

A Review of the Self-styled Ahmadiyya *Khilafat*

A baseless institution created in 1914

*Exposed as untrue
by its own contradictions*

**Compiled by
Dr. Zahid Aziz**

Ahmadiyya Anjuman Lahore Publications, UK
15 Stanley Avenue, Wembley, UK, HA0 4JQ
Published March 2020

Website: www.ahmadiyya.org

Email: info@ahmadiyya.org

[Link for accessing this booklet](#)

1. Introduction

In March 1914 a section of the Ahmadiyya Movement accepted Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad, a son of the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement and Promised Messiah, Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, as their *khalifa* and settled upon their main doctrine that, after the death of the Promised Messiah, Allah has established in the Ahmadiyya community an institution of *khilafat*. The basic concept of that system is that every *khalifa* is appointed by Allah, although he is chosen by a group of human beings, and all his words and actions are supported and confirmed by Allah as being right and correct. It is, therefore, incumbent on all those who accept the *khalifa* to render him their unquestioning and absolute obedience, as that is the only way of pleasing Allah. No criterion or standard, be it the Quran, the sayings and example of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, or human reason and logic, can be applied to judge the correctness of any command, statement or action of the *khalifa*. In no matter is the *khalifa* accountable before his followers.

Another group in the Ahmadiyya Movement, that is, those who founded the Lahore Ahmadiyya community, rejected such a concept of *khilafat* as it is not only against the teachings and practice of Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad and his successor Maulana Nur-ud-Din, but such an autocratic and a dictatorial headship is contrary to the religion of Islam itself. No sign or trace of it can be found in the life of the Holy Prophet Muhammad or the first four *khalifas* of Islam who followed in his footsteps. This group laid the foundations of the Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha'at Islam in Lahore in 1914.

In this booklet we have compiled essential information on this subject and shown that there is no legitimacy for such a *khilafat* system in the Ahmadiyya Movement. In particular, it is shown here that the steps taken to establish this *khilafat* by its creators, and their own pronouncements on this matter, reveal quite clearly that this system is simply baseless. In this booklet we have used the term

Qadiani *Jama'at* to denote the followers of the *khilafat* which was established at Qadian, India, by Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad, later moving its base to Rabwah in Pakistan, and its present centre being in England where the present *khalifa* Mirza Masroor Ahmad resides. The term Lahore *Jama'at* indicates those who, in 1914, rejected this *khilafat*, and established their centre at Lahore.

2. Publication of *Al-Wasiyyat*

Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad published a booklet entitled *Al-Wasiyyat* ('The Will') in December 1905, about two and a half years before his death, laying out how the Movement was to be managed after him. He announced the creation of a body (an *Anjuman*) and formulated its main objectives, rules and regulations. He wrote:

“For this purpose, an *Anjuman* is required which shall spend, as it determines fit, the funds which shall accumulate from this income, coming in from time to time, on proclaiming the teachings of Islam and propagating the message of the Oneness of God. ... and they shall spend it, by mutual agreement, on the advancement of Islam, the propagation of the Quran and other religious literature, and the preachers of this Movement, in accordance with the directions given above. ... Every form of activity that is included in the propagation of Islam, which it is premature to explain in detail at present, shall be carried out by means of these funds. And when one party responsible for this work have died, the people who are their successors shall also have the duty of carrying out all these functions in accordance with the rules of the Ahmadiyya Movement.”¹

As the booklet shows, he created this *Anjuman* to have control over all the income and expenditure of the Movement, and this system was meant to continue from one generation to the next.

1. *Al-Wasiyyat*, p. 17. See *Ruhani Khaza'in*, v. 20, p. 318–319.

He also published an Appendix to *Al-Wasiyyat*, in which he laid down rules and regulations of the Anjuman. One rule was as follows:

“9. The Anjuman, which is to hold these funds, shall not be entitled to spend the monies for any purpose except the objects of the Ahmadiyya Movement, and among these objects the propagation of Islam shall have the highest priority.”²

Therefore, the Anjuman was to be in control of all the finances and funds of the Ahmadiyya Movement. It was to receive all the income of the Movement and to determine how to spend it.

Another rule, on the same page, is as follows:

“13. As the Anjuman is the successor to the *khalifa* appointed by God, it must remain absolutely free of any kind of worldly taint.”

Here Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad calls the Anjuman as his successor (Urdu: *jansheen*). He himself is “the *khalifa* appointed by God” and his successor is the Anjuman created by him. Neither in *Al-Wasiyyat* nor anywhere else has the Promised Messiah mentioned a series of individuals who would be *khalifas* after him, and there is no mention by him of an institution of such a *khilafat* to be established after him in the Movement.

3. What is *qudrat sani*?

In *Al-Wasiyyat* the Promised Messiah has written that, after his death, Allah will send a second manifestation of His Divine power (*qudrat sani* or *saniyya*) to rescue and stabilise his community after him, just as during his life Allah helped him with the first manifestation of His power to make him succeed in his mission. It is claimed by the Qadiani *Jama'at* that this *qudrat sani* came in the form of their *khilafat* system established by Allah.

2. See *Ruhani Khaza'in*, v. 20, p. 325.

However, as soon as Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din became the head of the Movement, he instructed Maulana Muhammad Ali to publish an announcement to the Ahmadiyya community to pray for the coming of the *qudrat sani*. Consequently, in this announcement Maulana Muhammad Ali repeated the words of *Al-Wasiyyat*, in which the Promised Messiah directed, “So, in wait for the second power of God, you should gather together and pray”, and added the instruction from Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din as follows:

“In obedience to this order [of the Promised Messiah], Hazrat Maulvi [Nur-ud-Din] sahib has instructed that in all places where there are our members, they should gather together once every day, or however it may be possible, and within their regular prayers or outside these prayers they must pray for the coming of this promised *qudrat sani*.”³

If *qudrat sani* had already been manifested in the form of the establishment of the *khilafat* in the Ahmadiyya Movement, by Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din becoming the first *khalifa*, this announcement for prayer would be meaningless and without any purpose. There was no point in publishing this announcement in three issues of Ahmadiyya community newspapers!

Five years later, someone sent a question to Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din, asking: “What is meant by *qudrat saniyya*?” The question and the Hazrat Maulana’s reply were published in the Ahmadiyya community newspaper *Badr*. In his reply, referring to the manifestation of the power of God which took place in the lifetime of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, he said:

“...after him this manifestation continued in the times of his *khalifas*, deputies and *mujaddids*. They were all *qudrat saniyya*. *Qudrat saniyya* cannot be limited to a particular form. Whenever any nation becomes weak, then Allah the

3. *Badr*, 18 June and 25 June 1908, p. 1; *Al-Hakam*, 18 June 1908, p. 4.

Most High, out of His wisdom, sends the *qudrat saniyya* in order to strengthen it.”⁴

Nowhere in his reply does he say that *qudrat sani* is his *khilafat*. In fact, according to his reply the Promised Messiah himself is part of the *qudrat sani* granted to the Holy Prophet Muhammad, the manifestation of which began as soon as he died and will continue forever. An instance of the *qudrat sani* granted to the Promised Messiah is the Divine support which enabled the founders of the Lahore *Jama'at* in 1914 to save and rescue his real mission and claims, from being distorted and led in entirely the wrong direction.

As is well known, before his death the Promised Messiah was writing a lecture, *Paigham Sulh* or ‘Message of Peace’, while residing at Ahmadiyya Buildings, Lahore. This was due to be read at a public meeting on 31 May 1908. As he died on 26 May, Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din arranged for another public meeting, at University Hall, Lahore, on 21 June 1908, where he read out the lecture. A report of its proceedings was published in the Ahmadiyya community newspaper *Al-Hakam*. It has several paragraphs beginning with the words ‘**The day of 21st June**’ in bold. The last three are:

“**The day of 21st June** was one of the blessed days promised to his followers by the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement in his Will.

The day of 21st June was the day of the manifestation of an initial, brief glimpse of the *qudrat saniyya* for the community loved and honoured by God.

The day of 21st June is that holy and sacred day... when that great discourse which *Hazrat Aqdas* [the Promised Messiah] wrote as ‘Message of Peace’ in his last days ... was read out at University Hall, Lahore, in front of some

4. *Badr*, 22 May 1913, pages 3 – 4.

four thousand respected and educated persons belonging to all religions who had come from afar, by Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din in a magnificent and glorious way, and the function was completed in a peaceable and excellent manner.”⁵

Nowhere in this report is it mentioned that the manifestation of *qudrat sani* had taken place just three weeks before in the form of the *khilafat* established at the death of the Promised Messiah. Note that the Qadiani *Jama'at* celebrates *Khilafat* Day on 27 May every year, claiming that *qudrat sani* began its grand manifestation on 27 May 1908 by the establishment of the *khilafat* on that date. Yet this report in *Al-Hakam* of 10 July 1908, without at all mentioning the blessings of any *khilafat*, tells us that *qudrat sani* appeared at the hands of Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din on 21 June.

It may be added here that, in 1905, about one week after writing *Al-Wasiyyat*, the Promised Messiah gave a talk in which he expressed great dismay at the state of the *Jama'at* at the time. He said:

“If I look at the present condition of the *Jama'at*, I grieve very much at the fact that the [spiritual] condition is very weak and it has yet to progress through many stages. But when I look at the promises made to me by God, my grief turns into hope. . . . my worry is that at this time the *Jama'at* is in its infancy and my death is approaching. It is as if the *Jama'at* is like an infant who has taken milk for only a couple of days and its mother dies.”⁶

This deep worry and distress expressed by him contradicts entirely the claim of the Qadiani *Jama'at* that in his Will he was giving his followers the joyous news of the establishment of a *khilafat* which would rescue the Movement as soon as he died. In that case, he would have been expressing his joy and happiness to be

5. *Al-Hakam*, 10 July 1908, p. 2, col. 1.

6. Talk on 26 December 1905. *Malfuzat*, 1984 edition, v. 8, p. 298–299.

handing over the infant into the loving arms of the chain of *khalifas* to come after him who would protect the child forever.

4. Sadr Anjuman starts work during life of Promised Messiah

In February 1906, more comprehensive rules and regulations of the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya were published in the Ahmadiyya community newspaper *Badr* under the heading:

Regulations of the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya Qadian
Approved by Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, the Promised
Messiah.⁷

It is evident from these rules and regulations of the Anjuman, and the powers given to it, that the Promised Messiah established it as the supreme governing authority of the Ahmadiyya Movement after him. There is no sign or trace whatsoever in these rules of any system of personal *khalifat* or of any office of a *khalifa* having supreme authority over the Movement. The last rule is as follows:

“30. In every matter, for the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya, all the committees under it, and all its branches, the order of the Promised Messiah shall be final and binding.”

At the end of these regulations, it is stated:

“The Promised Messiah at this time appoints the following men as members and office-holders of the Council of Trustees (*Majlis-i Mu'timiddin*).”

Then a list is printed of the names of these fourteen men. Three of them are office-holders whose names occur as follows:

1. Hazrat Hakim Maulvi Nur-ud-Din of Bhera, President.
2. Maulvi Muhammad Ali, M.A., Ll.B., Secretary.
3. Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din, Attorney, Chief Court Punjab, Legal Advisor.

7. *Badr*, 16 February 1906, p. 5, and 23 February 1906, p. 8.

This Anjuman started its work immediately. About a year later, it so happened that Mir Nasir Nawab, father-in-law of the Promised Messiah, opposed a certain decision of the Anjuman. When this disagreement was brought to the notice of the Promised Messiah, he wrote down the following verdict about the authority of the Anjuman, in his own handwriting:

“My view is that when the Anjuman reaches a decision in any matter, doing so by majority of opinion, that must be considered as right, and as absolute and binding. I would, however, like to add that in certain religious matters, which are connected with the particular objects of my advent, I should be kept informed. I am sure that this Anjuman would never act against my wishes, but this is written only by way of precaution, in case there is a matter in which God Almighty has some special purpose. This proviso applies only during my life. After that, the decision of the Anjuman in any matter shall be final.

Was-salaam. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, 27 October 1907.”

The image of the original note, written in the hand of the Promised Messiah, has been published several times in Lahore Ahmadiyya literature. This clear verdict of the Promised Messiah confirmed the Anjuman’s position as the supreme authority of the Ahmadiyya Movement after his lifetime, its decisions being final and binding. No individual head or *khalifa* was to have the power to set aside, revoke, or go against the decisions of the Anjuman. As we will see later, the Qadiani *Jama'at khalifa* Mirza Mahmud Ahmad admitted in a speech in 1925 that there is no mention of the existence of any *khalifa* in the founding principles of this Anjuman.

5. After the Promised Messiah’s death

After the Promised Messiah’s death in May 1908, when the next annual gathering (*jalsa salana*) of the Ahmadiyya Movement took

place in December 1908, Maulana Muhammad Ali presented the report of the work of the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya on the morning of 27th December. At the end of his report, he read out the above handwritten note of Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. This was mentioned in the Ahmadiyya community newspaper *Badr* as follows in its news of the proceedings of this gathering:

“A handwritten note of the Promised Messiah was read, the summary of which is that after him all decisions of the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya will be final.”⁸

According to the news in *Badr*, after Maulana Muhammad Ali’s speech Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din addressed the gathering and spoke about the position of the Anjuman in the Movement as follows:

“Around about 22 December 1905 the Promised Messiah received a revelation that very few days remained [of his life]. Upon this, he immediately wrote and published his Will, and separated himself almost entirely from the management of the Movement, handing over all the work to the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya, as if he was ready to meet his Maker at any moment. Then God, in order to belie the predictions of certain false claimants to revelation, granted him life for a further two and a half years. Because of this, he saw in his own life the system working which was to come into effect after him. From 1882 to 1900 he sowed a crop entirely by his own labour with the help of God. But when the time came to reap the crop and eat the fruit, he gave it not to his offspring nor to his relatives, but to a man who had come from outside [meaning Maulana Nur-ud-Din]. For me there is no greater proof of his truth. The Holy Prophet Muhammad conquered the land but, in the end, made it unlawful for his own descendants to receive the

8. *Badr*, dated 24–31 December 1908, p. 13, col. 1.

zakat that came. This example of selflessness without personal interest was only again seen in the person of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, peace be upon him. ...

Anyhow, this Imam has appointed this Anjuman as his successor.”⁹

These speeches were delivered at the most important gathering in the calendar of the Ahmadiyya Movement. It was attended by the leading figures in the Ahmadiyya Movement including the head, Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din. Also present was Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad himself, who also gave an address, and others who were later prominent in the creation of the Qadiani *Jama'at*.

This also answers the frequently-raised Qadiani *Jama'at* objection, namely, that as the elders of the Lahore *Jama'at* accepted the first *khalifa*, they should also have accepted the second *khalifa*. They accepted the first *khalifa* because his *khilafat* was in accordance with the system established by the Promised Messiah, in which the Anjuman was the supreme executive body and there was no individual autocratic head above it. In the Qadiani *Jama'at* concept of the *khilafat* system, the *khalifa* wields absolute and autocratic power, he is taken by their members to be the representative of Allah on earth, whose every command must be obeyed with complete submission by the followers, and no one can question any order or action of the *khalifa* or hold him accountable. Everything that the *khalifa* says or does has the approval and support of Allah, and it is impossible for the *khalifa* to commit a sin. Such a *khilafat* was created by them at the time of the Split of 1914, and as this was in violation of the teachings of Islam, let alone the teachings of the Promised Messiah, this is why the Lahore Ahmadiyya *Jama'at* elders did not accept it.

When these speeches of December 1908 placed the true position of the Anjuman before the entire Ahmadiyya *Jama'at*, this was a

9. *Badr*, dated 24–31 December 1908, p. 13, col. 1.

cause of great perturbation, worry and alarm for the family members of the Promised Messiah who were dreaming of establishing a hereditary leadership in the Movement as a family dynasty. Such inherited seats of spiritual leadership had already come to exist in the earlier Sufi Orders in the Indian subcontinent after these movements had departed and deviated from the real teachings of their great, saintly founders. They realized that a hereditary successorship could not be established as long as the Anjuman was the supreme and sovereign executive of the Movement. They saw that a man from outside the family had become *khalifa*, and the other chief officeholders, Maulana Muhammad Ali and Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din, were also from outside the family. In fact, on becoming *khalifa* Maulana Nur-ud-Din had stated that it was a miracle of the spiritual progress of the Community that, while there existed several family members, a man was chosen to be *khalifa* who was in no way related to the Promised Messiah's family, not even having a tribal or ethnic relationship to the Promised Messiah.¹⁰ So they started raising questions as to who had the higher authority: the Anjuman or the *khalifa*? Their idea was to persuade Maulana Nur-ud-Din to declare that the *khalifa* was autocratic over the Anjuman. They also kept on telling Maulana Nur-ud-Din that the members of the Anjuman considered him as subordinate to them and did not accept him as their leader.

6. Maulana Nur-ud-Din's exposition of Anjuman's position

However, Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din in his Eid-ul-Fitr *khutba* of 16 October 1909 gave an explanation of the words of *Al-Wasiyyat* which supported the standpoint of the Lahore Ahmadiyya *Jama'at* elders. He said:

“In the writing of Hazrat sahib [i.e., the Promised Messiah] there is a point of deep knowledge which I will explain to you fully. He left it up to God as to who was going to be the

10. *The Review of Religions*, Urdu edition, June–July 1908, p. 260 and p. 263.

khalifa. On the other hand, he said to fourteen men: You are collectively the *Khalifat-ul-Masih*, your decisions are final and binding, and the government authorities too consider them as absolute. Then all those fourteen men became united in taking the *bai'at* (pledge) at the hand of one man, accepting him as their *khalifa*, and thus you were united. And then not only fourteen, but the whole community agreed upon my *khilafat*. ...

“I have read *Al-Wasiyyat* very thoroughly. It is indeed true that he has made fourteen men the *Khalifat-ul-Masih*, and written that their decision arrived at by majority opinion is final and binding. Now observe that these God-fearing men, whom Hazrat sahib chose for his *khilafat*, have by their righteous opinion, by their unanimous opinion, appointed one man as their *Khalifa* and *Amir*. And then not only themselves, but they made thousands upon thousands of people to embark in the same boat in which they had themselves embarked.”¹¹

This explanation clearly shows that the Promised Messiah made no mention of any individual to hold the office of *khalifa* in the Ahmadiyya Movement in a personal capacity. Instead, he appointed fourteen men, the members of the Council of Trustees (*Majlis-i Mu'timiddin*) of the Anjuman, as the *Khalifat-ul-Masih* collectively, and he declared their decisions as final and binding. In the eyes of the law of the land too, the decisions of the Anjuman were final and binding in the affairs of the Ahmadiyya Movement. Then these fourteen men, by unanimous agreement, decided to accept one man, Maulana Nur-ud-Din, as the head or *khalifa*. There was no *khilafat* of an individual in the Ahmadiyya community, nor did the Promised Messiah propose such a *khilafat* or even mention it. To accept one

11. *Badr*, Qadian, 21 October 1909, p. 11, col. 1.

man as *khalifa* was the decision of the Council of Trustees, a decision taken in the light of circumstances, not because there was such an office in the Ahmadiyya Movement of a person possessing autocratic power over the whole Movement.

7. Maulana Nur-ud-Din's visit to Lahore and speech in 1912

It is alleged by the Qadiani *Jama'at* that Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din had since early 1909 been greatly displeased with those who later founded the Lahore Ahmadiyya *Jama'at* and that he kept on reprimanding them for their disloyalty. From a speech he made in 1912 they present some quotations to the effect that he has been appointed *khalifa* by Allah and not by an Anjuman, and that he spits on an Anjuman which claims that it made him *khalifa*. First, we will reveal the true circumstances of that speech, which themselves show the high respect and regard that the Hazrat Maulana had for the Lahore Ahmadiyya elders. After that, we will reproduce his opinions expressed in other places, again showing his great regard for them.

This speech was delivered by Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din during his visit to Lahore in June 1912 at the mosque at Ahmadiyya Buildings. Here, only two years later, the Lahore Ahmadiyya *Jama'at* was founded. So the highly favourable opinions he has expressed during his visit about the people connected with this mosque cannot be dismissed as being just his early views.

Reports of that visit and his speeches were published in the Ahmadiyya community newspaper *Badr*. The purpose of his visit was to lay the foundation stone of a building belonging to Shaikh Rahmatullah, one of the fourteen men appointed by Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad to the Council of Trustees of the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya, who later became a founding member of the Lahore Ahmadiyya *Jama'at* at the Split in 1914.

At the foundation stone laying ceremony on 15 June 1912, Maulana Nur-ud-Din stated:

“My leader and my benefactor, the Promised Messiah, had promised Shaikh Rahmatullah that he would lay the foundation stone of his building with his own hands. It was the will of God that his promise should be carried out by a servant of his. The Shaikh sahib asked me to come. I am ill and in discomfort because of pain in various parts of my body, but there is an urge in my heart that I must fulfil the word of my beloved.”¹²

Shaikh Rahmatullah was prominent among the elders of the Lahore *Jama 'at*. His financial contributions played a vital role in the creation of the Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha'at Islam Lahore in 1914. Why would Maulana Nur-ud-Din undertake all this effort for Shaikh Rahmatullah if he were displeased with the Lahore members as alleged by the Qadiani *Jama 'at*?

The group of members who went with the Hazrat Maulana from Qadian to Lahore included the three sons of the Promised Messiah. In the same issue of *Badr* cited above, it is reported:

“In Lahore, Ahmadiyya Buildings had been chosen as the place of stay for the visitors. ... Hazrat *Khalifat-ul-Masih* [Maulana Nur-ud-Din] stayed at the residence of Dr. Mirza Yaqub Baig, which is situated within its bounds ...

“After arriving in Lahore, the first thing which pleased Hazrat *Khalifat-ul-Masih* [Maulana Nur-ud-Din] was the Ahmadiyya mosque, built in the middle of Ahmadiyya Buildings. He was the first to enter the mosque. After saying two *nafal* of *salat*, he said many prayers for the founders of the mosque, for their children, and for their future generations. He prayed so fervently that he said: ‘I am sure these prayers of mine have reached the *arsh* (Throne of Allah).’

12. *Badr*, 27 June 1912, p. 4, col. 2. Paragraph entitled: *Promise of the Hazrat Aqdas [the Promised Messiah] to Shaikh [Rahmatullah] sahib*.

We congratulate the *Jama'at* of Lahore on this good fortune. In the construction of this mosque, the entire *Jama'at* of Lahore has participated, each according to his means. However, when it was being built, we saw that the man who, more than anyone else, took pains over its construction and displayed the greatest zeal was our honoured friend Dr. Sayyid Muhammad Husain Shah. May Allah the Most High reward them all! After his return to Qadian, the Hazrat [Maulana Nur-ud-Din] also expressed his pleasure over the mosque in his first talk on the Quran.”¹³

According to the Qadiani *Jama'at* propaganda, these Lahore *Jama'at* elders, Shaikh Rahmatullah, Dr. Mirza Yaqub Baig, and Dr. Sayyid Muhammad Husain Shah, were at that very time leading the opposition to Hazrat Maulana's *khilafat*, and he castigated, condemned and warned them in a speech *during this very visit*. But the reality is clear from this report, that the Hazrat Maulana was in fact highly pleased with them and staying in their homes.

In the next two issues of *Badr*, that speech of Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din is published from which the Qadiani *Jama'at* propagandists quote certain extracts out of context in order to represent him as condemning and attacking the Lahore *Jama'at* elders. Here we reveal the truth about this speech.

In the speech, as soon as he turned to the topic of *khilafat*, he said:

“Even today someone said: There is great disagreement over the *khilafat* — those who were entitled to the right of *khilafat* did not get it, but it went to someone else. I said: Go and tell a Rafidi that the right belonged to Ali but Abu Bakr took it.”¹⁴

13. *Badr*, 27 June 1912, p. 3, col. 2.

14. *Badr*, 4 July 1912, p. 6, cols. 2 and 3.

By “Rafidis” are meant Shiahs who believe that Hazrat Ali was entitled to be the first *khalifa* on the basis of his close family relationship with the Holy Prophet Muhammad, but that his right was usurped by Hazrat Abu Bakr. He makes this point several times; for instance, the following is printed in large, bold lettering: “To raise the objection that the *khilafat* did not go to the rightful one is the creed of the Rafidis”.¹⁵

It could not possibly be the Lahore *Jama'at* elders who raised this objection because it is a fact agreed by all, friend and foe, that these elders did not believe in the Qadiani concept of a personal *khilafat*. So they could not be the ones raising the objection that the *khilafat* should rightfully have gone to someone else but instead it went wrongfully to Maulana Nur-ud-Din! He goes on to say:

“Now the question is: who has the right to the *khilafat*? One is my very dear Mahmud, who is son of my leader and benefactor. As son-in-law we can say Nawab Muhammad Ali Khan. Then as father-in-law there is the right of Nasir Nawab, or the mother of the faithful who is wife of Hazrat sahib. These are the people who can have the right of the *khilafat*. But it is strange that those people who argue about the *khilafat* and say that their right has been taken by someone else do not reflect on the point that all of these are obedient and faithful to me.”¹⁶

The people whom Maulana Nur-ud-Din is castigating are those who were saying that a member of the family of the Promised Messiah should have become *khalifa* instead of Maulana Nur-ud-Din. They were making the same complaint about him as the Shias make about Hazrat Abu Bakr, which in the words of the Hazrat Maulana is: “the right belonged to Ali but Abu Bakr took it”.

15. *Badr*, 4 July 1912, p. 7, col. 2.

16. *Badr*, 4 July 1912, p. 7, col. 1.

At this point, I (Zahid Aziz, writer of this booklet) may add an incident related by my maternal grandfather, Maulana Abdul Haq Vidyarthi, the famous debator of Islam, scholar of Sanskrit and world religions, and author of *Muhammad in World Scriptures*. He entered into the *bai'at* of the Promised Messiah in 1907. During the period of headship of Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din, he heard Mir Nasir Nawab, father-in-law of the Promised Messiah, openly saying to people in a public place: “The first *khilafat* went out of the family, but the second will be within the family.” I heard this from him in 1976, and after his death in November 1977 I published this incident in the Lahore Ahmadiyya Urdu journal *Paigham Sulh* in its special issue of 1 March 1978 on the life of Maulana Abdul Haq Vidyarthi.

The Qadiani *Jama'at* writers put forward the following words of Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din from this speech:

“I swear by God that: I too have been appointed *khalifa* by God.”¹⁷

But immediately after these words he says:

“This is the mosque which has pleased my heart very greatly. I have prayed much for its founders and those who assisted in its building, and I am sure that my prayers have reached the *arsh* (Throne of Allah). So, standing in this mosque which has pleased me very much — and when coming to this city what gives pleasure is to come to this mosque — I make it known that . . . it is Allah Who has made me *khalifa*.”¹⁸

It is a fact that those who built this mosque, and in whose charge it was, did **not** consider Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din to be appointed as *khalifa* by Allah in the sense in which the Qadiani *Jama'at* means

17. *Badr*, 4 July 1912, p. 6, col. 3.

18. *Badr*, 4 July 1912, p. 6, col. 3 to p. 7, col. 1.

that a *khalifa* is appointed by Allah. If the Hazrat Maulana had believed himself to be a *khalifa* in that sense, how could he have expressed such great pleasure towards people, and prayed for them, who did not consider him a *khalifa* of the kind that he was claiming to be? In this speech he is refuting the claims of those people who were saying that he became a *khalifa* by usurping the right of those who were genuinely entitled to it. So when he says that he was appointed as *khalifa* by God, he means that he did not become *khalifa* through some human pre-planning or scheming or taking away anyone else's right to *khilafat*. When he said:

“I was not made *khalifa* by any human being or by any Anjuman”¹⁹

he was addressing those people who were trying to create a hereditary *khilafat* and were alleging that the Hazrat Maulana was appointed *khalifa* by a few human beings, depriving anyone who was rightfully entitled to become *khalifa*.

Further on in this speech, Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din strongly warns these people to stop making unfounded allegations against the Lahore *Jama'at* elders. He said:

“The third thing is that some persons, who are known as my friends and are my friends, hold the view and say that the people from Lahore are an obstacle in the affairs of the *khilafat*. ... It is said in the Holy Quran: ‘O you who believe, avoid much of suspicion, surely suspicion is in many cases a sin’, and the Holy Prophet has said ‘suspicion is the worst kind of lie.’ ... Even now I have a slip of paper in my hand on which someone writes that the Lahore *Jama'at* is an obstacle in the way of the *khilafat*. I say to such critics, you are thinking ill of others, give it up. You should first of all try to make yourselves sincere as they are. The people of

19. *Badr*, 4 July 1912, p. 7, col. 1.

Lahore are sincere. They love Hazrat [Mirza Ghulam Ahmad] sahib. Human beings make mistakes and they too can make mistakes, it is human nature. But the works which they have performed, you should also try to do the same.

I say at the top of my voice that whoever thinks ill of the people from Lahore, saying that they are an obstacle in the way of the *khilafat*, he should remember that the Holy Prophet has referred to those who indulge in ill-thinking by calling it ‘the biggest lie’, and Allah says: ‘avoid much of suspicion, surely suspicion is in many cases a sin’, so it is called a sin by Allah. Thinking ill of others then leads to back-biting, and about that Allah says: ‘Do not backbite one another’. You mistrust the sincere ones and hurt me. Fear God. I pray for you, so do not deprive yourselves of my prayers.”²⁰

He went on to say:

“If you say that the people from Lahore are an obstacle in the *khilafat*, this is to think ill about my sincere friends. Give it up. ...

Remember what I have said and give up thinking ill of others and causing discord. Whatever decision Hazrat [Mirza Ghulam Ahmad] sahib has given in any matter, do not speak or act against it, otherwise you will not remain Ahmadis. Give up the notion that the people from Lahore are an obstacle in the affairs of the *khilafat*.”²¹

This is the reality of the speech about which the Qadiani *Jama'at* has spread the false idea that Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din reprimanded and chided the Lahore *Jama'at* in it. In fact, he severely

20. *Badr*, 11 July 1912, p. 4, cols. 1 and 2.

21. *Badr*, 11 July 1912, p. 5, cols. 1 and 2.

reprimanded the critics and opponents of the Lahore *Jama'at* elders, the people who were desirous of making Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad the next *khalifa*, and he told them: “You should first of all try to make yourselves sincere as the people of Lahore are sincere.”

Let us, for the sake of argument, assume that when Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din said, “it is Allah Who has made me *khalifa*”, he meant it in the sense in which the Qadiani *Jama'at* believes that the *khalifa* is appointed by Allah. The fact that in the same speech he has expressed such great love for the Lahore *Jama'at* elders, and declared them as sincere, shows that he respected and honoured those who did not consider him as appointed by Allah, and he treated them with tolerance and love. It was exactly this attitude which Maulana Muhammad Ali urged Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad to adopt at the death of Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din. For the sake of maintaining unity of the *Jama'at*, Maulana Muhammad Ali proposed to Mirza Mahmud Ahmad that a leader could be chosen but the taking of *bai'at* on his hand should not be required for existing Ahmadis, and both groups, while remaining in the same Ahmadiyya *Jama'at*, should present their standpoints before the whole community. Mirza Mahmud Ahmad rejected this proposal and refused to show the spirit of tolerance of Maulana Nur-ud-Din.

8. Maulana Nur-ud-Din's high regard for Lahore elders

Till the end of his life, Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din kept refuting the allegations made against the Lahore *Jama'at* elders by the supporters of Mirza Mahmud Ahmad. After the departure of Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din in 1912 for England, where he soon established a Muslim Mission and a monthly *The Islamic Review*, supporters of Mirza Mahmud Ahmad raised various objections against him. Maulana Nur-ud-Din said in his Friday *khutba* of 17 October 1913:

“You think ill of others. Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din does not

work out of hypocrisy. He works only for Allah. This is my belief about him. Of course, he can make mistakes. I am happy with his works. There is blessing in them. Those who spread mistrust about him are the hypocrites.”²²

In the *khutba* delivered on 7 November 1913, he said:

“Kamal-ud-Din is a good man. He is doing religious work. If he makes a mistake, [remember that] only God is pure ... He is engaged in a good work. None of you can compete with him. Ignore mistakes and look at goodness. ...

Kamal-ud-Din has not gone there [to England] for personal ends. He has not cared even for his family. Someone wrote that Kamal-ud-Din has shaved his beard [in England]. The other day I saw his photo. The beard is there. I think that even if he had shaved his beard, I would still say about the work for which he has gone there, that it is good. If there is some fault, I myself overlook it. There is no one who is free from faults. ...

Can any of you do the work which Kamal-ud-Din is doing? If he commits a fault, what does it matter?”²³

These *khutbas* were published at that very time in *Al-Fazl*, the newspaper founded in 1913 by Mirza Mahmud Ahmad, of which he was also the editor at that time.

Likewise, the correspondence between Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din in England and Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din in Qadian, published in the Ahmadiyya community newspapers from 1912 to 1914, largely in *Badr*, shows the love and informality that existed between them.

It was in 1909 that Maulana Muhammad Ali started work on his English translation of the Quran with explanatory notes. He used to

22. *Khutbat Nur*, p. 622, from *Al-Fazl*, 22 October 1913, p. 15, col. 2.

23. *Ibid.*, p. 631–632, from *Al-Fazl*, 12 November 1913, p. 15, col. 3, margins.

visit Maulana Nur-ud-Din to read to him his notes and to take guidance and advice from him. It was reported in *Al-Fazl*:

“Maulana Muhammad Ali, may Allah reward him, has completed the translation itself of the Holy Quran, and is now writing the notes which have reached the end of Part 23. ... The Maulana reads out the translation and the notes to Hazrat *Khalifat-ul-Masih*.”²⁴

Even in the last two months of his life in 1914, when he was critically ill, Maulana Nur-ud-Din was anxious to receive Maulana Muhammad Ali and listen to his notes. Reports of his health and activities were published in *Paigham Sulh* at the time. Here are some extracts from them:

“9 February 1914 — ... Then he said: ‘Maulvi [Muhammad Ali] sahib has pleased me very much, I am so happy. What wonderful research he has done on Gog and Magog, Companions of the cave and Dhu-l-Qarnain! He has searched through encyclopaedias. How clearly he has solved this problem! Marvellous!’ ”²⁵

“11 February 1914 — When Maulvi Muhammad Ali sahib arrived to read the translation of the Holy Quran, Hazrat *Khalifat-ul-Masih* said to him: ‘Come that I may live!’ ”²⁶

“18 February 1914 — While he was in a state of extreme weakness ... Maulvi Muhammad Ali sahib came as usual to read out notes from the Holy Quran. ... Then he addressed Maulvi Muhammad Ali sahib and said: ‘Seeing you every day is also food for my soul’. Then he added: ‘Maulvi sahib, you are very dear to me. ...’

24. *Al-Fazl*, 26 November 1913, front page, col. 2.

25. *Paigham Sulh*, 15 February 1914, p. 1, col. 2.

26. *Paigham Sulh*, 26 February 1914, p. 4, col. 3.

Then he added: ‘This translation will *inshallah* be beneficial in Europe, Africa, America, China, Japan and Australia’.”²⁷

“22 February 1914 — He was very cheerful today. ... When told that Maulvi Muhammad Ali sahib had come to read to him the [translation and notes of the] Quran, he said: ‘He is most welcome. Let him read it. Does my brain ever get tired of it?’ Then he pointed towards his bed and said: ‘Let Maulvi Muhammad Ali sahib come near me’. Then added: ‘He is very dear to me’.”²⁸

Mirza Mahmud Ahmad’s own paper *Al-Fazl* reported:

“This week Hazrat *Khalifat-ul-Masih* was generally unwell, with coughing and great weakness. ... Despite this condition ... he listens to the notes of the English translation of the Quran after *Zuhr*.”²⁹

“23 February — ... Even in this condition [of great weakness] he gives directions about the English translation of the Quran. The way he does it is that after listening to the verses of the Quran he gives important references.”³⁰

Five years before these events, shortly after he became Head of the Ahmadiyya Movement, Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din mentioned Maulana Muhammad Ali in the following words:

“I said to Maulvi Muhammad Ali sahib, who is at this time a friend of mine and my arm, at whose sincerity I am amazed and I envy it also, ...”³¹

27. *Paigham Sulh*, 3 November 1935, p. 2, cols. 2 and 3.

28. *Paigham Sulh*, 15 November 1935, p. 2, col. 3.

29. *Al-Fazl*, 28 January 1914, front page, col. 1.

30. *Al-Fazl*, 25 February 1914, front page, col. 1.

31. *Badr*, 14 January 1909, p. 15, col. 3.

9. Establishment of the Qadiani *khilafat*: Removal of the powers of the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya

As soon as Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din died in March 1914, the *khilafat* of Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad was established in Qadian. There is no scope in this booklet to go into the details of how he became *khalifa*. Those events are covered in detail in other Lahore Ahmadiyya literature; for instance, the biography of Maulana Muhammad Ali entitled *Mujahid-i Kabir*, translated into English as *A Mighty Striving*, the Maulana's own book *Haqiqat-i Ikhtilaf*, and the book *The True Succession*, published in 2014 at the centenary of the founding of the Ahmadiyya Anjuman Lahore.

Here we will show that the fundamental steps taken by Mirza Mahmud Ahmad to establish his *khilafat*, and his own statements in that connection, themselves prove that the system he created was in contradiction and conflict with what the Promised Messiah had set up and which Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din had followed.

Upon becoming *khalifa*, Mirza Mahmud Ahmad, by suppressing the freedom of expression of opinion in Qadian, made the Council of Trustees of the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya Qadian to pass the following resolution:

By Resolution 198 of the *Majlis-i Mu'timiddin* (Council of Trustees) held in April 1914 it was resolved that, in Rule no. 18 of the rules of the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya Qadian, in place of the words "Promised Messiah" the words "Hazrat *Khalifat-ul-Masih* Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad, the second *Khalifa*" shall be entered. Therefore, Rule no. 18 shall now be as follows: "In every matter, for the *Majlis-i Mu'timiddin* and its subordinate branches, if any, and for the Sadr Anjuman and all its branches, the order of Hazrat *Khalifat-ul-Masih* Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad the second *Khalifa* shall be absolute and final."³²

32. *Review of Religions*, Urdu ed., April 1914 and May 1914, inside of front cover.

By this resolution, Mirza Mahmud Ahmad removed from the Anjuman its position of supreme authority given to it by the Promised Messiah, and raised himself to the Divinely-appointed status of the Promised Messiah by writing his own name in Rule no. 18, giving his orders supremacy over the Anjuman's decisions. The wording of the resolution shows that during the headship of Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din the Rule no. 18, referred to, continued to contain the words "Promised Messiah". No amendment was made to replace them by the words "Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din, the first *Khalifa*." Therefore, the sense in which Mirza Mahmud Ahmad made himself *khalifa* was entirely different from, and quite opposed to, the sense in which Maulana Nur-ud-Din was *khalifa*. This was why the Lahore *Jama'at* elders, while they had accepted Maulana Nur-ud-Din as *khalifa*, could not accept Mirza Mahmud Ahmad as *khalifa*.

10. Mirza Mahmud Ahmad still entertains fear of Sadr Anjuman and his final solution

By means of the resolution mentioned above, Mirza Mahmud Ahmad arrogated himself to the position of an absolute, autocratic leader whose orders had to be obeyed unquestioningly by everyone in the Movement. Despite this amendment, and despite the fact that the Council of Trustees of the Anjuman now consisted entirely of his own pledged disciples, he still felt afraid and insecure that the Anjuman might seek to regain its authority some time in the future.

More than eleven years had passed over this, when in October 1925 Mirza Mahmud Ahmad delivered a speech in which he revealed his anxiety about the Anjuman re-asserting its powers and the danger this posed for the Qadiani *khilafat*. The speech was published under the title *Jama'at Ahmadiyya ka jadid nizam 'amal* ('A New System of Operation for the Ahmadiyya Movement') in *Al-Fazl* in October and November 1925. It is included in the collection of Mirza Mahmud Ahmad's writings and speeches entitled

Anwar-ul-'Ulum at volume 9, book number 9, pages 125–146. Here we give references to the pages of this volume.

Just after the opening of his speech, he said:

“As I have said again and again, the name Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya and its method of working were devised by others and not by the Promised Messiah. But since the approval of the Promised Messiah had been given in respect of it, I have decided that all those names which were established during the time of the Promised Messiah should be retained.” (p. 127)

So, according to Mirza Mahmud Ahmad, the name of the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya and its rules were “devised by others” and merely approved by the Promised Messiah. It did not occur to the Promised Messiah, nor to Maulana Nur-ud-Din in his time, that this system places the Movement in great danger; so now Mirza Mahmud Ahmad is going to rectify the Promised Messiah’s error, twenty years later! He also makes the baffling statement that he has decided to retain “all those names which were established during the time of the Promised Messiah” but alter the concept behind them. To us it seems that he did the same to the name ‘Ahmadiyya’ itself. He retained this name for the *Jama'at*, because the Promised Messiah had given it, but he altered its teachings, beliefs and aims!

Later in his speech, Mirza Mahmud Ahmad said:

“The first point is that the founding principle of the Council of Trustees (*Majlis-i Mu'timiddin*) did not include the existence of the *khalifa* of the time, which is the very fundamental issue in Islam. A resolution has been passed during the second *khilafat* to the effect that the Council must accept whatever the *khalifa* says.” (p. 132)

He is referring here to the resolution of April 1914 mentioned above.

He continued as follows:

“But this is not a matter of principle. What it means is that a body of members says that it would do so. However, the body which is entitled to say this, can also say that it shall not do so. For, the Anjuman which can pass the resolution that it shall obey the *khalifa* in everything, if ten years later it says that it shall not obey him, it is entitled to do so according to the rules of the Anjuman. Or if the Anjuman says that it will obey this *khalifa* in everything but will not obey another one, it has the right to do so according to its rules, as happened in the time of the first *khalifa*.” (p. 132)

Here Mirza Mahmud Ahmad has made a number of admissions, as follows:

1. There is no mention of the concept or the institution of a personal *khilafat* in the basic principles of the Anjuman, upon which it was created by the Promised Messiah.
2. It is within the Anjuman’s powers to revoke at any time its resolution, which he got it to pass in April 1914, to follow the *khalifa*’s orders. Then it would not be required for this Anjuman to obey the *khalifa*.
3. In the closing words about “the first *khalifa*”, he clearly admits that it was the Anjuman’s own decision to “obey this *khalifa* in everything”. The Anjuman was not bound to do so because of some principle or doctrine. He acknowledges that the Anjuman had “the right ... according to its rules” to decide to obey the first *khalifa* but not give the same status to the second *khalifa*. This admission made by Mirza Mahmud Ahmad is the answer to the objection which members and missionaries of the Qadiani *Jama’at* are till today putting to Lahore *Jama’at* members: “Your elders accepted the first *khalifa*, so why didn’t they accept the second

khalifa?” The answer is: They did not accept him because, as Mirza Mahmud Ahmad admits here, “according to the rules of the Anjuman” they had “the right to do so”.

Continuing his speech from the point where we left it above, Mirza Mahmud Ahmad said:

“For the sake of the issue of *khilafat* we had to make an unparalleled sacrifice. And that was that we sacrificed for its sake the old followers of the Promised Messiah, those who were called his friends, those who had a very close relationship with him. If this religious difference had not arisen between them and ourselves, they would be dearer to us than our own children because they included those who knew the Promised Messiah and those who were his companions, and had worked with him. ... So, over this issue, we have made such a magnificent sacrifice that no other sacrifice can equal it. ... Here we had to sacrifice a part of our Movement.” (p. 132)

Mirza Mahmud Ahmad has admitted here the close and long-standing connection of the Lahore *Jama'at* elders with the Promised Messiah. Yet he and his *Jama'at* also blacken their character with the worst possible epithets. In his well-known earlier book *Ainah-i Sadaqat*, translated into English as *Truth About the Split*, Mirza Mahmud Ahmad called them hypocrites who only had a “lukewarm” and “weak” faith in the Promised Messiah and were critical of him in his lifetime. He accused them of deceiving Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din and carrying out “intrigues” against him. If they were people of such a despicable character and behaviour, who were disloyal even to the Promised Messiah, why did Mirza Mahmud Ahmad consider them as “dearer to us than our own children”?

In his book *Truth about the Split*, Mirza Mahmud Ahmad also wrote that when “Maulawi Muhammad Ali and his friends departed

from Qadian” this fulfilled the revelation of the Promised Messiah that “Men of Yazid-like disposition would be expelled from Qadian”.³³ If this was really their disposition, he could not call their departure as an “unparalleled” and “magnificent” act of sacrifice made by the Qadiani *Jama'at*. Making a sacrifice means to lose something valuable and worthy, not the act of discarding something harmful and dangerous like people of a Yazid-like disposition. Again, if the commonly-made allegation of the Qadiani *Jama'at* had been true, that Maulana Muhammad Ali left Qadian because he failed to become *khalifa*, his departure would be his own act and not an act of sacrifice by the Qadiani *Jama'at*.

His speech continues, from where we left off above, as follows:

“If even after so much sacrifice the Movement still remains insecure, that is, it is at the mercy of a few men who can, if they so wish, allow the system of *khilafat* to continue in existence, and if they do not so wish, it cannot remain in existence, this cannot be tolerated under any circumstances. Because the institution of *khilafat* was not included in the basic principles of the *Jama'at*, the *Jama'at* remains in the

33. *Truth About the Split*, by Mirza Mahmud Ahmad, 2007 edition, p. 391.

A few years after writing these words Mirza Mahmud Ahmad had to flee Qadian for Lahore, along with many of his followers, at the partition of India in 1947. They came to Pakistan as Muslims, being considered in the same category as all those other Muslims whom they had been declaring as *kafir*. He and his brothers were thus deprived of burial in the *Bihishti Maqbara* in Qadian, having boasted for years after 1914 that Maulana Muhammad Ali and his companions were deprived of burial there. The next two Qadiani *khalifas*, Mirza Nasir Ahmad and Mirza Tahir Ahmad, were also deprived of burial in that cemetery. In 2008, under the present *khalifa* Mirza Masroor Ahmad, a centenary celebration of the *khilafat* was announced to be held in Qadian in December of that year. The *khalifa* went to India to attend the celebrations. However, certain national events took place in India which led to Mirza Masroor Ahmad having to abort his visit and leave the country before visiting Qadian. So he was deprived of celebrating the centenary of his *khilafat* system in Qadian.

danger which can turn pledged members into non-pledged members, and by the stroke of the pen of ten or eleven men Qadian can at once become Lahore.” (p. 132–133)

Firstly, the question arises that if the system of *khilafat* is established by Allah, how can its existence be “at the mercy of a few men”, so that if they do not allow it to exist “it cannot remain in existence”? The system of prophethood was established by Allah, as all Muslims, including the Qadiani *Jama'at*, believe. This system was never at the mercy of any human beings whatsoever, who could stop it from continuing. If the system of *khilafat* depends on human beings who may or may not allow it to exist, as Mirza Mahmud Ahmad says, then it cannot be a system ordained by God because human beings cannot stop the work of God.

Secondly, Mirza Mahmud Ahmad admits that what makes Lahore different from Qadian is that the Lahore Ahmadis hold the Anjuman to be supreme, and if this supremacy was again accepted in Qadian then Qadian would “become Lahore”. This statement again disproves the Qadiani *Jama'at* allegation that Maulana Muhammad Ali wanted to become *khalifa* in Qadian. If that were true, then the only way in which Qadian could become Lahore would be if the Qadiani *Jama'at* accepted the Maulana as their *khalifa*.

In his “new system of operation for the Ahmadiyya Movement”, sketched out in this speech, “the name Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya would mean the *khalifa* and his advisors”. The role of the advisors would only be to advise, while decision-making would only be in the hands of the *khalifa* (p. 134).

This speech of Mirza Mahmud Ahmad is clear proof that while the Qadiani *Jama'at* claims that their *khilafat* was established on 27 May 1908, the day after the death of the Promised Messiah, through Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din becoming the *khalifa*, in fact the *khilafat* of their conception was not established until October 1925.

Mirza Mahmud Ahmad had then been *khalifa* for more than eleven years. Up to that point, as he says, the Movement remained in the danger that “by the stroke of the pen of ten or eleven men”, meaning the members of the Council of Trustees of the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya under Mirza Mahmud Ahmad, a resolution could be passed that they would not obey the *khalifa* and, as a result, Qadian would suddenly become Lahore.

11. Did the Promised Messiah mention a *khilafat* after him in his book *Shahadat-ul-Quran*?

Sometimes Qadiani *Jama'at* members claim that the Promised Messiah wrote in his book *Shahadat-ul-Quran* that *khilafat* in his *Jama'at* will be ever-lasting. The present *khalifa* Mirza Masroor Ahmad had to raise this topic in his Friday *khutba* of 27 May 2005. He explained that some members of his *Jama'at* were distributing an article by Mirza Bashir Ahmad, brother of Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad, written during the *khilafat* of the latter, expressing the view that a time will come when the *khilafat* of their *Jama'at* will not remain the true *khilafat*, and that just as the *Khilafat Rashida* after the Holy Prophet Muhammad ended after the fourth *khalifa*, Hazrat Ali, and became merely a worldly kingship, similarly the *khilafat* of the Qadiani *Jama'at* will, after a few *khalifas* (meaning after four), not remain the true Islamic *khilafat* ordained by Allah.

While contradicting this view, Mirza Masroor Ahmad presented the following quotation from *Shahadat-ul-Quran*:

“Now it should be remembered that although there are many verses of this kind in the Holy Quran, giving the glad tidings of an ever-lasting *khilafat* in this *Ummah*, and Hadith is full of reports about this as well, for the moment this much will suffice for those who accept proven facts like a great treasure. There could be no worse misgiving about Islam than to consider it to be a dead religion and to believe its

blessings to be limited only to the first generation. (*Ruhani Khaza'in*, v. 6, p. 355).”³⁴

From this he concludes that “the institution of *khilafat* will continue in existence forever”. However, a reading of this book will show that to present the words “an ever-lasting *khilafat* in this *Ummah*” as referring to the so-called *khilafat* in the Ahmadiyya Movement after the Promised Messiah is nothing but a complete distortion. What he is discussing at length in this book is that the *khilafat* of the Holy Prophet Muhammad did not end, as believed by some Muslims, after the four righteous *khalifas*, but that it continued throughout the history of Islam in the form of the appearance of *mujaddids* and saints, and that he is one of those *mujaddids* and saints and is himself a *khalifa* of the Holy Prophet. The only *khilafat* he mentions in this book is the *khilafat* of the Holy Prophet and it is this which, he says, is ever-lasting. Leaving aside the rest of the book, if we simply continue the above quotation, it reads as follows:

“Does the Book [i.e., the Quran] which opens the door to ever-lasting blessings teach the disheartening lesson that there is no blessing or *khilafat* to look forward to, but that all has been left behind? Prophets certainly cannot arise in this *Ummah*, but if *khalifas* of the Holy Prophet do not come either, showing the marvels of spiritual life from time to time, then the spirituality of Islam comes to an end.”

This statement of the Promised Messiah refutes two basic doctrines of the Qadiani *Jama'at*. Firstly, it says that prophets *cannot* come in the Muslim *Ummah*, while the Qadiani *Jama'at* members believe that prophets *can* come among Muslims. Secondly, he himself is a *khalifa* of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, while the Qadiani *Jama'at* members believe that the Promised Messiah was a prophet, after whom his own *khilafat* was established.

34. *Khutbat Masroor*, v. 3, p. 315–316.

12. *Khilafat of Hazrat Abu Bakr and of Yazid*

During his Friday *khutba* on the occasion of *Muharram* delivered on 23 November 2012, the present *khalifa* Mirza Masroor Ahmad quoted the views of the Promised Messiah about Hazrat Abu Bakr and Hazrat Imam Husain to show the high regard in which he held these great holy figures. But a little reflection shows that what the Promised Messiah has written there is in complete conflict with the basic beliefs of the Qadiani *Jama'at*.

Regarding Hazrat Abu Bakr, Mirza Masroor Ahmad presents some views of the Promised Messiah from his Arabic book *Sirr-ul-Khilafah*. The first quotation he gives is as follows:

“I have been given the knowledge [i.e., by Allah] that the Siddiq [i.e., Abu Bakr] was the greatest in glory and highest in status among all the Companions. Undoubtedly he was the first *khalifa* and the verses about *khilafat* were revealed about him.” (*Ruhani Khaza'in*, v. 8, p. 337)³⁵

This is the topic of discussion in this book: that the *khilafat* verse of the Quran gives the promise of *khalifas* of the Holy Prophet Muhammad arising among Muslims. Nowhere in it does the Promised Messiah mention any *khilafat* to start after him in the Ahmadiyya Movement, even though he devotes the second chapter of this book to his own claim to be Mahdi.

Only a little before the above extract given by Mirza Masroor Ahmad, the Promised Messiah quotes the *khilafat* verse of the Quran (24:55) and writes:

“Allah indeed promised in these verses to raise a *khalifa* for the Muslim men and women out of His grace and mercy and change their state to security after their fear. This we do not

35. *Khutbat Masroor*, v. 10, p. 721. There is a Qadiani *Jama'at* Urdu translation of *Sirr-ul-Khilafah*, in which see p. 56 (we hereafter call it: ‘Urdu translation’).

find fulfilled in the most perfect and complete sense except in the *khilafat* of Abu Bakr.”³⁶

“In short, all these verses give the news about the *khilafat* of Abu Bakr, and they do not apply to anyone else ... There is no doubt that the one who fulfilled this news is none other than Abu Bakr and his time.”³⁷

So, according to the Promised Messiah, the *khilafat* verse of the Holy Quran in its most perfect sense applied only to the *khilafat* of Hazrat Abu Bakr even among the *khalifas* of the Holy Prophet Muhammad. This verse then cannot apply at all to the successive heads of the Qadiani *Jama'at*, as they are not even *khalifas* of the Holy Prophet Muhammad. Even by their own claim, they are *khalifas* of the Promised Messiah.

Mirza Masroor Ahmad gives another extract from *Sirr-ul-Khilafah* about Hazrat Abu Bakr as follows:

“By God! He was the second Adam of Islam and the first manifestation of the light of the Holy Prophet. He was not a prophet, but in him were found the powers of the messengers.” (*Ruhani Khaza'in*, v. 8, p. 336)³⁸

This shows clearly that just because a person is known by the name of a prophet, the “second Adam” in this case, and is said to possess the powers of prophets, it does not mean that he was a prophet. The same applies to Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. Although he was the Promised Messiah and the like of Jesus, he was not a prophet. Later on, in the same book, the Promised Messiah again writes about Hazrat Abu Bakr:

36. *Ruhani Khaza'in (RK)*, v. 8, p. 334; Urdu translation: p. 47.

37. *RK*, v. 8, p. 336; Urdu translation: p. 53 and p. 54.

38. *Khutbat Masroor*, v. 10, p. 722; Urdu trans. of *Sirr-ul-Khilafah*: p. 51–52.

“He was like the *zill* [shadow or reflection] of our Messenger and Master, the Holy Prophet, in all his character, and he had a connection with him from eternity.”³⁹

Despite being a *zill* of the Holy Prophet “in all his character” (*jamī‘-ul-ādāb*), Hazrat Abu Bakr was not a prophet. Therefore, being a *zill* of the Holy Prophet does not make such a person a prophet, which is exactly the case with the Promised Messiah.

We may add here that in this book *Sirr-ul-Khilafah* the Promised Messiah has given his claim as that of being the *Mujaddid* of the century and a *muhaddas* (one who is not a prophet but receives revelation). Right at the beginning of the book he writes:

“When Allah appointed me and gave me the good news of being the *Mujaddid* of this century and the Promised Messiah of this *Ummah*...”⁴⁰

Later he writes:

“I was granted the insight of *muhaddasīn*.”

“This [verse 15:9 of the Quran] points to the appointment of the *Mujaddid* in the age of tribulations.”

“Allah appoints a *Mujaddid* of the religion at the head of every century. ... Eleven years have passed over the head of the century but you have not thought over this.”⁴¹

The book has appended to it an open letter by the Promised Messiah addressed to several of his opponent Maulvis by name. There too, near the beginning, he tells them:

“The head of the century has passed which you were waiting for. So ponder: why has that *Mujaddid* not arisen whom you

39. *RK*, v. 8, p. 356; Urdu translation: p. 103.

40. *RK*, v. 8, p. 318; Urdu translation: p. 4.

41. *RK*, v. 8, p. 325, 362 and 383; Urdu translation: p. 24, 119 and 174.

were awaiting? ... He [Allah] has made me a *Mujaddid* that I may judge between you in matters in which you differ. ... By Allah! I do not claim prophethood.”⁴²

Sirr-ul-Khilafah is, in fact, a complete refutation of the doctrines that Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad was a prophet and that the *khilafat* verse of the Quran promised the founding of a *khilafat* after him.

Later in his *khutba*, coming to Hazrat Imam Husain, Mirza Masroor Ahmad refers to an incident in the life of the Promised Messiah and quotes the Promised Messiah as follows:

“Let it be known that I have learnt from a postcard sent by someone that some foolish men who describe themselves as belonging to my *Jama'at* say about Hazrat Imam Husain that, God forbid, because he did not enter into the *bai'at* of the *khalifa* of the time, namely, Yazid, therefore Husain was a rebel and Yazid was on the side of right. ‘May the curse of Allah be on the liars.’ I do not expect that such evil words would come from the lips of any righteous person from my *Jama'at*. ...

“I inform my *Jama'at* by this notice that we believe that Yazid was of an impure nature, bent low upon this world, and unjust. The sense in which a person can be called a believer, such a meaning did not apply to him. ... He was blinded by love for this material world. Imam Husain, on the other hand, was perfectly pure, and is without doubt one of those eminent persons whom God purifies by His own hand, and fills with His love, and no doubt he is one of the leaders of the dwellers of paradise...”⁴³

42. *RK*, v. 8, p. 422; Urdu translation: p. 232.

43. *Khutbat Masroor*, v. 10, p. 726 and 727. This writing of the Promised Messiah is a Notice entitled *Tabligh-i Haqq*, published 8 October 1905; see *Majmū'a Ishihārāt*, v. 3, p. 544–547, *Ishihār* number 263.

It is a most fundamental doctrine of the Qadiani *Jama'at* that a *khalifa* is appointed by Allah and that it is absolutely essential that everyone must enter into the *bai'at* of the *khalifa* and obey him unreservedly and unquestioningly. In this *khutba* the Qadiani *Jama'at khalifa* reads out from a notice issued by the Promised Messiah himself, saying that in the case of Yazid and Imam Husain it was the *khalifa* of the time who was the embodiment of wickedness and immorality, and it was the man who refused to pledge the *bai'at* to him who was a purified and chosen one of Allah.

The disrespectful statement about Hazrat Imam Husain made by some members of the Ahmadiyya Movement, for which the Promised Messiah so strongly reprimanded them, is exactly what members of the Qadiani *Jama'at* say commonly about Maulana Muhammad Ali: that because the Maulana did not enter into the *bai'at* of the *khalifa* of the time, he was therefore a sinner and rebel.

13. *Khilafat* becomes family inheritance

Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad declared at least three times that the *khilafat* in his *Jama'at* was not a family inherited seat (*gaddi*), passed on to the son as inheritance from the father.

1. In December 1914, at the first annual *Jalsa* of the Qadiani *Jama'at* since he became *khalifa*, Mirza Mahmud Ahmad delivered a speech entitled *Barakat-i Khilafat*. In it, under the subheading: "Has the *khilafat* become an inherited seat?", he declares:

"As to the foolish one who says that a hereditary seat has been established, I swear to him: I do not even consider it allowable that the son should succeed the father as *khalifa*. Of course, if God makes him His appointed one, then that is a different matter. But like Hazrat Umar, I also believe that the son should not be *khalifa* after the father."⁴⁴

44. *Anwar-ul-'Ulum*, v. 2, book number 7, p. 171.

2. In his book *Ahmadiyyat or The True Islam*, first published in 1924, Mirza Mahmud Ahmad stated near the beginning:

“It is not necessary that the head of the Community should be, in any way, related to the holy founder of the Movement, as, for instance, his first successor was not related to him either by blood or by marriage, nor, on the other hand, is it necessary, that the Head of the Community should not be related to the holy founder of the Movement, as, for instance, I have the honour to be his son.”⁴⁵

3. At the 1956 annual gathering of his *Jama'at*, Mirza Mahmud Ahmad made a speech under the title *Khilafat Haqqah Islamiyya* ('The True Islamic *Khilafat*'). In it he said about some of his critics:

“These people say that I want to make my sons *khalifa*. At present the spiritual descendants of the Promised Messiah are one million, while of his physical descendants there are only three persons alive, and if a son-in-law is included they become four. For such a large group I am saying that any one of them can be *khalifa*. ... I consider the four physical descendants of the Promised Messiah and his spiritual descendants who now number one million to have the right to *khilafat*. The man who says that you may chose as *khalifa* anyone from among these believers in the *khilafat*, to allege about him that he wants to make a son of his as *khalifa* is a most foolish claim.”⁴⁶

The passage of time, however, exposed the reality to the world when Mirza Mahmud Ahmad's son Mirza Nasir Ahmad became *khalifa* after him, and the next *khalifa* Mirza Tahir Ahmad was also a son of Mirza Mahmud Ahmad. The present, fifth *khalifa*, Mirza

45. *Ahmadiyyat or the True Islam*, ch. 'History of the Movement', p. 6. The Urdu version of this book is in *Anwar-ul-'Ulum*, v. 8, book number 5; see p. 115.

46. *Anwar-ul-'Ulum*, v. 26, p. 34–35.

Masroor Ahmad, is also a physical descendant, being in the third generation in the direct male line from the Promised Messiah.

Mirza Mahmud Ahmad's statements quoted above no doubt satisfied his followers, and perhaps other trusting persons also, that he was not laying the foundations of a hereditary leadership to remain in the same family. However, the scholars and leading lights of the Ahmadiyya Anjuman Lahore knew even at that time that these statements were being made with no other purpose than to silence and quell the criticism. Twenty-one years before Mirza Nasir Ahmad succeeded his father to the *khilafat*, a missionary of the Lahore Ahmadiyya *Jama'at*, Syed Akhtar Husain Gilani, wrote an article in this group's Urdu organ, *Paigham Sulh*, entitled: 'The office of *khilafat* cannot become a family inheritance', in which we read the following:

“At last Mirza Mahmud Ahmad became *khalifa*, and for the *khilafat* after him he has already prepared his son Nasir Ahmad. ... Mirza Nasir Ahmad is the president of the Khuddam-ul-Ahmadiyya, etc. The young are being instructed to render obedience to him, and everywhere he is being put forward for the *khilafat* in various ways. It is definite that the *khilafat* will pass down as an inheritance in the family of Mirza Mahmud Ahmad. The foundation of it is being laid on concepts such as the 'promised progeny', and it is impossible now that an un-related person could become *khalifa*. This system itself is an evidence that it has lost all connection with truth and veracity.”⁴⁷

At this wise and prescient observation, we close this booklet.

47. *Paigham Sulh*, 31 May 1944, p. 13, col. 1.