

Allegations of misinterpreting “The Will” of Promised Messiah

A reply to Ansar Raza’s article ‘Misinterpretation of The Will by AAIL’

by Dr Zahid Aziz

Mr Ansar Raza, in his capacity as Missionary of the AMJ, Canada (the Canada branch of the Qadiani Jamaat), has sent me an article he has written bearing the above title. It is written in reference to Maulana Muhammad Ali’s introductory and explanatory notes to the Will of the Promised Messiah (the book known as *Al-Wasiyyah*) which were published along with the Will itself shortly after the split in 1914. This edition being of course in Urdu, I translated it into English and added an Appendix of further references, and this was published in the year 2000. It is this publication which Mr Raza says he has analysed and found that we have “twisted and misinterpreted the concept of khilafat” presented by the Promised Messiah in his Will.

[See this link to read Ansar Raza’s article and our edition of The Will.](#)

Firstly, we welcome a response by a missionary of the Qadiani Jamaat, since the beliefs and arguments in it can be attributed to that Jamaat itself. Much more frequently, individual members of the Qadiani Jamaat engage with us in debate, but when we expose the hollowness of their arguments they reply that they were only representing themselves and not their Jamaat. So although our Qadiani opponent may lose the argument, yet the Qadiani Jamaat suffers no loss by sheltering behind that individual’s claim that he was speaking only on his own behalf.

Mr Ansar Raza begins by pointing out that the Promised Messiah has written in The Will that there are two manifestations of the power of God to help a prophet’s mission, the first during his life and the second after his death, and mentioning the examples of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, and of Moses and Jesus, he has written that after his own death too there will be the second manifestation of Divine power (*qudrat-i sani*) to strengthen his followers. According to the Qadiani Jamaat, this *qudrat-i sani* came in the form of the *khilafat* as soon as he died.

A point not realized by the Qadiani Jamaat is that Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad sahib has himself claimed to be part of that *qudrat-i sani* which was granted to the Holy Prophet Muhammad, just as Hazrat Abu Bakr was also *qudrat-i sani* granted to the Holy Prophet Muhammad.

He wrote in 1891 in his booklet *Fath-i Islam* that **God has sent him** as “a servant into the world specially for the purpose of the propagation of Islam, dissemination of the light of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, support of the Muslims and the reform of their internal condition” and that this was because God “had promised that He

would ever be the Guardian of the teaching of the Quran".¹ In the Will, he has written that **God raised Hazrat Abu Bakr** to rescue Islam from destruction in accordance with the promise given in the *khilafat* verse of the Quran (24:55) to the Holy Prophet of the coming of *qudrat-i sani* for his mission.² In many other places, for example in his book *Shahadat-ul-Quran*, he has quoted the same verse (24:55) and written that **he himself** has been raised by Allah in fulfilment of this promise that persons would be raised so that "the faith shall be revived at their hands and security shall be established after the prevalence of fear, i.e. they shall come at times when there would be disruption in the house of Islam".³

Apart from using similar words about his own mission and Hazrat Abu Bakr's rescue of Islam, the Promised Messiah has likened himself directly to Hazrat Abu Bakr. Writing in the same year 1905 when he wrote the Will, he explained while referring to the same verse (24:55) of the Quran: "There is a similarity between Abu Bakr, God be pleased with him, and the Promised Messiah, which is that the promise of God in the Holy Quran about both of them was that when a state of fear would prevail over Islam and people would start to become apostates, then these two would arise. Thus it so happened in the time of Hazrat Abu Bakr and that of the Promised Messiah".⁴

It is therefore absolutely plain and undeniable that the very basis of the claim of the Promised Messiah is that he is, like Hazrat Abu Bakr, part of the *qudrat-i sani* which was promised to the Holy Prophet Muhammad. And while the *qudrat-i sani* that was granted after Moses and after Jesus came to an end before the appearance of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, the *qudrat-i sani* granted to the Holy Prophet Muhammad is ever-lasting. Does the Qadiani Jamaat believe that the *qudrat-i sani* granted to the Holy Prophet Muhammad, which began with Hazrat Abu Bakr, **came to an end**, and it has been replaced by the *qudrat-i sani* granted to the Promised Messiah which is ever-lasting?

It is quite evident that the *qudrat-i sani* to come after the Promised Messiah for his Jamaat cannot be like the one which began with Hazrat Abu Bakr because the Promised Messiah himself is part of the same *qudrat-i sani* which began with Hazrat Abu Bakr. As Maulana Muhammad Ali has stated in his explanatory note number 2, when the Promised Messiah refers to the Divine aid which came for their followers after the Holy Prophet Muhammad, Moses and Jesus, he has simply pointed to the fact that God sends His aid and succour to the community of followers after the death of a prophet or a man appointed by God, whatever form that aid may take.

It is also abundantly clear that Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din did not consider his succession as the coming of *qudrat-i sani*. On the front page of *Badr*, dated 18 June 1908, there is an announcement to all Ahmadis everywhere, headed 'The Second

Power'. It states that it is issued by order of Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din who wishes to draw attention to "the following words of the Will". It then quotes the words relating to the coming of the *qudrat-i sani* after him, ending with: "So, in wait for the second power of God, you should gather together and pray. Every party of the righteous in each country should come together and pray constantly, so that the other power may descend from heaven and show you that your God is such a powerful God." The announcement then goes on to say that, in accordance with this, Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din has instructed that all Ahmadis must gather together and pray for the descent of this promised *qudrat-i sani*, and that this instruction is binding on all of them. It is signed by Maulana Muhammad Ali. If *qudrat-i sani* had appeared in the form of the *khilafat* of Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din, why was the Hazrat Maulana himself instructing the entire Jamaat to pray for its coming?

Less than a year before his death, Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din was asked the question as to what is *qudrat-i sani*. He replied:

"When the founder of a community is completing his work, then in order to accomplish that work the manifestation of the power of God (*qudrat*) takes place, as it says in the Holy Quran: 'This day have I perfected for you your religion and completed My favour upon you'. Its manifestation took place in the time of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of Allah be upon him. But after him, this continued in the times of his *khalifas*, deputies and *mujaddids*. They were all *qudrat-i sani*. *Qudrat-i sani* cannot be limited to a particular form. Whenever any nation becomes weak, then Allah the Most High, out of His wisdom, sends the second power in order to strengthen it." ⁵

I will add some more points about *qudrat-i sani* later in this reply when answering another criticism by Mr Raza.

Anjuman, responsible only for Administration and Finances

Mr Raza quotes some text from my Preface to the translation of the Will and draws from it the very strange conclusion that:

"...he (Zahid Aziz) **clearly admits** that the Promised Messiah created the Anjuman only for administrative and financial affairs of the Jamaat whereas the spiritual leadership is to be performed by an individual who shall be elected by at least forty members."

Mr Raza also quotes from Maulana Muhammad Ali's Introductory Note to support his strange conclusion. It is strange because there is no question of us making an **admission** on these points, since these are in fact our proclaimed beliefs, as opposed

to the Qadiani Jamaat standpoint! Mr Raza would have realized this if he had read the very next sentence after my words which he has quoted. I wrote:

“He (i.e., the Promised Messiah) has thus not given absolute power to any one individual nor created autocratic rule by a so-called *khalifa*.”

Certainly the Anjuman's role is, as Mr Raza puts it, “restricted only to administrative and financial works of Jamaat”, but it has complete authority over such matters. In fact, in the quotation that Mr Raza has himself given here from Maulana Muhammad Ali, the Maulana wrote that the Promised Messiah “**plainly gave all the powers** for the administration of the Movement after him to this Anjuman”. But the Qadiani Jamaat believes that the *Khalifa* may, at his entire whim and discretion, overturn any decision of the Anjuman in these matters. This disagreement was one of the main reasons for the Split in 1914. By calling it an admission by us, Mr Raza has shown that he has not understood what the disagreement was.

Similarly, on the point of who can receive the *bai`at* from people, Mr Raza has quoted me and Maulana Muhammad Ali as if we have made an admission in favour of the Qadiani Jamaat standpoint, and he claims that we have said that “the spiritual leadership is to be performed by **an individual** who shall be elected by at least forty members”. But immediately after the words he has quoted from Maulana Muhammad Ali from p. 4, the Maulana writes: “But Mirza Mahmud Ahmad does not accept its validity” and in his explanatory notes, the Maulana has made the point abundantly clear:

“These words (i.e., of the Promised Messiah) do not speak of only one man taking the *bai`at* from people. On the contrary, by using the plural he has made known that at any given time there may be several elders who could admit people into his *bai`at*. ... The words “any person...” clearly show that there can be more than one such person... For, whenever any forty faithful are agreed upon one man, he shall be entitled to take the *bai`at* from people.” (Note 5 on p. 39–40)

Khalifa of Jesus?

Ansar Raza attacks Maulana Muhammad Ali for saying, in reference to the coming of *qudrat-i sani*, that there was no series of *khalifas* after Jesus. He later claims (under sub-heading ‘Khilafat verse not revealed on Hazrat Isa?’) that the verse of the Quran promising *khilafat* among Muslims as there had been *khilafat* before them (24:55) requires that there should have been a *khilafat* after Jesus also, otherwise this statement of the Quran becomes untrue.

We point out that the Promised Messiah has repeatedly discussed and explained this verse of the Quran in many writings, and stated that the *khilafat* it refers to as having coming before Islam was the *khilafat* among the Israelites which began with Moses and **ended with Jesus 1400 years after Moses**. In his book *Shahadat-ul-Quran* he has dealt with this at great length:

“...having bestowed upon Moses His messengership, God then instituted in his law a long system of temporal as well as spiritual *khilafat*, by way of reward and favour, **which continued for about fourteen hundred years**, and ended with Jesus.”⁶

“...the system of *khilafat* in the *Shariah* of Moses **lasted for fourteen hundred years**, not just thirty years.”⁷

“...a system of *khilafat* was established in their progeny, which meant that many kings and elect of God arose in that nation, such as David and Solomon. And so it went on till this **system of *khilafat* came to an end in the fourteenth century with Jesus**.”⁸

“Given that God had explained by use of an analogy that He would raise *khalifas* among the Muslim people in the same manner as He raised *khalifas* after Moses, one should see what course did God follow after the death of Moses: did He send successors for only thirty years, or did He extend this series **for fourteen hundred years?**”⁹

“...God Almighty instituted for Moses **for fourteen hundred years a series of *khalifas*** who, in reality, appeared for the service of the Torah and the support of the law of Moses ...”¹⁰

Here are some of his statements from elsewhere expressing the same view:

“It is clear that the rank of *khalifa* of God among the Israelites began with Moses ... **and ended at last after 1400 years with Jesus**, son of Mary.”¹¹

“When the system of *khilafat* of the prophets of the Israelites is pondered over, it is seen that it began with Moses **and finished with Jesus 1400 years later**.”¹²

“It was written in the Torah about the last *khilafat* of the system of Moses that it would end with the Messiah who had been promised to the Jews, who would arise **at the end of this system after 1400 years**.”¹³

“God granted *khilafat* to the nation of Moses ... and He made His messenger Jesus, son of Mary, as its last *khalifa*. **So Jesus was the last brick of that building** and a sign of the hour of its decline.”¹⁴

“The limit of that system (i.e., of Moses) **was 1400 years** and *khalifas* kept coming ... The last *khalifa* of the Israelite system who came 1400 years after Moses was Jesus...”¹⁵

While writing this so many times, and so clearly, the Promised Messiah has never mentioned any *khilafat* after Jesus.

Also, explaining the basis of his own claim, the Promised Messiah has written extensively about the similarities between himself and Jesus. **Never once** has he mentioned any such similarity that a *khilafat* was established after Jesus and the same would happen after the Promised Messiah. In his book *Tazkirat-ush-shahadatain*, he has given a list of **sixteen** distinctive religious characteristics of Jesus and then shown how he resembles Jesus in all of these respects: “These are sixteen similarities between me and the Messiah”.¹⁶ Out of all those characteristics of Jesus, only number (7) and a part of number (5) relate to God’s assistance in rescuing the mission of Jesus. Number (5) includes that God accepted his prayer and saved him from death on the cross and granted him refuge in Kashmir. Number (7) is that eventually the Roman empire, which was at first opposed to Christianity, became Christian itself. The only resemblance with Jesus he has mentioned here in these respects is that people in Europe and America are starting to acknowledge the truth of his claims.

Many years before this, in his book *Fath-i Islam* published in 1891, the Promised Messiah did write about the help of God which came to Jesus after his death and how the same help would come to him after his own death. Before quoting that, let us remember for comparison what he has written in the Will in 1905:

“Similar was the case with Jesus. At the time of the crucifixion, all the disciples scattered, and one of them even became a renegade.”¹⁷

Now read what he wrote fourteen years before this in *Fath-i Islam*:

“Even the followers, disciples and friends of Jesus stumbled. One betrayed him for a bribe of thirty pieces of silver, another cursed him to his face pointedly, and the remaining disciples who professed great loyalty to him took to their heels, and they created many kinds of doubt in their hearts about Jesus. But as he was a righteous man, God brought his mission back to life after its death. The resurrection of Jesus, which is firmly fixed in the minds of the Christians, is in reality a reference to the revival of his religion which was res-

urrected after its death. In the same way, **God the Most High has also given to me the good news that after death He will raise me to life**, and has said that those who are near to God are brought to life again after their death. And He said: '*I shall display a flash of My light and raise you up by manifesting My power (qudrat).*' So the meaning of this second life of mine is only the keeping alive of my mission, but few are those people who understand these secrets." ¹⁸

So this is the *qudrat-i sani* as it came to Jesus and as it would come to Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. In this connection, please read notes (2) and (3) of Maulana Muhammad Ali's explanatory notes in our translation of the Will.

Khalifa of khalifa

Mr Ansar Raza objects to Maulana Muhammad Ali's statement that "it is meaningless to speak of a *khilafat* within a *khilafat*" and ridicules it by saying that every prophet is called *khalifa* of Allah, yet prophets themselves had *khalifas*, for example the Holy Prophet Muhammad is himself a *khalifa* but he has a *khilafat* after him. Again, he has not read the Maulana's opening words in the very quotation that he has himself given! The Maulana has written: "... in case of those men appointed by God **who are themselves khalifas of a prophet...**" (Note 2, p. 36), and Mr Raza has included this while giving the quotation about "meaningless". The example of the Holy Prophet Muhammad as himself a *khalifa* of Allah obviously does not apply here since he was not *khalifa* of a prophet!

As to his allegation that Maulana Muhammad Ali has made a "false attribution" to the Promised Messiah that Divine aid to *khalifas* of a prophet "does not take the form of *khalifas*", the Maulana has fully explained it in his next Note 3 on p. 36–38, referring to the promise to Jesus (the Quran, 3:55) and the Promised Messiah's similar revelation. We may also add that in the Will the Promised Messiah has made no mention of the powers of a *khalifa* and declared the Anjuman as being "the successor to the *Khalifa* appointed by God", i.e., his successor. Then, as shown just above, he wrote that the Divine aid after his lifetime is the "keeping alive" of his mission.

Misquoting Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din

Mr Ansar Raza, under this heading, not only accuses Maulana Muhammad Ali of "daringly" misquoting from an Eid *khutba* of Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din but he even seems to know the Maulana's inner mind because he adds that the Maulana was not afraid that "his tampering and manipulation" would be caught. We advise Mr Raza that instead of spewing out such hatred, all he need have said was that Maulana Muhammad Ali has quoted Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din out of context. Mr Raza has then highlighted three statements from the same *khutba*: one which occurs just

above the extract that the Maulana has quoted, one from within it which the Maulana omitted for brevity, and the third which occurs immediately after it. Let us look at these three.

The first as presented by Mr Raza begins as follows: "Four have been mentioned. Now I am your khalifa." Does he expect people to understand this without knowing what is meant by "four have been mentioned"? Members of the Qadiani Jamaat may well get the impression that by these "four" Maulana Nur-ud-Din means the four *khulafa rashideen*, Hazrats Abu Bakr, Umar, Uthman and Ali, and that he is a *khalifa* like them, because that is what they believe about *khilafat*. So let us provide even more context than Mr Raza has done.

Earlier in his *khutba*, Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din deals with a general point that the original meanings of terms becomes changed in general usage, and he gives a few examples.¹⁹ Later in his *khutba*, just before saying "four have been mentioned", what he has mentioned are four examples of the application of the word *khalifa*. He mentions: "One there was Adam...", "Then David...", and "The third *khalifa* is Abu Bakr...", and refers to the objections raised against these three. He then adds:

"Fourthly, all of you are *khalifa*. Thus God said: 'Then We have you *khalifas* in the land', after destroying the previous nations We made you their *khalifa*, 'that We may see how you act'." (He is quoting here the Quran, 10:14).²⁰

This is followed by what Mr Raza has quoted: "Four have been mentioned...". It seems clear that he is indicating different kinds of *khilafat* and the breadth of the meaning of this term, so much so that the fourth kind is the *khilafat* granted to a whole people who are successors or *khalifas* of unrighteous nations destroyed before them (i.e., there can be *khilafat* to something which was bad)!

In the next paragraph occurs the text which is quoted in the notes to our edition of The Will, where he calls the Anjuman created by the Promised Messiah as "collectively the *Khalifat-ul-Masih*", and says that he indeed made "fourteen men the *Khalifat-ul-Masih*" and that these were the men he "chose for his *khilafat*". Readers can easily see that Maulana Muhammad Ali has not at all "daringly misquoted" this *khutba* of Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din.

The second statement highlighted by Mr Raza are the words which Maulana Muhammad Ali omitted from within the extract that he quoted in his notes. After the words which he did quote, i.e., "And then not only fourteen, but the whole community agreed upon my *khilafat*", Mr Raza reminds us and highlights that Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din said: "Now, whosoever opposes this consensus is the opponent of God...".

The word for “consensus” here is *ijma*. In fact, what we ourselves translated in the preceding words as “the whole community agreed upon my *khilafat*” also uses the same word *ijma*, translated by us as “agreed”. Does Mr Raza realise what is *ijma*? It is unanimous or near-unanimous agreement of a people. When Allah appoints a person, as in the case of the Holy Prophet Muhammad or Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, the man appointed is actually rejected, and not accepted, by people at the time of his appointment, and the question of their *ijma* does not arise.

The third statement highlighted by Mr Raza, beginning “Would Allah destroy the whole community? Absolutely not” has the same meaning as the second one. In both statements, he is warning of the sin of opposing such a consensus and near-unanimous agreement of the community.

The conclusion drawn by Maulana Muhammad Ali from the above extract, which Ansar Raza has rejected, is absolutely established and is not at all nullified by the additional statements he has quoted. Ansar Raza’s conclusions from the same extract are as follows:

“...that the 14 members of Anjuman are under the command of a Khalifa and that they are answerable to him, not he is to them, (and) supposed to work under their whims and desires.”

I wonder if Mr Raza has read the extracts from the speech by his second *khalifa* Mirza Mahmud Ahmad, which I had reproduced in the Appendix of our translation of the Will on pages 56–60, the very book that he is commenting on. This speech was made in 1925, eleven years after he became *khalifa*.²¹

For the elucidation of our readers, in 1925 Mirza Mahmud Ahmad expressed his deep worry that the Anjuman’s obedience to the *khalifa* was only by the Anjuman’s own choice and decision, and by a resolution which it passed in April 1914 shortly after he became *khalifa*. He said:

“The founding principle of the Council of Trustees (i.e., the Anjuman) 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. But this is not a matter of principle.”²²

Here I pause to say that Mr Ansar Raza, under the heading *A Separate Matter?*, has bitterly castigated Maulana Muhammad Ali for writing that: “The fact that the whole of the Jama’at united upon his (i.e., Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din’s) hand is a separate matter which has no connection with the directions of *Al-Wasiyyat*.” Mr

Raza calls it "the most abominable allegation". But here his own second *khalifa* and so-called *Muslih Mau'ood* writes that the obedience of the Anjuman to the *khalifa* is a separate matter which has no connection with the founding principles of the Anjuman, i.e. the Will. After saying "But this is not a matter of principle", Mirza Mahmud Ahmad goes on to explain:

"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." ²³

This entirely disposes of the claim made by Mr Ansar Raza that the members of the Anjuman are "under the command of a Khalifa and that they are answerable to him, not he is to them (and) supposed to work under their whims and desires".

Mr Raza's mention of the "whims and desires" of the members of the Anjuman is also reflected in Mirza Mahmud Ahmad's speech. In it, he goes on to say that great sacrifices were made for the sake of establishing the *khilafat* and adds:

"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 movement lives in the constant 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**. Therefore, the works of the Jama'at relating to propagation and training cannot be entrusted to such an Anjuman, even though that Anjuman may consist of pledged members, and even though they may be men of the highest sincerity." ²⁴

He says that as long as the Anjuman, although it is now subservient to him, has the power to decide that it shall not obey the *khalifa*, even his own pledged members of the "highest sincerity" (*behtareen mukhlis*) cannot be trusted to remain loyal and could pass a resolution at any time which would turn the Qadiani Jamaat into the Lahori Jamaat. According to Qadiani Jamaat beliefs, the "whims and desires" mentioned by Mr Raza afflict everyone except the *khalifa*. The *khalifa* is the only one free from being misled by his personal desires, and even his most devoted and most sincere followers may at any time leave the right path and combine to sabotage the *khilafat*.

So until October 1925, more than 17 years after the *khilafat* was supposedly established upon the death of the Promised Messiah, the Anjuman created by him in his Will possessed the discretion and power whether to obey or not to obey the *khalifa*. And this was the Anjuman operating in the Qadiani Jamaat itself since 1914. It was in 1925 that Mirza Mahmud Ahmad took that power away finally.

Incidentally, the *khutba* by Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din, about which Mr Raza alleges that we have misrepresented it, contains some remarks about himself personally which show that his concept of the position of *khalifa* was opposite to the Qadiani Jamaat concept. He said:

"I am in the last phase of my life, at more than seventy years of age, and if I live much longer I would lose the strength which I had before. ... I have no anxieties about my children, that their livelihood depends on my money. ... If I have any anxiety, it is that no one will accompany me into my grave and on the Day of Judgment. **So whatever I preach to you, I cannot forget to apply it to myself. It cannot possibly be like that.**" ²⁵

"I wish to die as a believer. I hope for mercy from Allah. Just as He has taught and guided me up to this age, I hope also that He will grant me a good end to my life, and will cause me to die in a state of obedience to the Quran and the Messenger, may peace and the blessings of Allah be upon him." ²⁶

Has any Qadiani *khalifa* after him ever said that he is worried about the punishment of the next life if he fails to practise himself what he preaches to his Jamaat, or that he "hopes" to die in a state of obedience to Allah and the Holy Prophet? Their doctrine is that they, being *khalifas*, are representatives of Allah on earth and cannot be questioned by any human being since they are acting exactly according to Allah's commands. This is why they teach that no person except the *khalifa* can be trusted to remain true to the right beliefs.

Called Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din as *Khalifatul Masih*

Earlier in his article, under the above heading, Mr Raza has reproduced a page from *Badr* of 1910, where there is an announcement by Maulana Muhammad Ali and his comrades in which they refer to Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din as *Khalifat-ul-Masih*. He claims this shows that they held him to be *khalifa* in the sense of an autocratic and unaccountable head, as the Qadiani Jamaat members understand a *khalifa* to be. We have left answering this till here because this announcement appeared in the same issue of *Badr* in which the above-discussed *khutba* of Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din was published, and immediately follows it. In that *khutba* Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din has shown how the title *khalifa* is used in different ways, for example, for all the

people of a community, and for the Anjuman itself, about which he says that it was made *Khalifat-ul-Masih* by the Promised Messiah himself. Then how can the use of this same title in the announcement by Maulana Muhammad Ali and his comrades imply the Qadiani Jamaat concept of a *khalifa*? By calling him *Khalifat-ul-Masih*, they mean the successor of the Promised Messiah, but there is no implication whatsoever in this term of regarding him as an infallible, sinless leader to be obeyed blindly, and with whom no one can differ in any interpretation.

Maulana Muhammad Ali as *khalifa* of Allah

Mr Raza's last allegation is most absurd and bizarre. He puts forward an incident related by Mr N. A. Faruqi in Maulana Muhammad Ali's biography *Mujahid-i Kabir* on p. 407 to the effect that Syed Asadullah Shah, a recipient of revelation in the Lahore Ahmadiyya Jamaat, wrote about one of his revelations in a letter to Mr Faruqi. In this revelation Maulana Muhammad Ali was described by Allah as "Our *khalifa* in the earth". Mr Raza asks why we accept such a revelation without objection, which is giving the Maulana "a status which is not less than that of a Prophet".

Here is our answer. Maulana Muhammad Ali never himself put forward this revelation, let alone making any claim on the basis of it. Members of the Lahore Ahmadiyya Jamaat have never been asked to accept this revelation or to give Maulana Muhammad Ali any status in accordance with it. The recipient of this revelation only mentioned it in a private letter and it seems to have become public only after the Maulana's death. Such revelations in regard to persons who are not appointed with a mission from Allah, as the Maulana was not, do not constitute an argument to be presented for acceptance before anyone, but are for strengthening the personal faith of the recipient and his co-thinkers.

If Mr Raza turns to p. 411, four pages further on, he will read Mr Faruqi recounting a spiritual experience of Maulana Muhammad Ali which he related to Mr Faruqi in private with no one else present. The Maulana saw himself being closely embraced by Allah and clasped to His chest with love like maternal love. Writing some years later in an article in *Paigham-i Sulh*, Mr Faruqi related the same incident and added the following at the end:

"Just then someone else came in. I wanted to relate this vision to him but the Hazrat Maulana stopped me by an indication. However, I do not think there is any harm in relating it after his death."²⁷

A final point

Ansar Raza writes near the end of his article that with a friend like Maulana Muhammad Ali the Ahmadiyya Movement does not need an enemy. We say that the

Qadiani Jamaat definitely needs a friend like Maulana Muhammad Ali, because whenever they are caught in difficulties due to their extreme beliefs they seek shelter in the beliefs of Maulana Muhammad Ali which they rejected and for which they reviled him. Mirza Mahmud Ahmad, in his book *The Truth about the Split*, declared that his beliefs, which he had also expressed in an earlier writing, are as follows:

1. "...those who did not believe in the Promised Messiah were not Muslims."
2. "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."
3. "...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*."
4. "...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*." ²⁸

Yet when Mirza Mahmud Ahmad and his Jamaat were required to appear before the Munir Court of Inquiry in Lahore in 1954, they adopted the Lahore Ahmadiyya view-point and said:

1. "... no person can be called a non-Muslim because of not believing in the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement." ²⁹
2. "A person who does not believe in Mirza Ghulam Ahmad sahib cannot be declared as outside the pale of Islam." ³⁰

The next *Khalifa* Mirza Nasir Ahmad said at a press conference in Norway:

3. "Those people who do not accept us as Muslims are acting against the Quran. But we accept their right to call themselves Muslims, and we consider them to be a part of the Islamic community (*Ummah*)." ³¹

The fourth *Khalifa*, Mirza Tahir Ahmad, wrote:

4. "The Prophet^{sa} gave us two definitions of a Muslim. At the time of the first census of Medina, the Prophet^{sa} said: 'Write down for me the name of everyone who calls himself a Muslim.' On another occasion the Prophet^{sa} said: 'Whoever prays as we pray and turns to our Qiblah and eats what we ritually slaughter is a Muslim...'" ³²

Thus all these *khalifas* of the Qadiani Jamaat sought shelter in the standpoint of Maulana Muhammad Ali, while throughout his life the Qadiani Jamaat bitterly opposed him on exactly this issue and staunchly adhered to Mirza Mahmud Ahmad's creed as quoted above from the book *The Truth about the Split*.

Notes:

- ¹ *Fath-i Islam*, in *Ruhani Khaza'in*, v. 3, p. 6.
- ² *Al-Wasiyyah*, in *Ruhani Khaza'in*, v. 20, p. 305.
- ³ *Shahadat-ul-Quran*, in *Ruhani Khaza'in*, v. 6, p. 339.
- ⁴ *Barahin Ahmadiyya*, Part 5, in *Ruhani Khaza'in*, v. 21, p. 286, footnote; see also *Tuhfa Golarwiyya*, in *Ruhani Khaza'in*, v. 17, p. 189–191, footnote, for a similar statement.
- ⁵ *Badr*, 22 May 1913, pages 3 – 4.
- ⁶ *Shahadat-ul-Quran*, in *Ruhani Khaza'in*, v. 6, p. 322.
- ⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 324.
- ⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 326.
- ⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 354.
- ¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 363.
- ¹¹ *Izala Auham*, in *Ruhani Khaza'in*, v. 3, p. 461.
- ¹² *Ayyam-us-Sulh*, in *Ruhani Khaza'in*, v. 14, p. 283–284.
- ¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 284.
- ¹⁴ *Khutba Ilhamiyya*, in *Ruhani Khaza'in*, v. 16, p. 74–75.
- ¹⁵ Report of Annual *Jalsa* of 1897, p. 53 and p. 58.
- ¹⁶ See *Ruhani Khaza'in*, v. 20, p. 25–35.
- ¹⁷ *Al-Wasiyyah*, in *Ruhani Khaza'in*, v. 20, p. 305.
- ¹⁸ *Fath-i Islam*, in *Ruhani Khaza'in*, v. 3, p. 15–16, footnote.
- ¹⁹ One example he gives is the word *ulama*. According to the Quran it means those who fear God through their knowledge, but he explains that it has come to indicate those who are arrogant because of their knowledge.
- ²⁰ *Badr*, 21 October 1909, p. 11, col. 1.
- ²¹ Since the publication of our translation of The Will, this speech has become available on the Qadiani Jamaat website in the collection of Mirza Mahmud Ahmad's writings entitled *Anwar-ul-'Ulum*, in volume 9, number 9, on pages 125 to 146.
- ²² *Anwar-ul-'Ulum*, v. 9, number 9, p. 132.
- ²³ *Ibid.*, p.132.
- ²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 132–133.
- ²⁵ *Badr*, 21 October 1909, p. 10, col. 1.
- ²⁶ *Ibid.*, col. 2.
- ²⁷ *Paigham Sulh*, 10–17 October 1979. See also *A Mighty Striving*, English translation of *Mujahid-i Kabir*, p. 523, footnote.
- ²⁸ *The Truth about the Split*, 2007 edition, p. 144, 146, and 148. These are his own words translated into English by the Qadiani Jamaat.
- ²⁹ Signed statement of the advocate of the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya Rabwah, published as the Urdu pamphlet *Tahqiqati Commission kay Sat Swalon ka Jawab*, publisher Dar-ut-Tajleed, Lahore, September 1953, p. 2.
- ³⁰ *Tahqiqati 'adalat main Hazrat Imam Jama'at Ahmadiyya ka Bayan* ('Testimony of the Head of the Ahmadiyya Community at the Court of Inquiry'), published by Dar-ut-Tajleed, Lahore, p. 28.
- ³¹ Qadiani Jamaat publication *Daura Maghrib 1400 Hijra*, p. 217.
- ³² Mirza Tahir Ahmad, *Murder in the Name of Allah*, 1989, beginning of Chapter Six.