5. A most important petition for the attention of the government

As our British government treats all its subjects with equality, and its benevolence and mercy are available to every community, it is therefore our right to place before it each and every suffering and pain, and seek from it the remedy of our grievances. These days the most terrible distress that we suffer is that the Christian clergymen want in every way to dishonour our Prophet, on whom be peace and the blessings of Allah, to abuse him, to make false allegations against him, and to revile him in every way so as to torment us; and they want us to remain completely silent in response and not to have the right even to reply to their attacks. Consequently, they misrepresent any statement of ours, no matter how mild it may be, as if it were scurrilous, and complain to the authorities, despite the fact that their own language is a thousand times more abusive.

Considering that we people believe Jesus, on whom be peace, to be a true prophet of the Exalted God, and a good and righteous man, how could disrespectful words in respect of his status proceed from our pen? However, as the Christian clergymen do not believe in our Prophet, on whom be peace and the blessings of Allah, they say whatever they like about him. It was our right that we should have complained to our honourable government about their offensive statements and sought a just remedy. However, they first hurt our feelings by thousands of their painful statements and then, quite perversely,
they lodged a complaint in the court to the effect that the vituperative language and abuse originated from our side. It was on this basis that the murder case was instituted which has been dismissed by the office of Mr. Douglas, Deputy Commissioner, Gurdaspur.

For this reason, it is expedient that we inform our fair-minded government that we have not the words with which to describe the pain and offence that is being inflicted upon us by the pens and tongues of the Christian clergymen and, then in their following, by the Arya people.

It is clear that no one likes to hear even this much about his spiritual guide and prophet that he was a liar and an imposter. A self-respecting Muslim, on hearing insults over and over again, feels that he is living a life of dishonour. Then how can any believer tolerate the most vile abuses about his holy leader? At this time in British India there are many Christian clergymen whose constant occupation is merely to abuse our Prophet, Leader and Master, may peace and the blessings of Allah be upon him. Exceeding all others in hurling abuse is the Rev. Imad-ud-Din of Amritsar. In his books such as Taḥqīq-ul-Īmān he openly abuses the Holy Prophet Muhammad, calling him deceitful, covetous of the women of others, etc. etc., and uses very strong and inflammatory language. So also the Rev. Thakar Das in Sīrat-ul-Masīḥ and Review Barāhīn Āhmadiyya calls our Holy Prophet as slave to lust, illicit lover of women, cheat, highwayman, cunning, ignorant, making use of stratagems, deceitful. The Rev. Ranklin, in the pamphlet Daḥfī-ul-Buhtān, has used the following words about our Holy Prophet: he was a worshipper of lust, and his companions were adulterers, deceitful and robbers. Likewise, the Rev. Rogers in Taftīsh-ul-Islām writes that Muhammad was a follower of lust, a complete slave of his base passions, a womaniser, cunning, blood-shedder, and liar. In the pamphlet Näbī Maˈṣūm by the American Tract Society it is written that Muhammad was sinful, indulged in forbidden love, i.e. adultery, was cunning and a hypocrite. In the
pamphlet *Masīḥ al-Dajjāl*, Master Ramchandar says about our Holy Prophet that he was a ring-leader of robbers, highwayman, thief, cheat, womaniser, imposter, follower of lust, blood-shedder, adulterer. In the *Life of Muhammad* by Washington Irving it is written that the companions of Muhammad were robbers and highwaymen, and he himself was avaricious, a liar and deceitful. In the *Andrūna Bible* by the Christian Atham it is written that Muhammad was the Antichrist and deceitful. Then he says that the end of the Muhammadans would be dreadfully terrible, i.e. they would perish soon. In the [Christian] paper *Nūr Afshān* of Ludhiana it is written that Muhammad used to receive satanic revelation and he used to commit unlawful acts, and he was a follower of his low desires, misguided, cunning, a cheat, adulterer, thief, blood-shedder, highwayman, companion of the devil, and he used to look at his daughter Fatima lustfully.

Now all these characterisations in regard to our Holy Prophet which have come from the mouths of the Christian clergymen deserve to be pondered over, and it is worthy of consideration as to what the consequences could be. Could a Muslim ever utter such words in respect of Jesus? Do there exist, in this world, words more abusive than those used by the Christian clergymen concerning that pure Prophet in whose path hundreds of millions of creatures of God offer their lives as sacrifice, and who entertain for that Prophet such true love the parallel of which it would be futile to look for in other nations? In spite of these insults, abuses and foul words, how outrageous that the Christian clergymen accuse me of using strong language! We know it for certain that it is entirely impossible that our esteemed government could approve of their technique, or approve of it after learning about it. Nor can we believe that, in future, at a time of a similar, unjustified agitation of the Christian clergymen as was demonstrated during the Clarke case, our government would prefer the clergymen over the sixty million Muslims of India and give the former some latitude. The long list of the abuses of the Christian clergymen and the Aryas
which we have been compelled to present here is solely for the purpose that it may be useful in future, and at some time the esteemed government, having examined this list, may show mercy to the oppressed followers of Islam.

We make it known to all Muslims that until now the government is unaware of these facts as to the extreme limit that the abusive language of the Christian clergymen has reached. And we know with full conviction that when the esteemed government becomes aware of such strongly vituperative language, it will undoubtedly introduce the best measures for the future.

Now I give a detailed list of books in which Christian clergymen, and similarly under their influence the Aryas among the Hindus, have heaped the worst abuses on our Holy Prophet and the religion of Islam and its honoured personalities.¹

“To quote blasphemy does not constitute blasphemy”

**Abuses of Christians**

*Dāfīʿ-ul-Buḥān* by Rev. Mr. Ranklin, printed at the Mission Press, Allahabad, 1845:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Words inflammatory and hurtful to Muslims.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23–24</td>
<td>The messenger of the Muslims had sexual intercourse with his slave-girl, and when one of his wives reproved him he took an oath and then for his sensual pleasure he broke his oath and fabricated a revelation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>He issued new commandments according to his base desires.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>It is certain that when Muhammad could not prove his prophethood in any way he circulated this false story. Is such fabrication worthy of honesty?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>No wonder he abrogated the Gospels because all worldly-minded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Publisher’s Note: In translating the sample of abusive and scurrilous language quoted in this section of the book, we have omitted many of the examples for the sake of brevity. They can be seen in the original Urdu book.
people who are followers of lust do like this. But why grieve for them, because their end will be that they will fall under the wrath of God, that is the hell which burns with fire and brimstone.

Pamphlet Masiṣh al-Dajjal, by Master Ramchandar the Christian, 1873:
In this book an attempt has been made to show that our Holy Prophet was the Antichrist.

Sirat-ul-Masiṣh wal-Muḥammad by Rev. Thakur Das, Missionary, American Mission, 1882:
6 Muhammad was sinful in his person … he was sinful in his actions.
14 Personal, low, lustful desires were found excessively in Muhammad, so much so that he was always dominated by these desires.
15 In this respect Muhammad not only violated his own teachings but proved his selfishness.
31 To deceive people he concocted this strange falsehood. It shows that Muhammad used to be entrapped by the devil.

Andrāṇa Bible by Deputey Abdullah Atham:
70, 75 The religion of the Pope and the religion of Muhammad are two jaws of the Dragon.
123–131 (The locust of the Book of Revelation and their leader are taken to mean the Prophet Muhammad and his followers.)
144–145 (Founder of Islam called Antichrist.)

Muḥammad kī Tawārīkh kā Ijmāl by Rev. William from Rewari, published by Christian Mission, Rewari, 1891:
There is no page or line of this book which does not contain the most deeply provocative, offensive and repugnant words.
1–7 Leader of robbers, plunderer, thief, murderer by secret conspiracies, of deceitful character.
4 When, by chance, he caught sight of her [Zainab’s] beauty, sinful lust fired up in his heart. To fulfil this wicked desire he arranged to get permission from heaven.
8 As regards a half of the ten commandments, Muhammad was grossly sinful.

Review Barāḥin Ahmadiyya by Rev. Thakur Das, published by the Mission Press, Ludhiana, 1889:
7 This licentious behaviour conclusively proves him to be cunning and devious.
We cannot call his claim to prophethood anything but fraud, cunning or delusion.

In the life of Muhammad, instead of perseverance and truth, what is entirely clear is opportunism and fraud.

Muhammad was an ignorant man ... why do you follow the ignorance of the ignorant?

*Biography of Muhammad* by Washington Irving, translation of Lala Ralia Ram Golati, published in Lahore:

167 Muhammad was infatuated with and captivated by the beauty and charms of Israelite women.

169 When he became the prophet of the sword, worldly desires and filth reduced his personal qualities to the base level.

272 In some matters, he was a follower of lust.

282 At the doubtful commencement of his prophethood he used to get help from the cunning and fraudulent preaching of his angel of revelation Waraqa [uncle of the wife of the Prophet].

284 Till the end of his life he was troubled and vexed by a particular kind of mental derangement and hysteria, and he died in the delusion and deception that he was a prophet.

*Newspaper Nūr Afshān, American Mission Press, Ludhiana:*

13 March 1896, p. 5:

(Quoting the case of a Muslim religious leader who fell in love with the wife of a follower and contrived to get her divorced and then married her, the newspaper says) This act does not surprise us because that religious leader was exactly following in the footsteps of his Prophet.

19 June 1896, p. 6:

Muhammad worshipped female beauty and was a womaniser. (Quoting an incident of the Holy Prophet kissing his daughter the newspaper says) Muhammad cunningly made up an excuse ... if Aishah had not caught Muhammad indulging in unlawful acts (according to the newspaper, this was kissing his daughter with lustful intent) ... these acts went beyond the normal limits and were full of sexual lust.

18 December 1896, p. 9:

(Counting the signs of a sinful people, such as its leaders uttering falsehood, committing murder, allowing pillage and robbery, considering adultery to be good news, etc.. it is written) To sum up, the nation of Muhammad was created as a people who would commit these sins.
**Abusive Language of Christian Preachers**

*Taftīsh-ul-İslām* by Rev. Rogers, 1870:

22 Afterwards, not content with merely this, he invented a new man-made religion based on his own ideas and superstitions.

49 The Quran contains false verses and many senseless verses.

52 A description of the obscene and filthy teachings of the Quran and Hadith.

65 Muhammad's character in no way befits the office of a prophet. He was a slave of his passions, full of the spirit of revenge, and a selfish man, entirely devoted to following his base desires. The Quran is a false book, fabricated by him, which encouraged and fostered his slavishness to his desires and his lustfulness. It does not contain even one verse which says, O Muhammad, why are you so bent on low desires and selfishness, or, why do you look at Zainab with a lustful eye.

97 All his works are marked by imposture. In Muhammad, both bigotry and fraud are to be found … along with a treacherous, selfish mind. In fact, his speech and his ways increased in evil with age … His beginning and his end was the utmost worship of lust.

Rev. Imad-ud-Din:

This man's writings, which were published before 1874, are full of such hurtful words that Christians themselves have rebuked him. I do not give quotations from them here but only reproduce those opinions which Hindus and Christians have expressed about his book *Hidıyat-ul-Muslimin*.

_Hindu Parkash,* Amritsar, 1874, and _Aftab,* Lahore: “Are the writings of Rev. Imad-ud-Din any less in inciting disturbances than that book which changed the harmony and amity between the Muslims and the Parsees of Bombay into animosity, and took both to the door of destruction? … His writings … have been written with the aim of making the Muslims disgusted with the British government.”

_Shams-ul-Akbar,* Lucknow, under management of Rev. Craven, 15 October 1875: “Niyāz-nama … does not incite hatred, like the writings of Imad-ud-Din which contain abuses. If there were to be again a mutiny like that of 1857, it would be due to the abusive and scurrilous language of his writings.”

_Nabī Ma'sūm* published by the American Mission Press, Ludhiana, 1884:

16 The illicit love which Muhammad indulged in with the Egyptian slave-girl named Mary.
Abuses of Hindus and Aryas

Padāsh Islām by Inderman Muradabadi, 1866:

... How much further can we go on quoting this man’s filthy writing? This book consists of 380 pages, and in the extracts given above up to page 50 we have omitted countless abuses. Thus, this author has used the following epithets:

For our God: Cruel, absurd, tyrannical, cunning, deceitful, extremely stupid and idiotic, sender of revelation to commit adultery ...

For the Holy Prophet Muhammad: Worse than a beast or donkey, idol-worshipper, violator of chastity of the women and the daughters of the Muslims, adulterer beyond all limits, womaniser, no different from the devil, absorbed in following lust, foolish, liar ...

For other prophets: sinful, Moses and Jesus, all wrong-doers, violators of the chastity of women, shedding blood and killing unjustly ...

For the wives of the Holy Prophet: Adulteresses of the Prophet, more degraded than harlots, in fact harlots are better than them, Aishah had no shame ...

For the companions of the Holy Prophet: Looked lustfully at the wives of the Prophet ...

For the believing women of the time of the Holy Prophet: The wives and daughters of the Muslims took payment in the market-place to have illicit sexual relations ...

For the four founders of jurisprudence: Abu Hanifa pronounced it lawful to commit incest with and marry the mother. He did not consider it wrong to commit incest with the mother, sister or daughter ...

For other respected elders of the religion of Islam: ... The saints of the Muslims were murderers, insane, and unholy adulterers.

For ordinary Muslims: A Muslim is allowed to have sexual relations with anyone in order to produce offspring. They are shameless, sellers of their own daughters, and just like the people of Lot. Their words are filthy, their beliefs dirty. They are worse than wild beasts and dogs.

2. Publisher’s Note: The extracts referred to here, from the first 50 pages of the book mentioned, have been omitted in this translation.
Satyarth Parkash by Pandit Dayanand, 1875, from the translation published by Kishen Chand Co., Lahore:

For Allah: Merciless, exceeding the devil in devilry (p. 683); deceitful, liar (p. 687); Is your God deaf that He can only hear when you call Him? (p. 712); no difference between Him and the devil (p. 706). …

For the Holy Prophet Muhammad: fabricated the Quran for his own ends (p. 703); used the name of God to entice men and women with greed for his own ends, otherwise no one would have been caught in his net (p. 719); even a savage refrains from touching his daughters-in-law, how outrageous that there is no stopping the prophet from satisfying his lust (p. 742); it is a wonder that someone who plunders and robs should be called a prophet of God and religious (p. 714). …

Miscellaneous: Such a teaching cannot be given by God or His messenger but only by an ignorant and selfish man (p. 697); What is the Muslim paradise but a whorehouse? (p. 711). …

For the Holy Quran: Muhammad fabricated this verse of the Quran for his own ends (p. 695); It is not the word of God but the word of a fraudster (p. 715); Such obscene talk cannot be found in the writing of a decent man, let alone the word of God (p. 731). …

Nuskh Khait Ahmadiyya by Lekhram of Peshawar, published 1888:

Leaving aside the original hurtful statements of this man, we list here in summary the deeply painful words he has used about our God, our Holy Prophet, our Islam and our scripture.

About God: Needy, cunning, mean, schemer, deceitful, deceived (p. 68); … God is the devil and the devil is God, He misguides (p. 255).

About our Holy Prophet: The most famous Arab in committing plunder and murder (p. 37); his heart was full of low desires, a slave to his base passions, he fabricated God’s commandment so that he could give vent to his selfish desires and hide his vices, womaniser and false claimant of revelation (p. 41, 42); schemer, cheat, lusting after women, wicked, hypocrite, fraudster, deceiver (p. 46, 47); worst enemy of mankind (p. 48); not ‘mercy to the nations’ but a curse to the nations (p. 62, 63); used zakat as a false excuse for gaining looted property (p. 65). …

Miscellaneous: Moses learnt the Oneness of God from the devil (p. 318); Islam begins and ends with the worship of lust (p. 42); Friday means the day of a wicked harlot (p. 175). …

About the Quran and Hadith: Its basis is false (p. 29); its teachings are very evil, mostly full of error, and by reading it a man becomes hard-hearted
and selfish (p. 43); its teaching about paradise is meant to please the licentious and the evil-doers (p. 44); its teachings spread dark misguidance, make people malicious and heartless, and allow the greed of lust (p. 49, 50); if the Quran were to be put to an end, the continent of Asia would be free of this disease (p. 273). …

*Takdhīb Barāhīn Ahmadiyya* by Pandit Lekhram, Arya Musāfīr, printed at Chashma Noor, Amritsar, 1890.

*Sabāt Tanāsakh* by Lekhram, printed by Mufid-i ‘Am, Lahore 1895.

### About myself

**Nazir Hussain of Delhi, known as Shaikh-ul-kull**

The ruling pronouncing me to be an unbeliever (*fatwā* of *ta khôr*), published in the journal *Isha’at-us-Sunna*, no. 5, vol. 13, was written by this Shaikh-ul-kull as the one replying to the enquiry. The writer has used the following words in it about me:

“Expelled from the *Ahl-i Sunna*. His religious practice is like that of the heretical esoteric sects, etc., who are misguided. Because of his false claims and publications and heretical practices, he can be called as one *dājjal* out of the thirty *dājjāl}s whose news is given in Hadith. His followers are likewise progeny of *dājjal*. He has fabricated a lie about God. His interpretations are heretical and corrupting [the religion]. He makes use of falsehood and concealment [of truth]. *Dājjal*, ignorant, stupid, a follower of innovations and misguidance.”

(pages 140, 141, 145, 152, 167, 180, 183, 185)

“Whatever we have said in reply to the question of the enquirer, and the ruling given regarding the Qadiani, is right. Now it is obligatory on Muslims to guard against such a lying *dājjal*. They must not have religious relations with him as there ought to be between Muslims. They must not show him love, nor be the first to salute him with *salam*, nor invite him socially as a Muslim is invited, nor accept his social invitations, nor pray behind him, nor say his funeral prayer…”

---

3. *Publisher’s Note*: As these two books use similar abusive language to the Arya books already quoted, we have not included any excerpts from them in this translation.
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Shaikh Muhammad Husain Batalvi, editor Ishā’at-us-Sunna, vol. 16, 1893:


The words quoted above have been given as a sample from just one issue of the magazine, and many other similar words contained even in just this issue have been omitted.

The Ghaznavi group

Maulvi Abdul Jabbar, in signing the above-mentioned ruling (fatwā) on page 200, has written the following:

“...The one who makes these claims is an enemy of the Messenger of God, ... one of those regarding whom the Messenger of Allah has said that in the Last Days liar dajjāls will be born. ... Be on your guard from such people, lest they lead you astray and into error. His followers are the eunuchs of the Hindus and the Christians.”

Ahmad Ibn Abdullah Ghaznavi writes on page 201:

“I say about the Qadiani what Ibn Taimiya said: Just as the prophets are the best of the people, likewise the worst of the people are those who are not prophets but claim to be prophets by pretending to be like the prophets. ... He is the worst of creation, the most degraded of all men. He will be thrown into the fire.”

Abdus Samad Ibn Abdulla Ghaznavi on page 202:

“Ghulam Ahmad Qadiani is a stupid, dull-headed trouble maker, and of forged views. He is misguided and misleads others. He is a hidden apostate, nay he is more misguided than the devil who is toying with him. If he dies while holding these beliefs, his funeral prayers cannot be said, nor can he be buried in an Islamic cemetery.”
Abdul Haq Ghaznavi in "Istithâr ِDarb-ul-na’âl ‘alâ wajh-ul-dajjâl," dated 3 Sha’bân 1314 A.H.:


"Ta’id Āsmânî" by Munshi Muhammad Jafar Thanaysri, 23 July 1892:

Mirza sahib is deceitful and misleads people (p. 2). Mirza sahib has forsaken the Friday congregation and the community of Muslims; a breaker of promise, miles away from the path of the Holy Prophet (p. 13). Mirza sahib is an imposter and a false claimant (p. 23). Cunning and fraudulent (p. 24). Spendthrift, prodigal, evasive (p. 28).

"Istithâr" by Maulvi Muhammad, Maulvi Abdullah, and Maulvi Abdul Aziz of Ludhiana, published 29 Ramadan 1308 A.H.:

“The sum and substance of all our writings, past and present, is that this man is an apostate (murtadd) and it is forbidden to the followers of Islam to have any connection with him. … Likewise, those who believe in him are also unbelievers (kâfir), and their marriage ties no longer remain valid. Anyone can marry their wives.”

Poem by Sa’dullah, new Muslim of Ludhiana, 23 Sha’bân 1313 A.H.:


"But Shâkin" by Muhammad Raza al-Shirazi al-Gharauwi Shi‘î, printed at Qamar-ul-Hind:

Mirza is a liar. Imposter. Talks nonsense. Destroyer. Cunning. Transgressor. Wrongdoer. Stupid. Misguided. Imbecile. What he has brought is vilification, filth and slander. His arguments are fabrications and lies. He has no evidence except that which is disgraceful and abominable. This liar will go to hell. Darkness, unbelief and transgression in the world is because of him.
These are the abusive words and insulting and derogatory statements that the Christian clergymen and the Aryas have used in their books concerning our leader and master, the chief of Messengers and the Last of the Prophets, on whom be peace and the blessings of Allah. Most of these books have been printed and published several times in the Punjab as well as throughout India, and are always given to the students of Christian mission schools for study, and are read out in streets and market-places. Christian women appointed for preaching carry them into the homes of Muslims. It is impossible for me
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to describe how much revulsion, pain and shuddering I felt in reproducing all these statements. If the court proceeding had not compelled me to include them and Dr. Clarke had not levelled the false accusation against me that I employ vituperative language against Christians, I would never have quoted in this book these poisonous words which have been written in regard to the status of the King of the truthful and the Best of the Messengers.

I regret that I had to present to the authorities these foul and offensive words only for the reason that Dr. Clarke produced before the court some ordinary and harmless words of mine and complained that “we are being attacked with such scurrilous words”. Since the worthy District Magistrate did not know how far the Christian clergymen had gone in the use of strong language, and because our reply had not been taken [in court], so he had no knowledge at all of the vituperation of the clergymen, consequently he came under the false impression that I had used the strong language. And because of this false impression he had even to issue a notice. Had our reply been taken, it would not have been possible that the worthy official would have judged our words to be harsh as compared to those of the Christian clergymen. For, harshness or mildness can only be determined by comparison. Especially in books of religious controversy, no judgment can be made about the severity or softness of a writer until the writing of the adversary has been compared. If merely the repudiation of opposing ideas is termed as harshness, I cannot think that any book of religious discussion can be found in the world which would be free of harshness under this definition. No, what constitutes abuse and severity is to refer to the sacred founder of a religion extremely disrespectfully and to make false accusations against him of depraved actions and low morals. This is the path adopted by the Christian clergymen and the Aryas. They attribute to our Holy Prophet, on whom be peace and the blessings of Allah, entirely by way of fabrication, groundless accusations [based on stories] not supported by any standard, authentic Islamic book.
The pain this inflicts on the hearts of the Muslims cannot be measured.

Besides, how can we indulge in harsh language in response to the Christian clergymen? For, just as it is incumbent on them to believe in the greatness and dignity of Jesus, on whom be peace, so also it is binding on us. We only limit the office of Divinity exclusively for the Exalted God, and in all other matters consider Jesus, on whom be peace, to be truthful and righteous and deserving every honour that is due to a true prophet. But do the Christian clergymen hold such a favourable view regarding our Prophet, on whom be peace and the blessings of Allah? Their kindest word would be that that man — I seek refuge with Allah — was an imposter and a liar. No Muslim can hear even this statement without pain and distress. To be God fearing, these people should have avoided even the use of the words imposter and liar, for the arguments they advance to raise a man to godhead, those signs and arguments are met with hundreds of times more in this perfect man. The preaching and teaching of this Holy Prophet breathed the spirit of belief in the Oneness of God in thousands of the dead. He did not depart from this world until he had converted thousands of human beings to belief in One God. He presented that God, to be believed in, Who is being shown by the laws of nature. He preached continence, piety, worship and love of God and showed thousands of heavenly signs which are being manifested till today. But alas, due to the emotion of prejudice, the

4. The signs and miracles of our Holy Prophet are of two kinds. Firstly, those which were manifested by his hand or saying or action or prayer, such miracles numbering about three thousand. Secondly, the miracles which are always being manifested through the followers of the Holy Prophet, and the number of such signs has reached hundreds of thousands. There has not passed any century in which such signs have not appeared. Accordingly, in the present age, the Exalted God is showing these signs through this humble one. From all these signs, whose continuity does not break off in any age, we know for certain that the Exalted God’s greatest Prophet and most beloved is Muhammad Mustafa, on whom be peace and the blessings of Allah. For, the followers of other prophets are in darkness, possessing only tales and stories of the past, while the Muslim
Christian clergymen paid no regard to the honour and dignity of this eminent man, and they have made use of the worst kind of shameful fabrications.

Here I also fear the criticism of some ignorant Muslims.
They may ask if it was necessary to reproduce in this book these filthy statements in which the Holy Prophet has been vilified so maliciously. I have already given the reply to this that, because of the notice which is included in the record of the case, it had become obligatory for me to present the real truth to our honourable government as to whether the harsh language came from me or from the Christian clergymen. Had I not corrected this misconception, how could the authorities know that it was a sheer falsehood of the Christian clergymen that the injustice and vituperation came from me. The Christian clergymen had created this as an obstacle and barrier, not only for me but for all the Muslims, so that no one in future should take a stand against them and should be afraid that his words, being construed as scurrilous, would be liable to action under the law. In other words, in this way the desire of the Christian clergymen would be fulfilled that they could inflict abuses exactly as they like but the other party could not raise its head against them even in a mild manner. Hence it was imperative that we apprise our honourable government of the true state of affairs. We know for certain that this government of ours will never show partiality to the Christian clergymen in religious matters, and having come to know that, in the controversies, excess has always been committed from the side of the Christian clergymen, it will consider as redundant and revoked that notice which was issued under a misconception.5

5. Publisher’s Note: In the original Urdu book, the author continues the footnote given on the last page to present a sketch of his life and an explanation of his mission and claims. That section, although arranged as a footnote appearing in the lower part of the pages, constitutes nearly one-third of the entire book. As it is really an independent study, its translation was published as a separate book in 1996 under the title A Brief Sketch of My Life.