

The Qadiani violation of Ahmadiyya teachings

*A study showing the clash between
basic Qadiani beliefs
and the real teachings of
Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad.*

by

Zahid Aziz, Ph.D.



www.aail.org

Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha'at Islam Lahore Inc. U.S.A.

1995

Preface

This booklet has been compiled to show that the fundamental beliefs of the Qadianis, which form the basis of their existence as a movement, are entirely contrary to the noble teachings given in his books by the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement, the Promised Messiah, Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad (d. 1908). The term 'Qadiani' is used here to refer to the movement which was led by Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad (d. 1965) from 1914, being based originally at Qadian, India, and later moving to Rabwah, Pakistan. Its present leader is Mirza Tahir Ahmad, based in England since 1984.

Differences on four main issues have been dealt with here:

1. The Qadiani belief that no person can be a Muslim without accepting Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad as a prophet of God, *versus* the Founder's own belief that everyone who acknowledges the well-known Islamic *Kalima* is a Muslim.
2. The Qadianis' practical treatment of other Muslims as not being fellow-Muslims by refusing to say their funeral prayers, *versus* the Promised Messiah's teaching of being fraternal with all other Muslims except hostile opponents.
3. The Qadiani belief that prophets can come after the Holy Prophet Muhammad and that the Promised Messiah was a prophet, *versus* the Promised Messiah's affirmations that he regarded the Holy Prophet Muhammad as the Last Prophet.
4. The Qadiani system of rule by an autocratic *khalifa* possessing absolute power, *versus* the system set up by the Promised Messiah of the supremacy of the collective decisions of the Anjuman (the Central Executive Body).

We give extracts from books written by Mirza Mahmud Ahmad and contrast the wild, extreme and un-Islamic views expressed therein by the Qadiani leader with the beliefs of Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad in his writings which are, of course, wise, sober and wholly in accord with Islam. It will be evident that the doctrines put forward by the Qadianis are totally at variance with the basic teachings of Islam as well as being diametrically opposed to pronouncements of the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement.

In fact, as we will show at the appropriate places, most of these Qadiani views were actually held by *the opponents* of Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, and used to be put forward against him during his life. He, in reply, had refuted these notions, and described them as the false beliefs of his opponents — the beliefs which the Qadianis later came to adopt.

All quotations given in this booklet have been taken directly from their original sources and carefully checked for accurate reproduction. The references have been given fully and precisely. Readers wishing to verify any quotation can obtain from the publishers, by request, a photocopy of the page from the original source on which the extract occurs.

It may be of interest to note that in recent years the Qadianis have been seeking to suppress many of the books of Mirza Mahmud Ahmad which we have quoted in this booklet. This makes it all the more essential to publish key extracts from them as widely as possible, so that there remains no doubt whatsoever about the extreme Qadiani creed and the bold language used by Mirza Mahmud Ahmad in which to express it.

The compilation of this booklet was undertaken by Dr. Zahid Aziz of England, and is based on the extensive writings produced by the great scholars of the Lahore Ahmadiyya Movement since the Split in the year 1914.

The Publishers.

June 1995.

Contents

Preface	1
1. The Qadiani belief that the <i>Kalima</i> is no longer sufficient to make a person Muslim.	5
2. The Qadiani refusal to hold Islamic funeral prayers for other Muslims.	13
3. Finality of Prophethood.	22
4. Successorship or <i>Khilāfat</i> after the Promised Messiah.	31
Sources	43
Summary	45

Transliteration

Commonly-used words (such as *Quran*, *Hadith* and *Islam*) and names of persons and places are generally not transliterated with diacritics, but spelt in their ordinary form.

Names of other books and some terms and expressions have, for clarity, been transliterated to the extent of:

1. Indicating long vowels by the 'bar' over the letters *a*, *i* and *u*. Thus,
ā (or *Ā*) is pronounced as the *a* in the word *father*.
ī (or *Ī*) is pronounced as the *ee* in the word *deep*.
ū (or *Ū*) is pronounced as the *u* in the word *rule*.
2. Showing the Arabic letters 'ain and *hamza* by use of the two apostrophes ' and ' respectively.

The diacritical mark which consists of a dot placed under a letter such as *h* and *d*, and the underlining of pairs of letters such as *sh* and *gh*, have not been used in this book.

The Qadiani belief that the *Kalima* is no longer sufficient to make a person Muslim

As Islam was made perfect and complete by the Holy Prophet Muhammad, and its beliefs do not require any change or addition after him, this means that a person today should become a Muslim in the same way as people have been doing ever since the beginning of Islam. That is to say, by expressing belief in the universally-famous formula of faith, the *Kalima Shahāda*, which runs thus: *Ash-hadu an lā ilāha ill-Allāhu, wa ash-hadu anna Muhammad-ar rasūl-ullāh*, "I testify that there is no god but Allah, and I testify that Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah."

However, Mirza Mahmud Ahmad put forward the doctrine, in the year 1911, that expression of belief in the *Kalima* was *no longer sufficient* to make a person a Muslim because another prophet, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, had now appeared and belief in him must be acknowledged as well. Now it is a basic teaching of Islam that, with the coming of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, the followers of previous prophets (for example, Jews and Christians) are obliged to believe in him, and it is no longer sufficient for them to believe only in their previous prophets. Mirza Mahmud Ahmad applies this to say that as the prophet Mirza Ghulam Ahmad has now appeared, it is no longer sufficient for the existing Muslims to believe in the Holy Prophet Muhammad and all the prophets before him, but they must believe in the present-day prophet as well, otherwise they cannot remain Muslims.

In a book published in English, Mirza Mahmud Ahmad, acknowledging his beliefs, writes:

“(3) the belief that all those so-called Muslims who have not entered into his [Promised Messiah’s] *bai‘at* formally, wherever they may be, are *Kafirs* and outside the pale of Islam, even though they may not have heard the name of the Promised Messiah. That these beliefs have my full concurrence, I readily admit.”¹

M. Mahmud Ahmad gives summary of his article.

In this book, Mirza Mahmud Ahmad also gives a summary of his first article expressing these views which had earlier appeared in April 1911. He writes regarding this article:

“The article was elaborately entitled ‘A Muslim is one who believes in all the messengers of God’. The title itself is sufficient to show that the article was not meant to prove merely that ‘those who did not accept the Promised Messiah were deniers of the Promised Messiah’. Its object rather was to demonstrate that those who did not believe in the Promised Messiah were not Muslims.” (pp. 135–136)

It is clear from this that Mirza Mahmud Ahmad is *not* applying the word *kāfir* in its lesser sense of someone who denies a particular belief while still being a Muslim; on the contrary, he is calling Muslims as *kāfir* in its usual meaning of people who are “not Muslims”.

He further writes:

“Regarding the main subject of my article, I wrote that as we believed the Promised Messiah to be one of the prophets of God, we could not possibly regard his deniers as Muslims.” (pp. 137–138)

1. *The Truth about the Split*, Rabwah, 1965, pp. 55–56. This book was first published in 1924, and is the translation of his Urdu book *Ā‘īnah-i Sadāqat*.

“Then, in my own words, I summarised the purport of the quotations as follows: Thus, according to these quotations, not only are those deemed to be *Kafirs* who openly style the Promised Messiah as *Kafir*, and those who although they do not style him thus, decline still to accept his claim, but even those who, in their hearts, believe the Promised Messiah to be true, and do not even deny him with their tongues, but hesitate to enter into his *Bai‘at*, have here been adjudged to be *Kafirs*.” (pp. 139–140)

“And lastly, it was argued from a verse of the Holy Quran that such people as had failed to recognise the Promised Messiah as a *Rasul* even if they called him a righteous person with their tongues, were yet veritable *Kafirs*.” (p. 140)

According to these views, the *only* Muslims in the whole world at any time are those who have taken the *bai‘at* of the Qadiani leader of the time. In the last quotation above, the closing words given as “veritable *Kafirs*” are “*pakkay kāfir*” in the original Urdu book *Ā‘īnah-i Sadāqat*, of which *The Truth about the Split* is the English translation. The word *pakkay* conveys the significance of *real*, *true* and *full-fledged*, meaning that all other Muslims are *kāfir* in the fullest sense without the least doubt.

Views of M. Mahmud Ahmad’s brother Bashir.

Mirza Mahmud Ahmad’s brother Mirza Bashir Ahmad also expressed the same belief quite plainly. Referring to verses 4:150–151 of the Holy Quran, which say that those who believe only in some messengers of Allah and refuse to believe in others are “truly *kāfir*”, M. Bashir Ahmad writes in a book:

“Thus, according to this verse, every such person who believes in Moses but does not believe in Jesus, or who believes in Jesus but does not believe in Muhammad (peace be upon him), or believes in Muhammad (peace be upon him) but does not believe in the Promised

Messiah, is not only a *kāfir* but *pukka kāfir* and excluded from the fold of Islam.”²

This statement declares all Muslims who do not belong to the Ahmadiyya Movement as being non-Muslims because of not believing in Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, just as Jews and Christians are non-Muslims for not believing in the Holy Prophet Muhammad. Again the description used is *pukka kāfir*, meaning *kāfir* in the real, true, and fullest sense.

This Qadiani belief led to the Split.

It was to combat these false doctrines and to keep alive the Promised Messiah's real mission that Maulana Muhammad Ali and his comrades formed the Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha'at Islam at Lahore in 1914. The Maulana, writing at that time, explained this state of affairs as follows:

“M. Mahmud, a son of the founder of the movement, who is the present head of the Qadian section of the community, began to drift away from the basic principles of the Islamic faith about three years after the death of the Promised Messiah, going so far as to declare plainly that the hundreds of millions of Muslims, living in the world, should be no more treated as Muslims. He has laid down the basis of creating a breach with Islam itself, seeking to lay with the Ahmadiyya movement, which was a movement strictly within the circle of Islam, foundations of a new religion altogether and forcing it to take the direction which St. Paul gave to Christianity after Jesus Christ. A large number of the educated members of the community, who had the moral courage to dissent openly from the erroneous doctrines taught by him, perceived the great danger to the whole community, when after the death of the late Maulvi Nur-ud-Din a particular clique in the community succeeded in raising

2. *Kalimat-ul-Fasal*, by Mirza Bashir Ahmad, published February 1915, p. 20.

M. Mahmud to headship at Qadian without any general consultation. They at once rallied round the true doctrines of the Promised Messiah, and after in vain trying for over a month and a half to keep up the unity of the movement, formed themselves into a separate Society, known as the *Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha'at-i-Islam*, on 2nd May 1914, which is now earnestly working for the propagation of Islam.”³

Promised Messiah did not call other Muslims as *kāfir*.

The Promised Messiah had condemned the practice of declaring of Muslims as *kāfir*. He wrote:

“It is a matter of amazement that a person who recites the *Kalima*, faces the *Qibla*, believes in One God, believes in and truly loves God and His Messenger, and believes in the Quran, should on account of some secondary difference be declared a *kāfir* on par with, nay even more than, Jews and Christians.”⁴

Therefore, according to Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad no person fulfilling one of the basic requirements of a Muslim, for example, professing the *Kalima*, or facing the Muslim *Qibla* in prayer, etc., can be called a *kāfir*.

M. Mahmud Ahmad sides with opponents of Promised Messiah.

As to the allegation that he himself called Muslims as *kāfir*, the Promised Messiah writes:

“In his booklet, *Al-Masīh al-Dajjāl*, Dr. Abdul Hakim Khan levels the allegation against me of having written in a book that a man who does not believe in me, even though he may not have heard of my name, and even though he may live in a country to which my call has not

3. Maulana Muhammad Ali, *The Split in the Ahmadiyya Movement*, first published 1918, Preface. See pp. 1–2 of the 1994 reprint edition.

4. *Ā'īnah Kamālāt Islām*, published February 1893, p. 259.

reached, he shall nonetheless be a *kāfir* and enter hell. This is a complete fabrication of the said doctor. I have not written this in any book or announcement. He ought to produce any book of mine in which this is written.”⁵

So in 1907, just a year before his death, the Promised Messiah condemned it as “a complete fabrication” of an opponent the allegation that he had branded as *kāfir* all those who did not believe in him even though they may not have heard of his name. *And Mirza Mahmud Ahmad has made exactly the same allegation regarding the Promised Messiah*, as quoted earlier:

“all those so-called Muslims who have not entered into his *bai‘at* formally, wherever they may be, are *Kafirs* and outside the pale of Islam, *even though they may not have heard the name of the Promised Messiah.*”

Therefore, this doctrine put forward by Mirza Mahmud Ahmad, and ascribed by him to the Promised Messiah, had already been condemned by the Promised Messiah as *a complete fabrication made an opponent*. The Qadianis should seriously ponder over the question whether these words of the Promised Messiah about an opponent are also applicable to them!

Promised Messiah’s court declaration that he does not call Muslims as *kāfir*.

In February 1899, at the end of a court case between the Promised Messiah and one of his leading opponents, Maulavi Muhammad Husain Batalvi, the magistrate got each of them to sign a notice that he would not call the other *kāfir* or anti-Christ. Commenting on this, Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad wrote:

“If he [Muhammad Husain] had been honest in issuing his *fatwa*, he should have said to the judge: ‘I certainly regard him as a *kāfir*, and so I call him a *kāfir*’ ...

“Considering that till now, till the last part of my life, by the grace and favour of God I still hold those beliefs

5. *Haqīqat al-Wahy*, published May 1907, p. 178.

which Muhammad Husain has declared as *kufir*, what sort of honesty is it that, out of fear of the judge, he destroyed all his *fatwas* and affirmed before the judge that he would never again call me *kāfir*, or dub me anti-Christ and a liar. One should reflect as to what greater disgrace there could be than this ...

“It is true that I also signed this notice. But by this signing, no blame attaches to me in the eyes of God and the just people, nor does such signing reflect any disgrace on me, because *my belief from the beginning has been that no person becomes a kāfir or anti-Christ by denying my claim.* ... I do not apply the term *kāfir* to any person who professes the *Kalima*, unless he makes himself a *kāfir* by calling me a *kāfir* and a liar. In this matter, it has always been my opponents who took the first step by calling me a *kāfir*, and prepared a *fatwa*. I did not take the lead in preparing a *fatwa* against them. And they themselves admit that if I am a Muslim in the eyes of God, then by calling me a *kāfir* the ruling of the Holy Prophet Muhammad against them is that they are *kāfir*. So I do not call them *kāfir*; rather it is by calling me *kāfir* that they come under the judgment of the Holy Prophet. Therefore, if I have affirmed before Mr Dowie [the judge] that I shall not call them *kāfir*, *it is in fact my belief that I do not consider any Muslim to be a kāfir.*”⁶

The following points emerge plainly from this extract:

1. The Promised Messiah never called any Muslim a *kāfir* on the grounds of not believing in his claims.
2. It was when his Muslim opponents persisted in calling him *kāfir* that he reminded them of the ruling of the Holy Prophet Muhammad that anyone calling a fellow-Muslim as *kāfir* has the same epithet reflected back upon him. So it was

6. *Tiryāq al-Qulūb*, published October 1902, pp. 130–131.

the Holy Prophet Muhammad's judgment against them which they brought on themselves.

3. When a Muslim opponent signed a declaration to the effect that he would stop calling Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad as *kāfir*, the Promised Messiah had no hesitation whatsoever in signing a similar declaration about his opponent.
4. The Promised Messiah repeatedly calls it "my belief" that a Muslim cannot be called a *kāfir* for not believing in his claims.
5. The Promised Messiah wrote the above lines at a time which he himself describes as "...till now, till *the last part of my life...*". Therefore it cannot be argued that he held this belief only at an early stage in his mission and changed it later on.

After the extract quoted above, Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad goes on to write about his opponent:

"In short, the man who, after getting provoked without justification, declared me *kāfir* and prepared a *fatwa* concerning me, to the effect that I was a *kāfir*, anti-Christ and liar, showed no fear of the commandment of Almighty God as to why he was calling as *kāfir* people who face the *Qibla* and profess the *Kalima*, and why he was expelling from the fold of Islam thousands of servants of God who follow the Book of Allah and manifest the basic practices of Islam. However, after a threat from the magistrate of the district, he accepted for all time never again to call them *kāfir*, anti-Christ or liar." (p. 132)

According to the Promised Messiah here, to call as *kāfir* and to expel from Islam those people who profess the *Kalima* and follow the basic Islamic practices, *is to show no fear of God*. So the Qadiani movement's action in calling other Muslims as *kāfir* falls under the condemnation of the Promised Messiah.

The Qadiani refusal to hold Islamic funeral prayers for other Muslims

The Qadiani belief that all those Muslims who do not accept the Promised Messiah are rejecting *a prophet of God*, has led them to place other Muslims in the same category as followers of non-Islamic religions who reject the Holy Prophet Muhammad. Therefore, as regards all those special fraternal duties which Islam requires Muslims to perform only towards their fellow-Muslims, the Qadianis refuse to fulfil those obligations towards any Muslims except members of their own movement. So in practical terms too, they have restricted their religious relations with other Muslims to be on the same basis as with non-Muslim religious communities such as Hindus or Christians.

As the Islamic funeral prayers can only be held for a Muslim, Mirza Mahmud Ahmad forbade his followers from holding such prayers for any deceased not belonging to their movement. But curiously, while setting out to impose this prohibition, he admits that the Promised Messiah did not impose it! In his book *Anwār-i Khilāfat*, he begins a section entitled 'Funeral Prayers for a non-Ahmadi' with the following words:

“Then a question is asked about saying the funeral prayers for a non-Ahmadi. A difficulty pointed out in this respect is that the Promised Messiah has allowed the saying of such funeral prayers in some circumstances. There is no doubt that there exist some references showing this, and a letter has been discovered which will be

brought under consideration. However, the Promised Messiah's practice is against this."¹

He thus admits that the Promised Messiah allowed his followers to hold funeral prayers for deceased non-Ahmadis, and that written references bearing this out can be found. Nonetheless, he alleges that the Promised Messiah's practice was opposed to this! In other words, according to Mirza Mahmud Ahmad, the Promised Messiah preached one thing and himself did the opposite of it! This allegation is *grossly insulting* to the Promised Messiah, and needless to say it is *absolutely false* to assert that while allowing his followers, under certain conditions, to hold funeral prayers for non-Ahmadis, he himself always refrained from doing so. This is shown later in this chapter.

M. Mahmud considers other Muslims as non-Muslims.

After the lines quoted above, Mirza Mahmud Ahmad goes on to prohibit his followers from saying the funeral prayers for other Muslims, and then at the end he raises and answers another question as follows:

“Now another question remains, that is, as non-Ahmadis are deniers of the Promised Messiah, this is why funeral prayers for them must not be offered, but if a young child of a non-Ahmadi dies, why should not his funeral prayers be offered? He did not call the Promised Messiah as *kāfir*. I ask those who raise this question, that if this argument is correct, then why are not funeral prayers offered for the children of Hindus and Christians, and how many people say their funeral prayers? The fact is that, according to the *Sharī'ah*, the religion of the child is the same as the religion of the parents. So a non-Ahmadi's child is also a non-Ahmadi, and his funeral prayers must not be said. Then I say that as the child cannot be a sinner he does not need the funeral

1. *Anwār-i Khilāfat*, published October 1916, p. 91.

prayers; the child's funeral is a prayer for his relatives, and they do not belong to us but are non-Ahmadis. This is why even the child's funeral prayers must not be said.

“This leaves the question that if a man who believes Hazrat Mirza sahib to be true but has not yet taken the *bai'at*, or is still thinking about joining Ahmadiyyat, and he dies in this condition, it is possible that God may not punish him. But the decisions of the *Shari'ah* are based on what is outwardly visible. So we must do the same thing in his case, and not offer funeral prayers for him.”²

From this statement it is absolutely clear that the Qadianis treat other Muslims as belonging to another religion, like the Hindu or the Christian religion. A non-Ahmadi Muslim infant, says M. Mahmud Ahmad, must not be included among the Muslims and given the Muslim funeral rites, any more than a Christian or Hindu infant could be accorded the Muslim funeral service. Again, according to M. Mahmud Ahmad, an adult non-Ahmadi Muslim who, far from being opposed to the Ahmadiyya Movement, actually believes the Promised Messiah to be true, but has not formally joined the movement, does not qualify to receive the Muslim funeral service any more than a Christian or Hindu does.

Promised Messiah allowed funeral prayers for other Muslims.

1. When Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad was asked about funeral prayers for Muslims who were not his followers, he is recorded as giving the following reply:

“If the deceased was an opponent of this Movement and spoke ill of us and regarded us as bad, do not say funeral prayers for him. If he did not speak against us, and was neutral, it is permissible to say his funeral prayers, provided the imam is one of you; otherwise there is no need. If the deceased did not call us *kāfir* and liar, his funeral

prayers may be said. There is nothing wrong with that, for only God knows hidden matters.”³

2. About a year before his death, the Promised Messiah received a letter from an Ahmadi, Ghulam Qadir of Jeonjal, district Gujrat, seeking guidance on various questions, including the saying of funeral prayers. The Promised Messiah instructed one of his secretaries, Mufti Muhammad Sadiq, to write the following reply on this point:

“It is permissible to say funeral prayers for an opponent who did not abuse us. The imam must be an Ahmadi.”⁴

Promised Messiah’s practice.

Mirza Mahmud Ahmad’s allegation, referred to earlier, that the Promised Messiah’s own practice in this respect was against the teaching he gave to his followers, is proved absolutely false by well-known facts.

1. Khawaja Ghulam Farid of Chachran was a famous saint who praised and defended Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, but did not take his *bai’at* or become an Ahmadi. Writing after the Khawaja’s death in 1904, the Promised Messiah paid him the following tribute:

“To sum up, God had granted Khawaja Ghulam Farid a spiritual light by which he could distinguish between a truthful one and an imposter at one glance. May God envelope him in mercy, and grant him a place near Him — Ameen.”⁵

-
3. Statement made on 18 April 1902; newspaper *Al-Hakam*, 30 April 1902. See also *Rūhānī Khazā’in* no. 2, *Malfūzāt*, vol. 3, p. 276. The condition that the imam must be “one of you” does not mean that other Muslims are being considered as *kāfir*. See later in this chapter for the Promised Messiah’s reasons for his instructions to his followers on the question of joining prayers led by other Muslims.
 4. Letter dated 12 May 1907. Facsimile of letter published in Maulana Muhammad Ali’s *Radd Takfīr ahl-i Qibla*, first published 1920, sixth ed., 1970, pp. 46–47.
 5. *Haqiqat al-Wahy*, published May 1907, p. 209.

The prayer here, for the departed soul of the Khawaja to receive God's mercy and nearness, is only allowed by Islam in case of a Muslim deceased.

2. The sworn testimony of some eminent Ahmadis has been produced to show that the Promised Messiah had himself said, and even led, the funeral prayers of certain of their relatives while he was fully aware on those occasions that the deceased did not believe in his claims.⁶

Practice of the Ahmadiyya community.

During the life-time of the Promised Messiah and after him in the time of Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din, the Ahmadi communities in Qadian and other towns and cities used to hold funeral prayers for deceased Muslims not belonging to the Ahmadiyya Movement. Maulana Muhammad Ali challenged the Qadianis in this respect as follows:

“I address all the ‘one million’ Qadianis and issue the challenge to them that let even one man from among them announce the following:

‘In the time of the Promised Messiah and the time of Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din, that is before 1914, saying funeral prayers for non-Ahmadis was considered to be prohibited as it is now, and no Ahmadi community ever held the funeral prayers of a non-Ahmadi.’

“I had also appealed to Mirza Mahmud Ahmad to bring forth *even one single sworn testimony* from the whole of his community to the effect that before 1914, in Lahore, in Simla, in Sialkot, in other towns and cities, and in Qadian itself, funeral prayers for non-Ahmadis were not held. Among the ‘one million’ Qadianis, let even one man come forward and dare testify on oath, contrary to

6. See *Radd Takfīr ahl-i Qibla* by Maulana Muhammad Ali, published 1920, sixth edition 1970, pp. 56–58.

the facts, that before 1914 funeral prayers of non-Ahmadis were not said and were considered as prohibited.

“Mirza Mahmud Ahmad himself, standing right next to me, joined the funeral prayers of Maulana Nur-ud-Din’s niece in Qadian who was not an Ahmadi. The Promised Messiah himself said such funeral prayers in Qadian.”⁷

Prayers after other Muslim imams.

The Promised Messiah never prohibited Ahmadis from praying behind other Muslims on the grounds that the latter do not believe in his claims. For several years after he laid claim to be the Promised Messiah, Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad himself and other Ahmadis said prayers following other Muslim imams. However, the general Ulama continued to denounce Ahmadis as *kāfir* and to subject them to severe maltreatment and humiliation in mosques, with ever-increasing hostility as time went on. Therefore, the Promised Messiah eventually instructed his followers to refrain from praying behind any such maulvis who called Ahmadis as *kāfir* and those who were the followers of these maulvis.

The Promised Messiah made his position very clear shortly before his death. He received a letter from a non-Ahmadi in Baluchistan, dated 17th March 1908, saying that a good Ahmadi friend of his did not join the congregational prayers with non-Ahmadis friends, and asking the Promised Messiah to instruct him to pray with them. The Promised Messiah directed that the following reply be sent to this letter:

“As the maulvis of this country, due to their bigotry, have generally declared us as *kāfir*, and have written *fatwas*, and the rest of the people are their followers, so if there are any persons who, to clear their own position,

7. Maulana Muhammad Ali’s Urdu pamphlet entitled “Each and every Qadiani invited to arbitrate: Is not the Qadiani belief opposed to the Promised Messiah’s belief”, published 1940, pp. 12–13.

make an announcement that they do not follow these maulvis who make others *kāfir*, then it would be allowable [for Ahmadis] to say prayers with them. Otherwise, the man who calls a Muslim as *kāfir*, becomes a *kāfir* himself. So how can we pray behind him? The holy *Shari'ah* does not permit it.”⁸

The reason given here by the Promised Messiah for not praying behind other Muslim imams is *not* that they do not believe in him, but that they call him and the Ahmadis as *kāfir*, and one who calls *any* Muslim as *kāfir* has the same epithet reflected back on him according to the Holy Prophet Muhammad. The Promised Messiah clearly allows Ahmadis to say their prayers behind such other Muslims who openly dissociate and separate themselves from those who call Ahmadis as *kāfir*.

Compare the Promised Messiah's position to the instructions which Mirza Mahmud Ahmad gave to his followers:

“I say that no matter how many times you ask me, I will always give the same reply: it is not allowed to pray behind a non-Ahmadi. It is not allowed, it is not allowed.”⁹

“It is our duty that we must not consider non-Ahmadis as Muslims, and we must not pray behind them, because we believe that they are denying a prophet of Almighty God.”¹⁰

The Qadiani belief, as expressed here, is that it is unlawful to pray behind other Muslims *because they do not acknowledge the Promised Messiah to be a prophet of God*. This belief is entirely opposed to the teachings and the statements of the Promised Messiah.

8. Ahmadiyya newspaper *Badr*, 24–31 December 1908, p. 5.

9. *Anwār-i Khilāfat*, p. 89.

10. *ibid.*, p. 90.

Mirza Mahmud Ahmad's later speech admitting the facts.

In a speech delivered many years later in 1950, covering what he called "several aspects" of this issue, Mirza Mahmud Ahmad admitted the "historical" reason why the Promised Messiah stopped his followers from praying behind other Muslim imams. He said:

"This issue also has a historical aspect. For many years after being called a *kāfir* by the Ulama, the Promised Messiah did not prohibit prayers behind them. In fact, he himself continued to pray behind them. However, the Ulama continued to increase the severity of their *fatwas*, so much so that they put up notices in their mosques saying that Ahmadi 'dogs' were not allowed to enter therein. The floor on which an Ahmadi stepped was declared polluted and had to be washed with water. In many mosques prayer mats were burnt because an Ahmadi had prayed on them. When they took their opposition to the utmost limit, then God too forbade praying behind them. ...

"For several years our *Jamā'at* prayed behind them, but these people kept on repeating that Ahmadis were so impure that if they even entered a mosque it had to be cleansed. Consequently, God ordered the prohibition of praying behind them. Therefore, as the Ulama have themselves issued *fatwas* against us, which even till now they have not retracted, how can any blame be put against Ahmadis?"¹¹

It is obvious that if, as Mirza Mahmud Ahmad admits above, "for many years after being called a *kāfir* by the Ulama, the Promised Messiah did not prohibit prayers behind them" and in fact himself "continued to pray behind them", then his stopping Ahmadis from prayers behind other Muslims could not have been because of their rejection of his claim. Had that been the

11. *Al-Fazl*, 9 August 1950, quoted in *Paighām Sulh*, 13 September 1950.

case, he would have stopped prayers behind other Muslims as soon as he claimed to be the Promised Messiah.

It therefore stands proved beyond the least doubt that the Promised Messiah *never* prohibited his followers from praying behind other Muslims on the basis that the latter do not accept his claims or acknowledge him as prophet. This course of action was forced upon him by the unrelenting hostility of the Ulama towards the Ahmadis, and was not a consequence of his own claims or the position which he claimed to hold.

Finality of Prophethood

It has been conclusively shown above that the Promised Messiah regarded and treated as Muslim all those Muslims who did not believe in his claims but refrained from denouncing him as *kāfir*. This fact is sufficient to demolish the entire Qadiani edifice based on the doctrine that Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad was a prophet. Since people remain Muslims without believing in the claims of Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, and do not become *kāfir* by not believing in him, it follows that the Promised Messiah was not a prophet. According to accepted Islamic doctrines, Muslims must believe in all the prophets, without any exception whatsoever. Therefore, as the Promised Messiah says “*no person becomes a kāfir by denying my claim,*” it follows that he is not a prophet.

Promised Messiah believed in finality of prophethood.

Besides the above argument, the Promised Messiah also made numerous statements upholding the principle that no prophet whatsoever can come after the Holy Prophet Muhammad. We quote some of these below:

1. At one place, he quotes the *Khātam an-nabiyyin* verse of the Holy Quran (33:40), and translates it into Urdu as follows:

“That is to say, Muhammad is not the father of any man from among you, but he is the Messenger of Allah, and the one to end the prophets.”

He then comments:

“This verse also clearly argues that after our Holy Prophet no messenger (*rasūl*) shall come into the world.”¹

2. “The Holy Quran does not permit the coming of any messenger after the *Khātam an-nabiyyin*, whether he would be a new messenger or a former one.”²
3. “I firmly believe that our Holy Prophet Muhammad is the *Khātam al-anbiyā*, and after him no prophet (*nabī*) shall come for this Muslim people, neither new nor old.”³
4. “It does not befit God that He should send a prophet after the *Khātam an-nabiyyin*, or that He should re-start the institution of prophethood after having terminated it.”⁴
5. “The real fact, to which I testify with the highest testimony, is that our Holy Prophet is the *Khātam al-anbiyā*, and after him no prophet will come, neither any old one nor any new one.”⁵
6. “The Holy Prophet had repeatedly said that no prophet would come after him, and the hadith ‘*There is no prophet after me*’ was so well-known that no one had any doubt about its authenticity. And the Holy Quran, every word of which is binding, in its verse ‘he is the Messenger of Allah and the *Khātam an-nabiyyin*’, confirmed that prophethood has in fact ended with our Holy Prophet.”⁶
7. “By saying ‘*There is no prophet after me*’, the Holy Prophet Muhammad closed the door absolutely to any

1. *Izāla Auhām*, published September 1891, p. 614.

2. *Izāla Auhām*, p. 761.

3. *Nishān Āsmānī*, published May 1892, p. 28.

4. *Ā’īnah Kamālāt Islām*, published February 1893, p. 377.

5. *Anjām Ātham*, published January 1897, p. 27, footnote.

6. *Kitāb al-Barriyya*, published January 1898, p. 184.

new prophet or the return of any old prophet.”⁷

8. “If another prophet were to come, whether new or old, how could our Holy Prophet Muhammad be the *Khātam al-anbiyā*?”⁸
9. “The Holy Prophet Muhammad was the *Khātam al-anbiyā*, and no prophet was to come after him.”⁹
10. “Prophethood ended with him [Holy Prophet Muhammad] not only because of his being the last in time but also because all the accomplishments of prophethood came to an end with him.”¹⁰
11. “There is now no need to follow separately all the prophethoods and all the books which have gone before because the prophethood of Muhammad includes and encompasses them all ... Therefore, with this prophethood [of Muhammad] all prophethoods come to an end. And so it ought to have been, because that which has a beginning has also an end.”¹¹
12. “Allah is that Being Who ... made Adam, sent messengers, sent scriptures, and last of all sent Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of Allah be upon him, who is the *Khātam al-anbiyā* and the best of messengers.”¹²

The writings quoted above range from the time Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad claimed to be the Promised Messiah in 1891 till near the end of his life. So it cannot be argued that these were his “earlier books” after which he changed his views.

It may be noted that the Promised Messiah has here proved from the Holy Quran and the Hadith that no prophet, new or

7. *Ayyām as-Sulh*, published August 1898, p. 152.

8. *Ayyām as-Sulh*, p. 74.

9. *Tazkirat ash-Shahādatain*, published October 1903, p. 43.

10. *Lecture Islam, Sialkot*, November 1904, p. 6.

11. *Al-Wasiyya*, December 1905, pp. 10–11.

12. *Haqīqat al-Wahy*, published May 1907, p. 141.

old, can come after the Holy Prophet Muhammad. However, the Qadianis, very frequently in their publications, purport to give evidence from the Holy Quran, the Hadith, and the writings of Muslim religious authorities since the time of the Holy Prophet, to try to show the *reverse*, that prophethood has not ended with the Holy Prophet Muhammad and that prophets can still appear after him. The same sources cited by the Qadianis were also in the view, and under the study, of the Promised Messiah. But he drew from them the *opposite conclusion* and wrote that “the Holy Quran does not permit the coming of any messenger after the *Khātam an-nabiyyin*,” and that “the Holy Prophet Muhammad closed the door absolutely to any new prophet or the return of any old prophet.”

M. Mahmud Ahmad’s belief that prophets can still come.

Although it is a well-known Qadiani doctrine that prophethood has not ended with the Holy Prophet Muhammad and that prophets can come after him till the end of the world, nonetheless we quote below from some of the writings of Mirza Mahmud Ahmad laying down this belief. He writes in his book *Anwār-i Khilāfat*:

“Likewise they say that however much a person may advance in virtue and goodness, nay even surpass many prophets in righteousness and piety, may attain the utmost knowledge of God, but God will never make him a prophet, never raise him to that dignity. Their thinking thus is due to not assigning to Allah the attributes due to Him; otherwise to say nothing of one prophet, *I say there shall be thousands of prophets*, and a person who rises to the dignity of prophets like John can become a prophet. They question the prophethood of the Promised Messiah, on whom be peace, *but I say, even now there can be a prophet.*” (p. 62)

“I ask, Is prophethood a mercy or a curse? If it is a mercy, then why has it come to an end after the Holy

Prophet Muhammad? It should have increased all the more after him. He was a prophet of a very great status. Therefore a prophet who comes after him must also be of a great status, not that no one could at all become a prophet.” (p. 64)

“Even if someone placed a sword on my neck and told me to say that no prophet can come after the Holy Prophet, I would say to him: you are a liar, a great liar, prophets can come after the Holy Prophet, most certainly they can.” (p. 65)

It can be clearly seen how utterly opposed these views are to the beliefs expressed by the Promised Messiah as quoted earlier.

Use of term *prophet* for Promised Messiah.

The Qadianis, along with the opponents of the Ahmadiyya Movement, seek to mislead people by quoting from the Promised Messiah’s writings the use of the words *nabī* (prophet) and *rasūl* (messenger) as applying to him. They thus try to show that the Promised Messiah claimed to be a prophet. What they are reluctant to quote, however, are the extensive explanations given by the Promised Messiah of the meaning and the sense in which these terms apply to him, and his flat denials of claiming to be a prophet. As this subject has been fully dealt with in our other literature, here we merely give one simple argument. Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad always wrote, from the time he claimed to be the Promised Messiah till the end of his life, that these terms applied to him not in their *real* sense but in their *metaphorical* sense, the sense in which they apply to every saint (*walī* or *muhaddas*) in Islam. Some of his statements are given below:

1. “The coming Messiah, because of being a *muhaddas*,¹³ is *metaphorically* also a prophet.”¹⁴

13. A *muhaddas* is one who is *not* a prophet but receives revelation from God.

14. *Izāla Auhām*, p. 349.

2. "It is true that, in the revelation which God has sent upon this servant, the words *nabī*, *rasūl* and *mursal* (prophet and messenger) occur about myself quite frequently. However, they do not bear their real sense. ... We believe and acknowledge that, according to the real meaning of prophethood, after the Holy Prophet Muhammad no new or former prophet can come. The Holy Quran forbids the appearance of any such prophets. But in a *metaphorical sense* God can call any recipient of revelation as *nabī* or *mursal*.... The Arabs to this day call even the message-bearer sent by a man as a *rasūl*, so why is it forbidden for God also to use the word *mursal* in a *metaphorical sense*." ¹⁵
3. "I say repeatedly that in these revelations the word *mursal* or *rasūl* or *nabī* which has occurred about me is not used in its real sense. The real fact, to which I testify with the highest testimony, is that our Holy Prophet is the *Khātam al-anbiyā*, and after him no prophet will come, neither any old one nor any new one. ... As we have just explained, sometimes the revelation from God contains such words about some of His saints (*auliyā*) in a *metaphorical and figurative sense*; they are not meant by way of reality. ... The epithet 'prophet of God' for the Promised Messiah to come, which is to be found in *Sahih Muslim* etc. from the blessed tongue of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, is meant in the same *metaphorical sense* as that in which it occurs in Sufi literature as an accepted and common term for the recipient of Divine communication. Otherwise, how can there be a prophet after the *Khātam al-anbiyā*?" ¹⁶
4. "The Holy Quran clearly states that the Holy Prophet Muhammad is the *Khātam al-anbiyā*. But our opponents make Jesus the *Khātam al-anbiyā*, and they say that the

15. *Sirāj Munīr*, published March 1897, pp. 2–3.

16. *Anjām Ātham*, pp. 27–28, footnote.

mention of the Messiah as ‘prophet of God’ in *Sahih Muslim* and elsewhere refers to real prophethood.”¹⁷

What the Promised Messiah here calls the *wrong view held by his opponents*, namely, that mention of the Messiah as ‘prophet of God’ in Hadith “refers to real prophethood,” has become one of the principal doctrines of the Qadianis. One of the very basic arguments advanced by the Qadianis is that, as the coming Messiah has been called a ‘prophet of God’ in Hadith reports, it follows that the true claimant to this office, Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, was a real prophet of God.

5. “These words (*rasūl*, etc.) are used by way of *metaphor*, just as in Hadith also the word *nabī* has been used for the Promised Messiah.”¹⁸
6. “Here the words *rasūl* and *nabī* which have been used about me in the revelation from God, that he is the messenger and prophet of God, are meant in a *metaphorical and figurative sense*.”¹⁹
7. “God speaks to, and communicates with, His saints (*auliyā*) in this Ummah, and they are given the colour of prophets. However, they are *not prophets in reality*.”²⁰
8. “And I have been called *nabī* (prophet) by Allah *by way of metaphor, not by way of reality*.”²¹

The Promised Messiah has consistently explained that a saint in Islam, such as himself, can be called ‘prophet’ (*nabī*) and ‘messenger’ (*rasūl*) only in a metaphorical sense, and this does not mean that he becomes a prophet in reality, because in actual fact the Holy Prophet Muhammad is the Last Prophet, after whom no prophet whatsoever can come, new or old.

17. *Kitāb al-Barriyya*, p. 191, footnote.

18. *Arbaʿīn*, published December 1900, No. 2, p. 18, footnote.

19. *Arbaʿīn*, No. 3, p. 25, footnote.

20. *Mawāhib ar-Rahmān*, published January 1903, pp. 66–67.

21. *Haqīqat al-Wahy*, Supplement, p. 64.

Denials of claiming prophethood by Promised Messiah.

We quote below some of the denials issued by the Promised Messiah to the allegation that he claimed to be a prophet:

1. “*Question:* In the booklet *Fath-i Islām* you have made a claim to prophethood. *Answer:* There is no claim of prophethood; on the contrary, the claim is of being a *muhaddas*, which has been put forward by the command of God.”²²
2. “I have heard that some leading Ulama of this city [Delhi] are giving publicity to the allegation against me that I lay claim to prophethood. ... these allegations are an entire fabrication, I do not make a claim to prophethood. ... After our leader and master, Muhammad *mustafa*, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, the last of the messengers, I consider anyone who claims prophethood and messengership to be a liar and *kāfir*.”²³
3. “Those people have fabricated a lie against me who say that I claim to be a prophet.”²⁴
4. “I have not claimed prophethood, nor have I said to them that I am a prophet ... I did not say anything to the people except what I wrote in my books, namely, that I am a *muhaddas* and God speaks to me as He speaks to the *muhaddases*. ... It does not befit me that I should claim prophethood and leave Islam and join the disbelievers. ... How could I claim prophethood when I am a Muslim.”²⁵
5. “By way of a fabrication, they slander me by alleging that I have made a claim to prophethood and that I deny

22. *Izāla Auhām*, p. 421.

23. Statement issued 2 October 1891. *Majmū'a Ishihārāt*, vol. 1, pp. 230–231.

24. *Hamāmat al-Bushrā*, published 1894, p. 8.

25. *Hamāmat al-Bushrā*, p. 79.

miracles and the angels. It should be remembered that all this is a fabrication.”²⁶

6. “I make no claim to prophethood. This is your mistake, or you have some motive in mind. Is it necessary that a person who claims to receive revelation should also be a prophet?”²⁷
7. “I am not a prophet but a *muhaddas* from God, and a recipient of Divine revelation.”²⁸
8. “Another stupidity is that, in order to provoke the ignorant people, they say that I have claimed prophethood. This is a complete fabrication on their part.”²⁹
9. “Let it be clear to him [an opponent Maulvi] that I also curse the person who claims prophethood, and I believe that ‘There is no god but Allah and Muhammad is His Messenger’, and I have faith in the finality of prophethood of the Holy Prophet Muhammad. ... there is no claim of prophethood on my part either, only a claim of sainthood (*wilāyat*) and reformership (*mujaddidiyyat*).”³⁰
10. “Can a wretched imposter who claims messengership and prophethood for himself have any belief in the Holy Quran? And can a man who believes in the Holy Quran, and believes the verse ‘*He is the Messenger of Allah and the Khātam an-nabiyyin*’ to be the word of God, say that he is a messenger and prophet after the Holy Prophet Muhammad?”³¹

26. *Kitāb al-Barriyya*, p. 182, footnote.

27. *Jang Muqaddas*, June 1893, p. 67.

28. *Ā'īnah Kamālāt Islām*, p. 383.

29. *Haqīqat al-Wahy*, p. 390.

30. Announcement issued January 1897; see *Majmū'a Ishihārāt*, vol. ii, pp. 297–298.

31. *Anjām Ātham*, p. 27, footnote.

Successorship or *Khilāfat* after the Promised Messiah

Brief review.

For the administration and financial management of the Movement after him, the Promised Messiah created an Anjuman or association, which was called the *Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya*, and decreed this body as his “successor”. He designated the Anjuman to be the supreme governing body of the Movement after his death, and assigned to it the decision-making authority which he himself possessed during his life. The Promised Messiah appointed fourteen men to the executive body of the Anjuman, and gave the instruction that its decisions, made by majority opinion, would be final and binding. The *Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya* held this position and functioned in this way during the period of leadership of Maulana Nur-ud-Din, the first Head of the Ahmadiyya Movement after the Promised Messiah’s death.

However, in 1914 when Mirza Mahmud Ahmad succeeded in his plans to become the head of the Movement, he immediately proceeded to destroy the system created by the Promised Messiah and replace it with an autocratic, personal *khilāfat* giving the *khalīfa* absolute and supreme power over the movement. M. Mahmud Ahmad coined and taught the doctrine that the *khalīfa* is appointed by God, and therefore all his acts and pronouncements possess the seal of Divine authority. He cannot be questioned or called to account, and it is the foremost duty

of every member of the movement to obey the *khalīfa* implicitly and absolutely, utterly regardless of what he orders. This is the system of *khilāfat* which has prevailed among the Qadianis since then, and the highest goal and aspiration of their members is to please and obey the *khalīfa* of the time.

The Qadiani system of rule by a *khalīfa* possessing absolute, autocratic power is entirely repugnant to the teachings of Islam, and no trace whatsoever of any such concept is to be found anywhere in the writings of the Promised Messiah.

Anjuman made successor by the Promised Messiah.

It was in his booklet entitled *Al-Wasiyya* (The Will), published about two and a half years before his death, that Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad announced the creation of the Anjuman, and formulated its main objectives, rules and regulations. He wrote:

“If Allah wills, this system will continue to function after the death of us all. 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.”¹

In an Appendix to *Al-Wasiyya*, the Promised Messiah published some rules and regulations of the Anjuman, from which we quote below as they show the position he gave to this body:

“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.

1. *Al-Wasiyya*, published December 1905, p. 17.

2. This Appendix was published a few days later in January 1906.

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

Here the Promised Messiah calls the Anjuman as *his successor*. It is the Promised Messiah who is “the *Khalīfa* appointed by God” and his successor is the Anjuman created by him.

Rules and regulations of Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya.

In February 1906, more comprehensive rules and regulations of the *Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya*, as approved by the Promised Messiah, were published in the Ahmadiyya community’s newspaper *Badr*. We reproduce below some essential points from these rules, starting at the beginning:

Regulations of the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya Qadian

Approved by Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, the Promised Messiah.

1. The objective of this Anjuman is the propagation of Islam, to devise and put into action plans for the propagation of Islam, and to produce people who can preach Islam.
2. Every member of the Ahmadiyya movement who supports this movement in any way shall be a member of this Anjuman.
3. All the Ahmadiyya Anjumans established anywhere by members of the Ahmadiyya movement shall be branches of this Anjuman.
4. The control of the affairs of this Anjuman shall be in the charge of a Council of Trustees (*Majlis-i Mu’timidīn*).
- ...
6. Under the Council of Trustees there shall be four committees for the purposes of administration: *a.* Committee for the propagation of Islam; *b.* Committee for the affairs of the Cemetery; *c.* Committee for education; and, *d.* Committee for administration of miscellaneous affairs.
- ...
12. The powers and duties of the Council of Trustees shall be as follows:
 - a.* All the property which the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya or any branch of it may acquire anywhere shall be in the ownership of the

Council of Trustees. Whenever any property is acquired in the future, or sold, or let, the transaction shall be in the name of the Secretary of the Council on behalf of the Council. Likewise, in future all the income of the Ahmadiyya movement, whether by wills, gifts, *zakāt*, or under other heads, shall be in the name of the Council.

...

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. ...³

At the end of these regulations, it is stated: "The Promised Messiah appoints the following men as members and office-holders of the Council of Trustees." Then a list is printed of the names of these fourteen men, three of whom are office-holders whose names occur at the head of the list as follows:

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

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 trace whatsoever in these rules of any system of personal *khilāfat* or of any office of a *khalīfa* having supreme authority over the movement. Therefore the Qadiani concept and system of *khilāfat is totally alien and opposed* to the instructions of the Promised Messiah, and an utter negation of the system set up by him.

Anjuman to be supreme after Promised Messiah's life.

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

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

about the authority of the Anjuman, in his own hand-writing:

“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.”⁴

This clear verdict of the Promised Messiah confirmed the Anjuman’s position as the supreme authority of the Ahmadiyya movement after him, its decisions being final and binding. No individual head or *khalīfa* was to have the power to set aside, revoke, or go against any decision of the Anjuman.

Maulana Nur-ud-Din’s exposition of Anjuman’s position.

During his period as head, Maulana Nur-ud-Din too considered the Anjuman as being the *khalīfa* of the Promised Messiah for administrative affairs. During the course of his *khutba* on the occasion of ‘*Īd-ul-Fitr*’ on 16th October 1909, he re-iterated the position and the powers given to the Anjuman by the Promised Messiah. Referring to the booklet *Al-Wasiyya*, 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 *khalīfa*. On the other hand, he said to fourteen men: You are collectively the *Khalīfat-ul-Masīh*, 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* at the

4. Writing dated 27 October 1907. Its facsimile has been widely published.

hand of one man, accepting him as their *khalīfa*, and thus you were united. And then not only fourteen, but the whole community agreed upon my *khilāfat*.

“... I have read *Al-Wasiyya* very thoroughly. It is indeed true that he has made fourteen men the *Khalīfat-ul-Masīh*, 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 *khilāfat*, have by their righteous opinion, by their unanimous opinion, appointed one man as their *Khalīfa* and *Amīr*. 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.”⁵

The following points emerge very plainly from this speech:

1. The Promised Messiah made no mention of any individual to hold the office of *khalīfa* in the Ahmadiyya movement in a personal capacity.
2. He appointed the Anjuman, a body of fourteen men, as a collective *khalīfa*, whose decisions he declared as absolute, final and binding.
3. 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; in other words, the Anjuman was a legally registered association with the power of governing the movement.
4. It was the Anjuman which, by its unanimous agreement, had decided to accept one man, Maulana Nur-ud-Din, as the head or *khalīfa*. The Maulana did not become *khalīfa* because there existed any office or position of a personal *khalīfa* in the Ahmadiyya movement who would have supreme, absolute power over the movement.

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

M. Mahmud Ahmad usurps Anjuman's authority.

The establishment of the Anjuman on these principles by the Promised Messiah prevented anyone from becoming an autocratic head or creating an inherited spiritual seat (*gaddī*) in the Ahmadiyya Movement, as had been the fate of previous Muslim spiritual orders. Mirza Mahmud Ahmad, having exactly these ambitions of wielding absolute power, resented the formation and the powers of the Anjuman, and from the very time of the creation of the Anjuman he did all that he could to have it rendered powerless.

In March 1914, Mirza Mahmud Ahmad was successful in his long-standing plans to gain the headship of the movement upon the death of Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din. Immediately thereafter, having first ensured that no opposition could be voiced against him in Qadian, he had the following resolution of the Anjuman passed by his supporters:

“By Resolution 198 of the *Majlis-i Mu'timidīn* (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 Khalīfat-ul-Masīh Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad the second Khalīfa’ shall be entered. Therefore, Rule no. 18 shall now be as follows: In every matter, for the *Majlis-i Mu'timidīn* and its subordinate branches if any, and for the Sadr Anjuman and all its branches, the order of *Hazrat Khalīfat-ul-Masīh* Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad the second *Khalīfa* shall be absolute and final.”⁶

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

6. *Review of Religions*, Urdu edition, the issues for April 1914 and May 1914, inside of the front cover.

decisions. He thus destroyed the system created by Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, and replaced it by personal, autocratic rule by a *khalīfa*, the concept of which is in complete violation of the principles of Islam as well as the teachings of the Promised Messiah.

It will be seen that when Maulana Nur-ud-Din became head, he did not substitute his name for that of the Promised Messiah in this Rule. On the contrary, he followed the regulations laid down by the Promised Messiah regarding the powers of the Anjuman. Therefore, the sense in which M. Mahmud Ahmad made himself *khalīfa* was entirely different from, and quite opposed to, the sense in which Maulana Nur-ud-Din was *khalīfa*. This is one of the main reasons why those, like Maulana Muhammad Ali, who accepted Maulana Nur-ud-Din as *khalīfa* could not accept M. Mahmud Ahmad as *khalīfa*.

Anjuman made entirely subservient to *khalīfa*.

By means of the change in the rules referred to above, Mirza Mahmud Ahmad arrogated himself to the position of an absolute leader whose orders had to be obeyed unquestioningly by everyone in the movement. Despite this amendment and despite the fact that the Anjuman now consisted entirely of his own supporters, he still felt insecure that the Anjuman might seek to regain its authority some time in the future. In a speech in October 1925, therefore, he laid down a new system of administration, reducing the Council of Trustees to an entirely subservient body. In this speech, published under the title *Jamā'at Ahmadiyya kā jadīd nizām 'amal* ("A new system of working for the Ahmadiyya Movement"), at the very outset he attacked the principles upon which the Anjuman was founded, and declared:

“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.”⁷

He then announced his decision that the names *Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya* and *Majlis-i Mu'timidin* (Council of Trustees) would be transferred to certain other bodies, so that their names would be retained but the institutions themselves would cease to exist!

Mirza Mahmud Ahmad's statement given above is self-contradictory and indeed plainly absurd. Firstly, he admits that the Promised Messiah had given his approval of the name and the rules of the Anjuman, but he says that these were “devised by others” and then attacks the rules. This amounts to alleging that the Promised Messiah approved these rules merely at the behest of “others”, without himself knowing or caring that these would be harmful to the Movement, and now Mirza Mahmud Ahmad was going to rectify the Promised Messiah's error!

Secondly, since in his view the names as well as the rules were “devised by others” and merely approved by the Promised Messiah, it is entirely illogical for him to retain the names because of their association with the Promised Messiah's time but destroy the rules. The rules were also from the Promised Messiah's time. Therefore, the names and the rules should both be eliminated or both be retained!

M. Mahmud Ahmad's admissions in his speech.

There are several very interesting and revealing admissions made by Mirza Mahmud Ahmad in this speech. He said:

“The founding principle of the Council of Trustees (*Majlis-i Mu'timidin*) did not include the existence of the *khalīfa* of the time, which is the very fundamental issue in Islam. A resolution has been passed during the second *khilāfat* to the effect that the Council must accept whatever the *khalīfa* says.⁸ But this is not a matter of principle. What it means is that a body of members says

7. *Al-Fazl*, 31 October 1925, p. 3, col. 1.

8. The reference is to the resolution quoted on page 37.

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 *khalīfa* 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 *khalīfa* in everything but will not obey another one, it has the right to do so according to its rules.”⁹

Here Mirza Mahmud Ahmad has made the following two admissions:

1. There is no mention of the concept or the institution of a personal *khilāfat* 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 1914, to follow the *khalīfa’s* orders. This shows that the Anjuman was not originally created to be subservient to any individual leader, but was the supreme and sovereign executive of the Movement. He is, in fact, expressing his fear that the Anjuman may at some time in future decide to re-assert its original authority and cease to be subservient to an individual *khalīfa*.

Mirza Mahmud Ahmad then goes on to say:

“For the sake of the *khilāfat* 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. ... But because a difference arose regarding a teaching which was from God, and which had to be accepted for the sake of our faith and the *Jamā‘at*, we

9. *Al-Fazl*, 3 November 1925, p. 3, col. 1.

sacrificed those who were dearer to us than our children. So, over this question, we have made such a magnificent sacrifice that no other sacrifice can equal it. This is far greater than sacrificing one's life because in that case a man sacrifices only himself. But here we had to sacrifice a part of our Movement.

“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 *khilāfat* 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 *khilāfat* was not included in the basic principles of the *Jamā'at*, the movement lives in the constant danger which can turn the loyalists into non-loyalists,¹⁰ and by the stroke of the pen of ten or eleven men Qadian can at once become Lahore.

“Therefore, the works of the *Jamā'at* relating to propagation and training cannot be entrusted to such an Anjuman, even though that Anjuman may consist of loyalists, and even though they may be men of the highest sincerity.”¹¹

Here Mirza Mahmud Ahmad has made the following interesting admissions:

1. He and his supporters forced the “old followers, friends and companions of the Promised Messiah” out of the Ahmadiyya Movement, which he describes as “an unparalleled sacrifice” made by the Qadianis, in order to establish an autocratic *khilāfat*. This clearly disproves the allegation made commonly by the present-day Qadianis that the separation in the Movement in 1914 came about because Maulana Muhammad Ali was trying to become the head, and having failed in that

10. The word translated as *loyalists* is *mubā'īn*, referring to “those who have taken the *bai'at*” of the Qadiani *khalīfa*.

11. *Al-Fazl*, 3 November 1925, p. 3, cols. 1–2.

attempt he left and formed his own separate group. Mirza Mahmud Ahmad says here, on the contrary, that “we had to sacrifice a part of our Movement” for the sake of the system of *khilāfat*. In other words, Maulana Muhammad Ali and his associates were opposing the system of *khilāfat* which Mirza Mahmud Ahmad was striving to introduce, and this opposition was thus purged, or “sacrificed”, out of the Movement.

2. Mirza Mahmud Ahmad’s words that “by the stroke of the pen of ten or eleven men Qadian can at once become Lahore” are highly note-worthy. He is admitting 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. Since that is the difference, as admitted here, then it is false to allege that the Lahore Ahmadis separated from Qadian because Maulana Muhammad Ali failed to become the *khalīfa* there. If that had been the reason for the split, then the only way Qadian could become Lahore would be by accepting the Maulana as their leader!

Anjuman made entirely subservient.

Mirza Mahmud Ahmad then went on to announce in this speech that in his new system the term *Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya* would refer to “the *khalīfa* and his advisors”, the advisors would advise and the *khalīfa* would decide, and this would be known as the decision of the Sadr Anjuman. The *Majlis-i Mu’timidīn* (Council of Trustees) would merely carry out the decision without question.

A comparison with the *Regulations of the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya Qadian, approved by Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, the Promised Messiah*, as given on page 33, shows that the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya was meant to be the entire community (see no. 2), and the “control of the affairs of this Anjuman” was given entirely to the Council of Trustees (no. 4). It can be seen that Mirza Mahmud Ahmad demolished these institutions in order to create a system of absolute personal rule.

Sources

Listed below are the sources which have been quoted in this book, along with the year of first publication, and the page numbers of this book at which they have been cited.

Writings of Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad

<i>Izāla Auhām</i> (1891)	22 – 23, 26, 29.
From <i>Majmū‘a Ishihārāt</i> (1891)	29.
<i>Nishān Āsmānī</i> (1892)	23.
<i>Ā‘īnah Kamālāt Islam</i> (1893)	9, 23, 30.
<i>Jang Muqaddas</i> (1893)	30.
<i>Hamāmat al-Bushrā</i> (1894)	29.
From <i>Majmū‘a Ishihārāt</i> (1897)	30.
<i>Anjām Ātham</i> (1897)	23, 27, 30.
<i>Sirāj Munīr</i> (1897)	27.
<i>Kitāb al-Barriyya</i> (1898)	23, 27 – 28, 29 – 30.
<i>Ayyām as-Sulh</i> (1898)	24.
<i>Arba‘īn</i> (1900)	28.
<i>Tiryāq al-Qulūb</i> (1902)	10 – 11.
<i>Mawāhib ar-Rahmān</i> (1903)	28.
<i>Tazkirat ash-Shahādātāin</i> (1903)	24.
<i>Lecture Islam, Sialkot</i> (1904)	24.
<i>Al-Wasiyya</i> (1905)	24, 32 – 33.
<i>Haqīqat al-Wahy</i> (1907)	9 – 10, 16, 24, 28, 30.
Hand-written note (27 October 1907)	35.

Ahmadiyya journals (pre-Split)

<i>Al-Hakam</i> ,	15 – 16.
<i>Badr</i> ,	18 – 19, 33 – 34, 35 – 36.

Qadiani sources.

- The Truth about the Split*,
by Mirza Mahmud Ahmad (1924) 6–7.
- Ā'īnah-i Sadāqat*,
by Mirza Mahmud Ahmad (1921) 7.
- Anwār-i Khilāfat*,
by Mirza Mahmud Ahmad (1916) 13–15, 19, 25–26.
- Kalimat-ul-Fasal*,
by Mirza Bashir Ahmad (1915) 7–8.
- Journal Al-Fazl* 20, 38–41.
- Journal Review of Religions* (Urdu) 37.

Lahore Ahmadiyya publications.

- The Split in the Ahmadiyya
Movement*,
by Maulana Muhammad Ali (1918) 8–9.
- Radd Takfīr ahl-i Qibla*,
by Maulana Muhammad Ali (1920) 16, 17.
- Each and every Qadiani invited to
arbitrate* (Urdu)
by Maulana Muhammad Ali (1940) 17–18.
- Journal Paighām Sulh* 20.

Summary

Stark contrast between the views of the Promised Messiah and Mirza Mahmud Ahmad

The Promised Messiah:

1. “my belief from the beginning has been that no person becomes a *kāfir* or anti-Christ by denying my claim...”

“I do not apply the term *kāfir* to any person who professes the *Kalima* ...”

“I do not consider any Muslim to be a *kāfir*.”

He called it “a complete fabrication” the allegation that he had dubbed as *kāfir* those who had not even heard of him.

2. “If the deceased did not call us *kāfir* and liar, his funeral prayers may be said.”

Promised Messiah himself led funeral prayers

Mirza Mahmud Ahmad:

1. “all those so-called Muslims who have not entered into his [Promised Messiah’s] *bai‘at* formally, wherever they may be, are *Kafirs* and outside the pale of Islam, even though they may not have heard the name of the Promised Messiah. ... even those who, in their hearts, believe the Promised Messiah to be true, and do not even deny him with their tongues, but hesitate to enter into his *Bai‘at*, have here been adjudged to be *Kafirs*.”

2. “...a non-Ahmadi’s child is also a non-Ahmadi, and his funeral prayers must not be said ... if a man who believes Hazrat Mirza sahib to be true but has not yet taken the

The Promised Messiah
(*continued*):

for non-Ahmadis. He prayed for a non-Ahmadi saint who died in 1904 that “may God envelope him in mercy, and grant him a place near Him.”

3. “Our Holy Prophet is the *Khātām al-anbiyā*, and after him no prophet will come, neither any old one nor any new one.”

“...prophethood has in fact ended with our Holy Prophet.”

“The Holy Prophet closed the door absolutely to any new prophet or the return of any old prophet.”

4. After the Promised Messiah, “the decision of the Anjuman in any matter shall be final.”

Mirza Mahmud Ahmad
(*continued*):

bai‘at, or is still thinking about joining Ahmad-iyyat, and he dies in this condition, we must not offer funeral prayers for him.”

3. “Even if someone placed a sword on my neck and told me to say that no prophet can come after the Holy Prophet, I would say to him: you are a liar, a great liar. Prophets can come after the Holy Prophet, most certainly they can.”

“Let alone one prophet, I say thousands shall become prophets.”

4. “...for the Sadr Anjuman and all its branches, the order of *Hazrat Khalīfat-ul-Masīh* Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad the second *Khalīfa* shall be absolute and final.”