all Aḥmadīs should follow the teachings of the Promised Messiah and that it was a religious duty to be loyal to the British Government. This proclamation was followed by a letter addressed to the Lieutenant Governor of the Panjāb again indicating loyalty. This was, in turn, followed by the brief response of the Private Secretary to the Governor written on November 18 which not only indicated receipt of Aḥmadī letters but also that the Lieutenant Governor had met with an Aḥmadī delegation at Gūrdāspūr a few weeks earlier.[86] But, such professions of loyalty were not to keep the Aḥmadīyah out of trouble with the Government completely. The Urdū edition of Review of Religions was warned in November of 1916 "for reproducing the epitomized form of the objectionable pamphlet, "Khuruj-i-Dajjal," which had been declared forfeit. Al-Fazl, though described as "moderate" was criticised for excessive hostility to Hindūs and Christians and received "warnings" in 1915, 1917, 1923 and twice in 1927. A reprint by the editor of some articles dealing with the Lēkh Rām affair were "seized

for destruction" in 1919.[87] In the perspective of the issues emerging on the Indian scene, the Aḥmadīyah movement was suddenly playing a new and more assertive role resulting in its strange position vis à vis both the Government and its opposition in the Hindū and Muslim communities.

VI

We have examined the major events within the Aḥmadīyah movement during the period from 1908-1914 leading to the division of the movement into two sections. The remainder of this chapter will examine in greater detail a new thrust which developed within the Qādiyānī Aḥmadīyah with respect to one major development of the time--the Muslim response to the Turkish situation exemplified in the Khilāfat movement.

W. C. Smith has cited the date "1912" as the year in which political discontent began to spread widely among the "influential Muslims" of India. The kind of discontent found among Muslims of the nineteenth century was that of the "Wahhābī" movement and its abortive attempts at jihād, or later the events surrounding the uprising of 1857. The self-conscious kind of struggle for greater freedom which developed after 1912 was the struggle of an educated and more urbanized Muslim community. The period of Ghulām Aḥmad's leadership in Qādiyān, 1880-1908, had represented a period of sporadic discontent in the Muslim community of the Panjāb but this

related more to the aggravating presence of the Christian missionaries, the growing militancy of the Āryā Samāj, and the general insensitivity of the British administrative corps there.

1912 marked the height of the Balkan war, a war in which the standard of Christianity was being raised in some quarters against that of the Muslim Turk. It was also the year following the recinding of the partition of Bengal, a move generally resented by Muslims as it removed what had been created in 1905 as an essentially Muslim province of East Bengāl. On the Turkish question, the heart of the Muslim community was divided between its emotional loyalty to khilāfat that had not really existed in Turkey since the revolt of 1908 and its realization that, according to the teachings of Sir Sayyid Aḥmad Khān, who had written later in his career,

> We are devoted and loyal subjects of the British Government....We are not the subjects of Sultan ʿAbd al-Hamid II;...he neither had nor can have any spiritual jurisdiction over us as khalifa. His title of caliph is effective only in his own land and only over the Muslims under his sway.[89]

The violent feelings of Indian Muslims in reaction to the growing awareness of anti-Turkish feelings among the British first expressed themselves in such newspapers as Abū al-Kalām Azād's al-Hilāl of Calcutta, the influence of which Maḥmūd Aḥmad had feared would spread political discontent in the Aḥmadīyah community and had led to his decision to publish al-Fazl. Similarly, Zamīndār, published in Lāhōr, and Muḥammad

'Alī's two newspapers, Comrade and the Hamdārd (in Urdū) all took a militantly anti-British position.[90] The two latter papers were prosecuted in 1913 along with Payghām-i-Sulh for the position taken in the Kanpūr Mosque incident.[91]

Muḥammad 'Alī and his brother were interned by the British during the First World War principally for articles in the Comrade which had raised the question of whether Muslims should be loyal to the Turks or to the British during the war. Although absent during those years, Muḥammad 'Alī was often remembered in Muslim protest meetings concerning his internment. When he emerged after the war, he and his brother at once organized the All-India Khilāfat Conference, described in a 1921 British document as having

> originated among a section of advanced Muhammadan opinion whose views can broadly be described as Pan-Islamic and pro-Turkish.[92]

The author of this article analyzed the Indian Muslim position as one based on guilt for their contribution to the Turkish defeat in the war, the long period between the end of the war and the humiliating terms of peace offered the Turks, and finally, the demands of British and Americans angered by the massacres of Armenians. The tensions of those post war years were reflected further in the statements

> In vain did the Government of India express its sympathy for the sentiment of the Muslims; in vain, did it assure them that it was pressing their views upon His Majesty's Government. They had no desire to listen to reason. Did not leaders of their own faith assure them that Islam was in danger? The restoration of Turkey

> to her full pre-war status: the re-imposition of her yoke over emancipated Arabs and Armenians: the rendition of Palestine, Syria, Thrace and the Dardenelles--these were some of the demands put forward with the arguable finality of an ultimatum.[93]

Broader Indian dissent against the so-called Montague-Chelmsford Reforms of 1917 and the Rowlatt Act of 1919 had encouraged the work of Mohandas Gandhī in his non-cooperation movement known as "satyagraha" or "truth force." The militant demands being made by the khilāfatist Muslims led Gandhī to seek a union of the two organizations working towards governmental and legislative reforms favouring the Indians after the Dehlī Khilāfat Conference of November, 1919.[94]

The Aḥmadīyah reaction to the political events going on in India during and after the war was not quite what one might expect in view of past reactions by both Ghulām Aḥmad and Nūr al-Dīn calling for total non-involvement in political affairs. A new attitude on the part of the Khalīfah al-masīḥ II, Maḥmūd Aḥmad, was most evident in an article appearing in the Review of Religions, October-November, 1917, entitled "Political Unrest in India. Voice of the Ahmadiyya Community." An introductory section by Bashīr Aḥmad, editor of Review and brother of the khalīfah, began by assuming the knowledge of its readers concerning the current political agitation for self-government and home rule in India. If this were not fascinating enough, the editor then went on to indicate that Aḥmadīyah was sending a deputation to meet

the visiting Secretary of State for India, Edwin Montagu, in order to present Aḥmadīyah views to him and Lord Chelmsford at Dehlī. The reason for sending this deputation was explained by Bashīr Ahmad:

> The Ahmadiyya Community is a purely religious body and has nothing to do with politics. This is why so far it kept aloof from all political movements in India. But on the present occasion when a majority of the educated people of India are clamouring for Home Rule, in the grant of which the Ahmadiyya Community sees the ruin of its own interests, the head of the Ahmadiyya Community...thought it his duty to express the views of the Ahmadiyya Community....[95]

The delegation to Dehlī, composed of ten Aḥmadīs, was led by Chaudhrī Ẓafar Ullāh Khān, the young lawyer from Lāhōr, and Review of Religions editors Bashīr Aḥmad and Sher ʿAlī. The selection of Ẓafar Ullāh Khān as secretary of the deputation was significant. He was the one Qādiyānī who was not only highly educated, but who had also done a law degree in England. He had now returned, a Qādiyānī Aḥmadī since his youth in Siālkōṭ, to an important role of lay leadership.

Sir Ẓafar Ullāh, recently reflecting on this event as his first contact with public life, said,

> On the 20th of August 1917, Mr. Montague had made a declaration in London with regard to the advance that was contemplated and he came over later to hear Indian views at first hand. I led the delegation of the Ahmadiya community and read out our address, setting forth our views.[96]

What was it that Zafar Ullāh Khān presented to Montagu and Chelmsford? For Aḥmadīyah it was a remarkable

statement for it began with the assumption that India stood in need "of important and far reaching reforms." Although the majority of Indians were ignorant of the meaning of "Home Rule," the work of the educated minority in promoting the idea could not be ignored, the statement continued. Among the causes of the "present discontent", unsympathetic treatment by certain British officials towards Indians which "has turned some of the most loyal subjects of His Imperial Majesty into malcontents" was cited.[97] The special treatment accorded Europeans, the effect of radical economic changes in the country, and the lack of adequate and universal education in India were further reasons.[98]

Although these may have been the causes for discontent, Aḥmad wished to make it clear that while the country needed reform, the religious tensions and persecution of religious minorities alone was enough grounds to deny Home Rule. As an example, he cited the Aḥmadīs whose twenty-seven years of existence had been marked by persecution in spite of Aḥmadīyah constant professions of peace. The British Government was the only agency capable of "protect(ing) us from the religious fury of ignorant bigots." In proposing changes, then, the plea of the Aḥmadīyah was that no change affecting the interests of small minorities should be permitted, nor should any Indian domination of a high government office yet be allowed.

It is necessary that so long as religious pre-

> judice retains its sway over the minds of the populace, the British element in the Government of the country should not only be stronger than the Indian element, but it should predominate over the latter, so that religious excesses should be kept in check and majorities should not be able to tyrannise over minorities.[99]

While these proposals were far from radical, in the sense that Gaṇdhī and Muḥammad ʿAlī were radical, they were so different from the total non-involvement of the Aḥmadīyah in previous decades as to raise the question, how could such a change suddenly take place in the community--but was this really such a sudden change? The answer would seem to lie in the events leading up to the split in the 1908-1914 period. During those years the organization was caught up primarily in internal problems. At the same time, Muslim nationalism was suddenly blossoming. While the "split" seemed to divide the educated Aḥmadīs, identifying themselves with a "liberal" wing of Islām and with Muslims in the Kānpūr mosque affair, from the "conservative" or khilāfat Aḥmadīs who still claimed themselves as a purely "religious" organization, the events of the times were such as to affect the new young leadership of the Qādiyānīs forcing them into an increasing engagement on the political scene--even if they still supported the British position in most matters. That the Aḥmadīs were not puppets of the Government may be seen in just three of the statements of proposed reform appended to the khalīfah's statement read to Montagu and Chelmsford at Dehlī.

(6) All those distinctios (sic) and special priv-

ileges which the Europeans enjoy by virtue of their race should be abolished.

(7) Europeans charged with offences against Indians should not be tried by Jury, or as an alternative half the members of the Jury should be Indians professing the same religion as the person offended against; otherwise, justice is impossible, as is amply borne out by past experience.

(10) Mines, railways, etc., should be freed from the burden of foreign capital. They should be worked and managed either by Government itself or by means of Indian capital....[100]

An analysis of the twelve propositions made in this report and the additional recommendations to reform government at the local level may be seen as no more than an attempt of the Aḥmadīyah movement to gain more protection for itself in an increasingly hostile environment. From another point of view, however, it needs to be understood as far more than this (as the three particular examples quoted above clearly demonstrate). Where the Aḥmadī materials available for the decade preceding this meeting at Delhī with Montagu and Chelmsford did not hesitate to continue attacking the Āryā Samāj and may have expressed criticism of the Press Act of 1910, but only in light of the excesses of various native newspapers, the movement had never before stood other than on the side of the Government. The 1917 presentation, therefore, was significant for placing Aḥmadīyah in the role of social and political critic, although still very much on the side of the British, and secondly, for introducing Ẓafar Ullāh Khān to the public life of India.[101]

When the passive resistance movement against the Rowlatt Act led to considerable agitation and rioting throughout the Panjāb in 1919, there was no question as to where Maḥmūd Aḥmad and the movement stood. A letter written by the khalīfah to the Viceroy at Simla during the April agitation indicated that Aḥmadīs were not involved in the hartāls and that Aḥmad had sent a letter to all his followers urging them to keep their shops open during the strike, even at the cost of a later boycott. Beyond this, Aḥmad had organized an Aḥmadī committee which would offer its help to the Government in order to clarify and explain the Act to the Indian public. In addition, he proposed the publication of four tracts including an Urdū version of the Rowlatt Act, a pamphlet explaining that the Rowlatt proposals were the only way to attain governmental reform in India and a third and fourth in Urdū and Gurūmukhī aimed at the Sikh community reminding them

> of a prophecy of a Guru of theirs which speaks of the establishment of British Government in India and of its being a just and equitable Government....[102]

At the conclusion of the letter, the editor of the Review published the Government's grateful reply in which the commanding officer of the Lāhōr civil area wrote,

> Your community may rest confident that it will continue to receive full protection by Government and it has nothing to fear, while under that protection, from your religious and political opponents.[103]

In mid-December 1919, a delegation led once again by Zafar Ullāh Khān went to Lāhōr to meet the Lieutenant Governor of the Panjāb, Sir Edward MacLagen. While opening the presentation, prepared by or in the name of the khalīfah, with the profession that Aḥmadīyah was only a religious movement and following with a statement of gratitude to the Government and joy following its victory over Germany, the khalīfah then continued discussing "The Turkish Question." Referring to an address already delivered by Sunnī Muslims on the questions of "Mahomedan education" and the "Turkish Question," Aḥmad stated that while he agreed with what the previous address had said about Muslim educational needs in India, he disagreed on the matter of Turkey. While acceding to the demand that the feelings of the Muslim world should be considered in deciding the Turkish question, he wished to point out "that religiously speaking we do not admit owing any allegiance to the Sultan. We hold that only a successor of the Promised Messiah is entitled to be the Spiritual Head of the Mussalmans, and as for our temporal Sovereign we recognise only the Power under whose rule we live."[104]

This statement again demonstrated the middle position taken by the movement. Because they supported their own khilāfat, Aḥmadīs could not identify with a khilāfat in some other Islamic area. Yet, Ẓafar Ullāh Khān, in his reminiscences of the khilāfat movement, has asserted that Aḥmadīs still supported it "because Turkey did represent the secular

strength and prestige of Islām to a large degree.[105] Such a statement would not be entirely out of keeping with that made by Maḥmūd Aḥmad in the address to the Lieutenant Governor. Sir Ẓafar Ullāh corroborated this in a further statement:

> I did not take any active part in the Khilafat Movement myself. For one thing, I was rather young at that time; and for another, from a religious point of view, the Ahmadiyah Movement did not look upon the Turkish Sultanate as representing the Khilafat. Nevertheless, in one of the Khilafat Movement Conferences in Allahabad, an Ahmadie delegation which was led by me, made it quite clear that we were in support of the objectives of the Movement, without accepting the claim or position of the Sultan as spiritual head of Islam.[106]

Sir Ẓafar Ullāh's recollection of the Aḥmadī role in the Allāhabād Khilāfat Conference is at some variance with the statement of Maḥmūd Aḥmad in Review of Religions, June, 1920. Maḥmūd Aḥmad reported there that he had received an invitation to the Conference from Mawlawī ʿAbd al-Barī of Faraṇghī Maḥāl at Lucknow. He felt torn on the matter since, on the one hand, any deviation from the views of the majority which he might present would certainly be attacked, and therefore his attendance would be a waste of time and effort. "But on the other hand," he continued,

> a love and good will for my brethren and an earnest desire to be of some service to Islam persuade me to acquaint them with my views on the subject, regardless of the manner in which the same might be received.[107]

Thus, Maḥmūd Aḥmad did not appear at the Allāhabād meeting himself but sent a delegation with a detailed speech defending

the Aḥmadī position on the khilāfat. Could one imagine such action being taken by Ghulām Aḥmad or by Nūr al-Dīn? Qādiyānī Aḥmadīyah participation at Allāhabād even at the possible cost of further persecutions from the Sunnī community indicated that the Aḥmadīs had gone beyond deputations and letters to the Government and now had jumped in, feet first as it were, to direct confrontation with the nationalist, Pan-Islamic and khilāfatist-oriented Muslims.[108]

If the Qādiyānī Aḥmadīyah had moved far from its original position of non-involvement in political matters by its stand on the khilāfat issue, the Lāhōrī Aḥmadīyah had gone even farther. In a 38-page pamphlet published by the "Ahmadia Anjuman Ishaat-i-Islam" and written by their leader, Muḥammad ʿAlī, in 1920, the author argued strongly for the khilāfatist position tracing the origins of the institution in the Qurʾān and showing how it was religiously related to the holy places of Islām on the Arabian peninsula. He both attacked the Christian European tendency to equate the khilāfat with the papacy and the European assumption that non-Muslims could design political and religious destiny of Muslims. He also refused to accept the solution which would pass the khilāfat on to the family of the sharīf of Mecca. Muḥammad ʿAlī then concluded his tract with a plea for the reestablishment of the khilāfat in conjunction with the Turkish empire.

In the end I may add that putting aside the

> purely religious question of Jazirat-ul-Arab and the associated question of the Holy Places of Islam which have been under Muslim rule for the last thirteen hundred years,--and nothing but pure might without the least regard to right can upset the decision of thirteen centuries against the wishes of the community whose fate is involved--the Muslim desire to see the Turkish Empire maintained on the pre-war basis is not mere sentiment. The Jazirat-ul-Arab is no doubt an essential part of the Khilafat, but neither does it alone form the Khilafat. The Khilafat is...the Promised Muslim Empire...of God extending over both Arab and Ajam. Since very early days the capital of that Empire has remained outside Arabia. This Empire must moreover be absolutely independent. If therefore,...the question... is to be settled by the Muslims alone, and they refuse to accept anyone besides Turkey as the rightful owner of the Khilafat, the question of the maintenance of the Turkish Empire, independent and strong, with Arabia as one of the units of that Empire, is also a religious question; and the placing of Turkey under a mandate or divesting it of Arabia, the essential unit of the Khilafat, or placing it under restraints making its own defence impossible, shall be felt by every true Muslim to be nothing less than an attack on the religion of Islam by the Christian powers of the world.[109]

At this point we shall close out this survey of the Aḥmadīyah movement between 1908 and the post-war events in which Aḥmadīs became involved. However one may judge the position taken by Maḥmūd Aḥmad and the Qādiyānī Aḥmadīyah on the issues that confronted them, it is worth noting the effect the movement had, especially on the Panjāb during the years under consideration. The membership of the movement had increased in the Panjāb from 18,000 to 28,000 between the census of 1911 and that of 1921. Although they were, by far, exceeded by those Muslims claiming to be Shī'ah or

Ahl-i-Ḥadīth, Aḥmadīs exceeded the Ahl-i-Ḥadīth numerically in 17 districts of the Panjāb and the Shī'ah as well in Gūrdāspūr District. Although their total membership was significantly improved between 1911 and 1921, we cannot determine the number of new conversions as against second generation increases. Their numbers could have been locally influential only in Gūrdāspūr which reported 6,176, Siālkōṭ with 5,278, and possibly Gujrat with 2,786 and Hoshiārpūr with 2,511. Also worthy of note is the figure of 471 given for Lāhōr in 1921. Although the census charts do not differentiate Lāhōris from Qādiyānīs, it is evident that such a small figure must have principally represented members of the Lāhōr group who could not have been substantially larger than this in their numbers.

While the growth of Qādiyānī membership was significant during the decade from 1911-1921, the exposure of Aḥmadīyah religious and "political" ideas to an increasingly larger public, both through expanded missionary work and also because of the khalīfah al-masīḥ II's journey to Europe in 1924, made life more and more difficult for Aḥmadīs. While there are innumerable instances of crisis in the life of the community which could be cited, we will conclude our study by examining two of these: the pamphlet warfare of the 1930's and the Aḥmadīyah-Aḥrār encounter of 1934-1936. The examination of these two aspects of Aḥmadī history should not only uncover details of a segment of Indian religious history,

but should also help to place the Aḥmadīyah movement in a perspective in the light of the events of that later decade.

NOTES

[1]A. Q. Niaz, Fazl-i-Omar, Sultan Brothers, Qadian, 1939, pp. 13-14; see also Review of Religions, VII, p. 235. For a description of Ahmad's ancestral background and family landholdings, see Griffin and Massy, Vol. II, op. cit., pp. 49-50.

[2]Niaz, p. 17; RR, VII, p. 238.

[3]RR, VII, June, 1908, p. 235.

[4]Ibid., V, January, 1906, p. 24.

[5]Ibid., p. 35.

[6]Ibid., pp. 35-36.

[7]Ibid., VII, June, 1908, p. 230.

[8]Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad, The Truth About the Split, Qadian, 1924 (1938 edition), p. 204.

[9]Discussed above in Chapter 2, p.

[10]RR, VII, October, 1908, p. 415.

[11]Ibid., VIII, April, 1909, p. 153.

[12]Ibid., pp. 161-162.

[13]Mahmud Ahmad, op. cit., p. 201.

[14]Ibid., p. 207.

[15]Ibid., p. 209.

[16]Ibid., pp. 210-211. Cf. H. Q. Niaz, op. cit., pp. 100-101.

[17]Muhammad ʿAlī, True Facts About the Split, Ahmadiyya Anjuman Ishāʾat-i-Islam, Lahor, 1922 (1966 edition), p. 12.

[18]Ibid., pp. 14-20.

[19]For the full text of the letter, see ibid., pp. 73-78.

[20]Mahmud Ahmad, p. 212.

[21]Ibid.

[22]Muhammad ʿAli, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad: His Life and Mission, pp. 29-30, with quotes taken from al-Wasiyah. On the first question, that of the succession, ʿAli's view runs clearly counter to the Qādiyānī position which, as we have seen in Chapter 2, credits Nūr al-Dīn with being the first to have accepted bayʿah from Ghulām Aḥmad, thus giving him an especially prestigious position in the movement as early as 1890.

[23]Ibid., p. 31, quoted from Mansāb-i-Khilāfat, Qādīan, 1915 (diacritical marks in the quote as given).

[24]Mahmud Ahmad, op. cit., pp. 213-214. See Appendix "D" for the seven questions from Muḥammad ʿAlī, The Split, pp. 51-52; the text of Muḥammad ʿAli's response, p. 57; the rejoinder of Mīr Muḥammad Ishāq, pp. 58-59; Muḥammad ʿAlī's answer, pp. 59-64.

[25]Mahmud Ahmad, p. 225.

[26]Muhammad ʿAli, The Split, pp. 66-69.

[27]Mahmud Ahmad, p. 229. Cf. A. Q. Niaz, pp. 114-124.

[28]Muhammad ʿAli, pp. 70-73; Niaz, pp. 126-129; Mahmud Ahmad, pp. 232-238.

[29]Mahmud Ahmad, p. 237.

[30]Muhammad ʿAli, p. 73. The letter is on pp. 73-78. Further arguments of refutation appear on pp. 79-93.

[31]Mahmud Ahmad, pp. 238-240.

[32]Ibid., pp. 240-242; Niaz, pp, 129-130.

[33]Mahmud Ahmad, p. 244.

[34]Muhammad ʿAli, pp. 93-94; Mahmud Ahmad, pp. 248-250.

[35]Mahmud Ahmad, pp. 252-257; Niaz, pp. 65-69.

[36]Mahmud Ahmad, pp. 262-264.

[37]Ibid., p. 269.

[38]Ibid.

[39]Niaz, p. 70.

[40]Bartier and Wallace, op. cit.; S.V.N.P., XXIV, No. 35, p. 900, Nūr-i-Afshān, August 18, 1911.

[41]S.V.N.P., XXIII, No. 5, p. 123, Āryā Gazette, January 27, 1910.

[42]Ibid., No. 8, p. 210, Al-Hakam, February 10, 1910. For the text of the 1910 Indian Press Act, see Barns, op. cit., Appendix II, pp. 442-449.

[43]Government of India, Statement of Newspapers and Periodicals in Punjab in 1910, p. 467.

[44]"The Convention of Religions in India," Review of Religions, VIII, No. 5, May, 1909, pp. 189-196. For the text of KhawajahKamal al-Din's lecture, "Islam as Interpreted by the Ahmadiyya Movement," see pp. 145-165. For a report on the Proceedings, see RR, X, No. 7, July, 1911, pp. 305-308.

[45]"Islam," RR, X, No. 2, February, 1911, p. 45.

[46]Charles Wendte, The Wider Fellowship, Vol. II, Boston, 1927, p. 515.

[47]Khawājah Kamāl al-Dīn, from remarks made July 16, 1913 as recorded in a collection of materials about the Sixth International Congress presently located in the archives of the Unitarian Universalist Association, Boston, Mass.

[48]Wendte, op. cit., pp. 528-529.

[49]"An All-the-World Theistic Conference," RR, Vol. XII, No. 11, November, 1913, pp. 479-484.

[50]Al-Fazl, April 8, 1914, quoted in Niaz, pp. 71-72.

[51]Payghām-i-Sulh, July 10, 1913, quoted in Niaz, pp. 72-73.

[52]Mahmud Ahmad, pp. 270-271.

[53]Muhammad ʿAli, p. 96.

[54]Government of India, Home Department, Political File "A", Proceedings, October, 1913. For a detailed analysis of the facts and attitudes involved in this case, see a forthcoming monograph by A. Ghazi and S. Lavan, "Ramifications of the Kanpur Mosque Incident of 1913."

[55]Ibid., Proceedings of the Home Department, October, 1913, "Minute by the Lieutenant Governor," p. 75 (p. 2 of the "Minute").

[56]Ibid., Political "A", op. cit., Telegram from the Lieutenant Governor of the Panjab to Viceroy, dated Nami Tak, July 24, 1913.

[57]Ibid., p. 2, Telegram of August 3, 1913.

[58]Ibid., p. 4, Demi-official letters.

[59]Ibid., extract from "Comrade," Delhi, August 9, 1913, quoted from page 7 of "Political A," op. cit.

[60]Ibid., p. 44, Demi-official Letter from C. A. Barry, C.I.E., No. 1660 S.B., dated Simla, October 11, 1913.

[61]Ibid., p. 45.

[62]Muhammad ʿAli, p. 97.

[63]Mahmud Ahmad, p. 271.

[64]Ibid., p. 272.

[65]Payghām-i-Sulh, August 10, 1913, quoted in Niaz, p. 77.

[66]Mahmud Ahmad, pp. 274-286.

[67]Muhammad ʿAli, pp. 100-102.

[68]Mahmud Ahmad, pp. 317-320.

[69]Muhammad ʿAli, p. 108.

[70]Mahmud Ahmad, pp. 320-321.

[71]Ibid., pp. 323-327.

[72]Ibid., p. 340.

[73]Ibid., pp. 343-344.

[74]Ibid., pp. 61-132.

[75]Muhammad ʿAli, "Claims of the Founder of the Ahmadiyyah Movement in Islam," Ahmadiyyah Anjuman Ishāʿat-i-Islam, Lahore, 1951 (1968 edition); see also, Muhammad ʿAli, "Prophet or Mujaddid?," (translated by S. M. Tufail, March, 1957); and

also, Muhammad Ali, "The Ahmadiyah Doctrines," Lahore, 1932; Mumtaz Ahmad Faruqui, "Truth Triumphs," Ahmadiyyah Anjuman Isha at-i-Islam, Lahore, 1965. This tract is particularly vociferous in its attack on Mahmud Ahmad and is dedicated in its preface "to the sacred memory of Maulwana Muhammad 'Ali (the first president of the Ahmadiyyah Anjuman Isha at-i-Islam) who may rightly be given the title of--'The Saviour of the Ahmadiyya Community'."

[76] RR, XIII, April, 1914, p. 160.

[77] Niaz, op. cit., pp. 181-182.

[78] RR, XIV, January, 1915, p. 27.

[79] Ibid., April, 1915, p. 157.

[80] Ibid., p. 160; see also ibid., XV, February, 1916, pp. 76-79.

[81] Ibid., XIV, May, 1915, p. 199.

[82] Ibid., XV, January, 1916, "God Bless the British Government," pp. 1-11.

[83] Ibid., February, 1916, "What the Ahmadiyya Movement has Done for the Government," pp. 49-60.

[84] Ibid., March, 1916, pp. 145-147.

[85] Ibid., XIII, November, 1914, p. 415.

[86] Ibid., pp. 419-423.

[87] Statement of Newspapers and Periodicals Published in the Punjab During the Year 1934, pp. 220-221; 18-19.

[88] W. C. Smith, Modern Islam in India, p. 217.

[89] Quoted from 'Aziz Ahmad, Islamic Modernism, p. 125.

[90] Smith, p. 218.

[91] See above, this chapter, p. 268-272.

[92] L. F. Rushbrook Williams, India in 1921-22, Supt. Govt. Printing, Calcutta, 1922, pp. 34-35.

[93] Ibid., pp. 35-36.

[94] Ibid., p. 36.

[95]RR, XVI, Nos. 10-11, October-November, 1917, p. 349.

[96]Reminiscences of Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan, Oral Research Office, Columbia University, 1962, p. 8.

[97]RR, XVI, op. cit., pp. 352-354.

[98]Ibid., pp. 354-358.

[99]Ibid., p. 364.

[100]Ibid., pp. 374-375.

[101]The reporting of Review of Religions on controversial matters and Ahmadī involvement in them was inconsistent after 1917. An interview with Professor Khalīl Nasir, January 25, 1970, indicates that there were periodic crackdowns on the publication. Although we have no direct evidence of this, the indirect evidence is in the Review itself which for gaps of several years published only religious articles and never discussed controversial issues.

[102]RR, XVIII, March-April, 1919, pp. 108-117; quotation from p. 117.

[103]Ibid., p. 125.

[104]Ibid., December, 1919, pp. 401-402.

[105]Sir Zafrullah Khan, op. cit., p. 14.

[106]Ibid., p. 15.

[107]RR, XIX, June, 1920, p. 162.

[108]Ibid. See Appendix "E" for significant excerpts.

[109]Muhammad ʿAli, "The Khilafat In Islam According to the Holy Quran and the Sayings of the Holy Prophet," Ahmadiyya Anjuman Ishaʿat-i-Islam, Lahore, 1920.

CHAPTER 6

POLEMICS AND CONTROVERSY: (III) AḤMADĪYAH IN THE PERSPECTIVE OF INDIAN HISTORY IN THE 1930'S-- THE COLLISION WITH THE MAJLIS-I-AḤRĀR-I-ISLĀM

In the early 1920's, when Mohandas Gandhī began to crystalize the sentiment of the Hindū masses in the direction of self-government for India by working actively for an end to untouchability, demanding swarāj, and proposing a plan for Hindū-Muslim unity, the tide of Indian sentiment was running strongly against the British. On the Muslim side, the khilāfat movement, strongly pro-Turkish, was continuing its effectiveness throughout the community. In the midst of all this agitation, Aḥmadīyah seems to have stood almost alone, set within the framework of the teachings of Ghulām Aḥmad and the belief of the Qādiyānīs in his prophetic mission. By the 1920's, however, its new well-structured organizational pattern seemed designed, on the basis of past experience, to separate Aḥmadīs as a sectarian community from non-Aḥmadīs.

During the height of Āryā Samāj agitation, at the turn of the twentieth century, the pamphlet, the poem and the hymn had often been used as a means of communicating nationalistic feeling and fervor.[1] In the Muslim community, Aḥmadī opponent Zafar ʿAlī Khān, editor of the Lāhōr Zamīndār, became particularly well-known for his use of the political poem during

the period of khilafatist agitation.[2] The increasing use of the poem, sermon and pamphlet to stir religious controversy and political unrest, both serious and satirical, was to cause the British increasing difficulty in the 1920's and 30's, instigating renewed censorship and restriction of published materials.

A serious but mocking example of such a sermonic commentary on contemporary events first appeared in the Aḥmadī Review of Religions during the summer of 1922 in a series of articles entitled, "The Ahmadia Movement No. 1 (and No. II): The true path to Swaraj." Poking fun at the ideals and efforts of Gāndhī and Muḥammad ʿAlī, the author of this piece wrote:

> What was formerly most difficult of achievement, is coming to us so simple, that we can only wonder why it could not be achieved before? Hindu-Muslim unity, the removing of untouchability, the demand for Swaraj--they now seem so much a matter of course, while only a few decades ago reformers had shattered their brains and burst their veins to catch a listening ear to the narration of such dreams....
>
> Realize truth then; preach truth to the world and Swaraj will inevitably be yours....But truths have many forms. Most of them are indeed but half truths. To overcome violence by non-violence is a part truth....Self-determination, Swaraj are similarly mere part-truths....[3]

The whole truth to which the author was referring was, of course, God, who had in recent times disclosed himself in the Panjāb through Ghulām Aḥmad. Compared to the message which Aḥmad brought, that of swarāj was mere inadequate

parochialism, a partial truth of human life as compared with God's complete truth.

Veiled behind these indictments of the Gāṇdhīan programme was more than the religious assertion of Aḥmad's message to modern man. There was also a reflection of the continuing ambivalence Aḥmadīs were experiencing between the felt need to speak out on issues of political significance, on the one hand, and their basic fear that they, as a minority, within a minority, would suffer further persecutions if self-government was to come to India. In 1922, the answer still seemed to lie in Aḥmad's 1908 "Message of Peace," which was quoted in some detail at the end of the article on "The True Path to Swaraj". It is noteworthy that the sections of the original speech attacking the Āryā Samāj were left out here but that a small paragraph entitled "Non-violence as taught by Aḥmad" was used to conclude the series on "swarāj". This paragraph implied that it was Aḥmad's teachings about jihād which had real religious value and which predated by many years the human teachings by Gāṇdhī about non-violence.[4]

These short articles in 1922 were but one example of the inconsistency which Qādiyānī Aḥmadīyah was to employ in its response to various events during the next fifteen years. Five years later, in 1927, when Lāhōr experienced its first major communal disturbances in several years, the Aḥmadīyah had a tangential but not insignificant role to play in creating the hostile climate of opinion which prevailed in

the city. Although the original disturbances took place in May, tensions continued throughout the summer as the result of a decision by Justice Dalīp Singh not to prosecute strongly the author of the infamous pamphlet "Rangīla Rasūl" ("The Gay Prophet") which had been written and published by an Āryā Samājī. According to recorded correspondence between two members of the Government, the Aḥmadīs were responsible for circulating a poster on June 4, under the signature and picture of Ghulām Aḥmad, attacking the "Rangīla Rasūl" and quoting another anti-Islamic periodical, the "Risāla Vartman," throughout Lāhōr and Amritsar.[5]

While it is not possible to prove whether the Aḥmadīyah were really responsible for circulating the poster in question, their past history of making a strong defense against attacks on Islām, especially in tracts, would suggest that they were responsible. At the same time, the Qādiyānīs appeared to be acting in just the opposite manner, anxious to get the Government to stop any future publications such as "Rangīla Rasūl." In a letter dated August 27, 1927, written by M. Maḥmūd Ṣadīq, "Foreign Secretary to His Holiness the Khalifatul Mesiah," and addressed to Edward Frederick Lindley Wood (Baron Irwin), Viceroy and Governor General of India, the Aḥmadīyah community officially sent a draft copy of a proposed Memorial "about amendment in the law to safeguard the honour of Prophets Avatars and Founders of all religions."[6] That a new law was already under consideration by the Government was clear from

further correspondence sent directly from Maḥmūd Aḥmad who was at Simla on August 31. While he applauded the Government for its proposals he was emphatic that

> (a) It is necessary in our opinion that the words 'Prophet' 'Avatar' 'Founder of religion' should be clearly mentioned in the proposed section so that there may remain no loophole for misinterpretation.
> (b) The second portion of the proposed section is too wide in its significance and stands in need of certain limitations.

At the same time he asserted clearly that the Aḥmadīyah movement was supporting such a bill "with a view to improve inter-communal relations...."[7]

During the communal strife of 1927 and the years following, Bashīr al-Dīn Maḥmud Aḥmad and his staff not only maintained a regular correspondence with the Government about Aḥmadī views on communal relations, but Aḥmad also published two books on the subject. The first of these, "Hindu-Muslim Problem and its Solution," although published by the Ṣadr Anjumān, was printed at Calcutta in February, 1927. This pamphlet was directly addressed to Lord Irwin as a response to his well-circulated speech of July 17, 1926 in which he had called for an end to communal strife in India. The publisher's "Foreward" to the book indicated both the kind of audience Maḥmūd Aḥmad was aiming for while asserting that his proposed solutions to the "communal" problems of India were "well worth a perusal."

> The problems of intercommunal relations and communal representation have become subjects of all

> absorbing interest to the educated section of our countrymen. ...The present Head of the Ahmadiyya Movement...recently addressed a letter to H. E. the Viceroy expressing his own views on the burning questions of the day. This is now published in the form of a booklet....It is hoped that any one having the welfare of the country at heart will find much food for thought....

Thus, while rejecting communalist assumptions, Maḥmūd Aḥmad was seeking to establish a position for his own movement both as a defender of Islām and in the eyes of the Government. In writing such a book, he could not have effectively been communicating his views to any mass audience, however. Reciting the record of Aḥmadī support for Government and the statements recognizing support by such former eminent Government servants as Sir Michael O'Dwyer, Aḥmad claimed to have assessed the situation in India as early as 1924 when he had said that real peace could not be established unless Indians

> ...instead of preaching that there were no differences between the different peoples of India and that the Indians formed one homogeneous nation, they should admit the presence of differences and then proceed to remove the causes thereof.... Secondly, they should include in all their understandings and agreements the Government as well as the Anglo-Indians, because, no matter whether the coming of the Englishmen into India was rightful or not, it is a fact that they now form a part of the inhabitants of the country, and consequently complete peace could not be established without their cooperation.[8]

The problems Muslims were facing had come about because of the fact that "the political views of the British people run counter to the communal needs of the Muslims of India." Aḥmad went on to argue that the continued existence of the

Muslims as a community required that they receive separate representation in a legislative system, a concept clearly contrary to what he believed the British desired for India and one outrightly rejected by the Nehrū Commission Report being prepared at this time.

Aḥmad was not anxious to see India obtain political "freedom" in any real sense nor was he proposing any form of Muslim "nationalism". He identified his interests here with those of the Muslims although tacitly he was surely concerned about the interests of the Aḥmadīyah as a minority within the Muslim minority as well. Emphasizing again the importance of keeping British control over the Government of India until the position of minority groups was secure, Maḥmūd Aḥmad went on to stress the important responsibility the British had to educate Indians "in discharging their responsibilities with fairness and equity" with necessary steps being taken to remove the causes of excitement "for if the people continuously remain subject to repeated excitements," he wrote, "their old habits will become more firmly rooted and even the responsibility of government will not be able to remove them."[9] Although Maḥmūd Aḥmad, khalīfat al-masīḥ II, could not conclude his pamphlet without reference to Ghulām Aḥmad's three peace proposals of 1899, which were essentially the same as those Maḥmūd Aḥmad was now offering concerning attacks on the religion of another person, the essential manner of his presentation was lucid and very much

to the point at issue--communal tensions, their political impact and Aḥmad's proposals to resolve them.[10]

In 1930, Maḥmūd Aḥmad wrote a longer and more detailed book, The Indian Problem, in response to the unpopular Simon Commission Report which, he insisted, was "not as bad as would appear from the summary published in the Indian Press."[11] While he had first opposed it himself after a cursory reading, a more detailed study of the report had changed his opinion. As the First Round Table Conference was about to be held in London on November 12, 1930 (continuing until January 19, 1931), Maḥmūd Aḥmad felt it necessary to address his views to the delegates through this book. As the conference was concerned with the question of an Indian Constitution, Maḥmūd Aḥmad asserted that the delegates should begin by considering the Simon Commission Report and the related question of whether or not India was fit for independence. The latter question required a moral, political and religious answer, he continued.[12] A religious answer could not be given because of the broad religious differences between Europeans and Indians, but, certainly, moral and political answers to the question could be ventured. To both of these, Aḥmad's answer was a clear "yes". England was morally and politically obliged, by previous commitments, to grant eventual independence to India. But Maḥmūd Aḥmad stood far from a radical position on the question when he expressed his continued support of the British presence in India in the sentence: "In short, separation from England

is not only impossible but it is also opposed to the Divine Scheme of things."[13] His second point was that England was in no way responsible for the continual communalism India was experiencing. Finally, while Aḥmad supported the Simon Commission proposals, especially thankful for their recognition of the need to protect the interests of minority groups, he still expressed reservations that the proposals might be too vague.[14]

It is difficult to answer the question as to whether or not Maḥmūd Aḥmad was a "communalist". In his book, he has cited the current Hindū-Muslim tensions, again, as one of the reasons for postponing any radical program for independence and while professing to want inter-communal peace, he still sharply attacked the "Hindu mentality,"[15] which, he insisted, had always displayed a hatred for Muslims. While these remarks should not be taken to imply that Maḥmūd Aḥmad was in any sense a militant "communalist", his and his father's personal experiences with Hindūs, most notably Āryā Samājīs, had led him to distrust the prospect of a unified and free India overwhelmingly dominated by Hindūs. While his continual use of the terms "Hindū" and "Muslim" identify Aḥmad as one standing up for the interests of the Muslims, it is important to reiterate that inter-communal tensions had been extremely high throughout the Panjāb for some time before 1930. Maḥmūd Aḥmad's identifying of himself as a Muslim need not seem so unusual, then, nor need it be understood as identifying him

with militant communalism. At the same time, we shall see that his direct involvement with the all-India Kashmīr Committee during the next year identified Ahmad clearly with a pro-Muslim, anti-Hindū political and social reform programme. Still, the Kashmīr Committee and the situation out of which its work grew, while getting out of hand and well beyond the scope of what Aḥmadī leaders intended for it, was the outside limit of Maḥmūd Aḥmad's activities on a "communal" level.

What Aḥmad was proposing for the consideration of the Round Table Conference was a provisional form of Central Government which could gradually ease India into a scheme for permanent self-government. While the details of Aḥmad's proposals go beyond the scope of our study here, what is important to note is the depth and detail undertaken by the Aḥmadī khalīfah in his 450 page book which in no sense seemed to propagandize the Aḥmadīyah movement itself. Rather, the study represented a sophisticated and informed consideration of the Qādiyānī leader himself, even if it seemed conservative in the eyes of the more radical Hindūs and Muslims. One example of this change of Aḥmadī perspective in considering the "Indian Problem" more fully than he had ever done before was Aḥmad's detailed discussion of the military needs India would have to sustain in order to survive as an independent state. Her lack in this area alone, he suggested, was proof enough that she was not yet ready for independence.[16]

Although the first session of the Round Table Conference

was boycotted by the Congress which sought the prompt implementation of the Nehrū Report, the meeting was attended by Muslims, Sikhs and representatives of the Princely States, who, working together with representatives of the Government, made some headway on issues concerned with provincial government. Muslims found the deliberations of the Minorities Sub-committee not yet satisfactory, however, and reiterated their claim

> that no advance is possible or practicable, whether in the Provinces or in the Central Government, without adequate safeguards for the Muslims of India, and that no constitution will be acceptable to the Muslims of India without such safeguards.[17]

Among those Indian Muslim delegates present was Ẓafar Ullāh Khān, the Qādiyānī Aḥmadī whose public career during the 1920's had widened his influence and respect both with the British who appointed him Crown Counsel on the Dehlī Conspiracy Case in 1930-31 and also among the Muslims.[18] His election to the presidency of the All India Muslim League in December of 1931, during which brief period he attempted to unite the various Muslim splinter factions, lasted only for six months as his acceptance of a Government post in June of 1932 necessitated his resignation.[19]

Although the career activities of Ẓafar Ullāh Khān should not be taken to mean that there was a growing rapprochement between the Aḥmadīs and Government or the Sunnī Muslim community in general, his role in Government and in the Muslim League in 1931 gives evidence that an Aḥmadī who was qualified

could attain a position of leadership both among Muslims and in the eyes of the British. Neither did the diverse activities of Ẓafar Ullāh necessarily mean that the position of Aḥmadīyah was the same as that of the Muslim League nor that the League supported the Aḥmadīyah movement. Ẓafar Ullāh served the League and the Round Table Conference as an Indian Muslim. He also happened to be the first Aḥmadī to play a major role on the Indian political scene. These events happened to occur, however, during the year when Maḥmūd Aḥmad and other Qādiyānīs became politically active in the Kashmīr issue, thus indicating a continuing awareness of and need to be involved in the crucial questions which India in general, and Muslims in particular, were facing in 1930-1931. Five years later, during the height of the Aḥrār-Aḥmadī controversy, Ẓafar Ullāh would become the chief target of anti-Aḥmadī attacks, while at the same time would be cited in Government correspondence as a reliable source of information on the Aḥmadī side of the crisis. Although the events of 1934-1936 could not be foreseen by either Ẓafar Ullāh or Maḥmūd Aḥmad, the cautiousness with which Aḥmad presented the case for a Provisional Central Government in his 1930 book indicates his continuing concern for the Aḥmadīs as a minority within a minority. When the tide against the Aḥmadīs turned, it was not because of Hindū agitation but because of another Muslim organization they encountered in a series of events beginning in Kashmīr in 1930.

II

The situation of the suppressed Muslim majority in Kashmīr had long been an issue of concern in the Panjābī Muslim community. While there had been organizations concerned with the issue as early as 1892, the Muslim Kashmīrī Conference of 1901 and its successor organization, the All-India Muslim Kashmīrī Conference of 1911, were the earliest to mobilize sentiment for action to alleviate the Kashmīrī plight. On an educational level, Aḥmadīs appear to have shown a strong concern for their fellow-Kashmīrīs. According to one historian, many Kashmīrīs came to Qādiyān for education as early as 1914 and with some lapses continued to come there up to 1947.[20] The presence and proposals of the Simon Commission in India during 1928-1929 stirred up considerable controversy in both Hindū and Muslim communities. At the same time, Kashmīr was again "seething with discontent" under the rule of the Hindū Mahārājā and his Dōgra forces. For the first time, young Kashmīrī Muslims in some numbers had been receiving education in the Panjāb. On returning home they were, however, experiencing continuing discrimination when they applied for positions of responsibility in government. To improve the situation, a group of moderate Muslim politicians came to an agreement with the Mahārājā during 1929 planning a reform of his policies. This reform was never carried out, with the result being increasing bitterness spreading throughout the

Kashmīrī Muslim community.[21]

The situation was such that the concerns of the old All-India Kashmīr Conference were revived when they met to pass some nineteen resolutions of concern late in 1929. Apart from whatever the committee in the Panjāb may have done to stir up Muslim feeling in Kashmīr in 1930, the local leadership of the Muslims passed to Shaykh Muḥammad ʿAbd Allāh, a 25-year-old graduate of ʿAlīgaṛh who had just passed his M.Sc. Examination.[22] This young man gathered mass meetings in mosques and delivered "fiery speeches exposing the hardships and depressed conditions of the people."[23] Matters came to a head after the June 21, 1931 arrest of one ʿAbd al-Qādir, the servant of a visiting European in Srinagar, who made what the Government considered to be a seditious speech. During the trial of this man, held on July 13, 1931, a huge mob gathered in front of Srinagar Central Jail demanding dismissal of the charges against ʿAbd al-Qādir. The gathering led to a battle against the police in which twenty-one Muslims were killed. In the view of one Muslim historian, July 13, 1931 "is a landmark in the annals of modern Kashmir. It was on that day that open demonstrations against the despotic rule of the Maharaja took place."[24]

During the increasingly tense summer of 1931, the British established a commission to inquire into the Kashmīr situation. In order to allay the fears of the Muslims, the British asked that a Muslim judge be placed on the commission.

The Mahārājā would not agree to this plan, but in August he appointed a new Hindū Prime Minister to replace an English one. This new man, Harī Kishān Kaul, met with Kashmīrī Muslim leaders and on August 26 came to an agreement. The Muslims would suspend agitation if the provincial government would release all political prisoners.[25]

In response to what was happening in Kashmīr, a revitalized All-India Kashmīr Committee came into existence in the Panjāb on July 26, 1931, two weeks after the Srinagār uprising. The leading members of the committee included Sir Muḥammad Iqbāl, Zulfiqar ʿAlī Khān, Bashīr al-Dīn Maḥmūd Aḥmad, the Aḥmadīyah khalīfah and Aḥmadī, A. R. Dard.[26] The involvement of Aḥmadīyah leadership "to help and support this agitation for political rights by the people in Kashmir"[27] seems to contradict entirely the thrust of Maḥmūd Aḥmad's writings of 1927 and his presentation to the Round Table Conference in 1930. It is also important to realize that the Aḥmadīyah movement had branches in Kashmīr and had worked to educate Kashmīrīs for many years. From a more objective point of view than that of a Kashmīrī historian, it is possible to see that Maḥmūd Aḥmad's motivations here were social and educational as well as political.

It was just as Aḥmadīs became so deeply involved in serving fellow Muslims in Kashmīr that the Majlis-i-Aḥrār-i-Islām, a new, militant, anti-Aḥmadī Muslim organization entered the picture. The Kashmīrī historian, Bazāz, has described

their encounter:

> Evidently Ahrars and Ahmadis could not and did not join hands. Both worked mostly independently of each other. This produced an inevitable rift and a constant setback in the progress of the movement.
> ...Even Punjab politics were gravely affected by it subsequently....
> ...communal and religious sentiments (of other groups) were roused and, though they did not take as prominent a part as did the Ahrar and Ahmadis, yet their contribution was by no means negligible.[28]

What the Kashmīr Committee succeeded in doing during the summer of 1931 was to stimulate a renewal of agitation against the Mahārājā which initially led him to renew his severe persecution of Muslims. On October 5, however, he reversed his policy and released all political prisoners as a measure to take away the pressure of political agitation.[29]

In the meantime the Muslims of neighboring Jammū province, which touched Kashmīr on the north and Gūrdāspūr district on the south, became the scene of new agitation. In order to support the Muslims there, the Aḥrār sent jathās of supporters from the Panjāb over the border "with the intention of creating disturbances and disaffection against the government. Nearly 4500 such volunteers entered the State boundaries in the month of October."[30] One historian of these events has indicated that the Aḥrār took this action after "finding that the Ahmadya (sic) party were gaining influence with the Muslim population of the State, organised several demonstrations to show their sympathies with their co-religionists living in the State."[31] What is evident from these events is that

they served to precipitate the coming feud between the Aḥrār and the Aḥmadīs which would erupt violently late in 1934. The effect of the Aḥrār jathās of 1931 and the ineffectiveness of Kashmīrī troops to deal with the uprisings was the introduction of British Government of India forces into Jammū on November 3, 1931 and a closing of the border to any further jathās from the Panjāb.

Both the establishment by Government of the Glancy Commission to investigate the Kashmir situation and the creation of the Jammū and Kashmīr Muslim Conference in 1932 helped the turmoil to subside considerably. While some minor agitation occurred again in 1933, the creation of a representative legislature in 1934 took the edge off Muslim tensions once again. P. N. K. Bamzai has described the situation in Kashmīr and in the All-Kashmīr Committee at this point:

> The All-India Kashmir Committee of Lahore and Simla which had drawn its inspiration from Anglo-Indian officers and press, and directed the Muslim agitation in the state during 1931, died its natural death in June, 1933. Sir Muhammad Iqbal resigned from the membership of the Committee on the ground that it was a coterie of Ahmadyas (sic) who were more interested in propagating their religious beliefs among the Muslims of Kashmir than fighting for their political rights.[32]

In his statement of resignation from the All-India Kashmīr Committee, Muḥammad Iqbāl did not mince words concerning his view of the Aḥmadī role in the organization.

> Unfortunately, there are members in the Committee who recognize no loyalty except to the head of their particular religious sect. This was made clear by a public statement recently made by

> one of the Ahmadi pleaders who had been conducting the Mirpur cases. He plainly admitted that he recognized no Kashmir Committee and that whatever he or his colleagues did was in obedience to the command of their religious leader. I confess that I interpreted this statement as a general indication of the Ahmadi attitude of mind and felt doubts about the future working of the Kashmir Committee.[33]

Iqbāl believed that all Muslims on the Committee were agreed about a programme for helping KashmīrīS and that KashmīrīS needed the aid of Indian Muslims. The issues dividing the Committee, then, were petty and sectarian, but they, along with obvious pressures Iqbāl must have felt from Sunnī Muslims, were enough to cause Iqbāl to withdraw from it.

III

The ambiguous position of the Aḥmadīyah movement with respect to the Government of India and the Indian political situation in general reached a new height during 1934. Its role in the All-India KashmīR Committee at an end, the movement once again sought to defend itself and justify its activities in the eyes of both its followers and the Government. An article in the June issue of Review of Religions, 1933, written by the khalīfah Maḥmūd Aḥmad and entitled "Islamic Conception of Retaliation (Qisas) Versus Gandhi's Principle of Ahinsa (sic)" was written for the purpose of showing "how wide apart the two principles are in method and purpose and how when their essential qualities are brought into comparison the

former (ahimsa) sinks in the scale of moral justification."[34] Essentially, Maḥmūd Aḥmad was trying to indicate his belief that the Islamic law of retaliation would not be valid where its exercise involved infringement of the law. "It is for this reason," he continued, "that the present Civil Disobedience Movement is opposed to the Islamic teachings."[35]

Ten months later, in April, 1934, the Review published the "Ahmadiyya Community's Address to the Viceroy," a welcoming address to the new Governor General, Lord Willingdon, who had actually taken office in 1931. Excusing himself for delaying the sending of his representatives, the khalīfah indicated that the delay was due the "honerous and multifarious duties" which had claimed the Viceroy's time and attention since his arrival at Dehlī.[36] Tracing the recent missionary spread and the past history of the Community which, he stated, had followed a "path...of peace and cooperation with and obedience to the Government of the time."[37] Aḥmad gave no indication at any point of his possibly "disloyal" activities with the Kashmīr Committee in the years just preceding. Neither did he point out that the pamphlet "Safīna-i-Nuḥ" (Noah's Ark) which had been published by Kashmīrī Muslims but printed at the Aḥmadīyah Press in Amritsar had been banned by the Panjāb Government in an edict published at Lāhōr, April 18, 1932. The pamphlet lauded the martyrs of July 13, 1931 and supported ʿAbd al-Qādir and the Muslim nationalists in their struggle against the Māhārājā.[38]

By November 1, 1934, the Aḥmadīs of Qādiyān had come fully to the attention of the Panjāb Government and through it to the Government of India once again. In a letter from C. C. Garbett, the Secretary to the Panjāb Government, to M. G. Hallett headed "SECRET", Garbett issued his first report on the conference which the Majlis-i-Aḥrār-i-Islām had held at Qādiyān, October 21-23.

The Aḥrār, described by W. C. Smith as "an Indian nationalist and Muslim group," had come into existence in 1930 and, as we have seen, were militantly active in the Kashmīrī Muslim uprisings of 1931. Many of its founders were originally Muslim members of the Congress, active in the civil disobedience movement. "It grew also among men who were being alienated from the Congress, in an increasingly communalist India." During the thirties and since, the Aḥrār have been active in pro-Muslim and anti-British propagandizing and agitation, stimulated in their work by "religious emotional idealism." It was in this spirit that their conflict with Aḥmadīyah emerged in 1934 at the Qādiyān meeting.[39]

Although no "breach of the peace" had occurred during the Aḥrār conference, the situation had been ripe for a head-on clash between the two strongly opposed Muslim organizations. The intention of the Aḥrār to hold its meeting at Qādiyān had been noted by the Government as early as September when posters were issued indicating why this conference was being held. The reasons the Aḥrār had given were: "(i) the refutation

of false doctrines; and (ii) laying the foundations of an institution ("Jamia Muhammadiya") which would include a mosque."[40] Aware of the trouble that might arise from the Aḥrār holding a conference with such a stated purpose at Qādiyān, the Government, after some debate, decided against prohibiting the Aḥrār from holding the meeting. The lack of positive action was based on the feeling that the Aḥrār would have due cause to claim interference by the Government "with the freedom of religious discussion," and also because they felt that this would only increase the tension already existing between the two groups.[41]

Rather than a prohibition, the Government took four steps to maintain the peace at Qādiyān and prevent any injury to persons or property there. First, they insisted that the Aḥrār Conference not be held in lands immediately next to Qādiyān as was first proposed; second, that no procession be allowed through Qādiyān itself; third, that Aḥmadīs be allowed to hold no counter demonstrations; and fourth, that both parties should be fully aware that Government was watching them and was ready to act against anyone who broke the law.[42]

Although the Government had attempted to get the Aḥrār to abandon holding this anti-Aḥmadī conference, they were unsuccessful in doing so. The next step, then, was to remain in close touch with the leaders of both parties as a way of alleviating potential dangers in the situation. That the Aḥmadīs were ready for trouble, however, Mr. Garbett indicated when he wrote,

> A few days before the conference was to begin, it was reported to them that sticks of a highly dangerous character shod with iron, and which were to all intents and purposes spears, were being made in Qadian...It was also reported to Government that the Ahmadiyya organisation at Qadian had summoned 2500 volunteers from various parts of the province to be present at Qadian for the purpose of protection during the conference.[43]

To prevent the possibility of violence, the Government had to issue orders to Maḥmūd Aḥmad requiring that he withdraw his call to Aḥmadīs to come to Qādiyān. The Government took this action October 17, only three days before the conference was to begin and only after it had done so was it informed that the Aḥmadīs had decided themselves to cancel the request for assistance one day earlier. While it is interesting to note that the khalīfah withdrew his order for assistance a day before the Government required him to, the fact that he allowed his defensive measures to go as far as they had shows how much more defiant of Government he had become in spite of his recent professions of obedience to the Viceroy.

The Aḥrār had been equally recalcitrant. While they had agreed not to form a procession through Qādiyān, they were, in fact, planning to pass through the town in such a way as to antagonize the Aḥmadīs. Because of this the District Magistrate was forced to order the Aḥrār to remain outside Qādiyān, limiting themselves to a route watched over by the police. During the conference a force of more than 400 police and two additional superintendents were present at Qādiyān

attempting to observe "strict impartiality" and arranging "to report fully all speeches made."[44] Garbett observed that by and large the speeches made by the Aḥrār had been within the law. The most abusive had been against Ghulām Aḥmad and his son, Bashīr al-Dīn Maḥmūd Aḥmad, the present Khalīfah. Against these, Garbett indicated that the Government might be reluctant to prosecute the Aḥrārs whom, he felt, would use the occasion "for further exacerbating religious feeling...." The principal subjects discussed by the Aḥrār were:

(a) The Ahmadiyya religion and the claim of the present head and his predecessors to be prophets. The quotation of abusive sayings attributed to them gave the opportunity for retaliatory abuse.
(b) The alleged attempts of the Ahmadis to establish a position of temporal and religious independence at Qadian under the protection of Government.
(c) Strong attacks on the appointment of Chaudhri Zafrulla Khan as a Member of the Viceroy's Executive Council.[45]
(d) Criticism of the action recently taken by the local Government under the Press Act against the "Zamindar" and "Ahsan" newspapers.[46]
(e) Electioneering speeches in favour of Mr. Gauba, who is candidate for the Assembly elections against Khan Bahadur Haji Rahim Bukhsh, who is supported by the Muslim Conference and League.[47]

Garbett's report showed that close to ten thousands persons had attended the conference, about half of whom were from the vicinity. This would indicate that significant opposition to the Aḥmadīs had remained constant in Gūrdāspūr District over the years. But of greater interest to Garbett was the presence of 300 mawlawīs including many from as far

away as Dē'ōband and the North West Frontier. "Their presence in such numbers," he wrote,

> can only be explained by the appeal which the campaign against the Ahmadis has made to religious preachers; and there is no doubt that many orthodox Muslims, who are ordinarily opposed to the Ahrars, are in sympathy with this side of their activities. It is here that the danger lies. With the present state of feelings, the movement might grow in strength and become a real menace....[48]

The report also indicated the resentment expressed by the Aḥmadīs because of the Government order against their issue of a summons to their followers to come to Qādiyān. The unique position which the Aḥmadīs had created for themselves at Qādiyān was one source of the trouble, Garbett indicated, "out of which the Ahrars make considerable capital."[49] When the Aḥrār had attempted to establish an office in Qādiyān in 1933, the Aḥmadīs claiming the building in question was theirs, tore it down and built latrines on the site. Additionally, the Government had often received complaints from non-Aḥmadī residents of Qādiyān that they had been harrassed by Aḥmadīs. This, Garbett suggested, might have been the reason that the Aḥrār had so many sympathizers in the immediate area of Qādiyān now. Of key significance was the closing statement of Garbett's sixth paragraph which read:

> On the other hand, apart from the part which the Ahmadis took in the Kashmir agitation, the head of the community and his followers have always been strong supporters of Government and in civil disobedience and other subversive movements have come out openly on the side of law and order.[50]

Ending his report with some vague and uncertain predictions about a future in which he hoped the two groups would not clash, Garbett indicated that the Government would probably have to move against either side if another such Tabligh was suggested. The Aḥmadīs, he pointed out, were just as likely to create a situation as the Aḥrār. Only a few weeks before in the Shāhpūr district such an event had occurred, when Aḥmadī missionaries had to be stopped for trying "to prove in a public meeting that Guru Nanak was a Muslim."[51]

After some two weeks of correspondence between Lāhōr and Dehlī, with note taken of the events at Qādiyān by the India Office in London, Garbett wrote again to Hallett on November 12, this time enclosing copies of the resolutions which the Aḥrār had passed at their Tabligh conference in October, particularly those against Ẓafar Ullāh Khān. While there is no direct evidence as to why these resolutions were requested, there are informal notations in the files that Hallett had met with Ẓafar Ullāh on November 11, and had had a report directly from him about the incidents at Qādiyān.[52]

The resolutions against Ẓafar Ullāh were hardly calculated to please the Aḥmadīs:

> This representative gathering of the Ahrar Tabligh Conference, Qadian, views with grief, hatred and contempt the appointment of Chaudhri Zafar Ullah to the Viceroy's Executive Council; this appointment has been made in face of continuous protests raised by 8 crores of Indian Muhammadans to the effect that the Chaudhri being an Ahmadi himself regards all non-Ahmadis as infidels.

> In the opinion of this Conference the Government has, by spurning the unanimous protests raised by Muhammadans during the last two months, proved that it treats with indifference their religious feelings and forces them to declare that Government is not only promoting the Ahmadiya cause for political purposes, but also wishes to make the Ahmadiya faith the official religion of all Muhammadans.[53]

The resolution continued with a sharp indictment of the Government by declaring there would be a continual protest made until the decision concerning Ẓafar Ullāh was "cancelled" and a change in "pro-Qādīan" policy was made. The blame for this policy was firmly placed on Sir Faẓl-i-Ḥusayn who indeed had been influential in getting the Viceroy to appoint Ẓafar Ullāh to succeed him.[54]

The latter sections of the resolutions turned directly to the Aḥmadīyah movement itself urging that there be "organised efforts...to stamp out the Ahmadia faith" and that Muslims should "work with all energy and perseverance (sic) for the eradication of the mischief which has been brought about by the Ahmadis...."[55] To achieve this purpose the conference called on "all Muslims who cherish an ardent love for Islam" to strengthen their mission by helping to enlist new members and funds in order to help carry out the pledges made in the above resolutions.

Theological resolutions followed. Their tone and tenour were clearly reminiscent of similar resolutions which the Aḥrār brought against the Aḥmadīs twenty years later even as those levelled against Sir Ẓafar Ullāh had been.

> As Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of Qadian has clearly declared that those who do not recognise him as a Prophet are excluded from Islam and (as) the Ulema of the whole world consider the Mirza of Qadian to be an apostate and to be excluded from Islam because of his claim to prophethood and for his blasphemous beliefs and (as) his followers are excluded from Islam because they consider him to be a prophet and the Promised Messiah, this Conference demands that in its census report the Government should recognise all Ahmadis as non-Muslims.[56]

This resolution attacked the Aḥmadīs as they had not been attacked since the fatwās of the 1890's and specifically since the attacks by Muḥammad Ḥusayn Batālwī and the newspaper Mullah Ja'far Zatallī in 1898. All had been far from peaceful during the intervening years but the "enemy" had most often been the Āryā Samāj and the Christian missionaries. As a defender of Islām, Ghulām Aḥmad and his two successors had not directed their attacks against other Muslims but rather, because of the interpretation placed upon Aḥmad's teachings, had brought attacks upon themselves. The bitterest always seemed to come from Muslims who felt the most threatened. Now that expressions of nationalist feeling not involved in the 1890's crises were part of the picture and the Aḥmadīs appeared to the outside world in an increasingly sectarian perspective, the emergence of a new right-wing such as the Majlis-i-Aḥrār-i-Islām was prepared to polarize the situation in a new way.

Not content to attack only the Aḥmadīs and the Government for its clearly undocumented "favouritism" to Aḥmadīs, the

October Conference of the Aḥrār also attacked the Muslim League, the Muslim Conference and "all Muslim associations" which have allowed Qadiānis to become members and office-bearers of their bodies, thus helping to promote the Ahmadiya cause in the name of Islam." The resolutions continued by declaring a lack of confidence in any Muslim organization which did not specifically exclude Aḥmadīs from its membership. Similarly they urged all Indian Muslims never to elect to any government post any "Mirzai or pro-Mirzai."[57]

Aḥmadīs all over India were quick to respond to the situation. The Government of India had recorded some 22 resolutions of protest by separate Aḥmadī chapters by January 1, 1935. On November 8, 1934, the khalīfah-al-Masīh II, Maḥmūd Aḥmad, wrote a letter of protest to the Government in response to their order of October 17 interfering with his build up of Aḥmadīs in Qādiyān during the Aḥrār meetings and also in response to a letter of October 24 from the Deputy Commissioner at Gūrdāspūr which had explained why the Government felt this action was necessary.

> I am thankful to the Government for taking the trouble of showing sympathy for the wounded feelings of the Ahmadiyya Community. But I must respectfully beg to say that some of the important incident (sic) mentioned in the letter, on the basis of which the Government has sought to justify its action as an emergency step which it was constrained to take, are absolutely wrong and unfounded so much that their being so can be definitely proved by means of the testimony of reliable witnesses as well as from the records of the incidents in possession of the Government itself.[58]

Claiming that the letter issuing the orders to Aḥmadīs to come to Qādiyān was not his responsibility but rather that of another Aḥmadī official working under the "Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya," "authorised...in matters of this kind, any course he deems fit, without as much as mentioning the matter to me or to the Anjuman...", Maḥmūd Aḥmad attacked the Government for using a civil disobedience ordinance, clearly unwarranted, against him. The logical outcome of such a policy, he went on to argue, would be to drag him into court every time some Aḥmadī committed an offense, no matter where or when.

A reasonable historical evaluation of the situation cannot justify Maḥmūd Aḥmad's protest on these grounds. He, himself, within a year after his succession to the leadership, and as a result of the controversy with Muḥammad 'Alī, had taken power from the Ṣadr Anjumān and insisted that all major decisions of the community be approved by him.[59] Although the restructuring of the organization in the early 1920's[60] permitted more flexibility and a diversity of responsibility, it hardly seems likely that at a time when the community was under pressure as it was in 1934, that Maḥmūd Aḥmad would not have been consulted on an issue of such importance.

The Government of the Panjāb, seemingly unaware of this possible disparity, responded via its Deputy Commissioner in Gūrdāspūr on the question of carrying out the law. If the Government had known specifically who was responsible

for issuing the order in question, the commissioner wrote, they would have sent the summons to that person. Maḥmūd Aḥmad was also incorrect, according to this view, in assuming that the law only applied to subversives or those engaged in civil disobedience. The purpose of the law was to effect an action where one was necessary.[61]

In a seven page letter from Garbett at Lāhōr to Hallett at Dehlī, written January 21, 1935, the secretary to the Panjāb Government recapitulated the situation as it had developed since his letter of November 1. Garbett reported on a mass meeting of Aḥmadīs held at Qādiyān on November 12 in which Government was criticised for its actions against the Aḥmadīs and its failure to take action against the Aḥrār speakers. From Garbett's viewpoint, Maḥmūd Aḥmad was responsible for continuing the agitation by his sermons and by articles appearing in Qādiyānī newspapers espousing a plan to collect funds and organise devoted followers "who should be prepared to sacrifice their lives and everything they possessed...."[62] Referring then to the letter of explanation sent to Maḥmūd Aḥmad on December 1 which had said that had the Government known who was exactly responsible for the previous issuing of the orders, they would have summoned that person, Garbett went on to state that

> The Punjab Government, however, were unable to go further and accept a position, which is contrary to facts, that the Head of the community is concerned only with spiritual matters, and that secular affairs are carried out entirely by his Secretaries or other agents.[63]

It thus appears clear that the Government knew what it was doing but that it was not prepared to show the Aḥmadīs all the cards it was holding. Thus the letter to Maḥmūd Aḥmad had deliberately dealt only with the question of law. The letter seems to have satisfied the khalīfah enough so that in his sermon of December 21, he announced that he was satisfied with the assurances given by the Panjāb Government. According to Garbett, Maḥmūd Aḥmad had not given up criticising local officials "which is entirely without justification...."

In the meantime, another dimension of the Aḥrār-Aḥmadī conflict was emerging. The Panjāb Government, under Section 153-A, I.P.C. had sanctioned the prosecution of one ʿAṭā Ullāh Shāh Bukhārī for a speech he had delivered at the Tablīgh Conference over which he had presided. A trial had begun at Gūrdāspūr just before Christmas and, although no specific incidents had yet resulted, the trial itself was being used by the Aḥrārs to build support in Gūrdāspūr district. In Garbett's estimation there was no doubt of growing opposition to the Aḥmadīyah throughout the district with many Sunnī Muslims not ordinarily supporters of the Aḥrār joining forces with them. Evidence of this support was cited when on January 4, ʿAṭā Ullāh led Friday prayers in Gūrdāspūr which, because of wide publicity attracted some 25 to 30,000 persons, many of whom came from nearby towns and as far away as Amritsar. On this occasion, he was proclaimed by the crowd to be their "Amir-i-Shariat" and a pledge of faithfulness was made to him.

Garbett also reported that he expected the Aḥrār to call the Aḥmadīyah khalīfah as a defence witness and, "if the Court admits their application, the occasion may be the cause of local excitement."[64] Garbett's lack of sympathy for the Aḥmadīs was clearly evident from the remarks of his fifth section in which he said that the increased anti-Aḥmadī feeling was mainly due "to the foolish action of the Ahmadis themselves.

> The terms in which the Head of the Ahmadiya community and the Ahmadiya Press have referred to Government and its officers, have been the subject of much criticism, and the pretensions which have been put forward from time to time by the Head of the Community himself, have caused great resentment. Further, the Ahmadis have attempted to re-establish their prestige by various intrigues in Qadian itself.[65]

Of this latter point, Garbett reported that he felt the Aḥmadīs were doing all they could to prevent the intrusion of their opponents into Qādiyān. Apparently a few months before the October Aḥrār conference, the Aḥrār had gained influence with one Inayāt Ullāh, imām of the Sunnī Arainwālā Mosque in Qādiyān. In order to offset the pro-Aḥrār influence of Inayāt Ullāh, the Aḥmadīs had apparently imported another Sunnī imām from Kashmīr to staff the inactive Shaykhanwālā Mosque in the hope of drawing away the Sunnīs from the Arainwālā Mosque. The Aḥrār seem to have been fully aware of this plan, a fact which Garbett seems to have felt had led to even more heightened tensions.[66] Aḥmadī resentment towards the Government had also increased because of a continued police presence in Qādiyān. This had become necessary during the annual Aḥmadī

jalsah the week after Christmas, 1934, attendance at which had been lower than in recent years. The last day of the jalsah the Aḥrār had attracted a large crowd to Friday prayers at the Arainwālā Mosque. On this occasion the Aḥrār also distributed a large number "of objectionable pamphlets" before the police could stop them.[67]

Yet another complication arose when a Sikh dīwān was also held at Qādiyān January 5-7, 1935 which was attended by some 7,000 Sikhs. At this meeting anti-Aḥmadī speeches were made and a challenge was sent to the Aḥmadīs calling for a debate to prove the point as to whether or not Gurū Nānak was a Muslim. The debate never took place. Garbett's reference to the situation again reflected his own bias: "This absurd claim by the Ahmadis is naturally resented by the Sikhs."[68]

That there was great tension in the air throughout the Qādiyān vicinity and a potential danger at Gūrdāspūr because of the trial of ʿAṭā Ullāh Shāh Bukhārī was clear to Garbett. That the Aḥmadīs were persistent in following a course which could only lead to further alienation by not stopping their younger members from acting in an aggressive manner had already led to a threat on the life of Maḥmūd Aḥmad and letters of threat on both sides.

In closing his report of January 21, 1935, Garbett pointed out again that most Muslims still believed that the Government was favouring the Aḥmadīs and that with the exception

of the order issued on October 17 preventing an influx of Aḥmadī supporters to Qādiyān, the Muslim public believed that the Government had worked primarily against the Aḥrār. Insisting that the Government would have to maintain carefully an even balance in the situation, Garbett foresaw that it was the Aḥmadīs whose future conduct might compel new intervention.[69] A subsequent confidential document reporting on the situation in the Panjāb for the first half of January, 1935 tended to accent what Garbett was reporting. In addition to citing the recent Gūrdāspūr incident and the Sikh diwan at Qādiyān, the report also reported an interview between K. S. Farzand ʿAlī, the "Home Secretary" of the Ṣadr Anjumān-i-Aḥmadīyah and the Superintendent of Police on January 3. According to it, ʿAlī informed the Superintendent "that unless the official attitude changed, the Jamiat would release their younger members from the obligation laid on them by the Jamiat to act in conformity with the law."[70] If such an indictment were not enough already, the document went even further:

> This threat was confirmed by the head of the Community on the following day when he said... that at present he wished his followers to abide by the law, but the time would come when he would have to remove this restraint.

Continuing his comments, the author of the report concluded by saying:

> The position in fact is distinctly critical and it will be no easy matter for the local authorities, who have been adequately reinforced (sic), to prevent disorders.[71]

The reading of such official reports helps to place the situation in a perspective and does not show the Aḥmadīs in a very positive light. If there was any question about where the Government of India stood on the dispute as of January 25, 1935 such a question can be clarified by the handwritten note at the bottom of the covering memorandum which came with the above report. In this, Hallett noted, "The situation is certainly dangerous but there is nothing to be done except to wait and see. The Punjab Govt. are taking all necessary precautions."[72]

At Dehlī, the situation was further complicated by another memorandum indicating that the Viceroy, while generally aware of the Aḥrār-Aḥmadī controversy and the Government's role in it, had not yet been shown the detailed letters and reports. "I think it may be assumed," the official wrote,

> that H. E. the Governor is in close touch with Chaudhri Zafrulla Khan, who professes the Ahmadiyya faith.

Indicating that Ẓafar Ullāh may have been a go-between for the Government with the Aḥmadīs, the secretary continued his comments saying

> but unfortunately these do not seem to have had much effect though from what I know of Chaudhri Zafrulla Khan and from a conversation I had with him shortly after his return from England, I think it is safe to assume that he would do his best to compose differences between the Ahmadiyas and the Government.

That the Government was eager for any lead on the situation was reflected in the subsequent paragraph of the report:

> 2. It may interest His Excellency to know that a Muslim from the Punjab who visited me today (but who particularly desired that I should not mention his name) informed me that he had good authority for believing that the Congress, who are anxious to secure some Muslim supporters in the Punjab, have approached the Ahmadiyyas with a view to forming some sort of an alliance with them in the working of the new constitution. This is a most extraordinary story, which I feel considerable hesitation in accepting as true, but the mere fact that it has been put forward as a possible theory is significant.[73]

While Ẓafar Ullāh Khān does not appear in any further Government reports concerned with the Aḥrār controversy nor does the rumour that the Congress was seeking an alliance with the Aḥmadīs appear to have been substantiated by any further information, the three month controversy with the Aḥrār had brought the two religious factions to the complete attention of both Lāhōr and Dehlī with both governments eager to convey whatever facts or information either was amassing to the other. Similarly on January 29, an airmail memorandum was sent to Mr. R. T. Peel, secretary in the India Office, informing him of the situation as it was then evaluated.[74]

On January 27, 1935, Aḥmadī F. M. Sial sent a sixteen page letter to the Government of the Panjāb attacking recent Government letters and reports on almost every point, particularly on the issue of showing partiality to the opponents of Aḥmadīyah. Listing some eleven points which threatened, the writer reported, to shake the confidence of the Aḥmadīyah community in the Government, Sial detailed the incident in November when a "Pathan boy" attempted to assassinate the

khalīfah with a daggar and objected to the failure of the Government to prosecute the case properly; he chided the Government for failure to investigate the threatening letters sent to the khalīfah; he attacked a fabricated letter published in the Zamīndār of December 8, foretelling that its publisher would be murdered as an insidious plot to arouse the Aḥrār against the Aḥmadīs; he criticised Government for failing to suppress "inflamatory literature" circulated in Qādiyān during the jalsah and for failing to prevent a large influx of non-Aḥmadīs into Qādiyān, the holy center of the Aḥmadīs, during their own gatherings.[75]

During the last two weeks of January, Alan Mitchell, Commissioner of the Lāhōr Division, travelled extensively through Gūrdāspūr and Amritsar districts for the purpose of seeing the situation at first hand. His report to C. C. Garbett at Lāhōr dated January 27 included a seven page summary of his interview with Farzand ʿAlī and two other Aḥmadīs at Batāla on January 21. Farzand ʿAlī, who had already come to the attention of the Government because of his aggressive statements to the Superintendent of Police earlier in the month, came to verbal blows with Mitchell as well in a defensive response to Mitchell's suggestions that Aḥmadīs tone down their propaganda currently inflaming the Sikhs and the Aḥrārs.[76] After checking Farzand ʿAlī's denial that the Aḥmadīs had held another meeting in a Sikh village in which they had "caused trouble by saying that Guru Nanak was a Muslim and

ate beef," Mitchell wrote that "this statement made to me by Farzand ʿAli was a deliberate lie," and concluded the paragraph asserting, "After this it will be impossible to accept any statement made by Maulvī Farzand ʿAli."[77]

Also reporting on the Aḥmadīyah decision to put up candidates for public election, Mitchell's two assistants, the Messrs. Bassett and Shrinagesh (the Deputy Commissioner), who had shown him an abstract of the first public meeting of a political nature held by the Qādiyānis in which the Deputy Commissioner "has been called a bastard and other abusive terms," Mitchell indicated his support for a government proposal to ban all future public meetings at Qādiyān. "It is difficult," he concluded,

> to see what the Ahmadis are driving at by this new move. It almost looks like a case of "quem deus vult perdere prius dementat." Bassett says that the only explanation he can see is that the Ahmadis are getting desperate and want to goad the Ahrars into attacking them so that Government will have to defend the Ahmadis and so make the matter a war between the Ahrars and Government instead of between the Ahrars and Ahmadis.[78]

That Deputy Commissioner Shrinagesh wanted the Government to move against all parties concerned was evident from his eleven point report to Commissioner Mitchell, dated January 27.[79] He proposed the issuing of an order under Section 144, C.P.C. which would prevent further public meetings in Qādiyān and prevent further dissemination of "objectionable pamphlets". The directive approving the Shrinagesh proposal was sent by C. C. Garbett to Alan Mitchell as Commissioner of the

Lāhōr division on January 29 along with a detailed report entitled "Confidential Diary of the Deputy Superintendent of Police" dated January 23 which reported in detail what had been happening at Qādiyān.[80]

IV

While the actions of both the Aḥmadīs and Aḥrārs in their public gatherings had been the consistent concern of the Government, the content of the pamphlets that each group had been circulating about the other had also been an issue of concern. By the end of January, 1935, the Government of the Panjāb had decided to prevent the further circulation of certain tracts. As early as January 4, 1934, some ten months before the Aḥrār controversy reached its first climax, action had been taken against certain Aḥmadīs for the publication of the tract, "Ulema-i-Su-ke-karname", or "The Deeds of the Wicked 'Ulamā'." It had been written by one 'Abd al-Karīm Naqīd, secretary of the Pathānkōt Aḥmadīyah in Gurdāspūr district and was prosecuted under Section 295-A of the Indian Penal Code, "as it tends to insult the religious beliefs of the Sunni Mohammadans."[81] The pamphlet, obviously a refutation to another aimed at Ghulām Aḥmad challenged the Sunnī 'Ulamā' to prove from the Holy Qur'ān numerous quotations attributed to Abū Ḥanīfa,

otherwise they should not complain of the words

> of Hazrat Mirza Sahib, "O evil tribe of Maulvis how long shall you hide truth," etc. Here the quotations are given from the original books only, so that the readers may not feel any difficulty and finding out the reference....

Quoting from the fatwā of Muḥammadī Sharah Dē'ōbandī, Naqīd reproduced such passages as:

> (2) The semen of Hazrat ʿAli used to come out often on account of lustful thoughts (ibid., p. 23).

Or, a passage from the Baḥrār al-Sharīʿat of Mawlawī Amjād ʿAlī printed by the Ahl-i-Sunnat at Bareilly such as:

> (4) If a man observes fast and looks lustfully towards (his) wife, kisses her...even then his fast does not break (p. 112).

Or, from Hidayah's Kitāb-ul-Ḥajj, pages 97, 110, 200, the statement:

> (21) The sale of liquor and swine is lawful (sic).

The Government report on this tract cited some 35 offensive passages which if accurately quoted represent on the one hand, Aḥmadī antagonism to Sunnī Muslims demonstrated in the form of "scholarly research" and, on the other, some indication of the distance some ʿulamā' had moved from the original spirit of Islām while in the Indian context. The gist of the argument and further grounds for prosecution, from the Government point of view was evident from the last passage of the tract:

> Worthy readers! These are the deeds of the wicked Ulema on account of which the words of the Prophet, peace of God be upon him, "Their Ulema are the worst of all things under the expanse of heaven," are applicable to them, and on account of which they are the enemies of Islam and the Quran. And when the time is clamouring

> for the need of a reformer they insist there is no need of any, and that they can reform themselves. You are requested to place this tract before these Ulema and ask them whether they will reform you with this teaching. If you get a sound reply you should inform us and we shall criticise it in the second issue.[82]

The prosecution of those responsible for this pamphlet was not an isolated event in the Panjāb, January, 1934. The provincial government was busy employing the same censorship laws to keep the peace in other quarters thus preventing Sikhs from attacking the Mahārājā of Patiāla, the Hindustan Communist party for lauding the Soviet revolution, the Aḥrār for publishing a poster inciting Muslims in Jind State, and numerous other Muslim tracts for attacking each other's theological teachings with the kind of explicit sexual language cited above in "The Wicked 'Ulamā'" pamphlet.

In early December, 1934, the Government declared forfeit all copies of a poster issued by one Sayyid Imdād Ullāh, "Founder and Manager of the Ahl-i-Sunnah School" near Jandiyalah, Jullundār and entitled "Qadian main panjtan pak." This poster was an attack on passages in the Barāhīn-i-Aḥmadīyah, Volume 4, page 463, in which Ghulām Aḥmad spoke of a revelation he had had of the five holy persons: the Prophet, 'Alī, Ḥasan, Ḥusayn and Fatima who had come to Qādiyān. Of this, Ghulām Aḥmad had written in 1884,

> One of them, it was Fatima Zuhra, I remember, who placed the head of this humble person...on her thigh with great love and affection like a kind mother. After this I was given a book

> which was stated to be a commentary on the Quran composed by ʿAli which now he wished to be given to me.

In response Imdād Ullāh wrote (some fifty years later),

> Readers, you might have judged that even a mean Mussalman cannot utter such words from his mouth. The accursed Qadiani has brought such an imputation against Hazrat Fatima, who is superior to all women in the world in chastity and piety, that the Mirzai party cannot remove the blot till Doomsday....The Mirza has left no stone unturned in bringing disgrace to the Prophet, Hazrat Ali, Hasan and Husain.[83]

On December 13, 1934 and January 19, 1935 two poetic anti-Aḥmadī pamphlets published at Lāhōr were suppressed. The first of these, "Khachwan Nabi" not only attacked Ghulām Aḥmad, but implied a connection between his revelation experiences and the British Government.

> Those who have lighted a lamp when the sun is (shining) overhead have shown that they have gone bankrupt of wisdom.
>
> By the lamp I mean Mirza (Ghulam Ahmad) of Qadian and the lighters are his satanic followers. The sign of the anti-Christ in him is that his Lahore eye sees but his Qadian eye is blind.
>
> The word kufr is frequently exchanged between them. Muhammad Ali calls Mahmud a kafir and the latter calls the former similarly....
>
> Even Satan ran away a hundred miles from Mirza. If he wanted to know anything (the angel) Tichi told him.
>
> God knows what kind of a creature Tichi was? Whether he came from London or from Simla? He silently came to Mirza Sahib and taught him a new lesson every day....
>
> Rahi has written this poem only in the hope that perhaps any Mirzai hearing it may come to the straight path.[84]

The second tract, "Hansi ka Gol Goppa Qadianwala" was no more flattering or conducive to good inter-Muslim relations.

> ...O great fraud! Seeing this falsehood of yours we have to take you to task....
>
> All say, "Cursed be to you, O Qadian!" where any person eulogises you....
>
> No body can be so pious as you, (how then) did you meet sudden death in a latrine. (?)

A sub-section within this tract struck out more broadly in specifically attacking the "Reality of the Khalifa-tul-Masih."

> Go on flying the kite of prophethood,
> Go on spinning the top of khalafat,
> Go on humiliating the Muslims
> Go on enhancing the honour of Christians.
> Have securities demanded from those who do not believe in the prophethood of your father.
> Go on ensnaring youths by tempting them sometimes with women and sometimes with money.
> May one be sacrificed for the delicacy of your wives?
> Go on making the fashions of Paris.
> Your order will be binding on the enemy.
> Go on swinging the gong of Willingdon.[85]
> Go on preventing us from fighting.
> Go on teaching lathi-play yourself.
> Go to villages and make the villagers listen to your non-sensical talk.[86]

The tract referred to in the correspondence sent from Garbett at Lāhōr to Hallett at Dehlī on February 4, "Kia Mirza-i-Qadiani- aurat thi ya Mard," which had been published at Lāhōr by the imām of the Masjid Tajpūra, had been proscribed a week earlier. The gist of this particularly offensive pamphlet was to prove, by quoting passages from Ghulām Aḥmad's own writings that he was a woman.[87] That the campaign against the Aḥmadīs by Muslims not explicitly Aḥrār was increasing

was evident by the censorship of two more anti-Aḥmadī tracts during February while at the same time a new Aḥmadī tract written to prove again that Gurū Nānak was a Muslim, "Gur Bachon," was also proscribed.[88] Some of the more objectionable passages read:

> Be the disciple of Nanak and recite the Kalima, O Singh, for Kalima alone will help you when nobody else will be with you....
> Baba Nanak has said, "The Kalima is true and its reciters will not burn as infidels." Be careful, do not fly from it. It will cover all your defects.
> Baba recited it and embarked on the ship. He did not rot in hell and has entered paradise. The Kalima has elevated him.

During April, 1935, two other anti-Aḥmadī pamphlets were suppressed. Both of these focused on the issue of Aḥmad's claim to prophethood and typically went well beyond the bounds the Government could allow during this period of religious tension. Their titles alone give a good indication of their thrust: "Khatm-i-Nabuwat aur Takabbur-i-Qadiani" and "Munshi Ghulam Ahmad Qadiani ki Nabuwwat ka Butlan."[89]

The significance of these pamphlet polemics would seem to lie in the fact that they point to the widespread level of controversy in which the Aḥmadīyah were engaged with fellow Muslims in the years 1934-1936. Although the controversy with the Aḥrār became the focal point for the Government in dealing with Aḥmadīyah during this period, the attacks came from a broad section of the Muslim community, while Aḥmadīyah polemics were directed both against what they believed to be distortions of Sunnī Islām and against the Sikh community.

V

While a general evaluation of the activities of both Aḥrār and Aḥmadīyah during the years under consideration shows the Aḥrār usually on the offensive and the Aḥmadīyah on the defensive, there were occasions when Aḥmadī action won a clear victory because of concerted action taken. This was the case in the proposition of Mr. K. L. Gauba, the representative of the Aḥrār, who had attempted to put before the Panjāb Legislative Assembly and the Council of State the question of whether they were "aware that the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement has called the Mussalmans dhurriyya-tul-baghayam which expression translates as 'children of prostitutes'." Submitted in February, 1935, an answer was at once forthcoming from Aḥmadī Ṣūfī ʿAbd al-Qādir, President of the National League at Qādiyān in a pamphlet, "Did the Promised Messiah Abuse His Opponents?" which was republished in the Review of Religions, March, 1935.[90] In this, ʿAbd al-Qādir repudiated Gauba's interpretation of the phrase "dhurriyya-tul-baghiyya" as meaning "children of prostitutes" as having taken Ghulām Aḥmad's use of it in his 1893 work, at-Tablīgh, out of context. Since the word "dhurriyya" may also mean "followers" and "baghiyya" may mean "the advance guard of an army" it is clear that Aḥmad intended the expression to mean "either...'followers of the vanguard of the party which was out to crush the Ahmadiyya Movement' or as 'low

and ill-mannered people like the children of bondwomen'." He then cited passages from many scriptures which might well be interpreted as vituperative, and numerous passages from the joint fatwā of 1890 against Ghulām Aḥmad as examples of the way such terms were often used. Identifying what Mr. Gauba was doing with the Aḥrār leaflet campaign at Qādiyān, ʿAbd al-Qādir appealed to the Assemblymen, no matter what their religion, to reject the assumptions raised by Mr. Gauba's question. In this effort the Aḥmadīs were successful. The question was not allowed on the floor.[91]

The controversy between the Aḥmadīyah and Sir Muḥammad Iqbāl which broke out openly again during 1934 and 1935 needs some consideration in the perspective of the other events we have been considering. Aḥmadī sources suggest that Iqbāl's motives in attacking their group were primarily "political" but personal motives are not excluded from their appraisal. Muḥammad Iqbāl's father, Shaykh Nūr Muḥammad, who had died in 1929 and who came from Siālkōṭ, entered the bayʿah of Ghulām Aḥmad in 1891. In their youth, Muḥammad Iqbāl and his brother ʿAṭā Muḥammad considered themselves members of the Aḥmadīyah community and spoke of their faith in Aḥmad as masīḥ mawʿūd.[92]

According to one Aḥmadī historian, Iqbāl was impressed by Aḥmad's famous visit to Siālkōṭ in 1904 and the large number of people attracted to him on that occasion. Two years later, when Aḥmad was attacked by a mawlawī from Ludhiāna, while

Iqbāl was a student at the Scotch Presbyterian Mission School at Siālkōṭ, Iqbāl wrote a poem in defense of Aḥmad in which he referred to him as aftāb sidq (sun of truth). Although Iqbāl's father apparently withdrew from an active role in the movement in his later years, his brother, ʿAṭā Muḥammad, was a faithful Aḥmadī most of his life. Iqbāl may have made bayʿah with Aḥmad as early as 1897 and, according to one Aḥmadī historian, he wrote several articles proclaiming Ghulām Aḥmad "as the greatest religious thinker among modern Indian Muslims."[93] In 1910, Iqbāl spoke at ʿAligaṛh saying that in the Panjāb the truest example of the Islamic character had recently appeared in the Qādiyānī movement. He apparently remained active in the movement until 1913 when he probably left because of the tensions rending the movement.

Iqbāl's first overt criticism of the Aḥmadīyah movement appears to have come in his statement of resignation from the All-India Kashmīr Committee. One Aḥmadī has suggested that when Iqbāl served on the Kashmīr Committee he had already retired from public life. His law career had not been a great success. He now sought to maintain his prestige as a poet for the Indian Muslim community. When there was dissension in the Kashmīr Committee during 1930, Iqbāl felt that his integrity was being questioned by Aḥmadīs on the Committee and when the khalīfa al-masīh took over its leadership, Iqbāl felt even more threatened by the growing role of this small movement continually under attack by Sunnī Muslims.[94]

All of these forces as well as other economic, political and social factors may have contributed to Iqbāl's decision to write the article "Qadianis and Orthodox Muslims" which appeared in the Statesman during 1934. This article was addressed to the British people as a way of presenting the "social and political implications of the (Indian Muslim) issue."[95] Stressing the importance of the integrity of the Muslim community on a religious but not a racial basis, Iqbāl argued,

> Any religious society historically arising from the bosom of Islam, which claims a new prophethood for its basis, and declares all Muslims who do not recognize the truth of its alleged revelations as Kafirs, must, therefore, be regarded by every Muslim as a serious danger to the solidarity of Islam. This must necessarily be so; since the integrity of Muslim society is secured by the idea of the Finality of Prophethood alone.[96]

Arguing that the finality of prophethood "is perhaps the most original idea in the cultural history of mankind," Iqbāl likened "Ahmadism to Bahā'ism" depicting both, by contrast, as "two forms which the modern revival of pre-Islamic Magianism has assumed." Bahā'ī he saw as the more honest of the two as it chose to depart from Islām, while Aḥmadīyah "apparently retains some of the more important externals of Islam with an inwardness wholly inimical to the spirit and aspirations of Islam."[97] Relating the theological dissention of Aḥmadīs to the political division of Panjābī Muslims in general, Iqbāl concluded his article by suggesting that

the Government policy of non-interference with religious groups was somehow inevitable, while he asserted also that it would be perfectly consistent with the policy of Aḥmadīyah itself if the Government would "declare the Qadianis a separate community." Under these conditions, Indian Muslims could tolerate them as they do any other religious community.[98]

Perhaps the most bitter attack against Aḥmadīyah by Iqbāl came in response to the questions and defense of Aḥmadīyah raised by Jawaharlāl Neḥrū in the Modern Review of Calcutta in 1934. Muslims had written Iqbāl, he began, by asking that he "further elucidate and justify the attitude of Indian Muslims towards the Ahmadis."[99] Suggesting that his previous statement had been embarrassing to both Neḥrū and the Qādiānīs who "both inwardly resent, for different reasons, the prospects of Muslim political and religious solidarity," he went on to criticise Neḥrū for assuming "that the only way to Indian nationalism lies in the total suppression of the cultural entities of the country through the interaction of which alone India can evolve a rich and enduring culture."[100] Aḥmadīs were, of course, threatened by a Muslim political awakening which "is sure to defeat their designs to carve out from the Ummat of the Arabian Prophet a new Ummat for the Indian Prophet." Reciting the theological arguments against the Aḥmadī position in even greater detail than he had previously, Iqbāl also used a psychological analysis of Aḥmad's revelations as further grounds for repudiating Aḥmadī claims.[101]

Iqbāl's attack against Neḥrū centered on the latter's failure to understand Islām in all its diversity. In his presentation of the modern religious situation in the Islamic world, Iqbāl pointed to Jamal ad-Dīn al-Afghanī as the most significant Muslim "of our time."[102]

Iqbāl's attack on Neḥrū and the Aḥmadīs stirred considerable interest both in the British press and in India. The Statesman, which had published the first article and a criticism of Iqbāl's position also, published his rebuttal to their objections on June 10, 1935. The same month, Review of Religions responded strongly to Muḥammad Iqbāl, whom they associated with a "certain class of mullahs, aided and abetted by a few third class politicians and notoriety-hunters, followed by an unthinking and unreasoning rabble...,"for his participation in the "highly mendacious and malicious propaganda" being carried on against the Aḥmadīs.[103] The only grounds on which the Aḥmadīs could understand Iqbāl making such an attack were political, Tracing his past association with the movement, which he claimed was only an association with persons in the movement, the author wrote that such an argument might

> be regarded to possess some weight and substance, if as late as 1931 he had not offerred to the present Head of the Ahmadiyya Community...the virtual dictatorship of the All-India Kashmir Committee and had not consented to give him his unstinted support and cooperation.[104]

Such was the attitude of Review of Religions--clearly contra-

dictory to Iqbāl's own statements on resigning from the Committee in 1930. A further motive, the Aḥmadīs suspected, was jealousy of the leadership role played by Ẓafar Ullāh Khān at the Second Round Table Conference. Citing support from the Siyaset of Lāhōr, May 14, 1935, for its stand against the attacks of Iqbāl, the Review quoted passages admonishing Iqbāl for confusing religious and political questions. Here, the Siyaset put its finger on the issue which Iqbāl had raised previously about Aḥmadīs being declared non-Muslims, an issue which would rear its head again in the Aḥrār controversy of the 1950's.

> We mean only that it would be better to sublimate the dispute right out of the political field altogether: for to continue its present confusion with politics is to justify whatever fault he (Dr. Iqbal) seeks to find in his Government's attitude towards it. He does not make it perfectly clear, whether, when or where, he can tolerate official cognizance of any one community's religious differences. There has been some Muhammadan agitation, for instance, against the appointment of Qadianis to high offices under the Crown. The Government (with some "orthodox" Moslem support) regards them only as Moslems or Indians of proved ability in politics, administration and the law. It turns a neutrally blind eye to the question whether they are to be judged orthodox or heterodox. Does Sir Muhammad want the Government to take note of this question? And if doctrinal issues...are to impinge upon and influence each other to such an extent, where is the process to end.[105]

Attacking Iqbāl's contention that Aḥmadīyah advocated belief in a new prophet, the author of the article quoted passages from the writings of Aḥmad refuting such an idea as well as the claim of Iqbāl that Aḥmadīsm was like the

Magian idea of a continuing prophecy. He argued further that the Aḥmadīyah conception of the Messiah was totally different from that of the Jews and other non-Muslims. Where in Islām does it say that there is no place for a reformer?

> ...If Dr. Iqbal pleases himself by calling the founder of the Ahmadiyah movement, a religious adventurer, he must not forget that all Divine Teachers and Messengers have always been regarded and persecuted as "religious adventurers" in their time by their opponents.[106]

The logical outcome of Iqbāl's demands would be a reversal of the British non-intervention policy which would, in the past, have suppressed Ram Mohan Roy's campaign against satī and the anti-caste movement of the Āryā Samāj. Agreeing with the statement of Sir Herbert Emerson in his address to the Anjumān-i-Himāyat-i-Islām, of granting any person or group the inalienable right to criticise the religious views of others, the Review also agreed with his point that this was quite a different matter from "carrying on a virulent campaign of highly malicious...propaganda...(which) is exactly what the Ahrar leaders and a part of the vernacular Muslim press in the Punjab are doing."[107] Although this particular article seems to have terminated the Aḥmadīyah response to Iqbāl's challenge, it was not the end of Iqbāl's repudiation of the Aḥmadīs. When asked, in October, 1935 to chair a new organization, the Taḥrik-i-Kashmīr, he declined on the grounds Qādiyānīs would again be involved since the original All-India Kashmīr Committee was now defunct.[108]

The issues which the controversy between Muḥammad Iqbāl

and the Aḥmadīyah had brought to the fore were but symptoms of the greater problem the Aḥmadīyah still faced. Iqbāl challenged on his own, using his prestige among Muslims. The Aḥrār, far from finished, operated more effectively because they were a voluntary association, whether right or wrong, of religiously and politically committed Muslims, seeking in their militant, aggressive way to bring solidarity to the Indian Muslim community, while choosing the Aḥmadīyah as their scapegoat. The Aḥmadīyah could not meet the challenge posed by the Aḥrār in head-on confrontation, because this had been made almost impossible by the late-January, 1935 decision of the Panjāb Government to forbid public gatherings in Qādiyān and its decision to prosecute those who published inflammatory material. Instead, the Aḥmadīs would have to turn to their most eloquent spokesman, Farzand ʿAlī, already in bad repute with the Government as a frequent complainant to those at higher levels of Government.

VI

The final stage of the Aḥmadī-Aḥrār controversy of 1934-1936 essentially involved three kinds of activities: the correspondence between Farzand ʿAlī and the Governments of the Panjāb and India concerning Aḥmadī grievances; the events surrounding the prosecution of ʿAṭā Ullāh Shāh Bukhārī of the Aḥrar, the remarks made by Gūrdāspūr Sessions Judge

G. D. Khelsa on that occasion, and the appeal which followed; and the strong position taken by Bashīr-ud-Dīn Maḥmūd Aḥmad, khalīfah of Qādiyānī Aḥmadīs on the issue of kufr.

The question of kufr of non-Aḥmadīs was given its final definition by Maḥmūd Aḥmad in his khutbah delivered in Urdū on April 26, 1935 at Qādiyān.[109] Objecting to the manner in which certain Muslims had lately been disturbing the peace, Aḥmad pointed directly to the Aḥrār whose "activities are obviously detrimental to the best interests of the Muslim Community...." The attack on Aḥmadīs demanding that they be excluded from the Muslim Community was being promoted by such zealots as Ẓafar ʿAlī of the Zamīndār and Aḥrār leader Sayyīd ʿAṭā Ullāh, who claimed to speak for the Muslims of India. Aḥmadīs, the khalīfah continued, had more right to be Muslims than the Aḥrār, for Aḥmadīs spoke out against the Nehrū Report while the Aḥrār supported it, a point Aḥmad had made in his 1930 book, The Indian Problem. Aḥmadīs assisted the Indian Muslim delegation to the Round Table Conference, while the Aḥrār were quiet, Aḥmad asserted in a very political statement.

> The Ahrars again have always supported joint electorates, and have vigorously worked in this behalf whereas a majority of Muslims are decidedly against the principle of joint electorates. The proposal of excluding a part of the Muslim Community, emanating from such a faction...is utterly baseless, is extremely ridiculous and injurious to Muslim interests.[110]

Maḥmūd Aḥmad's response to Aḥrār threats was obviously

an angry one. While it would be easy to assume from these remarks that he had aligned himself with the demands of the Muslim League, we must remember that in his 1930 statement, Maḥmūd Aḥmad had taken the same position: the interest of religious minorities in India must be protected in any constitutional arrangement. In this article, Maḥmūd Aḥmad was employing the same argument to disprove the Aḥrār arguments against Aḥmadīs. The argument that there were only 56,000 Aḥmadīs, according to the census, a figure which Aḥmad asserted was an underestimation, was not adequate grounds for expulsion. The claim that Aḥmadīs called other Muslims kafīrs, even if it were true, could not be used as a reason for expulsion for, according to the arguments of Aḥmadī opponents, the true Muslims (Aḥmadīs) would be excluded then from Islām. What sect of Muslims had not been styled kafīrs by others? By kafīr, Aḥmad asserted, Aḥmadīs did not mean what most Muslims usually mean by that term.

> According to our definition of Kufr the denial of a fundamental doctrine of Islam renders a person Kafir....We never go about calling a person Kafir. It is only when we are compelled in answer to the enquiry of a person to say what we think of him that we have to give expression to our belief...(and) we believe that there exists no such community whose every member is foredoomed to everlasting hell.[111]

Charging in the end that political motivation was seeking to remove such prominent Aḥmadīs as Ẓafar Ullāh from power, Aḥmad saw this as the root cause of the disturbances against the movement. The khalīfah, on this occasion, made his stand

on the issue of kufr and the future of Aḥmadīyah clear from both a theological and Muslim political viewpoint. Maḥmūd Aḥmad could no longer claim he was acting in a purely religious framework.

The letters from Farzand ʿAlī to Government raised a different set of issues. The first, dated July 22 and addressed to the Chief Secretary to the Panjāb Government, opened with a statement recalling the "good and friendly" relations of the Aḥmadīs and Government which had been praised so often that Aḥmadīs had been "dubbed by our common detractors as sycophants and flatterers and were sometimes even proclaimed as paid spies of the Government."[112] During the past two years, however, Farzand ʿAlī believed a change to have taken place with respect to the Government's attitude towards Aḥmadīs which began early in the regime of the present Governor when "it began to be whispered about that Government was no longer so well disposed towards the Ahmadiyya Community as it used to be in the past."[113] Beginning with October, 1933, a series of concocted reports and exaggerated complaints brought against Aḥmadīs by their opponents brought public officials to Qādiyān to investigate and accuse. "In sharp contrast to this," he continued,

> our genuine complaints are pronounced as frivolous or exaggerated, our words are disbelieved and Government evidently appears to consider us to be usurpers of other's rights and disturbers of public peace.[114]

Unable to gain satisfaction to their complaints from local

authorities, Farzand ʿAlī indicated his desire for a small deputation of Aḥmadīs to call on the Governor or some deputy to put forward two basic proposals:

> (a) that (i) the Deputy Commissioner (ii) Superintendent of Police and (iii) District and Sessions Judge, Gurdaspur (iv) the Resident Magistrate and (v) the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Batala, may be transferred from the Gurdaspur District and that Nos. (i) to (iii) be replaced by British officers with open minds and Nos. (iv) and (v) by men who may not be infected by anti-Ahmadiyya bias.
>
> (b) that an enquiry may be held by a High Court British Judge or some other high British officer holding an independent position into all happenings that have taken place in Qadian and outside during the last two years....[115]

As part of the second proposal, Farzand ʿAlī also asked for an enquiry into the allegations made against Aḥmadīyah by the Sessions Judge at Gūrdāspūr who had in his judgment of June 6 against ʿAṭā Ullāh, included numerous remarks against both Ahmadis and Government.[116]

The response of the new chief secretary to the Government mistakenly headed "CONFIDENTIAL" and dated from Lāhōr on July 30 asserted that Aḥmadī claims about a change in the attitude of Government towards them were without foundation and that the Panjāb Government was not now prepared to discuss the two points in question with any deputation.[117] Farzand ʿAlī's immediate response to this letter on August 3 indicated something of the tension Aḥmadīs were feeling over the rejection of their deputation. In his response, he asked the

reason why the letter had been marked "Confidential", if this implied the contents were not to be made public. Since the issues between the Aḥmadīs and Government were of such wide public interest and importance, Farzand ʿAlī hoped that the correspondence might later be made available to the public.[118] F. H. Puckle's return memorandum to Farzand ʿAlī on August 15 indicated that the use of the term "confidential" had been an error. "The Punjāb Government," he concluded, "have not the least objection to the publication of the correspondence provided that the letters are published in full."[119]

While at Simla on September 23, Farzand ʿAlī sent a sixteen page letter to the chief secretary which covered in some detail fifty points backing up his previously stated concern that the attitude of the Government towards Ahmadiyah had changed markedly in recent experience. As an example, Farzand ʿAlī cited in his third point the recent case in Siālkōṭ where local Aḥrārs threatened to disrupt the funeral and burial of an Aḥmadī lady. When two lawyers called on the local Superintendent of Police to request precautionary measures, the police chief replied that he would not take action to help "because of instructions from, and the present policy of the Government." This, he continued, would, if true, hardly indicate Government support of the Aḥmadīs as in the past.[120] Of course, what he did not realize or recognize was that the Government had not really been involved in attempting to maintain a balance between two forces in its

earlier indications of support for Aḥmadīyah, nor had it been faced with the kinds of pressures from the Aḥrār and Sunnī Muslims with which it was now faced.

Certainly the event at Siālkōṭ, just one of many that could be mentioned, the clear acts of discrimination against Aḥmadīs by local and District authorities in Gūrdāspūr and the actions of the Sessions Judge in the ʿAṭa Ullāh case were reason enough for the Panjāb Governor to see an Aḥmadī deputation. A primary target of Farzand's anger was the Deputy Commissioner, Mr. Shrinagesh, who, in his reports to Alan Mitchell, had most strongly recommended the actions of January, 1935 to prevent public gathering and dissemination of controversial tracts relating to Aḥmadīyah. Detailing one complaint after another, Farzand concluded his lengthy presentation with the statement,

> We do not urge that our mere assertions should be accepted as true. We are prepared to substantiate them before any officer of high and independent position whom Government may appoint for this purpose.[121]

When nearly six months had passed and the Aḥmadīyah had received no reply to this last letter, Farzand ʿAlī then wrote directly to the Viceroy and Governor General, sending copies of the previous correspondence and requesting permission of a deputation to call upon him or his deputy in order constitutionally to "ventilate...its grievances" on the issue of the five officials and the holding of the impartial investigation. Although three of the five officials in question

had already been transferred and the Gūrdāspūr judge's statements against the Aḥmadīs overturned by the decision at Lāhōr, the root cause of the difficulties was far from reconciled. A prompt response rejecting the request for a deputation to visit the Viceroy was forthcoming on the grounds that the Viceroy did not feel he could intervene in a matter which was the jurisdiction of the Panjāb Government.[122] Farzand ʿAlī was quick to reply again, April 1, to ask for a reconsideration. On this occasion he wrote,

> I am sure His Excellency does not wish to leave us with the impression that if a Provincial Government wrongs a class of His Majesty's subjects or denies justice to it, there is no door open for the redress of its grievances....
>
> It seems difficult to understand what steps a class of people who are firm believers in the use of the only constitutional means for the righting of their wrongs should adopt for that purpose if the supreme representative in India of His Majesty the King Emperor is pleased to express his inability to help them.[123]

To this strong and not apparently unreasonable plea, the answer of April 10 was the same.

Not persuaded that he should stop with this rebuff, Farzand ʿAlī next wrote to the Secretary of State for India in Whitehall, enclosing copies of all the previous correspondence back to July, 1935. The reply from London did not come directly to the Aḥmadīs but was channeled through Hallett at Simla and then back to Puckle at Lāhōr. This can only be judged a bureaucratic maneuver to avoid a confrontation with the Aḥmadī letter described as an "irregular memorial" to "be

returned to the sender through the local Government with an intimation that any representations of this kind...should be forwarded through proper channels."[124]

VII

While the Governments of the Panjāb and India may not have wished to deal with the Aḥmadīs directly for fear of appearing partial in the controversy between the Aḥmadīs and the Aḥrār, there is ample evidence from actions taken by the Panjāb Government in 1936 to offset much of the emotion expressed by the Aḥmadīyah movement through its spokesman, Farzand ʿAlī. The first of these supportive activities was the High Court Judgment rendered by Mr. Justice Coldstream on November 11, 1935 "on the petitions of the Punjab Government and of the Ahmadiyya community...for the expungement of certain remarks passed in the course of the judgment by Mr. G. D. Kholsa, the Sessions Judge of Gurdaspur" in the appeal of the case of Crown v. ʿAṭā Ullāh Shāh Bukhārī, leader of the Majlis-i-Aḥrār-i-Islām.[125] After a lengthy original trial, the Aḥrārī leader had been convicted and sentenced to six months for his offensive speech at the October, 1934 Tablīgh Conference. The problems came about during the appeal of this case before Mr. Justice Kholsa who reduced the sentence to one month but who, in making this decision, made disparaging remarks about both the Government and the Aḥmadīyah. Some 36 points of objection the the remarks of the Justice were submitted on September 10 at

Lāhōr one month after the Panjāb Government initiated its own petition to force a retraction of the statements Justice Kholsa had made against the Government. Under the Criminal Procedure Code of 1923, Section 561-A, Justice Coldstream argued that a High Court had the "power to expunge a portion of a judgment by an inferior court...."[126] Questioning whether the appeals judge had approached the case "from a perfectly fair point of view," Justice Coldstream described some of his language as "exaggerated" citing Justice Kholsa's description of Aḥmadīyah as "new fangled," a factor which had no bearing on the evidence of the case.

While not accepting every objection raised by the Aḥmadī petition, since he believed some of the statements in question to be clearly based on the evidence submitted, Justice Coldstream expunged the passage involving the term "new fangled" among others which the Justice cited in their entirety for criticism.

> There was naturally some opposition and the majority of Mohammadans resented the arrogation of religious supremacy by the Ahmadi Founder. Non-believers in the new-fangled religion vehemently repelled the accusation of kafar which was bestowed on them by the Mirza.

Equally objectionable was the passage in the appeals judgment which read,

> The Qadianis, however, remained heedless to these foreign criticisms and secure in the local safety of their hometown, flourished as well as they could in the circumstances. This comperative security of their position gave birth to pride amounting almost to arrogance on the part of the Qadianis.[127]

Perhaps the key point at which the Aḥmadīs could feel supported by the decision of Mr. Justice Coldstream was with regard to passage "N" referred to in the Aḥmadī petition as point "32". This regarded the relevancy of interpreting statements made by Ghulām Aḥmad in 1890 or 1900 as grounds for sharp critical attack in 1935. The original statement of the appeals judge had read:

> ...as regards the sentence it is only necessary to take into account the conditions obtaining at Qadian and the extreme resentment which the millions of Muhammadans of India experienced on being called unbelievers and swine by the Mirza and by their women being compared to bitches, and I am inclined to consider that the offense of the appellant is only a technical one.[128]

The Aḥmadī complaint against this statement had insisted that the references Aḥmad had made were only to his personal and religious enemies and not to all Muslims. Justice Coldstream agreed and saw the matter as more than a technical one.

> Whether this objection be well founded or not, it is obvious that what was said by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad in the last century can have no relevancy when the matter under consideration is the punishment to be imposed on a person who has been convicted now under Section 153-A of promoting feelings of enmity or hatred between Qadianis and other Mohammadans. I order that the passage from the words "and the extreme resentment" to the word "bitches" be expunged from the judgment.[129]

On at least four more occasions during 1936, the Government of the Panjāb moved against persons delivering anti-Aḥmadī speeches designed to bring more pressure to bear against the Aḥmadīyah movement at Qādiān, but more significant in the minds of the Government, designed to lead to greater communal

strife. On March 31, 1936, one Muḥammad Shokh, a resident of Batāla, was prosecuted for delivering two inflammatory speeches at Mela Mandī Bariār, Narowal Police Station in Siālkōt District, February 27 and 29. Typical of these speeches were phrases such as:

> After 1300 years Mirza Ghulam Ahmad sprouts up from Qadian with a claim to be a Prophet....The claim is sometime to be God, sometime the son of God and sometime God's spouse....If the Quran proves Ghulam Ahmad to be a "Kafir" I will also do so....[130]

Nor did Ghulām Aḥmad's wife go unattacked in clever Urdū verses:

> Ahmad Beg di dukhtar bhai,
> Mohammedi Begum nam us mai,
> Oh haq mere wich ai,
> Eh Rab farmaya o.
>
> Mera Mohammedi Begum da
> Arshan utte hoya nikah
> Allah Mullan Farishte gowah
> Nikah Bab parhaya o.

(A woman called Moḥammedī Begum, daughter of Aḥmad Beg, God has ordained that she should come to my lot....The marriage of Moḥammadī Begum has been solemnized in heaven, Allah was the priest and the angels were witnesses, thus the marriage was solemnized by God.)[131] Later on, Muḥammad Shokh re-introduced the issue of the revelation Aḥmad had had concerning the five holy persons and his resting his head on the thigh of Fatima. This particular statement of Aḥmad's seemed to lead to particularly abusive language from opposing Muslims.

> We cannot have any consideration for him who says anything against the prophet. He says that

> he slept with his head on the thigh of Fatima. It seems that the mould was shaken and the child got squint-eyed. Mahmud, his son, is also cross-eyed and so were the previous children, it seems that the cast was disturbed.[132]

Early in May, 1936, Inayāt Ullāh, the mawlawī representing the interests of the Aḥrār at Qādiyān, was arrested for making a seditious speech at Jarānwāla, Lyallpūr District on April 13. This had been the occasion of another Tabligh Conference of the Aḥrār. Such an occasion called for polemic rhetoric. The principal attack against Ghulām Aḥmad was not theological on this occasion as much as it was for his pro-British position. Inayāt Ullāh was playing to the feelings of nationalism in the Aḥrār organization at that meeting.[133] On May 3 and 4 at another Tabligh Conference, this time at Pathānkōt, Gūrdāspūr, Sayyid Pīr Faiz al-Ḥassan, leader of the Central Majlis-i-Aḥrār-i-Islām-i-Hind, made "two rabidly anti-Ahmadiya speeches" and on July 21, was prosecuted for his actions.[134] Similarly, Mawlawī Khalīl al-Raḥmān of Ludhiāna was prosecuted August 1 for making an anti-Government, anti-Aḥmadī speech at the Arainwāla Mosque in Qādiyān, July 3. That the Panjāb Government was not siding with the Aḥrār against the Aḥmadīs was certainly evident from the comments of Mr. Puckle in his report to the Government at Simla describing Khalīl al-Raḥmān as

> a religious firebrand and...the son of the notorious Maulana Habib-ur-Rahman of Ludhiana at present President of the All-India Majlis-i-Ahrar-i-Islam-i-Hind, Lahore. The accused was recently entrusted with the charge of affairs

> of the Shoba-i-Tabligh at Qadian, which was established...to combat Ahmadis propaganda.[135]

The first of the two speeches By Faiẓ al-Hassan was significant for its strongly nationalistic and anti-capitalist strain combined with an attack on the Aḥmadīyah movement.[136] The speech at Qādiyān by Khalīl al-Raḥmān was more directly concerned with attacking particular Aḥmadīs and supporters of Aḥmadīs in which the speaker declared unabashedly,

> I desire that this mischief of Mirzait should end with my hands, no matter if my property, money and life are spent for the purpose. I am not prepared to recede a step in this respect.[137]

The spiraling of events in the tension between the Aḥrār and Aḥmadīs and the struggle of the Panjāb Government to keep the situation cool during the years 1934-1936 was cited again when Mr. Justice Muḥammad Munīr, President of the Court of Inquiry investigating the Aḥrār-Aḥmadīyah unrest in 1953 and 1954, reviewed the events just examined, describing one of the main activites of the Aḥrār in their early days as being their opposition to the Aḥmadīs.

> It may indeed be said that the Ahrar took their birth in the hatred of the Ahmadis. Only two years after they founded the Majlis-i-Ahrar, they passed a resolution that no Qadiani should be elected to any public body.

Reflecting on the original Tablīgh Conference held at Qādiyān in October of 1934 and the infamous speech of ʿAṭā Ullāh Shāh Bukhārī on that occasion, Mr. Justice Munīr stated that Bukhārī

> delivered a 5-hour diatribe against the Ahmadis

> in the course of which he said that "which could have no other effect than to rouse hatred in the minds of the hearers," the professions of peace in his speech alternating with abuse and wit of a very low order. Bukhari was prosecuted for this speech and convicted at the conclusion of a sensational trial which created more interest and anti-Ahmadiya feelings than the speech itself. Since then every Ahrar speaker of note has been saying one thing or another against the Ahmadis, their leaders and their beliefs.[138]

In concluding this examination of Aḥmadī-Aḥrār polemics and controversy in the 1930's, a logical question to raise would be that of the relation of the Aḥmadīyah movement to a whole host of other contemporary Indian political and religious organizations such as the Congress, the Muslim League, the Jamīyāt al-'Ulamā', etc. While Maḥmūd Aḥmad and the Qādiyānī Aḥmadīs became increasingly involved in political issues of the thirties--Kashmīr, the Round Table Conference, and the Simon Report--it seems clear that they did not seek out confrontation or involvement with these more politically-oriented movements. The Aḥmadī confrontation with the Aḥrār and the resulting activity was, from all evidence, instigated by the Aḥrār. For the most part, the Aḥrār were on the offensive and the Qādiyānīs on the defensive. In the greater perspective of Indian history in the 1930's, the Aḥrār-Aḥmadī controversy was a minor matter. None the less, the issues raised by this controversy reflected, in microcosm, the issues concerning the Indian Muslim community as a whole: the role of a minority religion in a free India, the kind of country a free India should be, and the future relationship, subject

or free, India should have towards Great Britain. The polemical involvement of Aḥmadīyah in the 1930's was significantly different from that in which Ghulām Aḥmad engaged in the 1890's, for in the thirties they asserted themselves on political issues in a way never imagined by Mirzā Ghulām Aḥmad when he declared himself to be masīḥ maw'ūd and mahdī in the Panjāb of 1890.

NOTES

[1]See N. G. Barrier, The Punjab in the Nineteenth Century Tracts, Asian Studies Center, Michigan State University, E. Lansing, 1969, pp. 49-69.

[2] Aziz Ahmad, Islamic Modernism, p. 101. The Muslim political poem began with Altāf Husayn Hālī who wrote during the second half of the nineteenth century.

[3] Abd al-Hashim Khan, "The Ahmadia Movement, No. 1: The True Path to Swaraj," RR, XXI, June-August, 1922, pp. 228-230.

[4]Ibid., September, 1922, pp. 335-340.

[5]Government of India, Home Department, File No. 132/27, Serial Nos. 1-39, p. 26; see also Confidential letter from Deputy Commissioner Haig to H. D. Craik, D. O., No. 68-C, June 4, 1927 as follows:

"3. The usual fair is being held at Mozang this afternoon. Elaborate precautions have been taken and I anticipate no trouble. This morning a Poster over the signature of Mirza of Qadian appeared in Lahore City giving extracts from an Amritsar Monthly Magazine entitled 'Risala Vartman.' These extracts show that the article from which they were taken is a vilely scurrilous and designedly offensive attack on the prophet of Islam in far worse taste and far worse language than even the Rangila Rasool. I have ordered that this poster be torn down wherever found, and also issued an order under section 144 Cr. P. C. on the model of that recently issued at Delhi, forbidding all posters and pamphlets other than purely trade advertisements for a period of two months."

[6]Home Department, Political File, 3608, dated September 1, 1927.

[7]Ibid., from the office of the Private Secretary, dated September 1, 1927.

[8]Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad, The Hindu-Muslim Problem, Qadian, 1927, Foreward and p. 4.

[9]Ibid., pp. 13-14.

[10]Ibid., p. 31.

[11]Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad, The Indian Problem, Qadian, 1930, p. 12.

[12]Ibid., p. 20.

[13]Ibid., p. 49.

[14]Ibid., p. 145.

[15]Ibid., p. 43.

[16]Ibid., p. 52.

[17]Indian Round Table Conference (First Section), Proceedings, London, 1931, p. 246.

[18]"The Reminiscences of Sir Zafrullah Khan," op. cit., p. 60.

[19]Ibid., p. 73; for a full report on the Conference of the Muslim League over which Sir Zafar Ullāh presided, as well as the text of his speech on that occasion, see N. N. Mitra (ed.), Indian Annual Register, Calcutta, July-December, 1931, pp. 213-224.

[20]Dost Muḥammad Shahīd, Tarīkh-i-Aḥmadīyah, Vol. VI, Rabwah, n.d., pp. 401-407.

[21]P. N. Bazaz, History of the Struggle for Freedom in Kashmir, Kashmir Publishing Company, New Delhi, 1954, pp. 140-148.

[22]P. N. K. Bamzai, A History of Kashmir, Metropolitan Book Co., Delhi, 1965, p. 656.

[23]Ibid., p. 657.

[24]Ibid.; cf. Bazaz, op. cit., p. 153, for a similar view. For the report of the commission investigating the riot, see N. N. Mitra (ed.), Indian Annual Register, Vol. II, Calcutta, 1931, pp. 394-395.

[25]Bamzai, p. 658.

[26]Report of the Court of Inquiry, Lahore, 1954, p. 11.

[27]Sardar M. I. Khan, The Kashmir Saga, Ripon Printing Press, Ltd., Lahor, 1965, p. 21.

[28]Ibid., pp. 21-22.

[29]Bazaz, pp. 156-157.

[30]Ibid., pp. 158-159.

[31]Bamzai, pp. 659-660; see also India in 1931-32, Calcutta, 1932, p. 31.

[32]Ibid., p. 663. See also Azim Husain, Fazl-i-Husain, Longmans, Green & Co., Ltd., Bombay, 1946, pp. 239-240.

[33]Shamloo (ed.), Speeches and Statements of Iqbal, al-Manar Academy, Lahore, 1945, pp. 198-199.

[34]"Islamic Concept of Retaliation...," RR, XXXII, June, 1933, pp. 281-291.

[35]Ibid., p. 291.

[36]"Ahmadiyah Community's Address to the Viceroy," RR, XXXIII, April, 1934, p. 121.

[37]Ibid., p. 124.

[38]Government of India, Home Department, General File, Lahor , April 18, 1932 by Order of C. C. Garbett, Chief Secretary, Government of the Punjab, 4 pp.

[39]W. C. Smith, Modern Islam in India, pp. 252-257.

[40]Government of India, Home Department, D 7245/34 Poll.; Letter from C. C. Garbett to M. G. Hallett, Secretary to the Government of India, Delhi, marked "SECRET", November 1, 1934, p. 1.

[41]Ibid., pp. 1-2.

[42]Ibid., p. 2.

[43]Ibid., pp. 2-3.

[44]Ibid., p. 4.

[45]Ibid., p. 5. For details of the resolutions against Sir Zafar Ullāh, see below.

[46]Zamīndār had long been an anti-Aḥmadī newspaper.

[47]Letter from C. C. Garbett to M. G. Hallett, op. cit., p. 5.

[48]Ibid.

[49]Ibid., p. 6.

[50]Ibid., p. 7.

[51]Ibid., p. 8.

[52]Government of India, Home Department, D. O. No. D-7245/34 Poll., New Delhi, November 7, 1934, Hallett to Garbett, "SECRET".

[53]Ibid.; enclosure to Confidential Letter from Supt. C.I.D., Punjab (Lahore) to W. D. Almeida, Asst. Sec'y to Government of India, Home Department, New Delhi, November 17, 1934.

[54]Ibid., p. 2. Cf. Reminiscences of Sir Zafrullah, op. cit., p. 144ff.

[55]Ibid., p. 2.

[56]Ibid., p. 3.

[57]Ibid., pp. 4-5.

[58]Ibid. From file of Punjab Civil Secretariat; background material to letter from Garbett to Hallett, January 21, 1935; p. 1 of the letter of Bashīr a l-Dīn Mahmūd Aḥmad to Garbett at Lahore. See also RR, Vol. XXXIV, January, 1935, pp. 1-4.

[59]See RR, XIII, April, 1914, p. 160, for text of resolution.

[60]As described in Appendix "F".

[61]Government of India, Home Department, Copy of a Letter No. C. 159 D.S.B., dated December 1, 1934, from Chief Secretary to Government, Punjab, to Commissioner, Lahore Division.

[62]Ibid. Confidential letter from Garbett to Hallett; Punjab Civil Secretariat No. C 16 (1), January 21, 1935, p. 2.

[63]Ibid.

[64]Ibid., p. 3.

[65]Ibid., pp. 3-4.

[66]Ibid., p. 5.

[67] Ibid., p. 6.

[68] Ibid., p. 7.

[69] Ibid.

[70] Confidential: Report on the Situation in the Punjab for the first half of January, 1935, p. 2.

[71] Ibid.

[72] Covering Memo to "Report on the Situation..."

[73] From H. D. No. 7 128/34 Poll., dated January 26, 1935. Such a rumour was all the more intriguing because the Aḥrār had broken with the Congress prior to their involvement in Kashmīr and opposition to Aḥmadīyah.

[74] Ibid., pp. 1-2, plus subsequent memo. from Home Political in Delhi to R. T. Peel, I. O. London.

[75] Letter from F. M. Sial, No. 661-G, Secretary to Hazrat Khalifa-tul-Masih (Head of the Ahmadiyya Community), January 27, 1935. For the full text reflecting the anger and concern of the writer, see Appendix "G".

[76] Confidential, D. O. No. 35-C. Commissioner's Office, Lahore Division, sent by Alan Mitchell, Camp Manihala, January 27, 1935 to C. C. Garbett, pp. 1-2.

[77] Ibid., p. 2.

[78] Ibid., pp. 3-4; for the full text of the "Note on a Conversation between Commissioner of Lahore and Khan Sahib Maulvi Farzand 'Ali..." see Appendix "H".

[79] Confidential, D. O. No. 16/ST, Deputy Commissioner's Office, Gurdaspur District; January 27, 1935, pp. 5-6, from Shrinagesh to Mitchell.

[80] Confidential, Punjab Civil Secretariat, No. C-124 D.S.B., Lahore, January 29, 1935. The text of the Order of the Gurdaspur District Magistrate read as follows:

"Whereas it has been made to appear to me that public meetings and assemblies have been organised and held at Qadian and in its neighbourhood, and whereas in these meetings violent and provocative speeches have been delivered and whereas further meetings and assemblies are likely to lead to a disturbance of the public tranquility, or a riot, or an affray, I, J. M. Shrinagesh, District Magistrate, Gurdaspur, finding that an emergency has arisen and that immediate prevention

and speedy remedy is desireable, in exercise of the powers conferred on me by section 144 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898, do hereby prohibit the convening of, or taking part in public meetings or public assemblies of more than five persons within the small town and the revenue estate of Qadian and any revenue estate immediately continuous with them during the next two months, except meetings for purposes of religion held in recognised places of worship."

[81]Government of India, Home Department, General Notification, Lahore, January 4, 1934. By Order of the Governor of the Punjab in Council, F. H. Puckle.

[82]"Review of a Pamphlet in Urdu entitled 'Ulema-i-Su-ke-karname'," pp. 1-3.

[83]Report on a poster headed, "Qadian Main Panjtan Pak."

[84]Report on the pamphlet in Urdū entitled, "Khechwan Nabi," published by ʿAbd al-Karim and printed by Hafiz Muhammad Alam at Lahore, 1934.

[85]The Urdū word "ghania" used here also means "penis" in slang.

[86]From the Urdū pamphlet "Hansi ka Gol Gappa Urf Qadian Wala," published by Ahmad Yar Khan, Lahore, pp. 1-2.

[87]"Kia Mirza-i-Qadiani aurat thi ya Mard," by Hafiz ʿAbd al-Rahim Haider, Lahore.

[88]The anti-Aḥmadī tracts were "Mirza Qadiani ka Nikah-i-Asmaʿi," written in Panjābī but using Persian script, by Sheikh Muhammad Hussain and printed at Amritsar, and "Qadian ke sar par yasrabi gola," also in Panjābī, by Dr. Mansur Ahmad Mansur Bhevi Salanwali, printed at Qadian and proscribed February 28, 1935.

[89]"Khatm-i-Nubuwat" was written by Mir Muhammad Din Mir and published at Lahore; "Munshi Ghulam Ahmad Qadiani" was written by Syed Muhammad Ghulam and published at Multan.

[90]Sufi ʿAbd al-Qadir, "Did the Promised Messiah Abuse His Opponents?," RR, XXXIV, March, 1935, pp. 90-91.

[91]Ibid., p. 90.

[92]Dost Muḥammad Shahīd, Tarīkh-i-Aḥmadīyah, Vol. II, p. 289.

[93]Ibid., p. 290.

[94]Interview with Dr. Khalīl Nasir, January 25, 1970, C. W. Post College, Greenvale, New York. We may never know all the motives involved but this theory places a new perspective on the issue. See also Shamloo, op. cit., p. 103, for Iqbāl's response to a question in the Muslim Sunrise, an American Ahmadiyah journal, on this point. He wrote, "Personally I became suspicious of the movement when the claim of a new prophethood superior even to the prophethood of the Founder of Islam was definitely put forward and the Muslim world was declared Kafir."

[95]Muhammad Iqbāl, in Shamloo, op. cit., p. 93.

[96]Ibid., p. 94.

[97]Ibid., p. 95.

[98]Ibid., p. 100.

[99]"Islam and Ahmadism," Lahore, p. 1, or Shamloo, p. 111.

[100]Ibid., p. 2.

[101]Ibid., p. 19.

[102]Ibid., p. 30.

[103]"Dr. Muhammad Iqbal's Bitter Attack on the Ahmadiyya Community," RR, XXXIV, No. 6, June, 1935, p. 201.

[104]Ibid., p. 202.

[105]Ibid., p. 204.

[106]Ibid., p. 210.

[107]Ibid., p. 212.

[108]"Statement of Rejection...," in Shamloo, op. cit., pp. 200-201.

[109]Text of this sermon was published in RR, XXXIV, No. 7, pp. 241-256.

[110]Ibid., p. 246.

[111]Ibid., p. 252.

[112]Government of India, Home Department, File No. 72/36 Poll., Political Section; Copy of a letter No. 152, dated July 22, 1935, from Maulvi Farzand ʿAli Nazir Umoor-

i-Amma, Ahmadiyya Movement, Qadian to Chief Secretary to the Punjab Government, Lahore, p. 1.

[113] Ibid., p. 2.

[114] Ibid.

[115] Ibid., p. 4.

[116] Ibid., p. 5. This matter was handled in the appeal decision of Mr. Justice Coldstream of the Lahor High Court on November 11, 1935, and reported in RR, December, 1935, and the Muslim Sunrise, November 25, 1935. For discussion, see below pp. 364-366.

[117] Ibid. Copy of a confidential letter No. C-1617 D.S.B., dated Lahore, July 30, 1935, from F. H. Puckle...to Maulvi Farzand ʿAli, Qadian, p. 1.

[118] Ibid.; copy of Letter No. 161, August 3, 1935, from Farzand ʿAli to the Chief Secretary.

[119] Ibid. Copy of a letter No. C 16 (1)-30-S.B., Lahore, August 15, 1935, Puckle to Farzand ʿAli.

[120] Ibid., Farzand ʿAli to Chief Secretary of the Punjab, September 23, 1935.

[121] Ibid., Farzand ʿAli to Viceroy, March 11, 1936.

[122] Ibid., Private Secretary to Viceroy to Maulvi Farzand ʿAli, Qadian, March 21, 1936, D. O. No. 1848, G. M.

[123] Ibid., Letter No. 485 from Farzand ʿAli to Private Secretary, April 1, 1936.

[124] Government of India, Home Department, File 4399/36 Poll.; P and J 1774/36, India Office, Whitehall, from G. Shepherd to M. G. Hallett, Simla.

[125] For the full text see RR, XXXIV, No. 12, December, 1935, pp. 447-482.

[126] Ibid., p. 462.

[127] Ibid., p. 473.

[128] Ibid., p. 458.

[129] Ibid., p. 482.

[130]Government of India, Home Department, File 2757/36 Poll., from F. H. Puckle, Chief Secretary Punjab to Secretary of Government of India, Home Department, Lahore, March 31, 1936; order under Section 196, Criminal Procedures Code, p. 1.

[131]Ibid., p. 2; Urdū transliteration as it appears in the document.

[132]Ibid., p. 5.

[133]Government of India, Home Department, Confidential File, 3747/36 Poll., from F. H. Puckle, Lahore to Secretary of Government of India, Home Department, Simla, May 12, 1936.

[134]Government of India, Home Department, Confidential File, 5708/36 Poll., F. H. Puckle to Secretary at Simla, July 21, 1936.

[135]Government of India, Home Department, Confidential File, 5981/36 Poll., from Puckle to Secretary, August 1, 1936.

[136]For the full text, see Appendix "I".

[137]Text of the speech of Khalil-ur-Rahman cited in Note 135 above, p. 3. For full text, see Appendix "J".

[138]Report of the Court of Inquiry, op. cit., p. 12. See also W. C. Smith, Modern Islam in India, who has described ʿAṭā Ullāh as follows: "The most obvious example of personal hold has been that of their prize attraction, ʿAṭā Allāh Shāh Bukhārī. This remarkable man might well lay claim to being India's most effective demagogue. He can, and repeatedly does, hold, with his oratory, an audience of thousands inspired and unflinchingly attentive for hours. With a telling use of apt poetry and of Islamic appeal; with an unswerving insistence that the British must get out; with a brilliant exposition of a romantic socialism; he has incited the Muslims to restlessness and activity." (p. 255)

CHAPTER 7

THE AḤMADĪYAH: PERSPECTIVE AND CONCLUSION

The introductory part of this study set the task of our research as an analysis of the origins, nature and role of the AḥmadĪyah movement during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century in India. Our objective now is to summarize the evidence we have presented and place in some perspective this Islamic religious movement.

In the spectrum of post-1857 responses to the condition of Muslims in India, the movement created by Ghulām Aḥmad was both similar and yet different than other "modernist" or traditional Islamic groups. We can say that Aḥmad was like Sir Sayyid Aḥmad Khān in his use of "reason" as a method for presenting theological issues but very different in the way the argument turned out. Sir Sayyid developed a "modernist" position on most religious issues while Ghulām Aḥmad reinterpreted the Qur'ān to explain his religious revelations and subsequent claims. While both supported the British in India, Sayyid Aḥmad devoted much of his life to improving the conditions of Muslims generally through the establishment of the college at ʿAlīgaṛh and various Muslim educational organizations. Essentially, Sayyid Aḥmad appealed to the Muslims who could respond positively to an educational approach. Ghulām Aḥmad, on the other hand, was the son of

a middle-class Muslim landowner who came from a small village in the Panjāb. He was never associated with academic figures or universities but was educated by tutors during his early years. His approach to communication was not so much through the school--although the Aḥmadīs did found schools even during his lifetime--but through the public debate and tract. It was through confrontation with Christian missionaries, Muslim mawlawī's and Āryā Samājī street preachers that he made his points. Ghulām Aḥmad's audience therefore was made up of two kinds of people. One kind was a literate, though not intellectual, audience which could read his Urdū, Persian and Arabic writings, and, after 1898, the various Aḥmadī newspapers. While Aḥmad addressed audiences in Urdū and not in Panjābī, these constant public appearances and the personal qualities he seems to have communicated brought him to the attention of a non-literate audience in the Panjāb as well.

Sir Sayyid sought to improve the condition of Muslims and continually indicated to the Government that Muslims were loyal and trustworthy. Ghulām Aḥmad was more concerned to prove his own loyalty to the Government and then, to defend Islām against the threats to it by Āryā Samājīs and Christian missionaries. When he became a controversial figure, drawing Muslims from other schools to his movement, he also had to defend his own position against the fatwās of other Muslim mawlawīs. Apart from both using a method of rationalism

in their arguments and being supporters of Government, the one other issue on which Ghulām Aḥmad and Sir Sayyid were in agreement was the issue of the khilāfat. Both denied that the Turkish sulṭān had any religious or political role to play in the lives of Indian Muslims. Ghulām Aḥmad did so because he believed he was the Promised Messiah and mahdī of the Muslims. Sayyid Aḥmad did so because he was concerned with the problem of proving Muslim loyalty to the British.

Ghulām Aḥmad had little in common with the 'ulamā' who founded Dē'ōband or the Farangī Maḥal for they were attempting to reestablish a traditional theological basis for Islām in India through educational institutions, while Ghulām Aḥmad was teaching new doctrines about Jesus, jihād and the mahdī which they vigourously repudiated. Of the movements which specifically identified themselves as "sects" in nineteenth century Islām, Aḥmad seems to have had most in common with the Ahl-i-Ḥadīth, even though the latter strongly opposed him throughout most of his career. While the Ahl-i-Ḥadīth were descendents of the jihādist movement of Sayyid Aḥmad Shahīd which had identified itself with the Wahhābīs of Arabia and had taken the name "Wahhābī" during the early part of the century, their concerns were primarily theological by the 1880's. Muḥammad Ḥusayn's "Treatise on Jihād" took essentially the same position which Aḥmad did and indicated support for the British as long as Muslims were free to practice their religious beliefs. Theologically,

the Ahl-i-Ḥadīth were conservative in emphasizing the traditions of Islām. As was the case with the Sunnī or Ḥanafī ʿulamāʾ, Ghulām Aḥmad's theological position became anathema to Muḥammad Ḥusayn, spokesman of the Ahl-i-Ḥadīth, once he understood the extent to which Aḥmad was deviating from an acceptable Sunnī position.

We have shown the extent to which Ghulām Aḥmad and the Aḥmadīyah were different from other forms of Islamic response to the situation in late nineteenth century India. To determine the fact that sociologically speaking, we may identify the Aḥmadīyah as an Islamic "sect" we should reiterate the point that while Aḥmad may have shown mystical tendencies in his revelation experiences and in the wording used in some of his writings, he and his followers have denied that he was ever connected with sūfīs or tarīqahs. While the influence of sūfī thought and organizational practices is evident in the fact that Aḥmad spoke of spiritual stages of "fanāʾ" and "baqāʾ" and that he accepted bayʿah from his followers, we cannot identify him as a sūfī. Since Aḥmad and his movement show "influences" from many sources, it seems most correct to locate the movement sociologically in the category of an Islamic "sect" embodying special or unique teachings as against that of "church", i.e., sunnī Islām, or that of "mystic", i.e., tasawwuf.

Beyond the sūfī influences which affected Aḥmad, it is clear that the approach of the Christian missionaries--

even though he openly repudiated their attempts at conversion to Christianity--played a role in shaping Aḥmad's approach to his own mission. The organization of missions, known as the programme of tablīgh in the years after Aḥmad's death, attests to the use of a technique not effectively used by Muslims before. The tablīgh programme was not for India alone. Its most effective work was done in such places as Ceylon, Mauritius and Hong Kong. Later it spread to England and America as well.

When Ghulām Aḥmad refuted the attacks of the Āryā Samāj against Islām, he was, in a sense, being a "communalist". The Āryā Samāj was largely responsible, through its more militant members, for having instigated the difficulties through its programmes of shuddī, and cow-protection, as well as through its strong stand favouring the use of Hindī over Urdū. Ghulām Aḥmad was concerned with the religious attacks of Swāmī Dayānand and other Āryās such as Lākh Rām on Islām. Cow protection, shuddī and the use of Hindī he did not raise as issues which concerned him. His response to the Āryās was to defend Islām on religious grounds alone. This he did by proving the truth of the Qur'ān and by challenging Āryās to debates in which they would try to prove the truth of the Vedas. Where Aḥmad chose an issue on which to attack the Āryās, he chose niyog, which was an issue with a scriptural basis to it and one which, because of its sexual implications, would appeal to the basic emotions of the Muslim population.

He never debated Hindī-Urdū or cow protection.

Aḥmad's use of reason and argument shows up best in his point by point attack on the Vedas and Āryā teachings. Similarly, when Aḥmad wished to prove that Gurū Nānak was a Muslim, he argued using evidence he had found in a variety of sources to achieve his goal. Aḥmad often turned to European writers to prove his arguments about Gurū Nānak or the death of Jesus. The use of these techniques indicates that, despite the fact that Aḥmad knew no European languages, he still became familiar with modern methods of argument used by missionaries which had also been introduced into India by Western educational methods.

We have examined in detail the events surrounding Ghulām Aḥmad's controversies with Muslim mawlawīs, Christian missionaries, Āryā Samājīs, and the Sikhs. The impact of the events surrounding each of his encounters had the effect of alienating Aḥmad and his followers from each of these major religious groups. In these controversies the press played an important role. It is interesting to note that before 1898, Aḥmad published only tracts in order to communicate his position to a broader audience. After the traumatic events following the murder of Lēkh Rām in 1897, all kinds of Panjāb newspapers were commenting about his prophecy. Aḥmad had no paper of his own with which to reply, but he realised the necessity for Aḥmadīyah to have regular publication. The creation of al-Ḥakam in 1898, of Review

of Religions in both English and Urdu in 1902, and later of Badr, Nūr and al-Fazl helped fill the information gap which Ahmad struggled to answer by means of his "Istiftā'" in 1897. While the significance of the Panjāb press in affecting public opinion during this period is only now being studied, the contribution which Aḥmadī publications made, in spite of the limited number of copies per issue, must have been significant in spreading the Aḥmadī position to the Urdū reading public.

What we find in Ghulām Aḥmad and his movement is an unusual mixture of assertions that Aḥmad was peaceful and loyal in his orientation, while at the same time we have witnessed Aḥmad's strong positions in support of Islam. We may trace his loyalty both to his middle-class land-owning status and his realization, in later years, that without the protection of the Government, his movement might have suffered violence at the hands of those who opposed it. We may trace his strong support of Islām--even to the point at which it created tension and conflict with other groups--from his own claims to be the Promised Messiah as well as from his realization that, religiously speaking, Islām was in need of a Messiah and mahdī. Aḥmad's interpretation of the concept "mahdī" explicitly rejected any such idea of mahdī as had been assumed by the Mahdī of the Sudan, however. Aḥmad claimed he came in peace even if one result of his coming was considerable tension.

The years of Aḥmadīyah history after the death of the

Promised Messiah were marked by the same mixture of forces at work. The movement essentially remained aloof from the growing number of politically oriented organizations that became active in the years after 1908. Where Aḥmadīyah became engaged as in a Khilāfat Conference in 1920 or in the Kashmīr Committee of 1931, it was there to make a point which in all cases was related to previous or current conditions and views of Aḥmadīyah itself. There is no doubt that Bashīr al-Dīn Maḥmūd Aḥmad, second khalīfah and son of Ghulām Aḥmad, was more politically and socially astute than his father. His involvement with political questions obvious within five years of his accession to the leadership is significant to note because when he became leader of the Qādiyānīs in 1914 and the more urbane, intellectual Aḥmadīs followed Muḥammad ʿAlī to Lāhōr, it was the political stance of the Lāhōr group which had, in part, caused the split, alienating Maḥmūd Aḥmad.

While Maḥmūd Aḥmad spoke out on the questions of "swarāj", "ahimsa", "khilāfat", and the Simon Report, taking a position on each occasion, he spoke out because of his interests as leader of the Aḥmadīyah movement. His recognition that reforms were needed in India, even as the Muslim League did, does not identify him with the League. Maḥmūd Aḥmad's desire to protect the interests of a Muslim minority in a free India spoke just as eloquently for his interests in protecting an Aḥmadī minority within that Muslim minority. Maḥmūd was an activist, administrator, religious leader and

traveller. He was neither an overt agitator nor a communalist as such. He obviously offended many non-Aḥmadīs by his political and religious stance, even as his father had offended many by his religious claims and support of the Government. To a certain extent, Iqbāl was correct in his assessment of Aḥmadī motives for involvement in the questions of his day when he suggested that Aḥmadīs had joined the Kashmīr Committee to promote the interests of their own organization.

Our examination of the Aḥmadīyah movement stops at 1936. Even in the period from 1914-1934, our study has not delved deeply into the internal organization or missionary development of the movement. Our task has been to study the origins, nature and role of the Aḥmadīyah up to 1914. After that we have examined only the question of how the movement could no longer resist being "involved" in the issues which India was facing during the twenties and thirties. While this involvement was minor during the twenties, the Kashmīr issue of 1931 led the Aḥmadīs into a head-on clash with the Aḥrār and renewed pamphlet warfare with more orthodox Muslims generally. The result of this activity in 1934-36 required the intervention of Government in the affairs of both Aḥrārs and Aḥmadīs, a factor which changed the complexion of Aḥmadī relations and understanding they felt they had with the Government.

The Aḥmadīyah story does not end here. The establishment of the Tahrik-i-Jadīd organization in the forties, the expansion

of missions in Africa, the hijrah from Qādiyān to Rabwah after partition failed to give Gūrdāspūr entirely to Pākistān, and the renewed struggle of Aḥmadīyah with the Aḥrār and Mawdūdī, among others, after their resettlement in Pākistān are all part of the continuing story of the Aḥmadīyah movement. We have not traced these developments nor the entire khilāfat of Bashīr al-Dīn Maḥmūd Aḥmad who remained head of the movement until his death in 1965, some sixty-one years after his accession.

Where then, do we locate the Aḥmadīyah movement? In the 1880's, Ghulām Aḥmad began his ministry as a serious attempt to renew Islām. His role as a charismatic personality was engulfed in controversy almost from the beginning because he referred to himself as nabī and claimed to be the Promised Messiah and mahdī of the Muslims. But he was equally disliked by Hindūs both for his claim that the Qur'ān was superior to the Vedas and his later claim that he was an avatar of Kriṣna. Similarly, he offended the Christian missionaries with his theories about the death of Jesus and his claim that he was the son of Mary. As Aḥmad developed his movement, he adapted more and more elements from a variety of sources. Choosing to remain within Islām, however, he and his followers suffered what many who have deviated from acceptable teachings within any faith had to suffer. Bahā'ī chose to withdraw from Islām and create a universalistic movement of its own. We would assert the view that had Aḥmad emerged in Iran or

another totally Islamic country, he might well have withdrawn also. Because of the large number of religious groups in India and the openness and variety of "Hindū" expressions of religiousness, it was easier for Aḥmad, while directing his mission to the Indian community in general, to remain within Islām, which, itself, was in a minority position in India.

The AḥmadĪyah movement up to 1908 was dominated by the teachings and personality of Ghulām Aḥmad. With changing times, the emergence of new leaders and new issues, the movement changed. On the one hand, the unique features of AḥmadĪyah which caused its alienation from the mainstream of Islām forced an increasingly sectarian framework on the movement. In this framework, the new leadership was forced increasingly to take positions on relevant issues. While the movement was in ill-repute among non-AḥmadĪ Muslims in India, it gained prestige in Africa and Europe for establishing the first mosques and Muslim education programmes for the propagation of Islām in these non-Islamic areas. In this latter field, the work of AḥmadĪyah has been significant for modern Islām.

Our concern has been to document aspects of the earliest history of AḥmadĪyah in the area of polemics and confrontation. This has not been an examination of a constructive phase of Indian religious history but rather of a difficult and controversial part of that history. To the extent that these events and the AḥmadĪyah movement are now better understood, we have succeeded in our effort.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

This Bibliography is divided into several categories. The first section contains a list of relevant works in European languages by both Aḥmadīs and non-Aḥmadīs. In this section, all names of authors, titles, and places of publication are given exactly as they appear in the work itself.

The remaining sections include "Published Government Records," "Unpublished Government Documents," "Periodical Publications" and "Unpublished Materials." The final section of the bibliography contains a listing of the Urdū works of Mīrzā Ghulām Aḥmad but has not attempted a complete listing of all Urdū works by other Aḥmadīs or non-Aḥmadī writers.

BOOKS AND ARTICLES IN ENGLISH

Abdul, Waheed Khan, India Wins Freedom, Karachi, Pakistan Publishers, 1961.

Addison, James T., "The Ahmadiya Movement and its Western Propaganda," Harvard Theological Review, Vol. XXII, 1929, pp. 1-32.

Ahmad, Aftab-ud-Din, "The Status of Woman in Islam," The Woking Muslim Mission and Literary Trust, England (n.d.).

Ahmad, Aziz, Islamic Modernism in India and Pakistan, Oxford University Press, 1967.

Ahmad, Aziz, Studies in Islamic Culture in the Indian Environment, Oxford University Press, 1964.

Ahmad, Basharat, "Taqdir or the Measurement in Islam," Woking Muslim Mission and Literary Trust, England, (n.d.).

Ahmad, Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud, Ahmad, The Messenger of the Latter Days, Part I, Talif-o-Isha'at, Qadian (sic), Punjab, India, 1924.

Ahmad, Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud, Ahmadiyyat or The True Islam, The American Fazl Mosque, Washington, D. C., 1957.

Ahmad, Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud, "The Ahmadiyya Movement in Islam," London, 1924.

Ahmad, Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud, "The Hindu-Muslim Problem and its Solution," The Sadr Anjuman-i-Ahmadiyya, Qadian, February, 1927.

Ahmad, Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud, The Indian Problem, Qadian, 1930.

Ahmad, Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud, Introduction to the Study of the Holy Qur'an, The London Mosque, 1949.

Ahmad, Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud, Invitation to Ahmadiyyat, American Fazl Mosque, Washington, D. C., 1961 (English edition; Urdu edition, 1926, Qadian).

Ahmad, Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud, "Islam and Slavery," Talif-o-Isha'at, Qadian, 1935.

Ahmad, Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud, The Life of Muhammad, Rabwah, (195?).

Ahmad, Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud, "Muhammad, the Liberator of Women," Moslem Sunrise Press, Chicago, Illinois, (n.d.).

Ahmad, Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud, The New World Order of Islam, Tahrik-i-Jadid, Qadian, 1945.

Ahmad, Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud, "A Present to His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales," Sadr Anjuman-i-Ahmadiyya, Qadian, 1922.

Ahmad, Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud, "A Present to Kings," (a translation of "Tuhfat-ul-Muluk" by Abul Hasham Khan Chaudhry), Sadr Anjuman-i-Ahmadiyya, Quadian (sic), (N.d.).

Ahmad, Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud, The Truth About the Split, Tahrik-i-Jadid, Qadian, 1938.

Ahmad, Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud, "What is Ahmadiyyat?," Rabwah, 1948.

Ahmad, Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud, "What is Islam?," Rabwah, n.d.

Ahmad, Ghulam, "The Aryas of Qadian and Us," (translation of "Qādīan ke Āryā awr Hum," translated by H. L. Saxena, British Museum typescript).

Ahmad, (Mirza) Ghulam, Barahin-i-Ahmadiyya, translated by Masum Beg, Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha'at-i-Islam, Lahore, 1955; published serially in The Light, Lahore, December, 1955-November, 1958.

Ahmad, Ghulam, Claims and Teachings of the Promised Messiah and Mahdi, D. Narojanreddy Co., Secunderabad, 1922.

Ahmad, Ghulam, "A Clarification," (translation of "Taudhih-i-Maram"), translated by Iqbal Ahmad, Ahmadiyyah Anjuman Isha'at-i-Islam, Lahore, 1966 (original Urdū edition, 1891).

Ahmad, Ghulam, "Fountain of Christianity," (translation of "Chashmah-i-Mashihi"), translation by Abdul Hamid, Tahrik-i-Jadid, Rabwah, 1961.

Ahmad, Ghulam, "Four Questions by a Christian and Their Answers," (translation of "Sirajuddin Isai ke char Swalaun ka Jawab"), Rabwah, 1968.

Ahmad, Ghulam, "Jehad and the British Government," Caxton Printing Works, Lahore, 1900.

Ahmad, Ghulam, "The Message or 'A Cry of Pain'," Lahore, 1899.

Ahmad, Ghulam, "A Message of Peace," Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha'at-i-Islam, Lahore, 1947 (translation of "Paigham-i-Sulh," Lahore, 1908).

Ahmad, Ghulam, "A Misunderstanding Removed," Ahmadiyya Muslim Foreign Missions Office, Rabwah, n.d. (original Urdū edition, 1901).

Ahmad, Ghulam, "My Attitude Towards the British Government," Mitra Vilasa Press, Lahore, 1895.

Ahmad, Ghulam, The Philosophy of the Teachings of Islam, American Fazl Mosque, Washington, D. C., 1953 (from the Lahore lecture of 1896).

Ahmad, Ghulam, "The Star that Guides," (translation of "Najm al-Huda") translated by Abul Hashim Khan Chowdhery, Ahmadiyyah Anjuman Isha'at-i-Islam, Lahore, revised 1960, (first Arabic edition, 1893).

Ahmad, Ghulam, "Throwing Open the Curtain," (translation of "Kashf-ul-Ghita"), Victoria Press, Lahore, 1898.

Ahmad, al-Haj Khawaja Nazir, Jesus in Heaven on Earth, Woking Muslim Mission and Literary Trust, England, 1952.

Ahmad, Kurshid, An Analysis of the Munir Report, Jamaat-i-Islami Publications, Karachi, 1956.

Ahmad, Mirza Mubarak, "Ahmadiyyat in the Far East," Nusrat Art Press, Rabwah, 1964.

Ahmad, Mirza Mubarak, "Islam in Africa," Rabwah, 1962.

Ahmad, Mirza Mubarak, "Islam on the March," Rabwah, 1960.

Ahmad, Mubarak, "Our Foreign Missions," Nusrat Art Press, Rabwah, 1958.

Ahmad, Qeyamuddin, The Wahabi Movement in India, Firma K. L. Mukhopadhyay, Calcutta, 1966.

Ahmad, S. N., "Jesus in the Qur'an," The London Mosque, England, 1952.

"Ahmadiyya Community and the British Government," edited and published by the Foreign Secretary to His Holiness the Khalifat-ul-Masih II, Qadian, 1927.

Aitchison, C. V., Lord Lawrence, Oxford University Press, 1892.

Albiruni, A. H. (S. M. Ikram), Makers of Pakistan and Modern Muslim India, Lahore, 1950.

Alhaj, 'Ali Muhammad (ed.), Islam and Its Comparison with Other Religions, The Anjuman-e-Taraqqi Islam, Secunderabad, sixth edition, 1933.

Alhaj, 'Ali Muhammad (ed.), The Way to Peace and Happiness, The Anjuman-e-Taraqqi, Secunderabad, n.d. (1931?).

'Ali, Muhammad, "Claims of the Founder of the Ahmadiyyah Movement in Islam," translated and edited by S. Muhammad Tufail, Ahmadiyyah Anjuman Isha'at Islam, Lahore, fourth revised edition, 1968.

'Ali, Muhammad, "Divorce in Islam," Woking Mission and Literary Trust, England, n.d.

'Ali, Muhammad, The Early Caliphate, Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha'at Islam, Lahore, 1932, (1951 edition).

'Ali, Muhammad, "Ghulam Ahmad of Qadian: His Life and Mission," Ahmadiyyah Anjuman Isha'at-i-Islam, Lahore, 1951 (revised 1959, 1967).

'Ali, Muhammad, "Islam: The Religion of Humanity," The Mosque, Woking, England, n.d.

'Ali, Muhammad, "The Khilafat in Islam According to the Holy Quran and the Sayings of the Holy Prophet," Ahmadia Anjuman Ishaat-i-Islam (sic), Lahore, 1920.

ʿAli, Muhammad, The Living Thoughts of the Prophet Mohammad, Cassell and Co., London, 1947.

ʿAli, Muhammad, Muhammad and Christ, Ahmadiyah Anjuman-i-Ishaat-i-Islam, Lahore, 1921.

ʿAli, Muhammad, Muhammad the Prophet, Ahmadiyya Anjuman-i-Ishaʿat Islam, Lahore, 1925.

ʿAli, Muhammad, "The Muslim Prayer Book," Dar-ul-Kutub Islamia, Lahore, n.d.

ʿAli, Muhammad, The New World Order, Dar-ul-Kutub Islamia, Lahore, 1944.

ʿAli, Muhammad, "Prophet or Mujjadid," translation from Tahrik-i-Ahmadiyyat by S. M. Tufail, Ahmadiyya Anjuman Ishaat-i-Islam, Lahore, 1957.

ʿAli, Muhammad, The Religion of Islam, Ahmadiyya Anjuman Ishaʿat Islam, Lahore, 1950.

ʿAli, Muhammad, "The True Conception of Ahmadiyyat," translation from Tahrik-i-Ahmadiyyat by S. M. Tufail, Ahmadiyya Anjuman Ishaʿat-i-Islam, Lahore, n.d.

ʿAli, Muhammad, True Facts About the Split, Ahmadiyah Anjuman Ishaʿat-i-Islam, Lahore, 1966, translated from "Hakikat-i-Ikhtilaf" by Masʿum Beg (Urdū original, 1922).

Ashraf, K. M., Muslim Revivalists and the Revolt of 1857, edited by P. C. Joshi, People's Publishing House, Delhi, 1957.

Azad, Abul Kalam, India Wins Freedom: An Autobiographical Narrative, edited by Hunayun Kabir, Orient Longmans, Bombay, 1959 (reprint).

Baden-Powell, B. H., The Indian Village Community, C. Scribner & Sons, New York, 1899.

Bamzai, Prithivi Nath Kaul, A History of Kashmir, Metropolitan Book Company, Ltd., Delhi, 1962.

Barns, Margarita, The Indian Press, G. Allen and Unwin, Ltd., London, 1940.

Barrier, N. Gerald, Punjab History in Printed British Documents, University of Missouri Press, 1969.

Barrier, N. Gerald, The Punjab in Nineteenth Century Tracts, Asia Studies Center, Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1969.

Bazaz, Prem Nath, The History of the Struggle for Freedom in Kashmir, Kashmir Publishing Company, New Delhi, 1954.

Beg, Ma'sum, "Prophecies of the Promised Messiah," Ahmadiyah Anjuman Isha'at-i-Islam, Lahore, Pakistan, 1947, (revised, 1967).

Bengalee, Sufi Mutiur Rahman, "The Tomb of Jesus," Moslem Sunrise Press, Chicago, 1946.

Bevan-Jones, L., The People of the Mosque, Baptist Mission Press, Calcutta, 1959.

Binder, Leonard, Religion and Politics in Pakistan, University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1961.

Bouvat, L., "Chronique et notes bibliographique: Les Ahmadiyya de Qadian," Journal Asiatique, CCXIII, 1928, pp. 159-181.

Brush, Stanley E., "Ahmadiyyat in Pakistan," Muslim World, XLV, April, 1955, pp. 145-171.

Burney, Muhammad Elias, The Qadian Movement, Makki Publications, Durban, U.S.A., 1955.

Chand, Gokal, "Luther in India," The Arya Tract Society, Lahore, n.d.

Chand, Gokal, The Message of the Vedas, Lahore, 1906.

Chhabra, G. S., The Advanced History of the Punjab, Vol. II, Parkash Brothers, Ludhiana, n.d. (1960?).

Chirol, Valentine, Indian Unrest, Macmillan and Co., Ltd., London, 1910.

Clark, Robert, The Punjab and Sindh Missions of the Church Missionary Society (1852-1884), Church Missionary Society, London, 1885.

Coupland, Reginald, The Constitutional Problem in India, Oxford University Press, 1945.

Cragg, Kenneth, Contemporary Counsels in Islam, Edinburgh, 1965.

Dard, Abdur-Rahman, Life of Ahmad, Part I, Sultan Brothers, Lahore, 1949.

Dard, Abdur-Rahman,"Meaning of Khatamun Nabiyyin," Al-Shirkatul Islam, Rabwah, n.d.

Dayanand, Swami...Saraswati, Introduction to Commentary on the Vedas, translated by Ghosi Ram, Sarvadeshik Arya Pratinidhi Sabha, Delhi, 1958.

Dayanand, Swami...Saraswati, Satyarth Prakash (The Light of Truth), translated by G. P. Upadhyaya, The Kala Press, Allahabad, 1960 (ed.).

Durrani, F. K. Khan, The Ahmadiyya Movement, The Ahmadiyya Anjuman-i-Isha'at-i-Islam, Lahore, 1927.

Durrani, F. K. Khan, Swami Dayanand: A Critical Study of His Life and Teaching, n.d.

Dutt, R. Palme, India Today, Victor Gollancz, London, 1940.

Farquhar, J. N., Modern Religious Movements in India, Munshiram Manoharlal, Delhi, 1967 (reprint).

Faruqi, Ziya-ul-Hasan, The Deoband School and the Demand for Pakistan, Asia Publishing House, Bombay, 1963.

Faruqui, Mumtaz Ahmad, "Truth Triumphs," Ahmadiyya Anjuman-i-Isha'at-i-Islam, 1965.

Fisher, Humphrey, Ahmadiyyah: A Study in Contemporary Islam on the West Africa Coast, Oxford University Press, 1963.

Fisher, Humphrey, "The Concept of Evolution in Ahmadiyyah Thought," Moslem World, XLIX, October, 1959, pp. 275-286.

Forman, Henry, The Arya Samaj, its Teachings and an Estimate of It, 1890.

Fuchs, Stephen, Rebellious Prophets, Asia Publishing House, London, 1965.

Gardner, W. R. W., "The Ahmadiya Movement," Moslem World, X:1, January, 1920, pp. 59-64.

Ghazipur, Two Decisions on the Rights of the Ahl-i-Hadis (Wahabis) to Pray in the Same Mosque with the Sunnis, Allahabad, 1907.

Gibb, H. A. R., Modern Trends in Islam, University of Chicago Press, 1947.

"Glimpses of the Life of the Prophet Muhammad," (by Eminent Scholars), the Woking Munshir Mission and Literary Trust, Shah Jehan Mosque, Woking, England, n.d.

Goldzieher, Ignaz, Vorlesungen ueber den Islam, Heidelberg, 1910.

Gopal, Ram, Indian Muslims: A Political History, Asia Publishing House, 1959.

Griffin, Lepel and Massy, C. S., The Punjab Chiefs, Civil and Military Gazette, 2 volumes, Lahore, 1890.

Griswold, H. D., "The Ahmadiya Movement," Moslem World, II: 3, October, 1912, pp. 373-379.

Griswold, H. D., "Arya Samaj," Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics (ERE), Vol. I, James Hastings, editor.

Griswold, H. D., "The Dayanandi Interpretation of the word deva in the Rig Veda," Lodhiana Mission Press, 1897.

Griswold, H. D., Insights into Modern Hinduism, Henry Holt and Co., New York, 1934.

Griswold, H. D., "Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, the Mehdi Messiah of Qadian," Indian Evangelical Review, Vol. XXX, January, 1903, pp. 322-354.

Griswold, H. D., "The Problem of the Arya Samaj," Indian Evangelical Review, Vol. XXIX, 1902, pp. 267-273.

Haq, S. Moinul, "The Aligarh Movement" (Educational), in History of the Freedom Movement, II:2, Pakistan Historical Society, Karachi, 1961, pp. 479-502.

Haq, S. Moinul, "Syed Ahmad Khan," in History of the Freedom Movement, II:2, Pakistan Historical Society, Karachi, 1961, pp. 451-478.

Heimsath, Charles H., Indian Nationalism and Hindu Social Reform, Princeton University Press, 1964.

Houtsma, M. T., "A Short Sketch of the Ahmadiyya Movement," Revue du Monde Musulman, I:4, 1907, pp. 533-576.

Hunter, W. W., The Indian Mussalmans, The Comrade Publishers, Calcutta, 1945 (reprint).

Husain, Abu Sa'id Muhammad, Treatise on Jihad, Victoria Press, Lahore, 1887.

Husain, Azim, Fazl-i-Husain, Longmans, Green & Co., Ltd., Bombay, 1946.

Husain, Mahmud, "Sayyid Ahmad Shahid," in A History of the Freedom Movement, Vol. I, Pakistan Historical Society, Karachi, 1957, pp. 556-600.

Husain, Mahmud, "The Successors of Sayyid Ahmad Shahid: Trials and Persecutions," in A History of the Freedom Movement, Vol. II:2, Pakistan Historical Society, Karachi, 1961, pp. 366-389.

Ikram, Muhammad, "Shah Waliullah" (I), A History of the Freedom Movement, Vol. I, Pakistan Historical Society, Karachi, 1957, pp. 491-511.

Ingham, Kenneth, Reformers in India 1793-1833, Cambridge University Press, 1956.

Iqbal, Afzal, Select Writings and Speeches of Maulana Mohammad Ali, Sheikh Muhammad Ashraf, Lahore, 1944.

Iqbal, Muhammad, "Islam and Ahmadism," Anjuman-i-Khuddam ud-Din, Lahore, n.d.

Iqbal, Muhammad, Speeches and Statements of Iqbal, edited by Shamloo, al-Manar Academy, Lahore, 1945, (second edition, 1948).

Jafri, Syed Rais Ahmad, Selections from Maulana Mohammad Ali's Comrade, Lahore, 1965.

Jain, M. S., The Aligarh Movement, Sri Ram Mehra and Co., Agra, 1965.

Kamal-ud-Din, Khawaja, "The Biblical and Quranic Adam," Woking Muslim Mission and Literary Trust, England, n.d.

Kamal-ud-Din, Khawaja, The Ideal Prophet, The Mosque, Woking, England.

Kamal-ud-Din, Khawaja, Islam and Zoroastrianism, The Mosque, Woking, 1925.

Kamal-ud-Din, Khawaja, The Message of Islam, The Mosque, Woking, 1927.

Kamal-ud-Din, Khawaja, The Sources of Christianity, The Mosque, Woking, 1924.

Kamal-ud-Din, Khawaja, Study of Islam, Woking Muslim Mission and Literary Trust, n.d.

Kamal-ud-Din, Khawaja, "Woman from Judaism to Islam," The Muslim Book Society, Lahore, n.d. (1913?).

Khan, Muhammad Yakub, "Quest after God," The Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha'at-i-Islam, Lahore, 1949.

Khan, Sir Muhammad Zafrullah, "The Head of the Ahmadiyya Movement in Islam," Moslem Sunrise Press, Chicago, n.d. (post-1944?).

Khan, Sir Muhammad Zafrullah, Islam, Harper and Row, New York, 1962.

Khan, Muin-ud-Din Ahmad, Selections from the Bengal Government Records on Wahhabi Trials (1863-1870), Dacca, 1961.

Khan, Sardar M. Ibrahim, The Kashmir Saga, Ripon Printing Press Ltd., Lahore, 1965.

Kraemer, Hendrik, World Cultures and World Religions: The Coming Dialogue, Lutterworth Press, London, 1960.

Lavan, Spencer, "The Brahmo Samaj: A Movement for Indian Nationalism and Hindu Social Reform," Faith and Freedom, Vol. 21, Parts 1 and 2, Autumn, 1967, Spring, 1968, pp. 21-28, 81-90.

Lillingston, Frank, The Brahmo Samaj and the Arya Samaj in their Bearing Upon Christianity, London, 1901.

MacNicol, Nicol, The Living Religions of the Indian People, S. C. M. Press, London, 1934.

MacNicol, Nicol, The Making of Modern India, Oxford University Press, London, 1924.

Majumdar, B. B., History of Political Thoughts from Rammohun to Dayananda, Bookland Private, Ltd., Calcutta, 1967.

Majumdar, R. C., History of the Freedom Movement in India, Vol. 1, Firma K. L. Mukhopadhyay, Calcutta, 1962.

Malik, Hafeez, Moslem Nationalism in India and Pakistan, Public Affairs Press, Washington, D. C., 1963.

Maududi, Abulala, "The Qadiani Problem," Markazi Sho ba-e-Nashr-o-Ishaat Jamaat-a-Islami, Pakistan, March, 1953.

Maududi, Abulala, "Statement Before the Punjab Disturbances Court of Inquiry," Jamaat-i-Islami Pakistan, Karachi.

McCully, Bruce T., English Education and the Origins of Indian Nationalism, Columbia University Press, New York, 1940.

McNeile, R. F., "The Koran According to Ahmad," Moslem World, VI:2, April, 1916, pp. 170-174.

Mehr, Ghulam Rasul, Saiyad Ahmad Shahid, Kitab Manzil, Lahore, 1956(?).

Monier-Williams, M., Hinduism, Calcutta, 1951 (reprint).

Monier-Williams, M., Religious Life and Thought in India, London, 1885.

Mosley, Leonard, The Last Days of the British Raj, Weidenfeld and Nicholson, London, 1961.

Mueller, F. Max, "Dayanand Saraswati," in Biographical Essays, C. Scribner's Sons, New York, 1884.

Mueller, F. Max, Rammohun to Ramakrishna, Calcutta, 1952 (reprint).

Mujeeb, Muhammad, The Indian Muslims, McGill University Press, 1967.

Murdoch, John, Vedic Hinduism and the Arya Samaj, Christian Literature Society for India, 1902.

Nag, B. A., "The Arya Samaj: its History, Progress and Methods," Indian Evangelical Review, October, 1901, pp. 178-188.

Nair, L. R., "Ahmadiyas, People with Great Enterprise," Times Of India, Bombay, April 5, 1953.

Natarajan, S., A Century of Social Reform, Asia Publishing House, Bombay, 1959.

Nehru, Jawaharlal, "The Solidarity of Islam," The Modern Review, Vol. LVIII, November, 1935, Calcutta, pp. 524-525.

Nevinson, H. W., "The Arya Samaj," The Nation, London, Vol. II, 1908, pp. 753-754.

Niaz, A. Q., Fazl-i-Omar, Sultan Brothers, Qadian, 1939.

Nyayaratna, Mohesa Chrindra, "A Few Remarks on Pundit Dayandanda Sarasvati's Veda Bhashya," Calcutta, 1877.

Oman, J. C., Cults, Customs and Superstitions of India, T. F. Unwin, London, 1905.

Oman, J. C., Indian Life: Religious and Social, T. F. Unwin, London, 1889.

Pandey, B. N., The Break-up of British India, St. Martins Press, New York, 1969.

Philips, C. H., Politics and Society in India, George Allen and Unwin, London, 1963.

Phoenix, His Holiness, The Islamic Literature Publishing House, Lahore, 1958 (Forward by Zafar 'Ali Khan, 1935 edition).

Prakash, Vishwa, Life and Teachings of Swami Dayanand, Kala Press, Allahabad, n.d.

Prasad, Durga, The Beliefs of Swami Dayanand Saraswati--as Given in his "Satyarth Prakash", Virajanand Press, Lahore, 1893.

Prasad, Durga, "The Ocean of Mercy," (an English translation of Maharashi Swami Dayanand Saraswati's, "Gocharuna Nidhi"), Virajanand Press, Lahore, 1889.

Prasad, Ganga, The Fountainhead of Religion, Arya Sahitya Mandal, Ltd., Ajmer, 1966.

Puri, Ram Nath, "A New Light in India: A History of the Arya Samaj," Overland Monthly, Vol. 52, San Francisco, 1908, pp. 26-29.

The Holy Qur'an, translated by Mawlawi Muhammad 'Ali, Ahmadiyah Anjuman-i-Isha'at-i-Islam, Lahore, 1917.

The Holy Qur'an, translated by Sher 'Ali, Rabwah, 1955.

Qureshi, I. H., The Struggle for Pakistan, Karachi University Press, 1965.

Rai, Lala Lajpat, Autobiographical Writings, edited by V. C. Joshi, University Publishers, Delhi, 1965.

Rai, Lala Lajpat, A History of the Arya Samaj, Orient Longmans, New Delhi, 1967 (reprint).

Richter, Julius, A History of Missions in India, translated by Sidney H. Moore, F. H. Revell, Co., New York, 1908.

Sarda, Har Bilas (ed.), Dayanand Commemoration Volume, Ajmer, 1933.

Sarda, Har Bilas, Life of Dayanand Saraswati, Ajmer, 1946.

Sarda, Har Bilas, Works of Maharshi Dayanand, Vedic Yantralaya, Ajmer, 1942.

Schimmel, Annemarie, Gabriel's Wing, E. J. Brill, Leiden, 1963.

Shams, J. D., "Islam," Ripon Press, Lahore, 1943.

Shams, J. D., "Where did Jesus Die?," Ripon Press, Lahore, 1945.

Sharma, Jagdish Saran, Indian National Congress: A Descriptive Bibliography of India's Struggle for Freedom, S. Chand and Co., Delhi, 1959.

Sherring, M. A., A History of Protestant Missions in India, The Religious Tract Society, London, 1875.

Singh, Bawa C., The Life and Teachings of Swami Dayanand Saraswati, The Addison Press, Lahore, 1903.

Singh, Kharak and Clark, H. M., The Principles and Teachings of the Arya Samaj, 1887.

Siraj-ud-Din, R., "Mirza Ghulam Ahmad: A False Messiah of India," Missionary Review of the World, N.S. XX, No. 10, October, 1907, pp. 749-756.

Sitaramayya, B. P., The History of the Indian National Congress (1885-1935), Madras, 1935.

Smith, Donald E., South Asian Politics and Religion, Princeton University Press, 1966.

Smith, Wilfred Cantwell, "Ahmadiyya," Encyclopaedia of Islam, Ed. II, Leiden, 1960, pp. 301-303.

Smith, Wilfred Cantwell, Islam in Modern History, Mentor Paperback edition, 1959.

Smith, Wilfred Cantwell, Modern Islam in India, Muhammad Ashraf, Lahore, 1943 (1963 reprint).

Spate, O. H. K., India and Pakistan: A General and Regional Geography, Metuen and Co., Ltd., London, 1954.

Stanton, H. V. Weitbrecht, "The Ahmadiya Movement," Moslem World, XV, January, 1925, pp. 10-20.

Tandon, Prakash, Punjabi Century 1857-1947, Chatto and Windus, London, 1961.

Temple, Richard, The Story of My Life, 2 volumes, London, 1896.

Thakur, Dass, "The 'Greatest Discovery' Exploded," Ludhiana, 1903.

Titus, Murray J., Islam in India and Pakistan, Y.M.C.A. Publishing House, Calcutta, 1930 (revised, 1959).

Titus, Murray, The Religious Quest of Indian Islam, Oxford University Press, 1930.

Troelsch, Ernst, The Social Teachings of the Christian Churches, Vol. II, Harper Torchbook edition, 1960.

Vidyarthi, Guru Datta, Wisdom of the Rishis, Sarvadeshik Pustakalaya, Delhi, n.d.

"Vindication of the Prophet of Islam," Abdullah Allahadin, Secunderabad, Deccan, n.d. (1944?).

Walter, H. A., The Ahmadiya Movement, Association Press, Calcutta, 1918.

Walter, H. A., "The Ahmadiyah Movement Today," Moslem World, VI, 1916, pp. 66-78.

Walter, H. A., "Qadiani," Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, Vol. X, pp. 530-531.

Wendte, Charles W., The Wider Fellowship, Vol. II, Beacon Press, Boston, 1927.

Wilson, S. G., Modern Movements Among Moslems, New York, 1916.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA DOCUMENTS

Census of India, 1881: Report on the Census of the Panjab Taken on the 17th of February 1881, 3 volumes, Lahore, 1883.

Census of India, 1891: The Punjab and its Feudatories, Part I, The Report of the Census, by E. D. MacLagen, Calcutta, Government of India, 1892.

Census of India, 1901, The Punjab, its Feudatories, and the North West Frontier Province, Part I, The Report of the Census, Vol. XVII, by H. A. Rose, Lahore, 1902.

Census of India, 1911, Punjab, Part I, Report, Vol. XIV, by Pandit M. Kaul, Civil and Military Gazette Press, Lahore, 1912.

Census of India, 1921, Punjab, Part I, Report, Civil and Military Gazette Press, Lahore, 1923.

Government of India, Statement of Newspapers and Periodicals Published in the Punjab, 1910.

Government of India, Statement of Newspapers and Periodicals Published in the Punjab, 1923.

Government of India, Statement of Newspapers and Periodicals Published in the Punjab, 1934.

The Imperial Gazeteer of India, Vol. XII, Einme to Gwalior, New Edition, Oxford, 1908.

India, Report, Home Department, Calcutta, 1917-1935.
India in 1920-21.
India in 1921-22.
India in 1927-28.
India in 1931-32.

The Indian Annual Register: An Annual Digest of Public Affairs in India, edited by N. N. Mitra, Annual Register Office, Calcutta, July-December, 1931 issue.

Indian Round Table Conference, Proceedings, 2 volumes, First and Second Sessions, 1931-1932.

Punjab District Gazeteers, Vol. XXI A, 1914, Superintendent Government Printing, Lahore, 1915.

UNPUBLISHED GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS

Commonwealth Relations Library, Selections from the Vernacular Newspapers Published in the Punjab (1885-1924).

Government of India, Home Department, Political File, Delhi Records, Proceedings of November, 1912, Nos. 46-47, "The Position of the Ahmadies in India."

Government of India, Home Department, Political File "A", Proceedings, October, 1913.

Government of India, Home Department, File No. 132/27, Serial Nos. 1-39.

Government of India, Home Department, File D 7245/34 Poll., 1934.

Government of India, Home Department, Political Section, File No. 72/36, Poll., 1935.

Government of India, Home Department, File 4399/36 Poll., 1936.

Government of India, Home Department, File 2757/36 Poll., 1936

Government of India, Home Department, Confidential File, 3747/36 Poll.

Government of India, Home Department, Confidential File, 5708/36 Poll.

Government of India, Home Department, Confidential File, 5981/36 Poll.

GOVERNMENT OF PAKISTAN DOCUMENTS

Report of the Court of Inquiry Constituted under Punjab Act II of 1954 to Enquire into the Punjab Disturbances of 1953, Lahore, Superintendent, Government Printing, 1954.

PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS

Church Missionary Society, Proceedings, (1891-1895), London.

Indian Evangelical Review, Vols. XXIX and XXX, Traill and Co., Calcutta, 1902-1903.

The Moslem Sunrise, Vols. XXIII-XXV, Chicago, 1951-1953.

Review of Religions, Vols. I-XXXV, Qadian, India, 1902-1936.

The Light, Ahmadiyyah Buildings, Lahore, issues from 1955-1959.

UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

Barrier, Norman Gerald, Punjab Politics and the Disturbances of 1907, Ph.D. dissertation, Duke University, 1966.

Friedmann, Y., Sheikh Ahmad Sirhindi, Ph.D. dissertation, McGill University, 1966.

Graham, J. Reid, The Arya Samaj as a Reformation in Hinduism with Special Reference to Caste, Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1942.

Jones, Kenneth W., The Arya Samaj in the Punjab: A Study of Social Reform and Religious Revivalism 1877-1902, Ph.D. dissertation, University of California at Berkeley, 1966.

Mushir ul-Haqq, Muslim English Relations in India (1803-1824), M.A. thesis, McGill University, 1963.

Mushir ul-Haqq, Religion and Politics in India (1857-1947), Ph.D. dissertation, McGill University, 1967.

Zafrullah Khan, Sir Muhammad, The Reminiscences of Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan, Oral History Research Office, Columbia University, New York, 1962.

WORKS IN URDŪ BY MĪRZĀ GHULĀM AHMAD

(This is as complete a listing of Aḥmad's Urdū works as was available. Dates are listed where given; publication at Qādiyān unless otherwise noted.)

Anjām-i-ʿĀṣim (1896)

Arbaʿīn (1900)

Āryā Dharm (1895)

Āʾinah-i-Kamālāt-i-Islām (1883)

Ayyām-i-Sulḥ (1899)

Barāhīn-i-Aḥmadīyah (4 volumes, 1888; 5th volume, 1905)

Barkāt ul-Du'ā' (to Sir Sayyid)

Chashma-i-Masīhī (1906)

Chashma-i-Ma'rifat (1908)

Dāfi' ul-Balā' (1902)

Fath-e-Islām (1890)

Gavarnament-i-Angrezī awr jihād (1900)

Hamamat ul-Bushrā (1893)

Haqqīqat ul-Mahdī (1899)

Haqqīqat ul-Wahī (1907)

Hazrat ul-Aqdās kī purānī taqrīrēn (1899)

Ī'jāz-i-Ahmadī (1902)

Ī'jāz-i-Masīh (1901)

Istiftā' (1897)

Itmān ul-Hujjah (1894)

Izāla-i-Awhām (1891)

Jang-i-Muqaddas (Amritsar, 1893)

Kalimah-i-Tayyibah (published, 1917)

Kashf-ul-Ghitā' (1898)

Kitāb-ul-Barrīah (1885?)

Lekchar Lāhōr (1896)

Lekchar Sialkōt (1904)

Majmu'a'-i-Malfuzāt-i-Khawarajajān-i-Chisht (1906)

Maktūbāt-i-Ahmadīyah (2 volumes)

Malfūzāt-i-Ahmadīyah (1902)

Manzūr-i-Ilāhī (published, 1922?)

Masīh Hindūstān Mēn (1899)

Nashūr-i-Da'wat (1903)

Nishān-i-Asmānī (1892)

Nūr ul-Qur'ān (Parts 1 and 2, 1895)

Nuzūl-i-Masīḥ (published, 1909)

Payghām-i-Ṣulḥ (1908)

Qādiyān ke Āryā awr ham (1907)

Radd-i-Niyog (1895)

Roz-i-Haqqīqat (1898)

Sabz Ishtihār (1888)

Sanātan Dharam (1902)

Sat Bachon (1896)

Shahādat ul-Qur'ān (1893)

Shaḥnah-i-haqq (1894)

Silsilah-i-Taṣnīfat-i-Ahmadīyah

Siraj ud-Dīn 'Isā'ī ke char savālonkā javāb (published, 1923)

Siraj-i-Munīr (1897)

Sirr-ul-khilāfah (1894)

Surma-i-Chashm-i-Āryā (1886)

Tabligh-i-Risālat

Tajjalī-i-Mayāt

Taqārīr (1897)

Tawzīh-i-Marām (1897)

Tazkirāt ul-shahādatayn (1903)

Tiryaq ul-Qulūb

Tuhfa-i-Bahdād (1892)

Tuhfa-i-Ghaznavīyah (1902)

Zarurat ul-imām

Ẓīyā al-ḥaqq

OTHER WORKS IN URDŪ

Rām, Lēkh, Āryā Musāfir.

Rām, Lēkh, Hujjat-ul-Islām, Jullundār, 1897.

Rām, Lēkh, Ibṭāl-i-Basharāt-i-Aḥmadīyah, Jullundār, 1897.

Rām, Lēkh, Jihād, Lahor, 1892.

Rām, Lēkh, Nuska-i-Khabt -i-Aḥmadīyah, Amritsar, 1888.

Shahīd, Dost Muḥammad, Tarīkh-i-Aḥmadīyah, 9 volumes, Rabwah, n.d.

APPENDIX "A"

MEMORIAL FROM THE PUNJAB WAHABI COMMUNITY

Your Honor's memorialists have respectfully to state that the peace and prosperity which prevail throughout India under the British Government and their principles of ruling are as brilliant as the sun in the sky. No other government have ever acted upon those principles to the same extent.

Your Honor's memorialists are therefore entitled to ask for their privileges. The loyal subjects of every government have right to ask for their privileges, but not so freely as from a just government. As much as a government is just, civilized and unprejudiced, the subjects ask for their privileges accordingly.

As the British Government abundantly possess the above virtues, and according to their principles, their subjects enjoy full liberty, both religious and social (the Mussalmans, as per Sir William Muir's saying, publicly offer their prayers, make loud calls for prayers in the mosques and make sacrifices, &c; the Hindus in their temples freely perform their religious rites; in short, all sections of the community enjoy perfect freedom in religious and social matters), it is a matter of great mortification, if, in regard to a portion of the subjects the principles of ruling are not attended to and their privileges rejected.

This applies to memorialists who are the faithful and loyal subjects of their enlightened government in the Punjab numbering several thousand individuals,--that they are not allowed to enjoy the same freedom both religious and social, and are also put to numerous troubles.

The reasons for the above treatment on the part of the Government is either from the false accounts of some of the journalists and newswriters or from the erroneous statements of the prejudiced Muhammadan professors and influenced persons possessing other religious persuasions than the memorialists. The Government or the executive high officers of the Government have entertained a suspicion that the memorialists are Wahabis, hold lawful the crusade or religious war against the Government, and keep communication with and assist the disaffected tribe of Muhammadans in Satana. This false suspicion has given birth to troubles and deprivations to the memorialists, some of which are here enumerated:-

1st. That like other people the memorialists do not enjoy perfect freedom in their religious exercises.

2nd. That those who think the memorialists right and have the same religious conviction, fearing to fall under the same suspicion, are debarred from associating from the memorialists, and consequently that the latter cannot perform the marriage ties, offer prayers in bodies in the mosques, or attend the funeral processions and Eed prayers.

3rd. That the people, finding the memorialists suspected by the Government, take all sorts of liberty to trouble them with impunity, being perfectly sure in such cases that the judgment would be opposed to the interests of the memorialists, and even the proceedings of the officers are rather prejudicial, and as a precedent they beg respectfully to refer to the case of one Sheikh Rahim Bakhsh, plaintiff, resident of Batala, in the Gurdaspur district, versus Sekunder Khan and others, defendants, also residents of the same place. The facts of the case were that the defendants had ill treated and abused the plaintiff in the following terms--"Wahabi. enemy of the human race, mischievous to the people, infidel and irreligious"--and prohibited all dealings with the plaintiff, and even filed a representation to the same effect in the court. On this the plaintiff filed a complaint in the district court, and on the evidence given the complaint was admitted and the charges defined and specified, but afterwards Mr. Maconachie, the magistrate, labouring under the same suspicion and crediting the false stories of the defendants, dismissed the case and recorded in the judgment that the Government regarded the Wahabis inimical, that they were troublesome and quarrelsome people, and that the Government had

considered them hostile to the peace and safety of their subjects, and had taken necessary precautions against them. Besides, other hard terms were used against the plaintiff, Sheikh Rahim Bakhsh, who is a respectable gentleman, in the court, and this proved a cause of disgrace to them. There are many other similar cases, a list of which is herewith enclosed for your Honor's perusal.

4th. In the cases instituted in the various courts no sooner the magistrate is informed that a certain party in the case is a Wahabi than he is prejudicial against the alleged Wahabi party, and the case is spoiled, although the religion of the parties to a case should not exercise any influence on the decision thereof.

5th. The Government officials of the memorialists' religious conviction are unnecessarily transferred from one place to another or dismissed under the erroneous suspicion above detailed.

6th. The professors of this persuasion are publicly exposed to disgrace. There are numerous instances of this fact, but here only one recent occurrence is related. Maulvi Ubdullah, resident of Guzni in Afghanistan, who was during the mutiny prosecuting his studies in Delhi (in the outburst of popular frenzy, when the friends turned into foes of the

Government) did not put his seal to the declaration of religious war against the Government at the risk of losing his life, but gave shelter to an English lady, who was wounded, in the house of Maulvi Nazir Hoosein and dressed her wounds, and when she got well, during the heat of war, managed to have her conducted safely to the English camp on the hill opposite Delhi. Copies of the letters from her husband relating to the Maulvi's services are herewith enclosed. It may be safely stated that the above proceeding of the Maulvie was fraught with danger to his life. It was considered by the mutineers an offence punishable with death. This Maulvie, when he returned from Kabul, having received ill treatment, hoping peace and safety under the British Government, settled at Khair Dee, Amritsar district. After a few days at the request of certain residents of that place, who provided quarters for him, he went to Amritsar, but was turned out of the city by the Deputy Commissioner for unfounded suspicion and suggestions of ignorant persons who attempt to prove themselves well-wishers of Government, but who in reality gain their object of religious prejudice, and was confined in the village of Khair Dee, where daily necessaries of life are procured with difficulty, and in case of illness the requisite

medicines are not available. This case was represented to the Commissioner of the Division, but no notice was taken, and the Maulvie is still there as a prisoner. There are numerous occurrences of similar description which militate against the principles of British ruling.

Under these circumstances your Honor's memorialists, persecuted as they are, most respectfully beg to remind the Government of their enlightened principles and to affirm that they are not Wahabis (there being no such tribe among the Muhammadans, but is a name given by nothing but ignorant persons to have them suspected by Government and thus secure their object of religious prejudice), and do not hold religious war lawful against the Government who observes toleration towards the other religionists, nor the memorialists maintain any communication with the people of Satana nor assist them. The memorialists, like other Muhammadans in India, belong to the Suni sect, the difference being only this, that the memorialists observe only the original doctrine of Islam, while the other Mussulmans practise and prefer the rites, ceremonies, and customs of the country observed by Hindus.

Regarding the religious war both hold the same opinion. The Mussulmans who observe customs published a book on the subject at Calcutta, and the professors of the memorialists did the same. These books show that to wage religious war against the English Government is not lawful, and to verify

this statement the Government may institute an enquiry and inflict consign punishment on the disaffected, but it is not consistent with justice to suspect the whole sect for any individual misdemeanour. If the Government credit the statement of the memorialists and believe them to be loyal and obedient subjects, they will look to the persecution and troubles to which the memorialists are subjected and issue instructions to the police and civil officers of the various districts to grant them their privileges, to remove the surveillance from them, and to abolish the registration of the names of the memorialists, and to prohibit the people from calling the memorialists hostile to Government, and to announce their restoration to the confidence of the Government.

The memorialists are sure that if the Government will not give them due protection the people will continue to persecute them, in which case they will have either to live in constant distress or perish.

source: enclosed in Punjab Government circular 63-3838, Nov. 17, 1876.

reply: undated, Oct. 29, 1876, Punjab Government to Maulvis Muhammad Hussain and Rahimulla, and three hundred other petitioners

you are known as Wahabi, not reproach by G--good not disloyal--G. treats all equally--but some in other areas have acted disloyal--also, Hazara border, Malka--

Any opposition to the public observance of the Wahabi form of worship is due to the body of Muhammadans themselves, and not to the Govern-

ment. The Wahabis are a sect of dissenters from that form of Muhammadanism ordinarily practised in the Punjab, and while they may claim the free practice of their ceremonies and the preaching of their distinctive doctrines in their own mosques, they cannot insist upon the use of the mosques which have been built by the money and for the use of orthodox Muhammadans.

APPENDIX "B"

LIST OF WORKS CONTAINING PROHIBITION OF JEHĀD AND SUPPORTING THE GOVERNMENT

BY MĪRZĀ GHULĀM AḤMAD

As quoted from the appendix of the tract "Jehad and the British Government," Lāhōr, 1900

No.	Name of Work	Pages	Date	Subject
1	Barāhīn-i-Ahmadīya, Part III.	الف and ب	1882	Prohibition against Jehād; the benefits conferred by the British Government.
2	Barāhīn-i-Ahmadīya, Part IV.	الف and ب ج د	1884	Urging sympathy for mankind in general and loyalty to the British Government.
3	Izāla-i-Auhām, Part I.	131-133	1891	The tyranny of the Sikhs; the numerous advantages of the British rule; the services rendered to this Government by the author's family.
4	Izāla-i-Auhām, Part II.	509, 723-726, 825-835, 849, 853, and 854.	1891	Calling upon the Muslims to pray for the success of the English; the impudence of the Muslims who oppose the Government; Jehad against such a Government strictly forbidden.
5	Appendix to Shahādat-ul-Qurān.	to	1893	The services of the author's family; illegality of Jehad against the British Government.

6	Āina-i-Kamālāt-i-Islām.	18-20 511-528	1893	The British Government is a great blessing of God for the Muslim community.
7	Hamāmat-ul-Bushrā.	39-42	1894	The benefits conferred on the people of this country by the British Government.
8	Nūr-ul-Haq, Part I.	23-54	1894	The blessings of the reign of Her Majesty the Empress of India.
9	Nūr-ul-Haq, Part II.	49-50	1894	Arguments showing that no Ghāzī Mahdi will appear, and that Jehād against this Government is unlawful.
10	Sirr-ul-khilafa.	71-74	1894	Refutation of the common belief in the appearance of a Ghāzī Mahdi; Jehād against this Government is a sin.
11	Itmām-ul-Hujjah.	26-27	1894	Jehād against the British Government is declared to be unlawful.
12	My Attitude towards the British Government.	Whole	1894	An account of the Blessings of the British Government; Jehād against it is unlawful; refutations of an objection of "The Civil and Military Gazette."
13	Notification...	Whole	27-2-95	An advice to the author's followers to be loyal and faithful subjects of the British Government.
14	Mi yār-ul-Mazāhib, an appendix to Nūr-ul-Qurān.	Whole	1895	The British Government is a blessing of God; its numerous advantages.

15	Notification...	Whole	1895	The British Government is a blessing of God; its numerous advantages.
16	Al-a māl-obinniyyāt.	Whole	1895	It is sinful to think of any rebellion against this Government; the Muslims should be loyal and obedient subjects.
17	Appendix to Ārya Dharm.	Whole	1895	Prayers for the welfare of the Government; a proposal to bring about union amongst the different religions.
18	Memorial to H. E. the Viceroy.	Whole	1896	A proposal to bring about peace and harmony amongst the adherents of different sects; methods in which excitement in religious controversies may be avoided.
19	Notification (Juma holiday)	Whole	1896	Gifts and favours of the British Government; calling upon the Muslims to pray for its welfare.
20	Anjām-i-Ātham...	36, 68, 137, 140 and 159	1896	The author's object can only be attained in peace and tranquility; hence, his prayers and good wishes for the British Government.
21	Notification attached to Kitāb-ul-Bariyat.	7, 9, 12, 13 and 16	1897	The author's services; directions to his followers to hate evil and to be loyal to Government; a request to this adversaries to be mild and polite in their writings.
22	Sirāj-i-Munīr...	23, 24 and 74	1897	The Promised Messiah and Mahdi will not wage wars, but show heavenly signs in his support.

23	Notification...	--	24-5-97	The doctrine of the advent of a Ghāzi Mahdi or Messiah is false.
24	Proceedings of a meeting held on the occasion of the Jubilee.	Whole	22-6-97	Thanksgivings for the benefits we enjoy under Her Majesty and prayers for Her Majesty's long life.
25	Notification...	Whole	1897	Notice to convene a meeting for offering thanks for the advantages of this Government.
26	Tuhfa-i-Qaisariya.	Whole	1897	A detailed account of the advantages of this Government.
27	Notification...	Whole	25-6-97	The Sultan of Turkey is not our religious Caliph; the British Government is preferable to the Turkish.
28	Notification about the plague...	Whole	22-4-98	Notice for a meeting at Qadian in support of the Government measures for the suppression of the plague.
29	Proceedings of a meeting held at Qadian on 2nd May 1898...	Whole	4-5-98	Government measures for the suppression of the plague are in accordance with Islamic law and should be supported.
30	Ishtihār.	Whole	6-2-98	It is the duty of every true Muslim to support the Government measures.
31	Memorial to H. H. the Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab.	Whole	5-3-98	The services of the author's family and letters from the Government acknowledging the same; refutation of the doctrine of Jehād.

32	Memorial to H. E. the Viceroy.	Whole	22-9-98	Undue harshness of the opponents of Islam, the Quranic teaching of patience and forbearance on such occasions; three proposals for bringing about peace and harmony amongst the various religious sects.
33	Ishtihār.	Whole	29-5-98	Exhorting his followers to be faithful and law-abiding subjects of the British Government.
34	Al-Inzār.	57-82	1898	The advantages of this Government; its measures should be supported.
35	Zarūrat-ul-Imām.	23, 41, 48	1898	It is shown with reference to the Qur'ān that we should sincerely obey the British Government which is our lawful sovereign.
36	Kashf-ul-Ghita.	Whole	1898	An account of the author and his family; a brief summary of the principles of his mission; the double policy of the Moulvies who believe in the advent of Ghāzi Mahdi and a thorough refutation of this doctrine.
37	Ayyām-us-Sulh.	28, 53, 59-61, 91, 120-131, and 161	1-1-99	The Promised Messiah shall not wage wars; Jehād against the Government strictly prohibited; the blessings of the British rule.
38	Haqiqat-ul-Mahdi	Whole	21-2-99	Falsification of the doctrine of the Ghāzi Mahdi, the general belief of the Moulvies and ignorant masses in this doctrine is unfounded; Jehād under the present circumstances is unlawful.

39	Ishtihār.	2	26-2-99	Advantages of the British Government.
40	The Star of the Empress.	Whole	24-8-99	The numerous earthly and heavenly blessings of the reign of Her Majesty.
41	Ishtihār.	2	22-10-99	Blessings of the British rule.
42	Ditto.	3	17-12-99	Ditto, ditto.
43	Proceedings of a meeting held on 2nd February 1900.	Whole	March 1900	It is proved with reference to the Qur'ān that obedience to this Government is the duty of every true Muslim; Jehād against it is a sin; comparison between the Sikh and the English rule; prayers for the success of British arms in South Africa.
44	Ishtihār.	-	28-5-1900	Prohibition against Jehād.
45	Ditto.	Whole	7-6-1900	Fatwa prohibiting religious Jehād.

APPENDIX "C"

A TRANSLATION OF THE "ISTIFTĀ*" (INQUIRY) BY MĪRZĀ GHULĀM AḤMAD
(published at Lāhōr, May 1, 1897)

Cover Letter

Sir,

I beg to enclose herewith a copy of the pamphlet named "Istifta".* The motive which had led me to write is, that the Aryas entertain quite a false notion that Lekh Ram was murdered at my instigation. I am inclined to excuse them for this, as they are entirely ignorant of the supernatural origin of prophecies, and according to their belief inspiration and revelation from God belonged only to the hoary antiquity, now they have become extinct, in other words the Divine influence is not eternal, but a thing of the past. Therefore they cannot reconcile the prophetic phenomena with the present age. However a study of the pamphlet, it is hoped, will not only clear me of any participation direct or indirect in Lekh Ram's murder, but will also be useful to those who deny the existence of prophetic revelation in this age, and who consider the power of telling future events inconsistent with the laws of Nature. At any rate this pamphlet will probably be

---

*Istifta is an Arabic word and means to consult a learned man for an opinion.

interesting and instructive to those who sincerely seek a reply to the questions;-(1) "Is there a God at all"?; (2) "If so, does He reveal future events to His Elite."? I have answered these questions by fully explaining such reasons as conclusively prove that the prophecy about Lekh Ram was actually revealed by God, and that it was altogether out of the province of man's capabilities and device.

I have repeatedly said that Lekh Ram had challenged me to make the prophecy concerning himself which if it were fulfilled was to be the sole criterion of the truth or falsehood of Islam and the Arya faith. And when the prophecy was made, both the parties agreed to give it a very wide publication and awaited the result most anxiously. At last it has been most clearly and definitely fulfilled. The most curious phase of the prophecy, which has been very thoroughly discussed in these pages, is, that it was published in clear and unequivocal words in the "BURAHIN-I-AHMADIYAH" about seventeen years ago when Lekh Ram was a mere boy of twelve or thirteen years. The readers of this pamphlet must carefully consider this fact which, I believe, will improve their faculty of discernment, and by clearly shewing them the difference between Divine and human powers, will settle their thoughts and satisfy their minds.

It would not be out of place to invite your attention to another of my books--"SIRAJ-I-MUNIR" or "THE BRIGHT SUN,"--which deals with this important question from another point

of view. All the prophecies which were made and literally fulfilled before Lekh Ram's death, have been collected therein, and a few of them concerned some other Aryas who are still alive to bear testimony to what they experienced in their own cases. If any of my readers before attempting a reply to this pamphlet should like to see the "SIRAJ-I-MUNIR" it shall be sent to him with great pleasure.

I should also mention that those Maulvies, who like the Aryas, bewildered by the too accurate and unexpected fulfilment of the prophecy, and who being utterly devoid of spirituality are befogged by doubt, will find it worth their while to peruse this book.

I send this pamphlet to you so that after a careful consideration of the arguments I have given, you may give your impartial opinion as to the following points:-

1. Has the prophecy about Lekh Ram been actually fulfilled?

2. If so can it be said that the prophecy is supernatural, that is, neither a design or man nor a mere accident, but a special manifestation of the Divine powers, which may be termed a revealed prophecy?

And communicate the same with your arguments in support of your views to

Your ever faithful,

Kadian:

Dated 1st May 1897.

MIRZA GHULAM AHMED,
Chief of Kadian.
Gurdaspur District,
Punjab.

Translation of the Urdū Text of Ahmad's Istiftā'

(This translation of relevant excerpts has been prepared with the assistance of 'Abid Ullāh Ghazī of Harvard University.)

I begin by asking those people who have eyes to see and who have intelligent opinions whether these revelations witness to the fact that the prophecies which I have made about the death of Lākh Rām have really been fulfilled or not? If, according to them, these prophecies witness (to the fact) that these writings are beyond the power of man's fingers to write or beyond the power of man's designs to create, and are extraordinary, then they must be the result of God's help. (If this is so,) I would ask them to sign as witnesses. God will grant them a reward for being good witnesses. (There are) those people who do not believe in these witnesses, arguments and prophecies, who think it was a man-made plan which I advertised as a prophecy and that as a consequence of our controversy, Lākh Rām was killed in Lāhōr, March 6, 1897. Those (unbelievers) are free not to subscribe to this prophecy. (But, they have no right) to count me among the killers....

(2) What the Āryā Samājīs have against this prophecy is that they did not recognize its prophetic nature and so have called it a man-made plan. This prophecy was already about four years old and had been made public through various meetings, speeches and writings when the Hindūs came to know that Lākh Rām's life would be ended disasterously; and also,

that he would die during the days of 'Id within six years (of the prophecy). The prophecy clearly pointed out that an assassination would actually occur. At that time, they thought it was beyond anyone to prophesy on behalf of God and they did not know who was putting these unknown (sayings) into the mouth of a man. Therefore, they contradicted (me) and boldly published (their view) that God does prophesy so clearly about an event such as the death of a man before its coming. They said, in fact, this man (Aḥmad) is the killer of Lēkh Rām and (his death) is part of a great conspiracy which has been planned for a long time. They wrote several newspaper articles and informed Government (of their view) so that on Thursday, April 8, 1897, English officers came and searched my house. At that time the handwritten letters of Lēkh Rām came into their possession and they saw the document of agreement (between us) also. In order to show the signs of Heaven, we had established conditions and by our mutual consent this prophecy had been declared as the standard of truth or falsehood. The subject of the paper, which was read before the District Superintendent of Police (at the time it was prepared), was that any prophecy that would be made about Lēkh Rām would be decisive in the relations between the Āryās and Qādiyānīs. (A favourable outcome) would prove the truth of Islām being established, but (if the prophecy turned out) false then Hindū religious truth would be established and Islām would be repudiated. (I take refuge in God for saying so.) These

Leaf 431 omitted in page numbering.

statements were included on the insistence of Pandit Lēkh Rām, (3) and because I believed in the promises of God and respected them.

Why is this "Istiftā'" necessary? It is not only that the Āryās are accusing me of a secret conspiracy but that some of the elders of our own community (i.e., Muslims) have agreed with them, in spite of the fact that the result of my great prophecy being proven false, according to the rules of the agreement, would then cause Islām to be declared false. So, Mawlawī Abū Sa'īd Muḥammad Ḥusayn Batālwi, the editor of Ishā'at-i-Sunnah, and other mawlawīs have published the opinion that this prophecy is proved false. He (Ḥusayn) even sent me a letter in which he wrote that he had decided in his own good conscience that this prophecy was not fulfilled and that Lēkh Rām's death was only an accidental matter in which God did not play any role.

For my part, I would not care about it (this assertion) but in accordance with the agreement which was signed and read before the District Superintendent of Police, everyone knew that ignoring the proof would allow an attack to be made on Islām which should not be allowed to pass. I am therefore writing all this detail so that intelligent people can see how cruel it will be if we start to argue like this. Then, no prophecy of any prophet would stand because the doors of suspicion would open everywhere. To say that this (Lēkh Rām's death) was only an accident and that they should now

agree that there is no witness to any prophet's prophecy is wrong. Tawrāt and Qur'ān have both accepted the proof of nabūwat. Any troublemaker could call any prophecy an "accident". Suspicions arise when people decide that God's system is not perfect. Such suspicions come in the hearts of those who do not have a real knowledge of God's truth. If Lēkh Rām died accidently (4) then such an accident, in which no one intended to kill him, would be possible; or, if he (the killer) had done so, he would have been unsuccessful in his attempt; or, if he was attacked, he might not have been killed. So why is it that such an accident did not occur? And this event, which could have had many variations to it--was it an act of God, or of someone else? The sign of truth is this: that some of its prophecies are fulfilled. There is a condition in some because prophecies of punishment may be delayed because of repentance as happened for the people of Yūnus.

(5) I want to begin by copying down those letters of Pandit Lēkh Rām, the agreement and the answer, all of which were part of our correspondance. First letter:

> ...Mīrzā sāḥib:
>
> Since I am here in Qādiyān and in our mutual correspondance we did not come to any satisfactory conclusion and since I have come to the conclusion (that we must meet) for the sake of truth, I therefore request you to take some time to come to the madrasah or some other place--your own house, so that I might come to you with brothers Kushān Singh and Ḥakīm Dayārām and Pandit Naḥāl Chand. Then we might come to an agreement about the heavenly signs and revelations (you claim). Otherwise, you should remember clearly from my side, I have exhausted the arguments. To turn

your face away is not the way of the wise man.
...Respects, The Seeker of Truth,
Lākh Rām,
December 5, 1885.

Second letter of Lākh Rām:

...Mīrzā sāḥib:

Orally through Kashān Singh and in detail through Mawlawī Dīn Muḥammad and Muḥammad ʿUmar I received a reply to my letter on this subject: that we should discuss two or three questions concerning the Āryā Dharma and the schools of Islam. The regulations about the dialogue should be settled according to the desire of the two parties. So I am writing to you in answer to that (oral) letter to say that my aim in coming from Peshāwar to Qādiyān was only this: that I am staying here in the hope that I should see and confirm your miracles, revelations, heavenly signs and extraordinary powers. Before we talk of anything else, this matter should be settled amiably in the company of respectable people. If you do not confirm this and try to deviate from it, then I am still prepared to join in any other dialogue. Let me tell you also that (it is one thing) to stay at home and prove (oneself) before one's own disciples but confirmation by the learned and educated is something else. I hope you will give me the right answer and not bring me excuses.

Lākh Rām

(P.S.) For the second and third times, I want to request that if you have any signs, then show (them), otherwise, for God's sake, just keep quiet....

Lākh Rām (no date)

Third letter:

Dear Mīrzā:

I hate the long detailed story of the Thousand and One Nights. I do not want to repeat myself and make this letter overly long. (6) Those conditions which I prepared (concerning the signs of God), which I sent you and which copy you have, should be sent along with your own conditions (to be considered by) four just persons. Whatever the judges support we should act upon. There is the (Persian) saying of a wiseman, 'Hold one door and hold it fast.' I

do act this way. Alas, you won't settle on anything. O, Brother, this will surely happen. [that at the time of the proof of the falsity or truth of the signs of Heaven] then I shall become a Muslim. And if the condition is such for me, then you shall become an Āryā. If these (conditions) occur, the reward will be 300 rupees forfeit. If God will establish (my) the truth, then I will get the money from you--otherwise your money will be returned to you and all my efforts will be wasted and your money increased ....You claim to be an answerer of prayers (mujīb al-da'wāt).* If you want to talk, then go ahead ...you are entitled to your own ideas. I have spent twenty-five days here and have to leave tomorrow or the day after that. If you want to demonstrate some conditions, then show them before righteous men, otherwise, after this, do not talk too much--even among your friends. The best thing would be for you to come to the madrasah and give proof of shaytān wa shafā'at wa shaq al-qamār....(Find) a judge to administer it (the agreement). On my behalf, Mīrzā Imām ud-Dīn sāḥib will be a judge. If you don't agree to that, then for God's sake, stop it all!

Lēkh Rām, December 13, 1885.

Fourth letter:

...Mīrzā saḥīb: I received your two page letter. From this it is obvious that the exalted Qur'ān is full of absurdities about Ibrahīm, Musā, 'Isā...etc. (7) I want to talk about yesterday's letter and you are obviously trying to postpone or find excuses. Mīrzājī, alas! alas! You don't desire a settlement....Apart from this you claim to be the second Messiah. Prove your claim and don't make unnecessary fuss.

Lēkh Rām at the Āryā Samāj, Qādīan
9 a.m. (no date)

---

*(Aḥmad's footnote) Lēkh Rām claims he knows Arabic but he does not because a "mujīb al-da'wāt" could only be God; what he wanted to say was "mustajāb al-da'wāt". Reflect on the claim of these Āryās that Lēkh Rām knows Arabic.... As a matter of fact, this man knows neither Arabic nor Sanskrit. But we cannot stop liars. (end of note).

Fifth letter:

> ...Mīrzā sāhib: Alas, that you regard your horse as a horse but other horses as mules. I have answered the Vedic objections and you have answered objections to the Qur'ān from Tradition. That is far from reason. If you are not free, then I, too, have much work to do. If you do not want to talk, then at least show some heavenly signs! Please ask the Lord to show some heavenly sign about me so that the matter may be decided.**
> Lākh Rām (no date).

(**Ahmad writes a long footnote here on the meaning of the phrase "khayr al-makirīn" in Qur'ān 3:53 as a way of explaining how God might punish Lākh Rām.)

All of these letters were answered in detail and it is not necessary to copy all of them here because Lākh Rām was in the habit of exaggerating and telling lies. He wrote again and again that I was not a prophet, (8) that I did not show signs or give convincing replies. As to the conditions, this method was presented before him clearly, that he should argue on the authority of Vedic srutī and we would accept the exalted Qur'ān (as authority). Since he was completely ignorant and did not have the ability to present the Vedas as srutī in every argument, therefore, he did not mention our demands in his letters. With great laughter and mockery he wanted heavenly signs....

Therefore, I wrote in my last letter,

> Pandit sāhib: I have read your letter. You must understand we are not denying the dialogue nor the showing of signs but because you are not asking for the search for truth with the proper intentions and (you) increase reasonable conditions, and your tongue does not stop from evil speech. You write that you do not want to argue. Then ask the Lord for some sign about me. (Your words)

> are but words of mockery. You have no faith in a God who warns against such daring. You use the terms "ʿarsh" and "khayr al-makirīn" to refer to God, out of your own ignorance. "Makr" is that hidden way which is properly applicable to God. The word "ʿarsh" refers to the greatness of God because he is highest of the high and he is exalted. It is not that he needs a throne. It is said in the Qurʾān that he holds everything and is established, not needing anyone's support. (9) How can you object to the word "ʿarsh" if you do not know Arabic at all? You do not even know what "makr" means. There is no such word which in its meaning could not be attributed to God and the plans that he has to punish the mischief makers. First examine the dictionary, then raise an objection! If you say I do not know the Vedas it does not matter because I argue according to established principles. But you go completely outside the established principles of Islām. You say open lies. For signs rest with God who is all powerful and He will show you.
> Mīrzā Ghulām Aḥmad (no date)

The agreement which Lēkh Rām and I decided (to sign) was headed in his own handwriting: "Om: Sat Chit Ananda" (O God, establish the truth and destroy the untruth that your true Vedic teaching shall be established universally).

To put that detailed argument briefly, (it) said that any prophecy which I made concerning Lēkh Rām which did not prove to be true would be accepted as an argument favouring Hindū religion and the person making the prophecy would be obligated to accept the Āryā religion or pay 350 rupees to Lēkh Rām. (We agreed) that this amount must be deposited before Sharampat Rāē of Qādiyān and if the one making the prophecy (Aḥmad) was proven true, then it would prove the truth of Islām (and) Pandit Lēkh Rām would accept the religion of Islām.

After that the prophecy was made according to which Lēkh Rām's life ended on March 6, 1897. On February 20, 1886, according to an advertisement, he was informed again, that if by this prophecy he should feel pain, he should not speak about it. But Lēkh Rām's impertinence and brazen courage led him to sent me a card under his signature as has been mentioned in the (later) advertisement of February 20, 1893. He wrote:

> I consider your prophecies ridiculous. (10)
> Publish whatever you think about me.

In spite of that, there was a delay from my side (for I realized that) God had not specified the exact date of the prophecy and Lēkh Rām insisted that it should be mentioned in connection with a specific period. Finally on February 20, 1893 after great contemplation, prayer and humility before God, it was revealed to me that within six years of that date a great disaster would befall Lēkh Rām and he would meet his death. On that occasion, I received this revelation:

عجل جسد له خوار - له نصب و عذاب

On page 2 and 3 of this document there is this statement.

> Now I publish this prophecy so that Christians, Aryans and Muslims and all other groups will know that within six years of this date--February 20, 1893--there will come an extraordinary and unique curse and this will have the great terror of God in it. If it doesn't happen then you will know that I am neither from God nor are my words from his soul. If according to these prophecies, I am proved a liar, then I will be glad to undergo any punishment. I am prepared to submit to having a noose around my neck.

Now people must realize what humiliation I was prepared to undertake in case the matter turned out false and how clearly I staked my life on this prophecy. There are those who may question if this has been done under the will of God (and he is the final arbitrator of all disputes). How can they say that the decision in such a major case whose result two great nations were awaiting could take place without God's knowledge or intention?

(11) The second revealed prophecy about Lēkh Rām was written in Karamāt al-Ṣadiqīn (p. 64).

> Verily, whatever deception (O, Muḥammad Ḥusayn, Batālwi) you may do, ultimately God will be victorious and God has given me good news. Know verily, that the day of ʿId and the ʿId is near. This man will die near to the day of ʿId itself. God has promised me mercy that he has accepted my prayer about this enemy of God...this Lēkh Rām of Peshāwar. God has informed me that verily, he is among the destroyers, for he abused the rasūl allāh and said evil things. God has informed me that he will die within six years.

And this revelation:

عجل جسد خوار- لہ نصب و عذاب

refers to the broken calf which was destroyed on the Jewish day of ʿId, as the Tawrāt says in Exodus 32:5 (a reference to the passage about Aaron and the golden calf) where it says that Harūn said: "Tomorrow is the day of ʿId for God." Thus on March 6, 1897, Lēkh Rām was killed. This coincides with the prophecy I made. Therefore, God has mentioned Lēkh Rām (comparing him to the golden calf which was destroyed on the ʿId). (12) That was sufficient to prove the point

although God did not make it definite any more than by saying "that day of ʿId (destruction) will be near the day of ʿId." If the Hindūs think I had planned this murder they surely knew for a long time. Why didn't they arrange special security? ... (A lengthy discussion of the "golden calf" passage follows.) (14) God never honours a liar. I have never had an enmity against Lēkh Rām or anyone. If he has insulted someone who is the fountain of all truth and has become the enemy (of God) and if he has insulted me, then God decides whose honour shall be upheld. This prophecy was written on the title page of the pamphlet, "The Blessings of Prayers"....There was another prophecy about Lēkh Rām Peshāwarī which I received.

> News about Lēkh Rām. Today, April 2, 1893--13 Ramaḍan--in the morning, in a condition of half sleep, I saw myself sitting in a big house with friends before me. Meantime, I saw a strong man with terrible features coming before me, his face bleeding. As he stood before me, I looked at him and saw that he belonged to a new kind of species. He was not a man but from among the angels that God sends to punish people. Terror was in people's hearts. He was looking at me and he asked: "Where is Lēkh Rām?" I realized then that this man had been appointed to punish Lēkh Rām as well as another one whose name I do not remember. Then it passed from my heart.... The other person may be one of those about whom I have also spoken in my pamphlets.
> (Monday, 4 A.M.) (p. 15)

All of these prophecies were saying that Lēkh Rām's life was destined to end by assassination. There are poems from (my) book ʿĀina kamalāt al-Islām which were written as a kind of sign about this. I reprint some of those couplets here.... (A page of the verses with detailed explanations, repetitive

of what Ghulām Aḥmad had already discussed and claimed follows through page 25.)

(25) ...Some people have objected that Lēkh Rām died in the fifth and not the sixth year. The revelation said within six years--it was not specific. Such stupid people do not understand the philosophy of God's revelation. Sometimes God fixes limitations and sometimes he does not. Who can object to what God says? (26) If such a hidden prophecy had been made so early, and if it is proven how extraordinary they are and if he has the authority to describe such hidden prophecies seventeen years early,* then he should be offered to the world as an example. (*A reference to the statement on pages 20-21 that Aḥmad had also received a revelation about this matter which he had written about in Barāhīn.)

Some cruel mawlawīs like Muḥammad Ḥusayn Batālwī who have attacked those signs which God revealed to express the truth of Islām. (28) Thus, I am presenting this fatwā with the full details of events and witnesses, the books in which they were written. If some intelligent men want to see those books, they can always ask us. I request those people who care for the respect and integrity of Allāh and his messenger, (which comes out of this fatwā) that they should write on the attached sheet and get other witnesses to also, asking (God's) mercy on those who have gone astray....I am certain that such witnesses will come from among the respectable men of opinion with great enthusiasm and honest people will not

hide those things for which there is great gradeur in Islam. But those whose heart is sick and vulgar, God knows they are sinful of heart.

(29) This is my experience: that in not caring for that great ruler (Allāh) and in hiding from the true evidence, one will be inviting disgrace. (If) anyone who has read such a clear report will not still be inclined to recognize the evidence, we believe that such a person cares neither about God, his religion nor the honour of his loving prophet. But if he will recognize the true evidence, then I will pray God for his success in this world and the next.

I intend to publish these things in English for men of opinion in Europe because those people, by nature, have great courage to uphold the truth provided they are really convinced that it is true. First, I send this appeal before my brethren here to give them an opportunity (to study) this evidence which will keep their name in the list of pious men forever. Ghulām Aḥmad Qādiyānī, May 12, 1897.

APPENDIX "D"

CORRESPONDENCE IN THE CONTROVERSY BETWEEN MUḤAMMAD ʿALĪ AND BASHĪR-UD-DĪN MAḤMŪD AḤMAD

(As quoted from the tract, "Tbue Facts about the Split.")

The Questions of Mīr Muḥammad Isḥāq to Muḥammad ʿAlī (pp. 51-52)

"1. What is the relation at present, and what will it be in future, between the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyyah and the man sitting in the seat of the khilafat? What is, and what will be, the difference between them?

2. Can or cannot, the khalifah set aside and quash any decision of the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyyah?

3. Can, or cannot, the khalifah dismiss and remove any member of the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyyah without the existence of a legal cause?

4. Can, or cannot, the khalifah, besides dismissing one or more members of the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyyah, dissolve the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyyah altogether for legal, political and moral reasons, and take into his own hands the work of the various affairs of the Jama at?

5. Can, or cannot, the khalifah, if he so desires, keep in his own custody all the money of the Bait-ul-Maal, the Maqbarah and other items, and spend it himself according to the Holy Qur an and Islam, of course, maintaining regular accounts?

6. What sort of relationship there should be, now as well as in future, between the people of the Ahmadiyyah Community and the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyyah?

7. In what matters is it essentially necessary for the people of the Ahmadiyyah Community to pay obedience to the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyyah, and in what matters are they free to act independently of the Sadr Anjuman?"

MUḤAMMAD ʿALĪ'S REPLY (p. 57)

"The Promised Messiah himself had appointed the Anjuman to take care of all the property and pelf of this movement, and manage and conduct its affairs.

There is, in my opinion, one answer to all these questions; and it is this, that as long as Hazrat Maulvi Noor-ud-Din is the khalifah, he can do whatever he likes. After him (may God keep us under his benign protection for mar years to come, and shower His blessings upon his life, health, knowledge and learning), if another similar selfless man could be found, for the community's good luck and fortune, who may consider it utterly unlawful to spend on his own self even a single penny out of the national funds, whose own wishes and desires have been blown out and extinguished whose very breath of life is spent in furthering the great cause of Truth, and who has conquered and won the hearts of the people by his spiritual power, to be installed upon the seat of khilafat, I do not understand why should not the community carry on their programme under his guidance and direction. It is my belief that the Promised Messiah, in order to safeguard possible dangers, had confided his work into the care and custody of a registered Anjuman; and the distinction that I have drawn in the case of Hazrat Maulvi Noor-ud-Din, is also based on the same Al-Wasiyyat by virtue thereof the Anjuman had been brought into existence; for, therein, too, I find particularly mentioned the name of this selfless man that he is the most reliable trustee of the movement's money and property. If the questioner should read Al-Wasiyyat twice or thrice, having disinfected his mind from his present ideas, he may probably be able to get rid of his difficulties."

REJOINDER SENT TO MUḤAMMAD ʿALĪ BY SUPPORTERS OF MAḤMŪD AḤMAD (p. 58)

"1. It is a matter of truth that the Promised Messiah had made the President of the Anjuman to be the custodian of the property, wealth and houses of the movement, and appointed him to keep and maintain accounts of its funds.

2. To all my seven questions I do not want to have one single reply; and if a reply is to be given, all the questions should be answered separately.

3. In my questions I have sought a reply not only about the khilafat of Maulvi Noor-ud-Din but also about all the caliphs who are to come in future.

4. It is unnecessary, in my opinion, to say that to the orders of the future khalifah the community will pay unrestricted obedience only if he should be righteous, noble and selfless like the Maulvi Noor-ud-Din, for, such a time, may God, should never come when the whole community may elect for themselves a khalifah who may not be noble and righteous nor selfless and virtuous.

5. To say that since the Anjuman have been regularly registered, its existence cannot be obliterated, is merely a foolish idea. The registration was done only for the reason that if the Anjuman had not been registered, it could not take posession of a testator's property. It was, therefore, to conform to a legal point that the registration was done, otherwise there was no need for it.

6. Although I have read the Will and shall read it again; but answers to all my seven questions may please be given seriatim.

The eighth question is: Whether, or not, the Sadr Anjuman can set aside and quash an order passed by the khalifah? We know not whom we are under. And so far as our knowledge goes there was, after the Holy Prophet Muhammad, only one khalifah who was again followed by one single man. We should act in accordance with the Prophet's tradition. Hazrat Mirza Sahib was not the bearer of a new law. I do not mean to say that Mirza Sahib (God forbid) committed an error in bringing the Anjuman into being. I only wish to know whom we are under, and whom we should pay obedience to. Answers to all my eight questions may please be furnished."

MUḤAMMAD ALĪ'S REPLY

"Most Respected Hazrat Maulana, peace and blessings of God be upon you! My submission is that there seems to be no need that such questions which pertain to the unborn future, should be dealt with and discussed at the present moment. When such conditions will crop up and arise, the people, present at that time, will themselves ponder over them and decide. The objector has very conveniently by-passed the vital point that the khalifah should necessarily be selfless, pure and righteous, with the remark that 'such a time, may God, should never come when the whole community may elect for themselves a Khalifah who may not be noble and righteous nor selfless and virtuous,' but an attempt is being made, right from now, to dismantle and dissolve the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyyah which the Holy Founder of this Movement has himself made the Successor of the Divinely-appointed Khalifah. Although if there had been agreement among the caliphs of the Holy Prophet Muhammad and his illustrious companions, it was with regard to these three caliphs whom the party professing to side with and support the Ahl-i-Bait calls and condemns as cruel extortionists. If these words should be considered enough to create the belief on the khalifah's selflessness and piety, then I may also offer a prayer about the relations between the khalifah and the Anjuman, that 'such a time, may God, should never come when our Jama at may elect for themselves a khalifah who may take it into his head to break the

Anjuman appointed by the apostle of God as his successor.' Therefore, if there be no need to worry about the fact of the khalifah's being righteous and selfless, why should there be any worry about their mutual relations; when the khalifah and the Anjuman have not submitted any dispute to the objector for decision, how a need has arisen for him to pose these questions? When such a dispute should ever arise (but may God such a day should never come) it will be unavoidably necessary that one of the two parties, either the khalifah or the Anjuman, will be in the wrong. But it is my belief that since the Most High God means to make this movement flourish and thrive in the world predominently, He will not, in case of such a crisis, leave the nation to grope in the error. I never wrote that the existence of the Anjuman could not be obliterated for the reason of its having been registered, as the objector has himself alleged, and then called it a foolish idea. What are the advantages of registration, and how far the existence of the Anjuman (61) has been strengthened and stabilized by this means, it is not for me to dilate upon and discuss at this time. But it is my conviction that since the Promised Messiah has created this Anjuman to be his sole successor, and the custodian of the wealth and property of the Movement for all time to come, it will neither break nor cease to exist.

Since the main question, as I understand from the second letter, is not about the present khilafat, but pertains to the future khilafat of which we have no knowledge, all that can be said at present, can be said on the basis of the Promised Messiah's Will and other writings.

Question No. 1

What is the relation at present, and what will it be in future, between the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyyah and the man sitting in the seat of khilafat (i.e., the khalifah). What is, and what will be, the difference between them?

Reply

The man who occupies, at present, the seat of khilafat, is the President of the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyyah, i.e., the person who had been chosen by the Promised Messiah to be the President of the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyyah's Majlis-i-Mu&tamedeen has been elected by the unanimous vote of the entire community to be their khalifah, so that he and the Sadr Anjuman are one and the same thing. What sort of relations will there be in future, will perhaps depend upon the status vested in him; for, no one knows what is there in the womb of future. But it follows not from the Promised Messiah's Will that the khalifah should necessarily be a single individual, although

it can be so under exceptional conditions, as in the present case. The Promised Messiah, however, has appointed the Anjuman to be his khalifah; and it is not necessary that the khalifah should essentially be one single individual; a whole Jama at can also be the khalifah. And it is so also for the reason that the Promised Messiah has (62) implored the Most High God to confer always on this movement such honest and selfless persons who should set their shoulders to the wheel and strive hard merely for the sake of God; and if one single man, as a particular case, has been thought and considered worthy of this great trust, he is exclusively Hazrat Maulvi Noor-ud-Din.

Question No. 2

Can or cannot, the khalifah set aside and quash any decision of the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyyah?

Reply:

With regard to the decisions of the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyyah the Promised Messiah has left us the following direction written with his own pen: After me the ijtihad of the Anjuman (i.e., the decision by majority vote) will be enough in every affair. 'Can or cannot' will depend upon the conditions present at the moment.

Question No. 3

Can or cannot the khalifah dismiss and remove any member of the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyyah without the existence of a legal cause?

Reply:

A member of the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyyah can be dismissed only under the rules and regulations which have been framed by the Anjuman, and published under the signatures of the Promised Messiah.

Question No. 4

Can or cannot the khalifah, besides dismissing one or more members of the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyyah, dissolve the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyyah altogether for legal, political and moral reasons, and take into his own hands the work of the propagation of Islam as well as the management of the various affairs of the Jamā'at?

Reply:

The Anjuman has been brought into existence by an apostle of God under Divine direction. Should there (63) be a khalifah raised by the Most High God, he can, in accordance with the Divine will and pleasure, introduce a change into this arrangement; but it is not permissible in the case of any other man.

Question No. 5

Can or cannot the khalifah, if he so desires, keep in his own custody all the money of the Bait-ul-Maal, the Maqbarah and other items, and spend it himself according to the Holy Qur an and Islam, of course maintaining regular accounts?

Reply:

The management of all the affairs of the Ahmadiyyah Movement as well as expending of its funds shall be exactly on the same lines as recorded in his Last Will by the Promised Messiah who was fully conversant with the Holy Qur an and Islam, and had it implemented and carried into execusion before his own eyes; and just as, after him, the Khalifah I had acted upon it.

Question No. 6

What sort of relationship there should be, now as well as in future, between the people of the Ahmadiyyah Community and the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyyah?

Reply:

It is quite apparent at present; and in future it should be just as it should be between the Anjuman formed by the khalifah appointed by God and the people who believe in him.

Question No. 7

In what matters is it essentially necessary for the people of the Ahmadiyyah Community to pay obedience to the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyyah, and in what matters are they free to act independently of the Sadr Anjuman?

Reply:

When you can understand and know the limit upto which Islam has given freedom, why should you feel any (64) difficulty in the appreciation of limit in this case. Unrestricted

obedience is essentially necessary in all such matters in which it has to be to the Anjuman created by the Khalifah raised by God; in other matters the people are free to act independently.

Question No. 8

Can the Sadr Anjuman set aside and quash the orders passed by the khalifah?

Reply:

This as well as the second question has the same reply namely, it depends upon the conditions prevailing at the time.

I may also add, in reply to the second letter, that the Promised Messiah had appointed the Sadr Anjuman not only as the custodian of the property, funds and buildings of the Movement, but also their rightful owner, of course with this interdiction that no member of the Anjuman will expend any property or money for his own selfish end, nor even the Anjuman for any purpose other than that of the Movement.

I have, in obedience to your order, written down the replies of these questions. But since these questions have now cropped up and arisen, it will be better if the Anjuman itself should give their replies."

APPENDIX "E"

"THE TURKISH PEACE AND THE MUSLIM'S DUTY,"
by Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad,
Head of the Ahmadiyah Community,
Qadian, India.

(Published in Review of Religions, XIX, No. 6, June, 1920, pp. 161-182.)

"Today the 11th day of Ramzan, corresponding to the 30th May, 1920, I receive a letter from Moulvi Abdul Bari of Feringhee Mahal (Lucknow), in which he informs me that a conference is to assemble on the 1st and 2nd June ensuing, at Allahabad to discuss the terms of peace, which have been offered to Turkey and to determine the policy which should in future be pursued by the Mussulmans with reference to those terms. The writer also invites me to attend the said conference and to explain my views publicly on the subject.

If my attendance at the conference had been likely to be productive of any useful result or if my personal participation in its deliberations could be expected to prove of any benefit to my brethren and fellow countrymen, I would have gladly left behind a thousand of other pre-occupations and joined the conference in order to publicly explain my views on this weighty and inportant (sic) matter. But since it is our usual experience of such conferences that people, who entertain views even the least shade different from the common, are not allowed an opportunity to give ulterance (sic)

to the same, it seems to be a mere waste of time on my part to undertake to attend the conference personally. But on the other hand a love and good will for my brethren and an earnest desire to be of some service to Islam persuade me to aquaint (sic) them with my views on the subject, relardless of the manner in which the same might be received. It is therefore that I endite the present note for the information of the gentlemen who will assemble on the occasion, and forward the same through some of my very esteemed friends, so that men who might find themselves favourably disposed towards the suggestions made therein, may, if they choose, hold further discussion on the topics with these my accredited representatives.

Worthy Gentlemen! On the occasion of the conference held at Lucknow in September last, I drew your attention to this fact that the basis of your activities in connection with the Turkish settlement should be grounded on the position that the Sultan of Turkey was regarded by a very large section of Mussalmans as their Khalifa and was the object of sympathy of the rest of the Muslim world by reason of a community of faith and that it was therefore necessary that in settling the terms of the peace with Turkey due consideration should be shown to the common sentiments of the Mussalmans all over the world and the Allies' dealings with Turkey should be guided by the same principles which have guided their dealings in the case of the Christian enemy States. I had pointed

out that the suggested basis would enable all classes of peoples denominated by the name of Mussalmans, no matter how great their mutual differences, to co-operate in this affair from a common platform. It is to be regretted that the suggestion did not meet with your approval, with the result that it gave Europe an opportunity to observe that on the question of Khalifat there was a marked lack of unanimity among the Mussalmans and that it was therefore far from correct to speak of a consensus of opinion regarding the future of Turkey.

Had you then seen your way to accept those suggestions there would have arisen no occasion for the Ahmadiya community to make public announcement of their own special views regarding the question of Khilafat and they could have joined their other brethren in pressing, by all legitimate methods, for a just treatment for the Turks. If those suggestions had been acted upon, there would have arisen no necessity for the Shiah section of the Mussalmans, whose number amounts to several crores, to dissociate themselves openly from the movement, and they could have frankly joined their other brethren in declaring with one voice their common sympathy for the Turks.

Had those suggestions then met with your approval, there would have arisen no occasion for the Arabs to declare that the Khilafat of right belonged to the family of Koreish, because just at that time, under the influence of events happening around them, the Arabs were half inclined to enter

into a friendly understanding with Turkey and the flow of sympathy for the Turks ran high in their hearts. The adoption of the suggestion would have enabled the Arabs notwithstanding all their differences with Turkey, to raise a voice of sympathey (sic) for the Turks, because in their intercourse with some of the European powers, the Arabs had already discovered matters for complaint and were therefore ready to come to some amicable settlement with Turkey.

If my counsel had then been accepted, there would have remained no objection on the part of the Wahabi section of the Arabs to join the other Mussalmans in common action over this question.

And again, had the counsel been adopted there would have arisen no occasion for Europe to taunt the Mussalmans with the remark that they had been appealing to the kindness of the Christian States for the preservation of the Khilafat of Islam.

And lastly, had the suggested plan of operation been forthwith practically carried out, of a certainty the terms of the Treaty of Peace would have been far different from what they have actually proved to be. The delay in despetching (sic) the depulatiou (sic) was so for (sic) prolonged, that the proper time for action was well nigh exhausted. No deputation whatsoever was sent to America. It was extremely important to send emissaries to Irak, Syria, Arabia and Constantinople, but the matter never received any attention.

There was need for the despatch of fully equipped missions to France and to Italy, but the need remained unheeded. Japan also required attention but was completely neglected. Only one mission was sent to England and that too almost too late in the day. All the available evergy (sic) was dissipated in idle criticism of the Government of India or in the abusing of those people, who, although they felt every sympathy for the Turks, were not prepared to recognise the validity of the Sultan's Khilafat. But abusing can never lead to practical result, which has always to be achieved by practical work.

Gentlemen! You ought in the first place to consider what things they are, which in the present age have proved to be the source of the greatest harm to Islam. The things which have proved to be the source of the greatest harm to Islam are nothing but the unworthy lives of the Muslims themselves, their lack of resolution, their want of character, their low aspirations and their hypocrisy. These are they, whose removal alone can bring about a revival of Islam. But how little is the thought given to these matters at this time of stress and trial? Today the Mussalmans are numerically far superior to what they were five centuries ago; but still, they were then the party of the victors, whereas now they form the party of the vanquished. Why? Simply because they had not at that time developed those qualities above-mentioned, which today mar their character. But then, let us ask, what

pains ave (sic) the Mussulmans taken to cast off those unworthy qualities and to acquire some nobler traits of character? Have the Mussulmans availed themselves of this time of danger and difficulty to repent and to turn the hearts towards God? We may everywhere notice that men, whose sole aim it is to win popular fame and applause, have been working to corrupt still more the morals of the Mussalmans, and instead of developing in them a fear of God, have encouraged them to increase in temerity. Accordingly, we may everywhere come across Mussalmans, whose tongues are full of abuse, who habitually clap and hoot and indulge in a thousand uncouth antics in order to insult any one who might differ from them in his views. All such excesses are regarded by them as rendering an eminent service to Islam.

Ye representatives of Islam! Even now, while you sit in solemn conclave to consider the future of the Turkish Empire, and your hearts are filled with grief and care, even now, in the very bosom of Hindusthan, in the sweltering heat of the mid-summer day, how many simple children and innocent women have been suffering from the agonies of thirst, for no other reason than that their fathers or their husbands do not recognise the title of Turkish Sultan to the Khilafat of Islam; and men there are, professing the faith of Islam but following in this matter some undiscoverable precedent, who refuse to supply them with that life-preserving draught, which Providence has not denied even to the worst infidels.

Well you may reflect whether the cries and sobs of these unfortunate ones, which can not fail to reach the divine seat, will be pleading with God that the efforts of their oppressors might be crowned with success or that they may be granted to attain the desire of their hearts. While you are deliberating over the question of the preservation of the sacred memorials of Kerbela and Najaf, at that very time, scenes are being enacted within the borders of India, similar to what Yezid and his associates enacted on those fields. And the reason for it all is that the Ahmadis do not recognise the validity of the Turkish Khilafat. The Ahmadi is denied the use of water, he is prevented from his daily markettings (sic), his house is denied the use of the sweeper and while he sits at his prayer, stones are showered at him. Well you may consider, whether this is the proper way for the Mussalmans to indicate a chastening of spirit and to attract to themselves the mercies of Heaven in this sore hour of danger and trial. Would it be of any possible benefit to them if under pressure of such persecutions some few of the Ahmadis were to play the hypocrite and join them in outward co-operation (because sincerity could never be secured by force)? Could the co-operation of such a hypocritical set bring the Mussalmans any nearer to their goal? The time was one (sic) when efforts should have been made to infuse into the Mussalmans a spirit of fortitude and courage, to turn them into a band of heroes, and not to force them to

play the part of mean hypocrite. Was there no one among the Mussalmans who could bring home to the more ignorant section of their people this homely truth hat (sic) men, who under pressure of force could give up their honest opinions, were likely under a more powerful pressure even to turn against the Mussalmans upon the occurrence of the first suitable opportunity?

In short, it pained me greatly to notice that at the time of this great tribulation, the Mussalmans had failed to follow those methods which alone could be expected to lead them to success. But now, since you have once more assembled (sic) to deliberate over the same momentous question, I deem it right again to take the opportunity to lay before you in all sincerity and goodwill my own views on the subject, in the hope that they may meet with a response in the heart of some sincere friend of Islam and induce him to gird up his loins in the cause of the faith.

The first question to be asked concerning terms of the Turkish Settlement is whether they are in conformity to the principles of right and justice. To me, however, it seems that just now it is of little consequence to us to devote much thought over the solution of this question, in as much as its solution cannot practically help us in the least. But nevertheless for the information of the coming generations and of the framers of the Treaty regarding what we think of the ethics of these terms, I shall express my

opinion concerning them briefly in the words, that in deciding upon the terms of peace with Turkey regard has not been paid to the principles which have been recognised by the statesmen of Europe as fundamental to the conclusion of a just peace.

For example, the people of Irak have not been granted an opportunity to express their choice of a Government in the same way as some of the parts of the former German Empire. No enquiry has been formally made of them to ascertain which Government of which form of Government they would prefer to live under. The people of Syria in spite of the fact that they have clearly expressed their wish to remain as an independent State, have been placed under the control of France. Palestine, where the Mussalmans number three fourths of the entire population, has been made into a new Jewish principality in spite of the fact that the Jews there form only one fourth of the population and that, too, as may be learned from the Eucyclopaedia (sic) Britannica, only since the year 1878, and "consisting principally of refuges (sic) from countries where anti-shemitism (sic) is an important element in politics". The deprivation of Turkey of this territory where Mussalmans form a majority of the population and which had proved to be the only asylum of the Jewish race, may well appear to be a very appropriate retribution for the crime committed by the Turks in affording shelter to the community at a time when they were being forcibly turned out of their homes and possessions by the Christian Governments

of Europe!

The same is the case with Lebanon. There is not the least reason why the territory should be placed under the control of France. Similarly, there is no justification for the formation of a separate state of Armenia, because the territory is so situated that it is surrounded on all sides by countries inhabited mainly by the Turks. An independent state of Armenia will therefore mean that the different sections of the Turkish race will find it impossible to unite into one nation and that the Turks living in the Russian Turkistan will never be able so (sic) join hands with their brethren in Asia-Minor. Moreover much of the territory granted to Armenia consists of areas of which the majority of inhabitants are Mussalmans. And there are proposals for ceding some more Vilayats in which the Mussalmans form all but the entire population. All this has been done in the face of the well established fact that the Armenian Christians have been guilty of most cruel excesses against the Mussalmans, so that even the British Premier has had to admit the truth of the charge. If therefore the Turks are being deprived of these territories on the ground that they have failed to restrain the Kurds from committing excesses on the Armenians, their (sic) is still less justification on the part of the Allied Powers to grant the Armenians, who themselves have been guilty of cruel murder of the Mussalmans to exercise power over the latter. If, however, any safe-

guards have been set up which will restrain the Armenians from committing excesses on the Mussalmans, why not under similar safeguards were the Turks allowed to retain control over the Armenians, safeguards which could have prevented the Mussalmans from committing excesses over the Christians?

In the same way, it has been altogether contrary to justice to make over Symrna to Greece, because it can never be that the preponderance of a certain element in the population of one city out of an entire country will entitle that element to the governing (sic) power of that city. Such a principle has never been recognised in politics and can not but prove to be a source of future troubles. The inevitable result of the policy will be that within a few years the Greeks in Symrna will foment troubles in the surrounding territories and seek to enlarge their sphere of control.

Then again their (sic) appears to be no reason why Thrace should be snatched from Turkey to be made over to Greece. Even the British Prime Minister, Mr. Lloyd George, was obliged to admit that in Thrace the Turks formed the majority of the population. How was then the cession of this territory to Greece to be justified? Even if we are to accept a later statement by the British Minister that in this territory the majority of the population are Non-Turks, still there will remain the undoubted fact that a very large proportion of the population of the area is Muhammadan. If therefore the Turks must be turned out of

the area on the ground that they do not form a majority of the population, there is even less justification for the Greeks to be placed in possession of the country. Under the circumstances the territory should be formed into an independent State. The result of placing the Greeks in possession of the country will be that within a few years, pursuing their old policy, they will by secret and open means compel the population to embrace Christianity or oblige them by severe persecution to leave the country.

In short, according to my way of thinking, there has been a gross spoilation of rights in several terms of the Treaty of Peace, and therefore the sooner they are modified the better it will be for the credit and good name of Europe. But the question is that if the Allied Powers should decline to modify the terms, in that case what would be the most proper step for the Mussalmans to take. This to me seems to be the only question of importance, because so far as I know the Allied Powers will never consent to any modification of their terms.

In answer to this question various suggestions have so far been offered. Some people have suggested Hijrat (Emigration) from the country, some have favoured a general Jehad (religious war), while others have recommended the adoption of a policy of non-co-operation with the Government. To me however none of these steps appeal as either suitable or practicable.

In the first place it is beyond the range of practical politics that the 70 millions of Mussulmans living in India should all leave the country and migrate to some outside territory, nor is such migration likely to produce any useful result. Hijrat (emigration) from any country becomes obligatory on a Muslim only when a person living therein is restrained from the free performance of duties imposed by the shariat (religious law) upon individual members of the community. But it is patent that there is no such duty imposed by Islam upon individual Muslims the performance of which has in any way been rendered impossible in this country. Then, again, considered from the practical point of view, the suggestion will appear to be one quite impossible of performance, because the number of people who are actually prepared to put the suggestion into practice cannot but be ludicrously small. Thus apart from the fact that a decision on these lines will be contrary to the dictates of the shariat, the acceptance of the proposal will be productive of no other consequence to the Muslims than that of a loss of prestige and esteem in the sight of other nations, because, we may well note, that even those who venture to put forward the suggestion are not prepared to put the same into actual practice.

Another suggestion put forward is that of waging a Jehad against the Government. It is not, however, legitimate for us to wage any such Jehad so long as we are residing

in this country. Residence in this country implies that we accept the authority of the British Government, and is tantamount to a practical covenant with that Government. Therefore for us, while we reside in the country, to do anything against the interest of the British Government would amount to a piece of treachery in no wise to be countenanced by Islam. The thing which is most important to us is our religion. If we are to sacrifice our religion for the sake of winning the empire of the world, we shall still be the losing party in the bargain. Therefore so long as we live under the Government of Britain and derive benefit from its protection, it will be highly improper for any of us, who entertains any respect for his faith, to do anything likely to cause harm to the British Government or to join in any conspiracy to that end; and no such counsel can therefore find favour with a Muslim who truly reveres his religion.

But it might be said that the Mussalman should first leave the country and then wage a Jehad. In that case there will arise in the first place the same question of Hijrat (emigration), which I have already proved to be both improper and impracticable under the present circumstances. But apart from this, there is one condition attached to all legitimate Jehads and that is that it should be waged only against a power which is given to attack the Muslims for the purpose of effecting an overthrow of Islam. But during the last war, the Allies, as we all know, were not the first to

attach (sic) Turkey, nor was the overthrow of Islam one of their objects in waging the war. So long therefore as it is not proved that the first step in the war was taken by the Allied Powers or that their object in waging the war was to force the Turks to adopt Christianity, there can be no justification on the part of the Mussalmans of India, who live under the protection of the British Government, to wage a Jehad against that Government.

A third proposal is that of Non-Co-operation with the Government. With regard to this proposal also my opinion is that the so called non-co-operation will virtually be a covert form of opposition, and its adoption will never lead to the maintenance of peace and order in India. For, it is incumbent that the people who will give up their employment will come by and by to feel the pinch of necessity and be obliged to take recourse to violent and illegal means to earn a living. Moreover, before you choose to decide upon this course it is only proper that you should well consider the aim you have in view in such a proposal. So far as I can see, the proposal can have only one end in view and that is that you wish by this means to bring pressure to bear upon the British Government in order to persuade them to rectify the mistake of the present treaty of peace with Turkey. But we may note that in the first place, any possible effect of this policy of non-co-operation will be confined solely to India and will make its appearance after

long years of waitings because, even if we are to assume that the Mussalmans will evince a common readiness to act up to the proposal, the fact can not be gainsaid that to prepare the community for such a common action will require years of enterprise and education, and by the time the proposal is actually carried out the Turkish settlement will have long become an accomplished fact, so that even if the British Government should then feel inclined to modify the arrangement it will not be in a position to deprive either France, or Greece or Armenia of their respective territories. In the second place it should also be borne in mind that even if all the Mussalmans should unite to act up to the proposal still it will not be possible for them to exert any pressure on the British Government, because the Mussalmans form only a fourth of the population of the country, the remaining three-fourths being almost all Hindus with the Christians numbering nearly four million souls. Thus, if the Mussalmans were all to renounce the honours and titles bestowed upon them by Government, they will do little harm to the latter, and if they choose to throw up their appointments there will be forthcoming the remaining three-fourths of the population to fill up their places.

There is no doubt that some of the Hindu leaders have declared their readiness to co-operate with the Mussalmans. But there is already a strong party among the Hindus opposed to the proposal and it is certain that not even a five percent

of the Hindus will actually join the Mussalmans in practically carrying out the proposal. If the Mussalman lawyers should decide to give up their profession, their Mussalman clients will, of course, employ Hindu lawyers to seek redress for their grievances and the latter will only be too glad to come to their help. If a Mussalman judge were to resign his appointment, a Hindu candidate will at once step in to fill up the berth. If the Mussalman employees in the army were to throw up their jobs, then apart from the fact that such a breach of the regulations will make them liable to punishment under the army rules, their action will be productive of little consequence, because all sections of the Hindu community have by this time fully realised the importance of military service and they will never agree to leave unprotected the old land of their birth. In short, whatever department we may consider there will not only be candidates available from other communities to fill up vacancies, but they will eagerly come forward for the jobs, since there is no dearth in our country of candidates waiting for employment. To such people a decision on the part of the Mussalmans to resign their posts under Government will come as an unexpected godsend and they will smile in their sleeves at the foolishness of these men. Thus, the proposal of non-co-operation, if practically adopted, will lead to no other result than to deprive thousands of Mussalmans of the means of livelihood and to make them fall back in education and will further

jeopardise the various rights of the community of which they already enjoy less than their proper share by reason of their comparatively small number employed under Government. ...

In short, to me it seems that all the proposals hitherto put forward are either contrary to the dictates of the shariat or impossible of practice. To me the only course which recommends itself as of advantage to the Mussalmans and the only way left open to them for adoption, consists in this, that they should with one voice point out to the Allied Powers that in framing the terms of the peace with Turkey they have departed from the principles of their own enunciation and that the Mussalmans do clearly perceive in those terms the secret hand of Christian fanaticsm (sic) and a solicitude for the interest of the European capitatists (sic), and that they appeal to the Allied Powers for a reconsideration of their decision. If, however, the Allied Powers should decline to alter their decision, the Mussalmans should make one last appeal to the conscience of their posterity and then avoiding every kind of disturbance and disorder as commanded by their religion, should leave the final decision of the matter in the hands of God.

There is no doubt that none of the proposals hitherto put forward nor the one now suggested by me will serve to effect any immediate alteration in the terms resolved upon by the Allies. But if the Mussalmans will act up to my suggestions, then it will inevitality (sic) happen that within

a few years these very people, who are now so jubilant over the terms of the treaty, or else their children will bow their heads in shame when they will come to remember the terms. And as it has happened with many other historical events that succeeding generations have remembered with a sense of humiliation and shame the decisions of their predecessors (sic), even so the descendants of the Allied nations will look back upon the present decision of the Allies with remorse and surprise. If, however, on the contrary, the Mussalmans were to attempt at reparation by methods of violence and crime, the authors of the treaty will have a fresh justification added to their credit and the future generations of Mussalmans will feel ashamed to recall the story of the methods employed. Such turbulent methods, far from proving helpful to the Mussalmans, will merely serve to hide the naked indefensibility of the terms and divert from them the attention of the world.

But my suggestion does not end here. ... First of all, we ought to consider what would be the effect of the terms of the peace, when fully carried out, upon the interests of Islam. In answering this question one thing which comes prominently into my mind is the case of those countries with large Mussalman populations, which have been made over to the Governments of Armenia and Greece. The hatred which the Armenians and Greeks entertain towards Islam is so intense and well-known as to stand in no need of proof. The outrages

which these nations have in the past committed on the Mussalmans are sufficient to justify a confident assertion that in spite of all the soothing words of the European Powers, the Mussalmans can have no safety under their administration. Similarly, in the new territorial changes that have taken place in Europe, there will be several other areas where the Mussalmans will be lacking in security. It is necessary for the protection of these brethren in faith from the danger which threatens them, that a 'League of Islam' should forthwith he (sic) organised which will keep in touch with the religious condition of the Mussalmans all over the world and whose duty it will be to keep itself informed of any attempt made in any part of the world to force the Mussalmans by open or secret means to change their religion, or otherwise to effect their extinction. ...

The proposal here set forth is one of great importance, and although this is neither the place nor the time for me to dwell on it at any considerable length, I am sure that every person who will give any serious thought to the subject will easily realise its great importance and will be in a position to form an opinion of its immense possibilities.

... My community has already undertaken the work and can supply the men necessary for the enterprise. If then there is among you any true friend of Islam let him come forward and join the work, because there is now no work more sanctified than this. It is this, which now alone of all

things, constitute a genuine love for Islam and without this it is all a mere sham to hold conferences and to pass resolutions. ... And we close our epistle with the prayer that all praise be to God, the Creator and Sustainer of the worlds."

APPENDIX "F"

ORGANIZATION OF THE AHMADIYAH COMMUNITY DURING THE 1920's AND 1930's

(As quoted from "The Life and Work of the Head of the Ahmadiyyah Movement," Moslem Sunrise Press, Chicago, n.d. (1945?).)

"The central organization of the Community is represented by the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyyah as reconstructed by the present Khalifa some ten years after his accession to that office. It is now composed of a Nazir-i-A'la (Chief Secretary), who acts as President, and several other Nazirs (Secretaries) who are in charge of various departments. The principal Nazirs are (1) Nazir Baitul Mal (Secretary of the treasury), (2) Nazir Umoor-i-Amma (Secretary dealing with miscellaneous matters or general affairs relating to the organization and discipline of the Community), (3) Nazir Umoor-i-Kharijah (Secretary dealing with matters relating to other communities and the Government), (4) Nazir Talim-o-Tarbiyat (Secretary in charge of education and training), (5) Nazir Dawat-o-Tabligh (Secretary for missionary work), (6) Nazir Talif-o-Ishaat (Secretary for compilations and publications), (7) Nazir Dhiafat (Secretary for hospitality). The finances of the Community are managed and administered by the Nazir Baitul Mal, who has attached to his department regular accounting and audit sections. A budget is prepared

every year by the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyyah containing estimates of receipts and expenditure for the ensuing financial year and is submitted by the Nazir Baitul Mal to the Majlis-i-Mushawarat (Khalifa's Advisory Council) before the end of the current financial year. It is scrutinized by the Finance Sub-Committee of the Majlis-i-Mushawarat and is then recommended for sanction by the Majlis to the Khalifa with such modifications as the Majlis might wish to make. The Khalifa then directs the Economy Committee to further scrutinize the proposals for expenditure and finally sanctions the budget himself. Sanction for any extraordinary expenditure which has to be incurred during the financial year and for excess grants must be obatined as occasion arises from the Khaifa (sic), but such extra or excess expenditure must, under the directions of the Khalifa, be reported to the Majlis in its next session. The budget provides a modest allowance for the Khalifa himself, but the present Khalifa has intimated that he will not draw the allowance. He not only maintains himself out of his private income, but makes large contributions out of it to the funds of the Community. In fact he is the biggest single contributor to these funds.

There are other departments and activities of the Community which are not covered by this organization but considerations of space forbid mention of all of them here. Some of them will come in for incidental notice later on.

Control over the members of the Community outside

Qadian is exercised through Amirs appointed by the Khalifa and through branch Anjumans affiliated to the Sadr Anjuman. Wherever there are a few Ahmadis they are required to set up an Anjuman and the usual office holders are appointed. Every Amir endeavours to organize the local members and to regulate the affairs of the Community along the same lines as are followed at the Centre as far as it may be practicable having regard to the number of members and other local circumstances. Every member is required to contribute a minimum of 6¼ per cent. of his income to the funds of the Central Anjuman and quite an appreciable number contribute a minimum of 10 per cent. Apart from this compulsory contribution, there are several other contributions which members are expected to make so that on the average an active and earnest member of the Community contributes from 10 per cent. to 33 per cent. of his income to sustain the various activities of the Community.

The Majlis-i-Mushawarat was instituted by the present Khalifa in 1922. The Majlis is composed of elected and nominated delegates of the Community. The total number of its members is not yet finally fixed, but is at present between 500 and 600. Roughly 75 per cent. of the members are elected by affiliated branches of the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyyah all over the country. The remaining members are nominated by the Khalifa himself to provide representation for such sections of the Community as may not otherwise be adequately represented,

or are invited to attend as individuals whose advice the Khalifa is desirous of obtaining. The Majlis is summoned to meet normally once a year, but as the number of matters on which it is called upon to tender advice is increasing it may have to be summoned oftener. Affiliated associations outside India at present find no direct representation on the Majlis, but with the rapid improvement in means of communication that is expected after the war, it may become possible to accord representation to these associations also.

The Majlis tenders advice to the Khalifa on such matters as it may be invited to advise on at the instance of the various departments or by the Khalifa himself. It also considers the annual budget. The agenda is printed and circulated to the branch Anjumans well ahead of the commencement of the session, so that delegates attend the session after ascertaining the views of and obtaining instructions from their respective Anjumans. The proceeding at each sitting of the session are opened after silent prayers for divine guidance by the Khalifa in which all assembled delegates and visitors join. After the Khalifa's inaugural address, Committees are set up to consider and report on each group of items in the agenda. When these reports are submitted the full Majlis meets to consider them. Each recommendation in a Committee's report is discussed and is voted on. The Khalifa takes note of the volume of opinion in support of and in opposition to each proposal and in most cases announces his decision immediately.

Normally he accepts the unanimous advice or the advice of the majority of the Majlis, as the case may be, but is not bound to do so. He often accepts such advice though he may himself think differently. When that happens or when his decision differs from the advice tendered he explains his reasons for the course adopted by him, but his decision is final and is always cheerfully accepted and loyally and scrupulously carried out.

The Qadha or the Islamic Judicial system was instituted by the present Khalifa in 1925. Under this system original jurisdiction is exercised by individual Qadhis (Judges or Magistrates). There is an appeal to a Board of Qadhis and a second appeal from the board to the Khalifa. If the Khalifa himself should happen to be a party to or interested in the result of a case, the decision of the Board of Appeal is final. The Qadha deals with only civil disputes of such matters of a disciplinary nature as are not required by the laws of the country to be dealt with by the ordinary courts. No member of the Community may commence or prosecute a proceeding of a civil nature against another member save in the Qadha. If for some reason it is found necessary to have recourse to the ordinary civil courts, this may only be done with permission obtained from the appropriate department of the Community. One special feature of the judicial system established in the Community is that while the Judges occupy themselves with the decision of cases, machinery for execution of decrees

is not attached to the Qadha, but is a part of the department of the Nazir Umoor-i-Amma. The whole system, of course, works on a voluntary basis and the only ultimate sanction behind its successful and efficient working is the moral and spiritual value that every member attaches to his membership of the Community. Apart from the moral and spiritual gain, the actual working of the department saves the Community the heavy expenses of litigation which are so sad a feature of the administration of justice in the ordinary courts. No court fees are levied by the Qadha. The rules of procedure and evidence followed are simple and free from many of the technicalities that often operate to defeat justice under more formal systems. They are designed to ascertain the truth rather than to satisfy the academic notions of lawyers.

For the purposes of training and to stimulate its activities the Community is organized into sectional associations. There is, for instance, the women's association called the Lajna-Ima-Ullah, with branches in several of the bigger towns. The Women's Association at Qadian has succeeded in achieving complete literacy among the female section of the Community at Qadian, and this represents only a part of its activities. The proportion of women at Qadian who have completed courses of higher education to their total number is probably higher than at any other place in India, and this has been achieved while observing strict conformity to the teachings of Islam concerning purdah, etc.

The male members of the Community are divided into three sections. Children between the ages of 8 and 15 are organized into an association called the Atfal-ul-Ahmadiyyah. The object of the association is to impregnate its members with the ideals of the Movement and to train them in habits of conduct in consonance therewith. Those between 15 and 40 are members of the Khuddam-ul-Ahmadiyyah. This is the most active of the three men's asociations (sic). Its members are expected to illustrate in their own lives the ideals of the Movement in every respect. Great stress is laid upon complete integrity of thought and conduct, and strict discipline is sought to be maintained. Members are taught that complete fulfilment can be achieved only through service and sacrifice. The dignity of manual labour is inculcated by requiring the periodic participation of very member in labour of that kind. Members are also trained in physical endurance and in cheerful acceptance of privations.

Those above 40 years of age are organized in an association called the Ansaar-Ullah. Their activities are more of an intellectual than of a physical character, though the last are not excluded."

APPENDIX "G"

(Exact Copy of Letter From)

"_____
Chief Secretary
to
HAZRAT KHALIFA-TUL MASIH,
(Head of the Ahmadiyya Community)

Qadian (Punjab)

Dated 25:1:35. 193_.

No. 661 - G

To

The Chief Secretary,

Government of the Punjab,

L A H O R E .

Sir,

I have the honour to request you to very kindly place the following before His Excellency the Governor.

His Excellency the Governor is aware that the great resentment caused among the members of the Ahmadiyya Community on the uncalled for order dated the 17th of October 1934 issued by the Punjab Government to Hazrat Amirul Momineen Khalifatul-Masih Head of the Ahmadiyya Community had been very materially allayed by the subsequent assurances of the Government. On the basis of these assurances Hazrat Amirul Momineen had issued a manifesto in the Alfasl wherein he had expressed satisfaction on the amicable settlement of the affair and had called upon the members of his Community to forget the incident and devote all their attention and

energies to the pursuit of their religious activities which formed their real and primary duty. As regards the other grievances which yet remain to be redressed Hazrat Amirul Momineen expressed the opinion they could be settled privately with the Government or through the Council and that the Community as a whole need have no concern for the present about these questions. But it is matter for extreme regret that the peaceful and friendly atmosphere created by the aforesaid manifesto has been very badly spoiled and still continues to be spoiled by some of the local officials who seem to enjoy the confidence and support of the higher authorities, with the result that there is again a bad feeling of great unrest and dissatisfaction among the members of
(2) the Ahmadiyya Community. I would briefly give below some of the later incidents which are threatening to shake the confidence of our Community in the Government.

1. In November last a Pathan boy armed with a dagger came to Qadian and having gained access into the house of Hazrat Amirul Momineen wanted to see our Imam in connection with some religious matter. On our suspicion having been aroused he was reported to the local police who searched him and found on him a sharp dagger. In the subsequent examination the young man confessed that he had come with the intention of killing the Head of the Ahmadiyya Community. But the case was so badly handled by the prosecution that not only no attempt was made to discover a conspiracy behind the affair

(which it ostensibly had behind it, and the existance of which even some of the police officials admitted to us in private conversation) but some of the important witnesses were also left out, for instance Maulvi Nazir Ahmad, a graduate of the Punjab University who deposed having travelled with the accused from Batala to Qadian in the same compartment and having heard from him words which clearly established the fact that he had come with the intention of killing our leader, was not produced before the court in spite of the fact that the police was in full possession of his statement which even the accused admitted to be true before the police. The result was that the culprit escaped with a nominal conviction and with practically no sentence and the whole affair instead of proving a lesson for other criminally minded fanatics became a veritable source of encouragement for them. We cannot say whether it was the district police who was to blame or it was the C.I.D. that was at fault, but there was certainly something wrong in the matter somewhere in the prosecution and we have grave doubts that all has not been fair.

(3)

2. Subsequent to the above case Hazrat Amirul Momineen Khalifatul Masih received a number of threatening letters in which he was called upon to desist from his missionary activities and renounce Ahmadiyyat or he would be put to death, and in some of the letters definite dates were

mentioned for his intended murder. A copy of one of these letters was sent to the Chief Secretary Punjab Government on 16:12:34 and subsequently the original was sent to the Deputy Commissioner Gurdaspur on 4:1:35, but we do not know whether any enquiry has been instituted and if so with what result. Anyhow these letters indicate the extremely inflamed state of the Ahrar masses against the Ahmadiyya Community and without doubt this is the result of the highly mischievous and inflammatory propaganda carried on by the Ahrar leaders.

3. In its issue of December 8, 1934, the Zamindar of Lahore published a letter alleged to have been written by an Ahmadi from Karachi. In this letter it was stated that a certain other Ahmadi from Karachi had dreamt a dream that Maulvi Zafar Ali Khan would be murdered on the 11th of December. On the publication of this letter the Government detailed a strong party of police to guard and protect Mr. Zafar Ali Khan on the date specified, whereas, as the very story shows and as we have definite information to believe, the letter was entirely a ficticious affair and was fabricated by an Ahrar and Published in the Zamindar with a view to vilifying the Ahmadiyya Community on the one hand, and indirectly inciting the Ahrar hot-heads against our blessed Imam and his followers on the other. This is not a mere conjecture, for after the publication of this letter in the Zamindar Hazrat Amirul Momineen received a letter threatening him and all the members of his family with death if anything happened

to Maulvi Zafar Ali Khan. This letter is dated (4) 9:12:34 as indicated by the date mark on the postal stamp of the envelope and may be produced before the authorities in original if they should so desire. But as I have said above the truth is that the threatening letter to Mr. Zafar Ali Khan was all a made up affair and if the authorities had cared to investigate the matter, which, seeing that Mr. Zafar Ali Khan had later published both the name and the address of the writer of the letter, was quite an easy one, they would have at once been convinced of the game behind it. The mere fact that on the 12th of December Mr. Zafar Ali Khan hastened to announce that the writer of the letter had repented and renounced Ahmadiyyat unmasks the whole secret. Indeed there is, or was, no Ahmadi at Karachi of the name revealed at the end of the threatning (sic) letter, and we challenge anybody to come forward and prove that the person bearing the name indicated as the writer of the letter ever existed. Infact our private enquiries indicate that this letter was actually written by a non-Ahmadi Ahrari clerk at Karachi and was published in the Zamindar as a part of the malicious propaganda against Ahmadiyya Community. But the Government instead of investigating the affair and exposing the mischievous falsehood came forward to help in a game which was set afoot with the only object of vilifying our Community and inciting the fanatics against our leader and, God forbid, anything should now happen to our beloved

Imam the responsibility would lie very heavily on the Government.

4. On the occasion of our last jalsa which is an annual affair and has been peacefully held at Qadian for the last 45 years the Ahrar distributed extremely offensive, most provocative, and highly inflammatory literature at Qadian; and although this literature was brought to the notice of the Deputy Superintendent of police and through him to that of the Ilaqa Magistrate, both stationed at Qadian in those days (vide our letter addressed to D.S.P. dated (5) 27:12:34) no action was taken or indeed has till now been taken with regard to it. The literature which was in the form of handbills etc., is on the file of the Government and even a cursory glance over it will convince any gentlemen how extremely offensive and provocative it is. But inspite of our protest the literature continued to be freely distributed during the days of our annual jalsa when about twenty thousand Ahmadies had gathered at Qadian from all parts of India. The "Ihsan" of Lahore in its issues of December 30 and January 3 boastfully states that over 20 thousand handbills etc. were distributed among Ahmadi men and women at Qadian in these days. In sharp contrast to this I may mention that fact that during the Ahrar jalsa of October last the local authorities prohibited the distribution of our literature at Qadian inspite of the fact that our literature was peaceful and purely religious, and contained nothing offensive and provocative, and inspite, further, of the fact that, unlike the Ahrar,

Qadian is our headquarter where our religious propaganda is normally and always carried on. Moreover the distribution of our literature which was objected to and prevented by the authorities was confined to our quarter of the town whereas the Ahrar distributed their filthy literature even in parts inhabited by Ahmadies.

I may incidently mention here that once pervious (sic) to present occasion as well we complained to Government of the publication of offensive literature against us and we were told that our literature also sometimes contained offensive matter. When, however, we challenged the authorities to produce a single instance when a member of the Ahmadiyya Community had offended in this respect and yet prompt and effective action was not taken against him by our leader the Government gave no reply to our letter which still remains unanswered (6); and we here repeat the assertion that whenever it has been brought to the notice of our leader that a member of the Ahmadiyya Community has offended the feelings of a community by writing an objectionable article he has invariably taken prompt action against him. Indeed, as it was in the case of Maulvi Abdul Karim Naqid of Pathankot, our members have sometimes been punished both by Hazrat Amirul Momineen and the Government of indulging in offensive writing.

5. A still more glaring example of deplorable partiality shown by some Government officials is provided by the following facts. Before and during the Ahrar jalsa of October last

the local officials were all out in search for the activities of the Ahmadiyya Community and on finding out the fact that one of the Secretaries of the community had issued an invitation to the neighbouring Ahmadi to come to Qadian during the days of the Ahrar jalsa so that the sacred places and the sacred persons of the Community might be duly protected against any possible attack by the Ahrar fanatics they (i.e. the local officials) at once reported the matter to the higher authorities whereupon the Punjab Government immediatly (sic) issued an order to Hazrat Amirul Momineen prohibiting him from inviting any outside Ahmadi to Qadian or holding any Ahmadi meeting here during the days of the Ahrar gathering. But when our jalsa was held during the last Christmas holiday the selfsame authorities allowed a gathering of the outside Ahrar at Qadian in the very days when our jalsa was being held. It is a fact, which no local official can deny, that on the 28th of December 1934, the last day of our three days gathering, the Ahrar held a jalsa at Qadian in which accoring (sic) to their own report no less than 15 thousand outside non-Ahmadies (7) attended (vide the Ihsan dated 2:1:36). This figure may be an exaggeration but even the S.P. of the Gurdaspur district admitted that according to the estimate of the officials on the spot the attendance was no less than 5 thousand whereas the local non-Ahmadi population does not exceed a few hundred. This jalsa was held under the cover of Friday prayers but it was a jalsa all the same to which

non-Ahmadies were specially invited from outside and the coming of an Ahrar leader was anounced (sic) by beat of drum and a procession was also taken out through the town. Another feature of this Jalsa was that it was not held at the mosque where the Ahrar ordinarily offer their Friday prayers, but at a special place borrowed for the purpose from the local Sikhs and that on a route which was frequented by Ahmadi visitors. The matter was brought to the notice of the D.S.P. who was at the time in charge of the local police (vide our letter dated 27:12:34) but no action was taken and the Ahrar jalsa was allowed to take place inspite of our protests. It is indeed a very signigicant (sic) contrast. The Ahrar come from outside and hold a jalsa at our headquarters and inspite of their threatning (sic) anouncements (sic) we are not allowed to invite Ahmadies from outside to help us in protecting our sacred places and the person of our holy leader who is served with an order to desist from inviting any outside Ahmadies to Qadian, their Headquarters. On the other hand when our anual (sic) jalsa is held the Ahrar take out a procession, anouce (sic) the holding of a jalsa by the beat of drum, make special arrangements for inviting non-Ahmadies from outside, and select for the holding of this jalsa a new place which lies on the very route used by the Ahmadi visitors in going to and coming from their meeting place, and yet the officials do not consider it necessary to take steps to prevent it. Can there be a more glaring

example of partiality?

(8)

6. Subsequent to our jalsa on the 26th, 27th and 28th of December and the "inset" jalsa of the Ahrar on the 28th, and the Sikhs held a jalsa of their own at Qadian, on the 6th and the 7th of January 1935. In this jalsa an Ahrar speaker succeeded in obtaining permission from some of the local Sikh workers to address their audience and in his speech he indulged the typically filthy and offensive vituperation against us. We do realise that it is not the business of the Government to prevent the member of one party to go and address the audience of another when they mutually agree to do so, but certainly it should have served as an eye opener for the Goverment (sic) to realise that the Ahrar are striving to use the Sikh population of the neighbourhood to poison the countryside against the Ahmadies, and under these circumstances it was the duty of the Government to take adequate measures to stop these mischievous activities of the Ahrar. There are rumours afloat that the Hindus and the Christians are also intending to hold their meetings at Qadian in the near future. If this is true it defies our understanding how all this could merly (sic) be the result of chance. There is it appears, a well thought out and concerted effort behind it on the part of the Ahrar to form a sort of malicious coalition against the Ahmadiyya Community and that at their own headquarters. Of the population of Qadian Ahmadies go

to make about ninety per cent and as regards social, economical, educational, and other interests also they far outweigh all other local communities put together. Moreover Qadian is the headquarters of the Ahmadies and is a sacred place with them while it holds no such position with regard to any other Community. Why should then the Ahrar be allowed to come and use our own headquarters as a base for their nefarious activities against us? Nobody can more strongly support the principle of freedom of conscience and freedom of speech than we, but certainly that (9) principle should not be allowed to be used as a garb for mischievous propaganda against a peaceful community and that at their own headquarters. Our members, who on the occasion of our last jalsa saw everyting (sic) with their own eyes, are now asking us, what are the Government doing to stop this state of affairs, and to confess the truth we find ourselves at a loss to answer that question?

7. On the occasion of the last Sikh jalsa at Qadian and even subsequent to that, the allegation, first made some time ago, was repeated that Ahmadies attributed the eating of beef to Bawa Nanak ji, the holy founder of the Sikh Community. This is a most malicious and absolutely false allegation for no Ahmadi has ever said such a thing, but inspite of the fact that in a special communique issued by the concerned department of the Ahmadiyya organisation this allegation was denied and exposed as false and baseless and Government officials were also informed of its being utterly unfounded

it still continues to be made by the Ahrar with a view to inflaming the Sikh masses against us, but the legal officials are complacently observing all this provocative propaganda and doing nothing to stop it. We do realise that it is not the lookout of the Government to refute the charges made by one class of people against another but there the question is not of refuting a charge but that of preventing a highly mischievous propaganda carried on with intention of working up the inflamable masses of one community against another. Under these circumstances it was certainly the duty of Government to take steps to prevent it.

8. A similar example is provided by the allegation which is still being made and for which originally the responsibility lies with Government officials, that on the occasion of the Ahrar jalsa of October last spears were found among the Ahmadi population of Qadian. We have repeatedly asserted that this is a piece of malicious (10) fabrication and we have challenged anybody to come forward and prove it, but still the allegation is repeated and the Government, from whose officials this false news originally emanated have done nothing to stop it. It was from the local officials that the Associated press representative obtained the information that spears were found among the Ahmadi population at Qadian but inspite of the fact that it was proved to be absolutely false and groundless, the allegation was never exposed and it still continues to circulate among the people and poison their hearts against the Ahmadiyya Community.

The truth underlying the whole affair was only this that a local carpenter had made a khud stick for his own private use and this stick was wrongfully taken away by the police who hastened to report this "find" to the higher authorities and some of the officials also informed the Associated press representative of this discovery who immediately flashed the news to all parts of India in the words that spears (conveniently changing a stick into a spear and a spear into spears) had been found at Qadian, but inspite of being informed of the groundlessness of this allegation the Government officials never took any step to correct the false information which originated from them. Nor inspite of our challenge did they prosecute the Ahmadi with whom the stick or the "spear" was found.

In this connection it is also worthy of note that when Khan Sahib Mirza Mihraj-ud-Din of the C.I.D. had a talk with our leader at Qadian before the Ahrar jalsa took place he informed Hazrat Amirul Momineen of this find by the local police and was in return told by him that the news was false and fictitious, and Khan Sahib Mirza Miraj-ud-Din (sic) was invited to search the house of every local Ahmadi to test the truth of that assertion but he expressed his satisfaction and did not consider the search necessary and yet the (11) allegation has never been publicly refuted and the mischief goes on.

9. The Ahrar leader and local workers are carrying on a

most vigorous and malicious propaganda against the Ahmadiyya Community and its holy leader. They are not only using the press and the pulpit for the purpose but have also devised other means of vilifying the Community. Their workers are constantly touring the countryside round about Qadian and poisoning the local population against us. They are issuing handbills and other literature of highly offensive and inflammatory nature against the Ahmadiyya Community, its holy founder and its present leader, copies of some of which have already been sent to the local officials. They advertise their wicked and malicious views about us on boards publicly displayed on the thoroughfares of Qadian, copies of some of these announcements have also been supplied to the district officials. But so far nothing has been done to prevent this malicious propaganda against us while the whole countryside is being rapidly surcharge with highly explosive matter by the perdicious activities of the Ahrar workers. The man in charge of the local Ahrar propaganda, Maulvi Inaitullah by name, is a veritable firebrand whose pen and tongue are devoted to the pernicious work of kindling fire wherever he goes. He has turned the local non-Ahmadi quarter into a war camp vowed to annihilate the entire Ahmadi population of Qadian. But the Government, are doing nothing to stop these unlawful activities.

10. There are two non-Ahmadi mosques at Qadian known as Masjid Araian and Masjid Sheikhan respectively. The former

is situated in the south and the latter in the north of the old abadi of Qadian. The non-Ahmadies have for sometime past used the former mosque for their Friday prayers. With the coming of the Ahrar workers to (12) Qadian, however, the local non-Ahmadi population was naturally split up into two parties, the one siding with the Ahrar and the other, though still retaining their orthodox non-Ahmdi (sic) views, remaining friendly towards the Ahmadies. The latter section being dissatisfied with the malicious activities of the of the Ahrar wanted to arrange the offering of their prayers separately from them and proposed to hold their Friday prayers in the Masjid Sheikhan which being not used by the Ahrar party was easily available for a separate congregation. But the Ahrar opposed this peaceful and legitimate move on the part of this non-Ahmadi section with a view to forcing them to combine with the Ahrar party and be imbued against their will with anti-Ahmadiyya venom. The attitude of the local officials in this matter has been so palpably biased and partisanlike that our members have lost all confidence in them. By their action they have shown beyond any shadow of doubt that they are as keenly desirous as the Ahrar themselves that no section of the non-Ahmadi public at Qadian should remain outside the pernicious influence of the Ahrar. The act virtually amounts to forcing an unwilling section of the local non-Ahmadi population to saying their prayers in congregation with the Ahrar party and thus becoming imbued

with anti-Ahmadiyya poison of the most virulent kind. Plicemen (sic) have often been seen standing at the entrance to the Masjid Sheikhan and obstructing any non-Ahmadi friendly to the (13) Ahmadies from entring (sic) it and once the Ilaqa magistrate himself went to the mosque and instructed the police officer posted there not to allow anyone into the mosque. All these indicidents (sic) have been duly reported to the higher authorities but they have never taken any action in the matter; Does it not show that it has been the policy of the local officials to see that the Ahrar are firmly established at Qadian and that no section of the local non-Ahmadi population remains outside their influence. (sic) I cannot here go into details but if so desired I can produce evidence to prove that the attitude of the local officials has been extremely partisanlike and clearly anti-Ahmadiyya in this matter. I may however add, here that our complaint about the local police does not refer to the newly arrived officers of whom we have not seen enough to form judgment.

11. As the Government are aware a member of our Community, Muhammad Ismail by name, was expelled from the community on his disobeying the instruction, given in compliance with the wish of the local officials, that no Ahmadi should attend the Ahrar jalsa held in October last. This man was already suspected of being a man of low morals, unscruplous (sic) character and of doubtful fidelity to the Ahmadiyya faith and the occasion of this disobeying the instructions of the

community regarding the attendance of the Ahrar jalsa, was welcomed as providing an opportunity for clearing him off. But this very man who in addition to being of objectionable character is a man of no position and no social status is on terms of intimate relationship with some of the district officials who use him as their informer against the Ahmadiyya Community. We possess definite material to prove that Muhammad Ismail is a man of no position, no character, and of extremely low and corrupt morals and, if so desired, we can place (14) that material before the Government. Nothing can be more unfortunate for the Government than this that its responsible officials should use men of Muhammad Ismail's type as their friend and informer against a community whose high traditions of loyalty and service stand unparalleled in the history of the country. Indeed a good deal of the present mischief is traceable to the false reports of this man, who, for his own personal ends, has entered upon his present career of deceit, faithlessness, hypocrisy and corruption. These are strong words but I am prepared to substantiate them before any judge or impartial officer of the Government.

12. The malicious activities of the Ahrar backed by the secret support of some of the officials have created an atmosphere of tense excitement in the Punjab and reports are daily coming in to show that in all parts of the province defenseless Ahmadies are exposed to the bitterest persecution by their non-Ahmadi neighbours; and it is an undeniable fact

that never in the history of the community has there been such a time of peril for its members as it is now. Our lives, properties and honour are all in danger and the danger is the greatest in the case of our beloved Imam, but the Government, to which naturally one looks for protection in the first instance, is doing nothing effective, that we know of, to ease the present situation.

I have mentioned these points only briefly and have not gone into the details but we possess sufficient material to prove all that has been said above and to furnish instances wherever it may be necessary. So far the members of our community have exercised great self-control and have shown admirable power of restraint in the face of great provocation, but there is a limit to every thing and I am afraid if the Government does not soon take effective steps (15) to put a stop to the nefarious activities of the Ahrar and mend the ways of such of their officials as are either leading (sic) a hand of help to the mischief mongers or complacently look on without (sti)rring (sic) a finger in helping the wronged party the result will be extremely deplorable. The Ahmadiyya Community has always stood for law and order and has never failed to side with the Government in fighting the forces of anarchy and disorder in the country even at the risk of their lives, property and honour. But it is an irony of fate that the very Government for which the Community has done so much should, knowingly or unknowingly, become instrumental in strengthening the hands of a party, whose hostility

to us is mainly based on our policy of cooperation with the Government and upholding the principle of constitutional advance. In short the above are our chief grievances and we are convinced that with regard to some of them the responsibility lies heavily on the shoulders of the present Deputy Commissioner Gurdaspur District. The actions of such officials irrespective of the fact whether they are based on inefficiency, negligence or hostility towards, a loyal people eventually prove more harmful to Government, then even the activities of bodies like the Indian National Congress, for they strike at the very root of all confidence in Government and go a long way in estranging hearts that were once united. Anyhow we have now placed our grievances before the Government and explained the situation as best as we could, and we hope the Government will take early steps to redress our grievances and maintain (16) the high traditions of British justice and impartiality. And our last words are that all praise is due to Allah, the Lord and Master of the Universe.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Sd/ - F.M. Sial, M.A.

No: 1053-G dated Qadian the 27th January, 1934.

Copy of the above letter forwarded to the Home Member, Government of India, New Delhi, for information.

for Chief Secretary

AHMADIA COMMUNITY,

Qadian"

APPENDIX "H"

"Note on a conversation between the Commissioner of Lahore and Khan Sahib Maulvi Farzand Ali and two other representatives of the Qadian Community held at Batala on the afternoon of Monday, January 21st, 1935.

On January 19th I wrote to Khan Sahib Maulvi Farzand Ali saying that I was spending a few days in the Gurdaspur district and would like to take the opportunity of having a talk with him over the situation at Qadian. I said that I should be able to see him at Batala on the afternoon of Monday, the 21st or Tuesday, the 22nd.

Accordingly about 3-0 p.m. on the 21st Maulvi Farzand Ali arrived and asked if he could bring with him to the interview two other gentlemen. He then brought in and introduced Maulvi Abdul Mughni, whom he described as the Financial Secretary to the Community, and Sayed Mahmud Ullah Shah who, he informed me, had been the liaison officer between the Ahmadi community and the officers of Government during the Ahrar conference.

I asked Maulvi Farzand Ali if there were any matters which he wished to discuss with me about further developments in Qadian, and he said that there were.

The first matter that he took up was the case of the boy who was found with a butcher's knife in Qadian and who said he had come there to kill the Mirza Sahib. (The expression now always used by Maulvi Farzand Ali to describe the head of the community is now the "Amir-ul-Mominin" and no longer "His Holiness"; he also uses the expression 'Head of our Community').

He explained that Government had not been sincere in the prosecution of this youth. I told him that he could take it from me that Government regarded the matter as of the utmost seriousness and had pressed the prosecution home. He complained

(i) that there was an important witness in the shape of an Ahmadi who happened to be travelling in the train by which the youth came to Qadian and to whom the youth had disclosed his intention of killing the Mirza Sahib, but that (2) Government weakened the case by not putting this witness in the witness-box; and

(ii) that the youth had been released on bail during the hearing of the appeal and that the Sessions Judge had changed the sentence of four years' detention in a Reformatory School into an order binding the accused over for a year under Section 562, Criminal Procedure Code.

I replied by assuring him that Government regarded the case as a very serious one and must, I am sure, have included all evidence which seemed essential. As regards

the second point I reminded him that Government could not control the actions of judicial officers acting judicially and that it was unfair to blame Government for anything which displeased them in a judicial finding.

Maulvi Farzand Ali then referred to a matter of which I had not previously heard. He stated that a letter had been published in the Zamindar purporting to be from an Ahmadi in Karachi, and giving full name and address, which prophesied that Maulvi Zafar Ali, Editor of the Zamindar, would die suddenly on the 11th January. Maulvi Farzand Ali then stated that Police ptotection (sic) was afforded to Zafar Ali on the 11th, and mentioned that Mirza Mehraj-ud-Din, Deputy Superintendent, C.I.D. had himself gone to the Zamindar office to protect Maulvi Zafar Ali though Government should have known that such a letter could not possibly have been written by an Ahmadi, and that in any case Government should have made enquiries from the address given on the letter as published before taking any action. He further stated that after the 11th January another letter was published in the Zamindar purporting to be from the same writer as the first in which it was said that the writer had based his first letter on a dream of an Ahmadi friend whom he trusted, and that as the prophecy had proved false he, the writer, has been convinced that the Ahmadi faith was not the true faith and that he had, therefore, ceased to be an Ahmadi.

The points of his complaint seemed to be that Government

should suppress the form of propaganda adopted by (3) the Zamindar which was inciting people against the Ahmadis and at the same time that Government afforded police protection to Zafar Ali while it did not do so to the Head of the Ahmadiya Community. I replied that I had not heard this story before and could not say anything about the letters appearing in the paper. I pointed out, however, that if the officers of Government became aware of a statement that a certain person would be killed on a certain day they might doubt the bona-fides of the statement but, at the same time, would be failing in their duty if they did not take some precautions to ensure the safety of the person threatened. I also pointed out that so far from Government not protecting the Mirza Sahib they were maintaining an additional force of police at Qadian at the present moment merely to protect the lives of the Ahmadi community in general.

Maulvi Farzand Ali then commenced a number of allegations against the police constables on duty at Qadian, and vehemently asserted that the Ahmadi community believed that the official policy adopted against them was a deliberately hostile policy.

This gave me the opportunity of saying what I particularly wished to say to Maulvi Farzand Ali, namely that the police were sent to Qadian as their friends to protect them; that Government and all its officers were under considerable anxiety as to the safety of the Ahmadi community which was

a small community in a population which contained many elements bitterly hostile to the Ahmadis, and that instead of treating the local police and other officers of Government as friends and co-operating with them the Ahmadis lost no opportunity of making complaints against the local officers, and that it was not to be wondered at if occasionally constables and others resented the constant criticism to which they were exposed at the hands of those they were trying to protect.

I pointed out that the attitude of Government to the Ahmadis was actuated by nothing but friendliness and the need of protecting a minority community, but Maulvi Farzand (4) Ali stated that he could only judge by the constant pin-pricks to which the community was subjected. He said that other communities were of the opinion that the Ahmadis had come into opposition with Government and that they had received overtures from the politically-minded among the Sikhs, and from the Congress to join them in open opposition to Government. In the course of my remarks I said that it was surely not advisable for a community situated as they were and exposed at the moment to a particularly hostile attack on the part of the Ahrars to accentuate their difficulties by choosing this moment to start propaganda which was likely to stir up the hostility of the Sikhs. They denied hotly that they had at this time said anything about Guru Nanak being a Mussalman and eating beef though they admitted that they did regard Guru Nanak as a Mussalman. I did not press this

point as I was not sure of my ground but I am definitely under the impression that I heard an account lately that after asking the Sikhs to say nothing provocative at their recent diwan at Qadian the Ahmadis themselves a few days later made speeches on this subject.

Maulvi Farzand Ali constantly returned to the point that he considered that the action of the local police at Qadian was hostile to the Ahmadi community and he quoted a number of instances. He referred to the incident at the Sheikhanwala mosque which is referred to in paragraph 3 of the Weekly Confidential Diary of the Superintendent of Police for the week ending the 5th January 1935. The Diary refers to the incident having occurred on Friday and I am not clear whether Friday, December 28th or Friday, January 4th is meant. Mr. Bassett's report makes it clear that Khan Sahib Maulvi Farzand Ali was a witness of the incident, and there is another note dated the 4th January in which Mr. Bassett states that Maulvi Farzand Ali visited him in his office that day. Maulvi Farzand Ali stated to me emphatically to-day that when the Maulvi who wished to read the prayers and the other persons with him wished to enter the mosque there were two constables in uniform who stood in front of the gate and (5) endeavoured to dissuade the persons concerned from going in. (Margin note: Mr. Bassett has since assured me that the police have very strict orders on this point and could not possibly have acted in the way alleged. A.M. 27.1.35.)

As I had stated definitely on a previous occasion that no police officers would ever endeavour to stop worshippers going into a mosque, and as I understood that orders to this effect had been given to the local police, I could only say that it appeared to me that Maulvi Farzand Ali must have been mistaken. He was, however, very emphatic that he had seen the constables with his own eyes barring the way and remonstrating with persons going in. There is no mention of this episode at all in Mr. Bassett's note of the conversation on the 4th January. It is of course possible that this conversation took place early on the morning of the 4th and that Maulvi Farzand Ali was back in Qadian by the time of the midday prayers when, I understand, the incident occurred. Mr. Bassett's account of the incident only mentions the presence of Police at a later stage when a posse of police arrived on the scene and halted at a distance. Mr. Bassett concludes his account of the incident by saying that Maulvi Farzand Ali "probably hoped to secure evidence of the police preventing Muslims from entering the mosque," from which it appears that Mr. Bassett has obviously given the necessary instructions to the police not to prevent persons entering the mosque. Either then the orders were disregarded or Maulvi Farzand Ali was not telling me the truth.

Maulvi Farzand Ali also alleged that the Assistant Sub-Inspector in charge of the post at Qadian sent for the Maulvi in question after the incident and asked him why he

had tried to restart prayers in that mosque.

Another instance quoted by Maulvi Farzand Ali as showing the bias of the local police against the Ahmadis is the incident of an Ahmadi who attended the Arainwali mosque where the Ahrar Maulvi, Inayat Ullah, preaches with the intention of taking notes of the sermon. Maulvi Inayatullah (sic) is said to have asked the Sub-Inspector to turn the Ahmadi out of the mosque and the Sub-Inspector is said to have told the man to go. When the man refused to go it is alleged that the Sub-Inspector then said he had no authority to turn him out but that the congregation themselves could do so. I can hardly believe this story to be true because if the Assistant Sub-Inspector felt he had no authority to turn the man out he would not have told him in the first instance to go, and would certainly not have permitted him to be forcibly ejected in his presence by private individuals.

It appeared to me, however, that Maulvi Farzand Ali and his friends implicitly believed these stories to be true, and did not accept any assurance that the police were in Qadian merely to protect the Ahmadi community and could have no possible motive in acting in the manner alleged. I pointed out, however, that in view of the fact that the police were in Qadian merely to protect the Ahmadi community from attack by their enemies and were having a difficult time which was accentuated by the constant complaints being made against them by the persons they were there to protect; it would not

be surprising if individual constables occasionally lost patience and did or said something that their officers might not approve of, and I added that the obvious remedy for this was for the Ahmadis to let the police see that they were welcomed by the Ahmadis as friends and that the Ahmadis appreciated the difficult position in which they were placed.

In this connection I pointed out that Government were taking every precaution to prevent the possibility of any misunderstandings by sending to the Gurdaspur district to be placed in charge of the area including Qadian a senior and experienced officer in the shape of the Deputy Superintendent recently appointed to the district.

Maulvi Farzand Ali was inclined to question my statement that the extra police now in Qadian were there to protect the Ahmadi community. He said that the Ahmadis had not been consulted and did not see the necessity of protection. I pointed out, however, that it was the duty of Government to protect its subjects whether the subjects thought they were in need of protection or not, and I said that in the present circumstances when feelings of bitter hostility were being stirred up against the Ahmadis, who were an isolated small (7) community Government would not run the risk of leaving them unprotected.

The whole tenour of the interview was that Maulvi Farzand Ali and his friends were convinced that they were the subject of deliberate ill-treatment at the hands of the

local officers, and were on the look-out to aggravate every minor incident into a deliberately unfriendly act. This is a very difficult frame of mind to deal with, and my assurance of the continued good will of Government fell on deaf ears.

My conversation with Maulvi Farzand Ali and his companion lasted from 3-0 p.m. to 5-30 p.m., and I have naturally not been able to put down in this note everything that passed between us.

(SD.) ALAN MITCHELL,

Commissioner, Lahore Division

Camp Batala:

January 21, 1935."

APPENDIX "I"

(From Government of India, Home Department, Exact Quotation from the

"Translation of a speech delivered by Pir Faiz-ul-Hassan, son of Pir Muhammed Hussain, of Alo Mohar, Sialkot district, on the occasion of the Ahrar Tabligh Conference at Pathankote, Gurdaspur district, on the 3rd and 4th of May, 1936.

(Speech made on the 3rd May, 1936.)

Muslim brethren, so far as I have studied the world my experience at Pathankote and other corners of the Punjab and India regarding the relations and customs of other countries satisfied my hopes. Dissatisfaction and disappointment of the World, colliding of the master of one country with another, struggle between nations, begging food and rights and propaganda of liberty is being carried on and religion is assuming a new aspect. The world is after some new law. Europe which is a champion of modern civilization founded the League of Nations in co-operation with other nations. The christianity preaches tolerance and the boycott of war, disarmament and the establishment of Councils and these facts are before you. To-day a nation is out for the destruction of another nation. Italy is confident of its strength, army

and science. What fault lies with Abyssinia, she is a poor country in the world and is devoid of science. The strong (2) beats the weak. The blood suckers English, Germans and French, who are claimants of peace have enslaved forty crores of people. They (Italians) are annihilating the Abyssinians with bombs and have used such a poisonous gas that the poor Abyssinians have become dumb and deaf and their bodies have blistered. The critics of Islam say that they are claimants of civilization. History tells us that 74 lakhs of people were killed in the Great War, I enquire of the English that the Indian women became widows and in spite of so many sacrifices Abyssinians, Japanese and the English decide that the world should give up war and should safeguard human lives, but they have not succeeded. What my master (Hazrat) Muhammed sallam did for the protection of humanity. He fought eighty battles during his life to protect himself and only 1110 men were killed in those crusades. The result was that he manned the barbarious Arabs. He was a perfect man who has been defamed in Qadian. I have studied so many books of the world but none has satisfied me except Kamliwala, who has been denounced by a bad character, who is worse than a dog of the Darbar of Muhammad. This claimant of prophethood says that our Hussain was a prey of Karbla, and he is prey of love. He has thrived his prophethood under the patronage of the English. In the preachings of (Hazrat) Muhammad Sallam there was no differentiation (3) but what should I talk of

him, who promotes his nabuvat at the instance and discretion of the English, Mahmud's father had promised in the Court of the District Magistrate, Gurdaspur, to the effect that as long as he did not order, he (Ghulam Ahmad) would not publish any of his revelations. Ahrar is said to be a political body which intends to liberate India. Shah Sahib goes to Juma prayers, is arrested and convicted. Our object is that we do not confess any prophet after RASUL-I-KARIM SALLAM, hence we have a belief that a claimant of Nabuvat after the RASUL (Prophet of God) if assassinated is trifling matter. And whosoever shall claim "Nabuvat" will meet the same fate. The critics criticize, but I say, tyrant be ashamed, because during your lifetime the personality of Kamliwala (the Prophet of Muhammad) is attacked. Oh you the Muslims and Maulvis of Pathankote you claim to be respectful to Hazrat Muhammad. He is Ata Ullah Shah Bokhari. I solemnly affirm that I do not sleep for nights (lit: three, three days). I am afraid a catastrophe is imminent on the Muslims. The Ahrar party is out not on the prop of the world. Our determination are still wide. (Narrating an incident of Hazrat Ali the speaker said) he was a brave man and took barley bread but these (4) consumers of musk and ambergri are the self-planted trees of the English, and they have formed a company in the garb of religion. If our namas (prayer) is stopped and we would be in service, we would resign it, but would not give up namas, because the said namas would not be accepted. There

is a pardon for an idle and negligent "namaz". We do not go to Qadian to say prayers as there is no ban on us. When it was banned by the Government we violated the orders and resolved to encounter the English for two or three years. During the "SHAHIDGUNJ" agitation Mahmud issued a challenge for the "MUBAHILA" and Maulvi Mazher Ali Azhar stood in front of MAHMUD'S house and asked him to come out for a while. Mirza Mahmud sent congratulations to Government on the incident of firing at Karachi and the defeat of Bhagdad. He also sent congratulations when the Turks were murdered. We hear abuses in the SHAHIDGUNJ agitation. Mahmud has not replied to the challenge of the "MUBAHILA" so far and will not do so till the day of judgment. They (Ahmadis) do not join our funeral ceremonies. The Germans injected poisonous germs of plague in rats in order to be let loose in the enemy's ranks to destroy them. The English had bred up these Qadiani rats in order to rob us of our faiths and to weaken us by opposing "Jehad", and have left them off in you. The murderers of these rats are being incriminated. The entry of Maulvi Ghulam Gaus in the Hazra district is banned, but the (5) Mirzais are allowed to go everywhere to preach their faith. The place where Jehad is opposed there is no religion there. The C. I. D. representatives of Government would be present in the meeting. They should note it down that my tongue may be cut off, if I tell a lie that we shall abandon our campaign against the Qadianis. We are too much worried, therefore,

the Government should renounce its pro-Ahmadi policy, and whosoever will side (with) them would be obliterated from India. We do not know how to yield but know how to die. (Narrating an incident of HAZRAT IBRAHIM-ILAH-US-SALLAM and the Tabligh of Nabuvat by RASUL-I-ALLAH. the speaker asserted) "What do you think of Ahmadiyaat. Is AHRAR not a match for it (Ahmadiyat)? We are to hoist the banner of Islam in England and to do Tabligh work in China and Japan. We are nine crore Muslims in India and if we spit upon the Qadianis they would be washed away. Now the Mirzait is obliterated. In Qadian the houses of the people were burnt and murders committed. Mr. Khosla passed a judgment. It is not a judgment of the Government that it is being criticised? Does the Police not submit its reports to the Government? To-day our Muhammadi banner is waving at Qadian and now nobody can check us from entering into the town. The Mirzais have now adopted mean (6) methods, and now they (Ahmadis) bite our feet (with their teeth). (One of the audience shouted "make water in their (Ahmadis) mouths"). I do not approve your verbal show of affection but come up and accompany me to Jail. The Mirzais attempted to throw Maulvi Inayat Ullah from the running train. Had he been thrown out, he would have met his death. Oh you the Mirzais you are fortunate. Had Maulvi Inayat Ullah (been) martyred the cost of his one drop of bolld (sic) was worth one lakh of Mirzais. Maulvi resides in Qadian and if the Ahmadis tackle with him the

consequences would not be good. If Maulvi Sahib is put to any harm, on Mirzais do not think yourself to be safe (lit: your plant will be rooted out) and Mirzait would meet a dog's death. Since the day I have been to Qadian, revelations have begun to dawn upon me. I too predict and think that Mirzait would be effaced from India within five years, and no Mirzai would survive. Fortunate are those who have served this mission. Oh Muslims be cut into pieces, wake up, otherwise you would repent. The Ahrars have two drawbacks in them, the one is that whosoever did Tabligh was put to trouble. (Narrating the incident of HAZRAT BALAL the speaker said "defend your faith." There is a particular reason for the growth of Mirzait in India. In 1876 Mr. H. Heamue in league with Lord Daffrance (?Dufferin) (7) laid the foundation of Congress which adopted different lines of action, when the passions of the people were acellerated (sic). What was the principle of a ruler. When a Nation is active he lulls it to sleep. Whenever you demand your rights from Government it will oust a string in your neck. At that time they (Ahmadis) claimed prophethood, and taught the Muslims to oppose Jehad. Nature shows when the weak is attacked, he retaliates like a hen. "Jehad" is a medium of our protection. If the English take posession of India and Medina, they (Ahmadis) say that we should not criticize the English, but to obey them. ILM DIN martyred his life for Prophet Muhammad, but this enemy of Islam and an outlaw of Muhammadi sovereignity

(sic) and slave of the English says that ILM DIN died a "haram" DEATH. He (Mirza Mahmud) declares his (Ilm Din's) death to be illegal. When their (Ahmadis) Muhammad Ali attacked Maulvi Abdul Karim, Maulvi Muhammad Hussain was assassinated and the assassin was hanged. He (Mirza Mahmud) participated (in) Muhammad Ali's funeral ceremonies in a keen seal (Lit: gave a shoulder to his pyre) and buried him in the Bahishti Maqbra free of charge. One who died for the cause of Muhammad is styled as Kafar who (in realty) (sic) (8) was a martyr, but one whose corpse was supported to the grave by Mahmud is called a martyr. These Mirzais are the rebels of Muhammad and enemies of Islam as well as freedom. They side with the capitalists. This incarnated Nabi of the Government is out to ruin the spirit of freedom, therefore we wish to annihilate Mirzait, so that liberty may be achieved. A man should attain prosperity (lit: world) before he meets his death. The people of Jhelum district attack Baghdad and Turkey for rupees seventeen (their monthly salaries). The English say that we lack civilization. This is all due to our poverty. None is poor in England. The poor becomes a bad character. I wish to point out that the problem of poverty is before us, which is in the hands of the Providence and not in ours. It requires reforms in our social customs. A nation which keeps no account of its income and expenditure cannot prosper. Government is not prepared to enact such laws for you, but Iran (Government) is an exception to it.

Hazur (the Prophet of Arabia) has ordained to perform Jihad, to trade and to incur reasonable expenses on marriages and deaths, therefore you should curtial your expenses on the latter customs. If you want to sure yourself you should reform your social evils. Your Pirs as well are burden upon you (lit: eat you up). Act in accordance with your Shariat and never do anything contrary to the teachings of Quran. Do not take money on interest and cease the practise of (9) women singing on marriages. (The speaker in the conclusion secured a pledge from the audience regarding the prohibition of women singing on marriages)."

APPENDIX "J"

"Translation of Verbatim notes taken down by an Urdu Stenographer of speech made by Khalil-ur-Rahman, son of M. Habib-ur-Rahman of Ludhiana at a public meeting held inside Arainwala Mosque, Qadian on 3d July, 1936."

"Respected elders and my friends, this is my first chance to visit Qadian. Since the Majlis-i-Ahrar has commenced opposing the nabuvat (prophethood) of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, I am the only individual among the Majlis-i-Ahrar who had not the opportunity to visit this place. All friends insist me to speak something on Mirzait, but I think that for the last two years much has been said about it, and now there seems to be no necessity to deliver any more speeches on the subject, but this is such a topic that cannot be ignored unless this mischief is totally done away with. Unless MIRZAIT, the nabuvat of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad and his followers who confessed his nabuvat to be genuine and believe in the appearance of a nabi after Prophet Muhammad were destroyed from Qadian as well as from other parts of the world, this topic cannot be finished. Now I explain a few things to you that why this mischief of Mirzait arose after (2) Thirteen hundred years Mirza Sahib did not the least neccessity (sic) for the inauguration of this Nabuvat. After the mutiny such were the circumstances that the British Government stood

in need of dividing the inhabitants of India into different communities and the Government found two individuals for this purpose. Before the interview with Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, the English met Sir Syed Ahmad in the United Provinces and got opened a college by him in Aligarh and faith of the Muslim children was thus spoiled, who were led astray from their religious teachings and the students were misled to hate their teachers. On the other hand this man (Mirza Ghulam Ahmad) was made to claim prophethood. Both these individuals appeared together. I cannot say for what purpose Sir Sayed Ahmad opened this college. No advantage is drawn by the Muslims out of this institution. Thirty five crore Muslims of the world have a faith that no Prophet can appear after Hazrat Muhammed. One who says that he gets revelations is a liar, "Kasab" and "dajjal". We are asked by the Muslims to hold religious debates with them (Ahmadis) and if they lose then we will take it for granted that the Ahmadis were liars. If somebody asks me that I am not the son of Habibur-Rahman, then will I say in reply that let me enquire from my mother about it and would not I be (3) ashamed of it. Is it possible that after thirteen hundred years we can have the faith of prophethood after Prophet Muhammed. When I cannot tolerate to enquire from my mother how can this be possible to hear such allegations about the great Prophet. I desire that this mischief of MIRZAIT should end with my hands, no matter if my property, money and life are spent

for this purpose. I am not prepared to recede a step in this respect. Outside India in the Islamic independent Governments, the Mirzais have performed the work of reporters and have pointed out to the British Government their (Islamic independent Governments) weakness and other secrets. The English are now endevouring (sic) to put to sword all the Islamic Kingdoms in order to hoist their own flag there. Today the English are even the friends of the Mirzais, but the English should remember that the time is fast approaching when the mischief of Mirzait will end. At that stage even the biggest power cannot control this mischief. Let the most powerful nation come at its back even then we will win and this our enemy will be removed from our way. The liar cannot prosper. The reason why the Ahrar party is being opposed is that the true may the false. The liar (Mirzai) cries now and ask the world to come to his help. First they quarrelled individually and (4) now they have stood against the JAMAIT which will grind them. It is a question of the honour of Prophet Muhammed. The Jamait whose head (Ghulam Ahmad) declared that he in his dream slept with his head on the thighs of Fatama, has no right to live in the world. He also claimed that he bore in himself hundred personalities like Imam Hussain and declared himself a nabi but he is not worthy to live in this world. He ought to have had the habits of a Nabi. Everybody cannot secure prophethood. Nabis don't have telephones in their bungalows nor have they cars at their doors. The

true prophets taught lesson of the oneness of God and warned us from the commission of thefts and gambling if we desire to attain salvation. The Qadiani Nabi came out and encouraged his followers to commit thefts and adultery as there was no body to take them to task. This does not behove the Khalifa of a Nabi to say his prayers on guards. On my way to the mosque I observed the Constables and volunteers on his guard. If any body had to see the grandeur of the Khilafat he could find it in Hazrat Umar (the second khalifa of Prophet Muhammed) who used to sit alone on sand no body could dare to see on him and towards who he saw, he could not stand, but on the other hand just look towards this Khalifa, who is sometimes in (5) Quadian and sometimes at Palampur. The Prophet Muhammed conveyed the message of God to the world when even his friends had turned their faces. When he gave his message to the gathering nations that would they believe in whatever he would say they owing to his truthfulness replied in the affirmative. When he said that God is one and bring your faith in Him then the people began to shower bricks and stones on him. Every body left him but he required no body for his assistance. He possessed Godly powers in him. When God wishes to complete his work through any body none can kill that person. This Khalifa has no trouble whatsoever. The claim of Prophethood is only with the help of the English and whatever the English say is revelation and from whatever they prohibit is deleted from ilham. Their Gabreil (an angel who is alleged to bring

the message of God to nabis) is the English and God is King George. Now the Mirzais are raising a dispute in Qadian in order to (harm) us and save themselves. The Government will be at their back up to the time of Assembly Elections. We know the English since a long time. We remember the tyrannies of the English perpetrated upon the Muhammedans. When the time will come we will display our revenge. We challenge the Government to tyrannies to the extreme so that they (English) may realize the feelings of revenge. The prophet (6) Muhammed had even pardoned his enemies but today our rulers put obstructions in our religion and encourage their (Ahmadis) nabuvat to exist. The English have pinched the hearts of the seventy five crore of Muslims not only of India but of the whole world by helping the Qadianis who have made up their mind to popularize their nabuvat. Let the Qadiani nabi, his followers and the English spend their full strength in prospering their nabuvat, but the time is fast approaching when neither the Mirzais nor the English will remain in India. The Government is compelling the world to stand against it. Those English men who oppressed the Hindus and Muslims would not be pardoned. When the Mirzait was on the verge of its destruction the Shahidgunj mosque was demolished. I inform the Sikhs that they were not responsible for its demolition, but they were made to demolish it and a big power had a hand in it. When the Government realise that the Majlis-i-Ahrar had mustered up a great strength not only in the Punjab but

also in India, then Emerson could not tolerate, because Assembly Election was approaching in which the Majlis-i-Ahrar will send some of its diligent workers and this Emerson is the same individual, who when as Multan's Deputy Commissioner caused a communal clash for the first time. He got the mosque demolished only on the reasons that the workers of the Majlis-i-Ahrar (7) are enthusiastic, will come into the field and will be crushed. At that time the Election will be quite easy and the Mirzais will be saved. The mosque was demolished and Maulana ZAFAR 'ALI KHAN took the movement into his hands and delivered provocative speeches and crowd of Muslims proceeded towards the shahidgunj and then even the said Mauslana could not stop the mob and consequently guns were fired. Zafar Ali khan was interned and later on the parents of those men went to him and enquired as to who was responsible for their troubles and in order to save himself he said that if the Majlis-i-Ahrar itself took upon this work, the mosque could be obtained within fifteen daus (sic). By this they turned the sympathy of the Muslims towards the Majlis-i-Ahrar and what happened to the latter is now known to every body. The office-holders of the Majlis-i-Ahrar knew the inner policy of the Government and they told the Muslims that the mosque was not demolished by the Sikhs but was the work of some other power. The Muhammadans were blind at the moment and said that the Ahrars were faithless and traitors as they had not helped them at that stage. The

Majlis-i-Ahrar took upon it the sentiments of the Muslims and did not mind their abuse and thus succeeded in diverting their attention from the Sikhs towards themselves and thus the Government failed in its purpose. By this the Majlis-i-Ahrar no doubt suffered (8) a lot. At this moment several Mirzais made speeches, several of them had gone to Lahore at the time and whenever they saw anybody belonging to the party of Maulana Zafar Ali they told him that the Ahrars were traitors, while on the other hand when they met an Ahrar they told him that ZAFAR Ali KHAN was a traitor. The Majlis-i-Ahrar kept quiet for a year. We do not speak a word against Maulana Zafar Ali Khan and the Shahidgunj affair. It is the intention of the Government to revive the Shahidhunj (sic) agitation and to do away with the prestige of the Majlis-i-Ahrar, which it has regained since then. The Mirzais including Sir Zafar Ullah Khan, Sir Fazal-i-Hussain and the Government are now trying to place such a scheme before the Ahrars by which they would go to Jails, but the members of the Majlis-i-Ahrar are now not likely to be suppressed by these acts and they know their inner moves. If the Majlis-i-Ahrar had taken any part in Shahidhunj agitation and Syed Ata Ullah Shah Bokhari had made a speech at Lahore there would have been a fight between the Muslims and Sikhs. (He enquired from the audience that by this how many Sikhs and Muslims would have been dead, upon the audience replied that several would have died. He further remarked that throughout India

there would have been several dead bodies. He further said that the Majlis-i-Ahrar had bestowed a (9) favour upon the British Government what to say of India, and saved the former from this agitation, and by this Emerson sat down quietly having been disappointed.) You should hear and bear it in mind that you should unite and should not vote in favour of a Mirzai or a pro-Mirzai in the Punjab and in their respective districts. If Sir Fazal-i-Hussain and his party went to Council and Sir Fazal-i-Hussain became the Chief Minister then you should remember that the Mirzai sect would spread all over the world. If this power would fall into your hands then neither the prophethood of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad nor Zafar Ullah Khan nor Sir Fazal-i-Hussain would remain and this Mirzait would perish of its own accord, and if after this you did not come to know the worth of your vote you would be doomed. Do not vote after relationship and brotherhood. If in the next year pro-Government party came into power then during the next five years, if not in the first, the anti-Government party would be crushed. Except that the capitalist party and the capitalist Government will remain, you do not know your future difficulties. India at this stage is a theatre and every community in it is playing the part of an actress. The Hindus and Sikhs are progressing whereas the Muhammedans are going down. After two years' (10) labour on enquiry we find that the brain of the Muslims is wavering and that it is difficult to leave brotherhood. You may not leave your brotherhood

and if you do not leave it, then you will be compelled to do it after five years and your condition would grow from bad to worse and you would again realize this at that time. There are only six or seven months at your disposal now, you should organize yourselves and insist this on brains and minds of every body that you have not to vote for any Mirzai, a pro-Mirzai or a Government man. The right to vote does not belong to the Government but (it) is a trust on behalf of God. Think before you vote. This is not an ordinary thing. The Muslim Governments have been carried on by these votes. Do not commit a breach of trust bestowed by the Almighty. Insist on every one, young and old, that he has to vote for a true Muhammedan of a candidate of the Ahrars who stands for the Council. As long as you did not send them into Councils, the Mirzait cannot be done with, and this is the only way to do away with it that your votes should be against them. Then you would see that Mahmud would go straight to Sind and from there to London and then there would be no place for such people here. Today Mirza Mahmud and his followers are oppressed you and the Muslims of Qadian are tired of them, but I (11) would say to the Muslims of Qadian and its neighbourhood that they should put all their energies to this work. If three seats of your district go to Ahrars it would be better. The greatest follower of the Mirzai (Sir Fazal-i-Hussain) is standing for the Council from this district and he is doing so on the strength of

Qadian. It is up to you that you should not vote for him and on the other hand you should vote for some one who is an Ahrar. If you vote for some one after taking a cup of ten (or ten) or fifteen rupees it would not be right and then after this you come to us and say that you are in trouble we would not help you. You should not sell your vote as it is not a thing to be sold, as this spoils your conscience, nor you should vote after the idea of relationship. You should expel these things from your brain. When the Prophet Muhammed claimed prophethood who was he who brought faith in him. (The audience said Abu Bakar Sadiq.) Did not he possess money and property and did not he want this? Did not he possess any relationship with any one, but as so on as Muhammed said that Sadiq I am a prophet, at once the latter neither cared for his parents, nor his wife and children and stood by the prophet till his last moment and that the love for his parents, wife and children or that of his (12) money and property could not stand in his way. He has set before us historical fact. He did bait at the hands of Prophet Muhammad, because poor and when he died, did not he possess all worldly powers and property? (The audience said yes). Did he not reign? (The audience replied in the affirmative). This should be the feelings of a Muslim that if a cannon is placed before him and I say that there is a cannon ball in it, it would go off and I will die, but if my faith is that it cannot go off, if would not go off. A Muslim can pull down all the powers

of the world by his faith, who fear death, death follows them, and there is death for them at every step. In Qadian the Mirzais are in power, but there is a guard at their mosque. In spite of all this power they fear that any body may not assault or attack them. This is due to the fact that they realize that they are faithless and that their principles are wrong. What were the sentiments of Bedouins of Mecca whose biographies are before us. They had their faith in the oneness of God and one who has this faith, none can do him any harm, and if any one can do so it is Almighty. There is none else besides God in this world who can do any harm or good to an individual. Narrating the incident of a Bedouin going to Kinan during the time of Prophet Muhammed and on being arrested he was asked by the King as to what (13) he was witnessing and thereby the individual replied that he was selecting a site for the erection of his house as this country would soon be in their possession. He was then sent to gallows. The present Government is creating many mischiefs in India. When Mirzait was done away with and when Sir Iqbal declared that the Mirzais were Kafirs and were out of the fold of Islam then the Government who could do nothing at the moment compelled the Nizam Hyderabad who was the Chancellor of the Aligarh University, for the appointment of Chaudhri Zaffar Ullah Khan as a member of his Council, which he did. By so doing the Government wished to prove that the Muslims who declared the Mirzais as Kafirs

were not justified in announcing so. Zaffar Ullah being a Mirzai is appointed by the greatest Muslim Ruler as a member of the biggest Muslim University. Nizem Hyderabad realizes this fact that he (Zaffar Ullah) is infidel but he has appointed Zaffar Ullah as a member according to the desire of the Government. This has pinched the hearts of the Indian Muslims. Nizam Hyderabad should take it for granted that he can annihilate the followers of Prophet Muhammed, but he cannot defame their Prophet. Mirzais are thinking now what should be done in the coming election. Sir Fazal-i-Hussain's party and the strength of the Mirzais (14) Mirzais are thinking that there should be majority of the Mirzais in the forthcoming election, and Sir Fazal-i-Hussain be placed as its President. This is the desire of the Mirzais that Sir Fazal-i-Hussain should be the President of the Council. They are aware of this fact that they can only be safe in India if it so happens. At this time I request you that if you and your generations wish to lead an honourable life in the Punjab, then obliterate the mischief of Mirzait, and send your members to the Council. The Majlis-i-Ahrar announced that "Qadian Day" should be celebrated throughout India."