

Read the full book: *The True Succession*

5. Events of the Split*

The foundations of the split were laid during the life of Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din, but to understand it one has to go back to 1905–1906 when the Promised Messiah wrote the booklet *Al-Wasiyyat* and established the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya. He created the administrative system of his community on the broad Islamic principles of democracy, thus putting before the world a magnificent achievement of the revival of true Islam. During his own lifetime he set that system into operation and ran the Movement according to those principles, by setting up the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya Qadian in 1906 and handing over to it all the management of the Movement. He declared that after his lifetime the decisions of this Anjuman would be final and binding.

Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad, son of the Promised Messiah, inwardly resented this, and began to entertain feelings of jealousy and animosity particularly towards Maulana Muhammad Ali and Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din. He devoted much time to devising ways of rendering the Anjuman powerless.

Death of Promised Messiah and *bai'at* of Maulana Nur-ud-Din

After the death of the Promised Messiah on 26 May 1908, when his body reached Qadian for burial, Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din said to Maulana Muhammad Ali in the cemetery garden that it had been proposed that Maulana Nur-ud-Din should succeed the Promised Messiah. He replied that he fully agreed with the proposal. Then the Khwaja sahib added that it was also proposed that all Ahmadis should take the pledge (*bai'at*) on Maulana Nur-ud-Din's hand. Maulana Muhammad Ali replied that there

*Material for chapters 5 and 6 is taken from the English translation of the biography of Maulana Muhammad Ali entitled *A Mighty Striving*, with editing and many additions.

was no need for that because only new entrants to the Movement need take the pledge and that this was the purport of *Al-Wasiyyat*. The Khwaja sahib said that it was a delicate time and any difference of opinion may cause division in the community, and there was no harm in Ahmadis taking the pledge again. At this, Maulana Muhammad Ali agreed and the pledge was taken at Maulana Nur-ud-Din's hand. A few prominent Ahmadis, one being Maulana Ghulam Hasan Khan, did not take the *bai'at* on his hand on principle. Maulana Nur-ud-Din did not criticise or expel them, but, in fact, continued to treat them with respect.

Maulana Nur-ud-Din and Maulana Muhammad Ali were very close to one another. Maulana Nur-ud-Din consulted Maulana Muhammad Ali about all the matters in hand, and whatever announcement he had to issue he would get it drafted by Maulana Muhammad Ali. This close bond further intensified the jealousy that some others felt towards Maulana Muhammad Ali and they decided to undermine this relationship between the two. Maulana Muhammad Ali considered the *khilafat* after the Promised Messiah to be only in the sense of 'successorship', and he held that the Divinely-ordained *khilafat*, whose establishment is mentioned in the *khilafat* verse of the Holy Quran (24:55), was promised to the Holy Prophet Muhammad only, and not to Hazrat Mirza sahib. The persons bearing a grudge against him misrepresented this by telling Maulana Nur-ud-Din at every opportunity that Maulana Muhammad Ali did not accept him as *khalifa*. For some time they succeeded in misleading him.

Mischief-making questions about Anjuman versus *khalifa*

In the annual report for 1908, prepared by Maulana Muhammad Ali and read out by him on 26 December 1908 at the annual gathering, the first such gathering since the death of the Promised Messiah, the creation of the Anjuman by Hazrat Mirza sahib was mentioned and it was stated that the running of the Movement after him had been placed by him in the hands of the Anjuman. The Maulana also read out the note by Hazrat Mirza sahib about the powers of the Anjuman after his lifetime, which we have already quoted on page 34. In the news of the gathering in *Badr* it is stated:

“A hand written note of the Promised Messiah was read, the summary of which is that after him all decisions of the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya will be final.”¹

Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din also mentioned in his speech at this gathering that Hazrat Mirza sahib had appointed the Anjuman as his successor. He was reported in *Badr* as saying:

“Around 22 December 1905 the Promised Messiah received a revelation that very few days remained [of his life]. Upon this, he immediately wrote and published his Will, and separated himself almost entirely from the management of the Movement, handing over all the work to the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya, as if he was ready to meet his Maker at any moment. ... he sowed a crop entirely by his own labour with the help of God. But when the time came to reap the crop and eat the fruit, he gave it not to his offspring nor to his relatives, but to a man who had come from outside [Maulana Nur-ud-Din]. ... Anyhow, this Imam has appointed this Anjuman as his successor.”²

This gave an opportunity to the mischief makers, so that Mir Muhammad Ishaq, maternal uncle of Mirza Mahmud Ahmad, composed a set of seven questions: (1) Is the Anjuman subservient to the *Khalifa* (Maulana Nur-ud-Din) or vice versa? (2) Can the Anjuman dismiss the *Khalifa* or vice versa? (3) How far can the *Khalifa* interfere in the affairs of the Anjuman?, the remaining four questions being along the same lines.

These they sent to Maulana Nur-ud-Din and told him that Maulana Muhammad Ali, Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din and their associates did not really accept him as *khalifa*. Maulana Nur-ud-Din sent those seven questions to Maulana Muhammad Ali to give a reply to. When he received his reply, he sent it to the questioner. But they did not rest at that, and sent further questions to Maulana Nur-ud-Din. The answers which Maulana Muhammad Ali gave are quoted in full by him in his book *Haqiqat-i Ikhtilaf*.³ In brief he repeated that Hazrat Mirza sahib had made the Anjuman as his successor but everyone unanimously accepted Maulana Nur-ud-Din as their leader. There was no dispute between him

and the Anjuman so all these questions were hypothetical and premature, and an attempt to break up the Anjuman. He added that the Anjuman should answer these questions. On receiving this reply Maulana Nur-ud-Din directed that these questions be sent to forty people for their views, he should be informed of their opinions and they should all assemble in Qadian on 31 January 1909.

At the gathering on 31 January, Maulana Nur-ud-Din expressed his views. Though he did state that a *khalifa* had other duties and functions than merely to lead the prayers, he did not clarify any further and in the end he repeated what Maulana Muhammad Ali had already said, that these questions were irrelevant at that stage and it was wrong to dwell on them. His final decision was that, as both the parties had confidence in him, these questions must not be raised in his lifetime.

After his speech he made Mirza Mahmud Ahmad and Mir Nasir Nawab, father-in-law of the Promised Messiah, to promise that they would obey him, and then he took the pledge from Maulana Muhammad Ali and Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din on one side and from Shaikh Yaqub Ali and Mir Muhammad Ishaq on the other. The purpose of this was to affirm that they would obey him during his life, as both sides had already acknowledged that they obeyed him. This was all that happened, but afterwards this incident was misrepresented with embellishments by Mirza Mahmud Ahmad and his followers. Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din clarifies this event as follows:

“It is said that Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din made me take the *bai'at* again. This is perfectly true. But what was the *bai'at* about? It was the *bai'at* of obedience (*bai'at-i irshad*) to him. Can you honestly say that he made me retake the *bai'at* of repentance? Now go and read the histories of the Sufis and see from which discipline they take the *bai'at* of obedience. ...

It is the height of injustice and fabrication that it has been spread about that we were opposed to him and he made us renew our *bai'at*. ... It was this very *bai'at* of obedience that Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din took from

Hazrat Mian sahib [Mirza Mahmud Ahmad] and [Mir Nasir] Nawab sahib verbally in my presence at that time.”⁴

He goes on to write:

“In 1908 the Promised Messiah left this world. Immediately after the close of 1908, some questions are raised about the Anjuman and the *khalifa*, with the aim of giving absolute power to the *khalifa*. These are sent to certain people. I write my reply to them and send it to Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din. I state plainly that I give preference to your decision over my opinion and the opinion of the Anjuman only because, due to your personal qualities, I believe that I should follow your instructions, otherwise I do not consider the *khalifa* to be a ruler over the Anjuman. I said this to him verbally as well. At that time there were two groups which differed over the issues raised in these questions. On the one side was Hazrat Mian sahib [Mirza Mahmud Ahmad] and [Mir Nasir] Nawab sahib, and on the other side was Hazrat Maulvi Muhammad Ali and other friends. As both sides regarded the instructions of Hazrat Hakim sahib as above all, and I too said to him that I accept his orders, so he took from me the *bai‘at* of obedience in the manner of the righteous ones of the past. Before doing this, he asked the Mian sahib if he would obey him. The Mian sahib replied that he would, and that he would also obey *khalifas* after him. As far as I remember, he took the same promise from the Nawab sahib. This is the *bai‘at* which has been unjustly called as the renewal of my *bai‘at*.”⁵

It may be noted here that Maulana Nur-ud-Din never made people acknowledge him as the kind of autocratic *khalifa* with absolute and dictatorial powers that Mirza Mahmud Ahmad became in 1914, nor did he ever override any decision of the Anjuman. Above all, the rules and regulations of the Anjuman remained the same during his period of headship as they had

been framed by the Promised Messiah, but Mirza Mahmud Ahmad started altering them as soon as he became *khalifa*.

As Mirza Mahmud Ahmad and his supporters did not succeed in achieving their real aim, they continued trying to revive the dissension. They tried their level best to impress again and again upon Maulana Nur-ud-Din that these people were inwardly opposed to him. Mirza Mahmud Ahmad was the main instigator of this, as is proved by a letter he wrote to Maulana Nur-ud-Din which was published later on by Maulana Muhammad Ali in his book *Haqiqat-i Ikhtilaf*. In it Mirza Mahmud Ahmad did his best to provoke Maulana Nur-ud-Din to expel Maulana Muhammad Ali and his associates from the community. He wrote:

“A boil full of pus gets worse the longer it is left. ... I have come to the conclusion that now is the time that this ill condition should be remedied. ... it is best to nip it in the bud before it becomes a firm tree.”⁶

As Mirza Mahmud Ahmad and his party continued their propaganda, and attempted to influence Maulana Nur-ud-Din, he said that he would make an announcement on the coming *Eid* day in October 1909. The mischief-makers expected him to announce that he would take away power from the Anjuman. As it turned out, the day before *Eid* Maulana Nur-ud-Din accepted assurances from the Lahore members that this was all false propaganda against them, and he did not make any announcement on *Eid* day. However, during the course of his *Eid khutba*, on 16 October 1909, he reiterated the position and the powers given to the Anjuman by the Promised Messiah. Referring to the Promised Messiah's Will, he said:

“In the writing of Hazrat sahib [*Al-Wasiyyat* by 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 *khalifa*. On the other hand, he said to fourteen men: You are collectively the *Khalifat-ul-Masih*, your decisions are final and binding, and the government authorities too consider them as absolute. Then all those fourteen men became united in taking the *bai'at* at the hand of one man, accepting him as

their *khalifa*, and thus you were united. And then not only fourteen, but the whole community agreed upon my *khilafat*. ...

I have read *Al-Wasiyyat* very thoroughly. It is indeed true that he has made fourteen men the *Khalifat-ul-Masih*, and written that their decision arrived at by majority opinion is final and binding. Now observe that these God-fearing men, whom Hazrat sahib chose for his *khilafat*, have by their righteous opinion, by their unanimous opinion, appointed one man as their *Khalifa* and *Amir*. And then not only themselves, but they made thousands upon thousands of people to embark in the same boat in which they had themselves embarked.”⁷

Maulana Nur-ud-Din’s 1912 visit to Lahore — exonerates Lahore members

Mirza Mahmud Ahmad continued his most strenuous efforts to create mistrust in Maulana Nur-ud-Din’s mind against Maulana Muhammad Ali, Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din and other prominent persons who later founded the Lahore *Jama’at*. The Ansarullah party, a group created by Mirza Mahmud Ahmad, continued their false propaganda especially against Maulana Muhammad Ali and Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din.

However, when Maulana Nur-ud-Din visited Lahore in June 1912 he exonerated them of the charges against them. He paid this visit to lay the foundation stone of a building belonging to Shaikh Rahmatullah, a member of the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyah appointed by Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, who later became a founding member of the Lahore Ahmadiyya *Jama’at*. According to the Qadiani *Jama’at* version of the split, Shaikh Rahmatullah was among the rebels against the so-called *khilafat*. Yet Maulana Nur-ud-Din said in his speech at the foundation stone laying:

“My leader and my benefactor, the Promised Messiah, had promised Shaikh Rahmatullah that he would lay the foundation stone of his building with his own hands. It was the will of God that his promise should be carried

out by a servant of his. The Shaikh sahib asked me to come. I am ill and in discomfort because of pain in various parts of the body, but there is an urge in my heart that I must fulfil the word of my beloved.”⁸

In a report of his visit to Lahore, published at the time in *Badr*, it is stated:

“Hazrat *Khalifat-ul-Masih* [Maulana Nur-ud-Din] stayed at the residence of Dr Mirza Yaqub Baig, which is situated within its [Ahmadiyya Buildings’] bounds...

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

We congratulate the *Jama‘at* of Lahore on this good fortune. In the construction of this mosque, the entire *Jama‘at* of Lahore has participated, each according to his means. However, when it was being built we saw that the man who more than anyone else took pains over its construction and displayed the greatest zeal was our honoured friend Dr Syed Muhammad Husain Shah. May Allah the Most High reward them all. After his return to Qadian, Hazrat [Maulana Nur-ud-Din] also expressed his pleasure over the mosque in his first talk on the Quran.”⁹

Here two founding members of the Lahore Ahmadiyya Movement are mentioned, Dr Mirza Yaqub Baig and Dr Syed Muhammad Husain Shah, who were, according to the Qadiani *Jama‘at* propaganda, rebellious against Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din and whom he was castigating *at this very time*. But the reality is clear from this report, that Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din was highly pleased with them. His own words from his speech at

Ahmadiyya Buildings were reported in the next issue of *Badr* as follows:

“This is the mosque which has pleased my heart very greatly. I have prayed much for its founders and those who assisted in its building, and I am sure that my prayers have reached the *arsh* (throne of Allah).”¹⁰

He ended this speech on the same note:

“Look at your differences. Will they lead you to meet God? If not, then accept what I say and live in harmony, and live in such a way that, when I see you, it would please me just as I was pleased to see this mosque.”¹¹

This is the mosque where the Lahore Ahmadiyya Movement established its headquarters two years later in 1914, after the split.

In this speech Maulana Nur-ud-Din referred to the allegations being made against the Lahore members. He said:

“The third thing is that some persons, who are known as my friends and are my friends, hold the view and say that the people from Lahore are an obstacle in the affairs of the *khilafat*. ...

It is said in the Holy Quran: ‘O you who believe, avoid much of suspicion, surely suspicion is in many cases a sin’ [49: 12], and the Holy Prophet has said suspicion is the worst kind of lie. Allah has given the teaching to refrain from thinking ill of others, as it will turn you into evil doers. The Holy Prophet has said that he who indulges in thinking ill of others is a great liar, so keep away from this. Even now I have a slip of paper in my hand on which someone writes that the Lahore *Jama‘at* is an obstacle in the way of the *khilafat*. I say to such critics, you are thinking ill of others, give it up. You should first of all try to make yourselves sincere as they are. The people of Lahore are sincere. They love Hazrat [Mirza Ghulam Ahmad] sahib. Human beings make mistakes and they too can make mistakes, but the

works which they have performed, you should also try to do the same.

I say at the top of my voice that whoever thinks ill of the people from Lahore, saying that they are an obstacle in the way of the *khilafat*, he should remember that the Holy Prophet has referred to those who indulge in ill-thinking by calling it 'the biggest lie', and Allah says: 'avoid much of suspicion, surely suspicion is in many cases a sin', so it is called a sin by Allah. Thinking ill of others then leads to back-biting, and about that Allah says: 'Do not backbite one another' [49: 12]. You mistrust the sincere ones and hurt me. Fear God. I pray for you, so do not deprive yourselves of my prayers.

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

Remember what I have said and give up thinking ill of others and causing discord. Whatever decision Hazrat [Mirza Ghulam Ahmad] sahib has given in any matter, do not speak or act against it, otherwise you will not remain Ahmadis. Give up the notion that the people from Lahore are an obstacle in the affairs of the *khilafat*. If you do not, then God will make your case like that of Musailima."¹²

As is obvious from these statements of Maulana Nur-ud-Din, it had become fully clear to him that this was just mischief created by certain persons, and there were no grounds for the allegations against Maulana Muhammad Ali and his associates. He got so exasperated with the insidious propaganda that he wrote a letter to Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din, dated 13 May 1913, who was then in England, expressing his heartfelt feelings, one sentence of which is translated below:

“Nawab,¹³ Mir Nasir and Mahmud are useless people, fanatical for no good reason. This trouble is still afflicting us. O Allah, deliver us from it. *Amen!*”

A facsimile of this letter was published in *Paigham Sulh*, dated 26 November 1937.

Defends Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din in *khutbas*

In 1913, in two of his last Friday *khutbas* that Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din delivered before his death, he defended Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din against the allegations of the supporters of Mirza Mahmud Ahmad. Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din was in Woking, England at the time, establishing the Woking Muslim Mission. In the *khutba* delivered on 17 October 1913, Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din said:

“You think ill of others. Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din does not work out of hypocrisy. He works only for Allah. This is my belief about him. Of course, he can make mistakes. I am happy with his works. There is blessing in them. Those who spread mistrust about him are the hypocrites.”¹⁴

In the *khutba* delivered on 7 November 1913, only four months before his death, Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din said:

“Kamal-ud-Din is a good man. He is doing religious work. If he makes a mistake, [remember that] only God is pure, none besides Him, the only One free from all defects and weaknesses, and possessor of all perfect attributes. He is engaged in a good work. None of you can compete with him. Ignore mistakes, and look at goodness. He calls me his master again and again. ...

Kamal-ud-Din has not gone there [to England] for personal ends. He has not cared even for his family. Someone wrote that Kamal-ud-Din has shaved his beard [in England]. The other day I saw his photo. The beard is there. I think that even if he had shaved his beard, I would still say about the work for which he has gone there, that it is good. If there is some fault, I myself overlook it. There is no one who is free from faults.”¹⁵

The report of the above *khutba* ends as follows:

“(After this, the *Huzoor* sat down. He felt weak. He then rose and said:) Can any of you do the work which Kamal-ud-Din is doing? If he commits a fault, what does it matter? He is a man who used to earn thousands. I teach the Quran. Many new points of understanding have occurred to me. How can it be known that I did not teach it insincerely? I taught it with sincerity before and do so now as well.”¹⁶

This report shows that although Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din felt so physically weak that he had to sit down during the *khutba*, yet he rose again merely to continue defending Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din and concluded his *khutba* at that point. In his final comment, the Maulana has indicated that just as some people question Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din’s sincerity, they might as well question his own sincerity. He has thus placed the proof of Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din’s sincerity on an equal level with proof of his own sincerity.

After the annual gathering of December 1913, an article by Maulana Nur-ud-Din appeared in *Al-Fazl* entitled ‘Thanks’, in which he rendered thanks to Allah for the success of the gathering and the failure of his critics and he asked the *Jama‘at* to give thanks as well. He added at the very end of this article:

“Also, the work being done in the West to proclaim *La ilaha ill-Allah, Muhammad-ur Rasul-ullah*, that is also no less a matter for giving thanks. Therefore I give thanks for that as well.”¹⁷

The scandal of calling Muslims as *kafir* and the establishment of the Ansarullah party

As already mentioned in detail in the last chapter, Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din used to lecture in different cities of India and his fame had spread throughout the land. When, during a public meeting, he declared that Ahmadis consider all those who profess the *Kalima* of Islam (‘There is no God but Allah, Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah’) as Muslims, Mirza Mahmud Ahmad contradicted this in an article published in his magazine *Tashhiz-ul-Azhan* for April 1911 and declared that each and

every Muslim in the whole world who has not formally taken the *bai'at* (pledge) of the Promised Messiah is a *kafir* and outside the pale of Islam, even if that person has never heard of the Promised Messiah or even if he believes the Promised Messiah to be true.¹⁸ It was this article that struck at the very foundations of the Ahmadiyya Movement and split it into two in 1914.

Mirza Mahmud Ahmad at the same time founded a party called the Ansarullah, with himself as its leader. Its members actively propagated Mirza Mahmud Ahmad's viewpoints as well as canvassed for him to succeed Maulana Nur-ud-Din as the next *khalifa*, while the Maulana was on his death bed. This Ansarullah was the party that had been brought into Qadian just before the death of Maulana Nur-ud-Din to help in taking over the succession after him. Thus one of the letters written to the Ansarullah party in various towns and cities, which was reproduced in *Paigham Sulh*, stated that Maulana Nur-ud-Din's life was now only a matter of hours, not of days, so they must immediately assemble in Qadian.¹⁹

The propagation of the wrong belief that other Muslims are *kafir* went so far that Maulana Nur-ud-Din, from his sickbed, on 15 February 1914, said in the presence of a large number of people that Mirza Mahmud Ahmad had failed to comprehend the doctrine of *Kufr* (unbelief) and Islam, and he asked Maulana Muhammad Ali to clarify this issue.²⁰

Maulana Muhammad Ali writes tracts to clarify beliefs

Accordingly, Maulana Muhammad Ali wrote a tract which was published in Qadian on 13 March 1914, in which he refuted Mirza Mahmud Ahmad's wrong belief. In it the Maulana writes:

“After writing this article I read it to Hazrat *Khalifat-ul-Masih* [Maulana Nur-ud-Din]. As he was ill in those days, his son Abdul Hayy, thinking that he perhaps could not listen with full attention, asked him: Sir, are you listening? He replied: I am well able to listen to it, if I disagreed with anything I would say so. When the article ended, he directed that a hadith report from Sahih Muslim be added at the close. That has been done.”²¹

At the same time Maulana Muhammad Ali also wrote and issued a tract entitled *Ayk Nihayat Zaroori I'lan* ('A very important announcement')²² in which he impressed the following five points upon the Ahmadiyya community:

1. It is not the case that an Ahmadi upon whom forty members have agreed becomes *khalifa*. Rather, what the Promised Messiah has instructed is that such a man can take the *bai'at* (pledge) from new entrants to admit them into the Movement.
2. The Promised Messiah has not given any instruction that existing Ahmadis have to renew their *bai'at* upon another person's hand.
3. The executive committee of the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya Qadian is the real and true successor of the Promised Messiah.
4. Be very careful and fearful of God in the matter of 'unbelief and Islam', and follow the belief of the Promised Messiah who never declared as *kafir* those Muslims who did not accept his claims.
5. Settle the successorship to Maulana Nur-ud-Din with thought and deliberation by consulting the entire community.

Maulana Nur-ud-Din's death and subsequent events

On 13 March 1914, while saying his Friday prayers despite great weakness, Maulana Nur-ud-Din breathed his last (may his soul rest in peace). Later that day Maulana Muhammad Ali went to see Mirza Mahmud Ahmad and had a discussion with him which he relates in his book *Haqiqat-i Ikhtilaf* as below:

"I said to him that as the community is openly split into two on the question of *Kufr* (unbelief) and Islam, so we have to think about the future and devise some way of keeping the community united. His answer was that we should elect a *khalifa* at whose hand both parties should take the *bai'at*, and obey him; only thus could we remain united. I replied that the very problem was that both parties could not take the pledge of the same man. At least I could not accept a man as spiritual guide who calls Muslims as *kafir*, and by the same token the other party cannot take *bai'at* on the hand of a man who according to them is in error on such an important issue.

I suggested two possible solutions to him. One was to choose a leader now and not make the *bai'at* obligatory: whoever wished could take the *bai'at* but those who did not so wish need not do it. Then after some time had passed over this, each side should put forward its arguments on the question of unbelief and Islam. This would make it possible that, seeing which side had the stronger case, the entire community would unite upon that as its creed. To this he answered that anyone who does not take the *bai'at* of the *khalifa* cannot remain in the community, so this cannot work. My other suggestion was that no leader be elected at this time for at least fourteen days, and in this interim a representative gathering of the community be called to find a solution to the problem. But his answer was that there could not be such a wait because unless the next *khalifa* was elected, the previous *khalifa* could not be buried. The result was that no solution could be achieved.”

Continuing this account, what happened the following day is described thus by Maulana Muhammad Ali:

“At last, after the *Asr* prayer a meeting took place. The Nawab sahib [Muhammad Ali of Malerkotla] read out the will of Maulana Nur-ud-Din. Maulana Muhammad Ahsan of Amroha proposed the name of Mirza Mahmud Ahmad for *khilafat*. I rose up to mention the discussion that had taken place between me and Mirza Mahmud Ahmad but some men began to shout that they would not listen, and there arose cries of: *Takht-i khilafat mu-barak* (congratulations on the throne of *khilafat*)! The Mian sahib listened to all this silently and did not even ask the people to let me speak. So we left from there.”²³

In the issue of *Paigham Sulh* dated 17 March 1914, three days after this, there is a letter by Dr Syed Muhammad Husain Shah giving his eye-witness account of what happened:

“*Asr* prayers were said in the Nur Mosque. Afterwards, the Nawab sahib stood up and read the will of Hazrat *Khalifat-ul-Masih*, and then said that a successor should

be chosen, and it was up to us to choose whomsoever we wished. As had been prearranged, voices were raised from different directions calling out 'Mian sahib' [Mirza Mahmud Ahmad]. After that Maulvi Muhammad Ahsan also proposed the Mian sahib, but when Maulana Muhammad Ali stood up to say something, Shaikh Yaqub Ali, Hafiz Roshan Ali and some others shouted 'sit down, sit down' and did not let him speak. ... The Mian sahib himself also instructed that, after Maulvi Muhammad Ahsan, no one should be allowed to speak. Thus the instruction in the will of Hazrat *Khalifat-ul-Masih*, that his successor should treat the older members with tolerance, forbearance and kindness, was violated and it was ignored in the euphoria of acquiring the *khilafat*.

After this, although the body of Hazrat *Khalifat-ul-Masih* lay unburied, yet slogans of congratulations to Mirza Mahmud Ahmad on becoming *khalifa* were being raised and loud shouting broke out like that of a common mob. ... After that, some supporters of the *khilafat* took up position at the arrival port in the town while others started roaming around the town, forcing people to sign [to accept him as *khalifa*]."²⁴

Many members of the community who were present in the mosque on this occasion wrote letters at that time expressing regret and dismay about what had happened. Many of these letters were published in *Paigham Sulh*. What they deeply regretted above all was that, in the very presence of Mirza Mahmud Ahmad, people who had no stature or standing as compared to Maulana Muhammad Ali told the Maulana insolently to sit down and keep quiet, but Mirza Mahmud Ahmad watched all this in silence even though the will of Maulana Nur-ud-Din had just been read out exhorting that his successor must treat all the old and new friends of the Promised Messiah with kindness. All these letters were written in the month of March when Maulana Muhammad Ali was still in Qadian.

Maulana Muhammad Ali's emigration from Qadian

After these events Maulana Muhammad Ali continued to stay in Qadian for a while. He made an announcement published in *Paigham Sulh* to the following effect. In matters of faith and religion, decisions must not be made in haste. However, our Movement cannot unite on regarding other Muslims as unbelievers. Hazrat Mirza sahib had never declared that those who did not accept him were *kafir* because of denying his claims. Maulana Nur-ud-Din held the same belief and in his last days he had plainly told Mirza Mahmud Ahmad that he did not correctly understand this issue and had appointed him (Maulana Muhammad Ali) to publish a clarification of this matter. So we cannot take the *bai'at* at the hand of a man who calls Muslims as *kafir*, although we do wish to stay together for the sake of the work of the Movement.²⁵ In the next issue, dated two days later, he wrote:

“If I am seeking and desiring any personal gain, creating discord under the guise of upholding the truth, then I am the most accursed person. But I have an urge in my heart that compels me to speak out even if I have to accept all manner of tribulation. Calling the followers of the *Qibla* as being *kafir* is the crime which Hazrat Mirza sahib bitterly accused his opponent Maulvis of committing. But alas! Today we ourselves are doing what we accused others of. I shudder at the thought of calling those who recite the *Kalima*, ‘There is no God but Allah, Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah’, as being *kafirs* and excluded from the fold of Islam.”²⁶

Maulana Muhammad Ali's life was now being made intolerable in Qadian by supporters of Mirza Mahmud Ahmad shouting abusive slogans and hurling insults at him. When conditions deteriorated from bad to worse he left Qadian for Lahore in April 1914.

Other Muslims in India also took note of this dissension. Maulana Abul Kalam Azad commented on this in his famous newspaper *Al-Hilal*, dated 25 March 1914, as follows:

“For some time, there had been two parties in this Movement over the question of *takfir*. One party believed that non-Ahmadis are Muslims even though they may not believe in Mirza sahib’s claims. The other party, however, declared openly and clearly that those people who do not believe in Mirza sahib are *kafir* absolutely — *inna li-llahi wa inna ilai-hi raji’un*. The head of the latter party is Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad, and this faction has now made him *khalifa* but the first group does not accept this. The writing published in this connection by Maulana Muhammad Ali, and the wonderful and admirable courage he has shown in expressing these views while staying in Qadian, where the heads of the other party live, is truly an event which shall always be regarded as a memorable event of this year.”

It may here be noted that in the official record of the Proceedings of the National Assembly of Pakistan held in August and September 1974, after which this Assembly declared that Ahmadis are non-Muslim, it is mentioned that Mirza Masud Baig, appearing for the Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha‘at Islam Lahore, read out the above quotation from *Al-Hilal* when answering the question from the Attorney-General of Pakistan as to why the split in the Ahmadiyya Movement had taken place. The hostile Attorney-General was trying his hardest to show that Maulana Muhammad Ali left Qadian because he failed to become *khalifa*. After Mirza Masud Baig read out this quotation, the Attorney-General had no comment to make.²⁷

Notes to this chapter:

1. *Badr*, 24–31 December 1908, p. 13, col. 1.
2. *Ibid.*
3. *Haqiqat-i Ikhtilaf* by Maulana Muhammad Ali, published 1922. It was later translated into English and published as *True Facts about the Split* in 1966.
4. *Ikhtilaf Silsila Ahmadiyya kay Asbab*, December 1914, p. 55.

5. *Ibid.*, p. 55–56.
6. *Haqiqat-i Ikhtilaf*, p. 48 and 51.
7. *Badr*, 21 October 1909, p. 11, col. 1.
8. *Badr*, 27 June 1912, p. 4, col. 2, paragraph entitled *Promise of the Hazrat to Shaikh Sahib*.
9. *Badr*, 27 June 1912, p. 3, col. 2.
10. *Badr*, 4 July 1912, p. 6, col. 3.
11. *Badr*, 11 July 1912, p. 5, col. 3.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 4 and 5.
13. Nawab Muhammad Ali of Malerkotla is meant.
14. *Khutbat Nur*, p. 622, from *Al-Fazl*, 22 October 1913. (Note that *Khitabat Nur* is a different book, not containing all the sermons.)
15. *Ibid.*, p. 631, from *Al-Fazl*, 12 November 1913.
16. *Ibid.*, p. 632. The words in parentheses are thus in the original.
17. *Al-Fazl*, 7 January 1914, p. 14, col. 2.
18. The original article is in the collection of Mirza Mahmud Ahmad's writings entitled *Anwar-ul-'Ulum*, v. 1, number 9 (pages 303–330). He later gave a summary of this article and defended it in his book *A'inah-i Sadaqat*. We have quoted from this summary on pages 123–124 of the present book.
19. *Paigham Sulh*, 17 March 1914, p. 1.
20. *Paigham Sulh*, 3 March 1914, p. 4, col. 3.
21. *Mas'ala Islam wa Kufr Hasb Irshad Hazrat Khalifat-ul-Masih* ('Issue of Unbelief and Islam according to the directions of Hazrat Khalifat-ul-Masih'). This was also published in *Paigham Sulh*, 17 March 1914, p. 2–3.
22. This was also published in *Paigham Sulh*, 15 March 1914.
23. *Haqiqat-i Ikhtilaf*, p. 70–71.
24. *Paigham Sulh*, 17 March 1914, p. 1, col. 2.
25. *Ibid.*, p. 3–4.
26. *Paigham Sulh*, 19 March 1914, p. 4, col. 3.
27. Official Report of the National Assembly of Pakistan entitled *Proceedings of the Special Committee of the Whole House held in Camera to consider the Qadiani Issue* (held August–September 1974), p. 1534–1537.

6. Founding of the Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha‘at Islam Lahore

لاہور میں ہمارے پاک ممبر موجود ہیں
لاہور میں ہمارے پاک محبت ہیں

“Our members of pure character are to be found in Lahore.”

“Our true devotees are in Lahore.”

— Revelations of Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad.¹

After the deplorable events in Qadian mentioned in the last chapter, Maulana Muhammad Ali called a meeting of Ahmadis at Lahore on 22 March 1914. A few members attended this at the house of Dr Syed Muhammad Husain Shah. After giving careful consideration to the prevailing state of affairs, some resolutions were passed the gist of which is as follows:

1. According to the Will (*Al-Wasiyyat*) of the Promised Messiah the decisions of the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya, Qadian, should be regarded as final and binding, and no individual man should have the power to revoke them.
2. It should not be obligatory for people who have previously taken the *bai‘at* to renew their pledge at the hand of the new head of the Movement.
3. As forty persons or more have already taken the *bai‘at* at the hand of Mirza Mahmud Ahmad, he is entitled to take the *bai‘at* from new entrants to admit them into the Ahmadiyya Movement.
4. If Mirza Mahmud Ahmad accepts the decisions of the Anjuman as being final and binding, and does not con-

sider it obligatory for existing Ahmadis to renew their *bai'at* at his hand, then he should be accepted as the President of the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya and Head of the entire community (*jama'at*).²

These resolutions were exactly according to the following directions of the Promised Messiah — that “you must all work together after me”, that after him the decisions of the Anjuman were to be final and no individual would have the power to alter them, that the Anjuman was to be his successor, and that to admit new entrants into the Movement, any elders upon whom forty members agree would be entitled to administer the *bai'at* in the name of the Promised Messiah.

Although all those who attended this meeting disagreed in principle with Mirza Mahmud Ahmad’s doctrine of calling other Muslims as *kafir*, they were prepared in order to preserve the unity of the community to accept him as head if he worked according to the conditions of *Al-Wasiyyat*. They intended to put the issue of *takfir* before the entire community and believed that the *Jama'at* would accept the right belief.

Copies of these resolutions were sent to Mirza Mahmud Ahmad in Qadian and also published in *Paigham Sulh*, dated 24 and 26 March 1914. A deputation of fifteen men was proposed to go and meet Mirza Mahmud Ahmad on 28 March in order to seek his acceptance of these terms. However, Mirza Mahmud Ahmad, in his response, refused to talk to the deputation about these proposals.

As a result, on 28 March once again a meeting was held in Lahore and Maulana Muhammad Ali put to it the question as to how to proceed. He made a very well-reasoned, detailed speech to the effect that the question was whether we should give priority to Hazrat Mirza sahib’s writings or not. He placed before the meeting the handwritten note of Hazrat Mirza sahib dated 27 October 1907 which stated in plain words that the Anjuman was to be his successor and all its decisions were to be final. He also proved that Hazrat Mirza sahib never envisaged a *khalifa* as his successor who would rule over the Anjuman. He also related all the past events when during Maulana Nur-ud-Din’s time efforts

were made to expel him and the Lahore members from the Sadr Anjuman, and how these efforts had failed. After his speech, others gave expression to their views. Dr Syed Muhammad Husain Shah described the conditions in Qadian, explaining that it had now become impossible for Maulana Muhammad Ali to continue working in Qadian.

Accordingly, the following decisions were taken:

1. As Mirza Mahmud Ahmad had refused to meet the deputation to discuss the proposals of 22 March, the delegation would not now go to Qadian.
2. The resolutions passed previously would still remain in force (i.e., the door for reconciliation with Mirza Mahmud Ahmad would remain open).
3. According to the Will of the Promised Messiah, the propagation of Islam is the real aim of the Movement and it is obligatory to carry out this service so far as it is within our power. As, due to the dissension, it would be troublesome to do this work from Qadian, so it is appropriate as a matter of necessity that an Anjuman should be created by the name of *Isha'at-i Islam* which should have its head office in Lahore.
4. There were to be at least forty trustees of this Anjuman. Some office holders were agreed upon, the President being Maulana Muhammad Ali.

To draft the rules and regulations a committee was set up. Twenty-nine members were present in this meeting.³

The position at that time was that these people had not severed their ties with the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya, Qadian. However, as it had become impossible for Maulana Muhammad Ali and his associates to work and serve religion in Qadian, this was why they wanted to continue their work from Lahore through an Anjuman. To divide the community in two was a step they were forced to take after very careful consideration, but their first offer was still open, namely, that within the limits specified by the Promised Messiah in his *Al-Wasiyyat* and in his

other rules, Mirza Mahmud Ahmad could be the head of the community.

Maulana Muhammad Ali wrote a lengthy article, published as an appendix in the issue of *Paigham Sulh* for 2 April 1914, in which he went through the origin and history of the differences between the two parties and the proposals by the Lahore side for maintaining unity. In the end he said:

“In spite of our strong feelings we must not forget our real object, which is the propagation of Islam. In view of this necessity, and having in mind that the energies of the community should be channelled towards its real objective ... and considering that the doctrine of calling other Muslims as *kafir* poses a danger to the work of the propagation of Islam and the progress of the Movement, and in order to prevent damage to the work of spreading Islam in Europe that has just now been started, it has been deemed advisable that in addition to the work that members of the Movement are carrying on under the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya, an Anjuman be created in Lahore for the purpose of the propagation of Islam whose main aim should be to strengthen the real objective of this Movement, which is the propagation of Islam. A firm foundation should be laid for this work and all friends who do not call the general Muslims, the *ahl-i Qibla* and the reciters of the *Kalima* as being *kafir* should join it with renewed fervour. ... Accordingly, it is on this basis that the foundation of an Anjuman has been laid, with trust in Allah.”⁴

Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya

On 10 April 1914 was held the first meeting of the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya, Qadian, after the death of Maulana Nur-ud-Din, and was attended from the Lahore side by Maulana Muhammad Ali, Dr Mirza Yaqub Baig, Dr Syed Muhammad Husain Shah, Shaikh Rahmatullah and Maulana Sadr-ud-Din. Of the seven attending from the Qadiani side, three had stopped coming to the Anjuman’s meetings long ago but came for this meeting, namely, Mirza Mahmud Ahmad himself, Nawab

Muhammad Ali of Malerkotla and Mir Muhammad Ismail. The first two of these had in fact resigned from the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya but withdrew their resignations two days before Maulana Nur-ud-Din's death.

The Lahore members soon found that dictatorship prevailed in the meeting and matters that were not on the agenda were being approved. When those who disagreed with the motions insisted that their dissenting views should be noted in writing, this was rejected. Besides other matters, it was also decided by the casting vote of the president of the meeting, Mirza Mahmud Ahmad, that Maulvi Sher Ali should not be sent to England to help Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din even though in Maulana Nur-ud-Din's time a firm decision had been taken to this effect, and Maulana Nur-ud-Din had himself repeatedly instructed that he should go to England. Upon this decision, these four members left the meeting: Maulana Muhammad Ali, Shaikh Rahmatullah, Dr Mirza Yaqub Baig and Dr Syed Muhammad Husain Shah.⁵

Two days after this, on 12 April 1914, Mirza Mahmud Ahmad called a meeting of a few select persons and made an attack on the powers of the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya which destroyed its very foundations. Rule number 18 of the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya had, up to that time, read:

“In every matter, for the *Majlis-i Mu'timidin* [Council of Trustees] and its subordinate branches if any, and for the Sadr Anjuman and all its branches, the order of the Promised Messiah shall be absolute and final.”

It was proposed that it should be amended by replacing the words “the Promised Messiah” with the words: “*Hazrat Khali-fat-ul-Masih* Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad the second *Khalifa*”, so that Mirza Mahmud Ahmad would gain absolute power over the Anjuman. When the news of this proposal reached Maulana Muhammad Ali he published an announcement in *Paigham Sulh* of 21 April entitled:

Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya Qadian — *Inna li-llahi wa inna ilai-hi raji'un.*

He warned that if this amendment were made, the Sadr Anjuman as founded by Hazrat Mirza sahib would in effect cease to exist. He wrote:

“If this proposal were correct in the least, then such an amendment should have been made at the death of the Promised Messiah. For, if anyone had the right to have such a change made, it was that selfless man [Maulana Nur-ud-Din] before whom the entire community bowed its head unanimously. ... Is it not worth pondering why the words ‘Promised Messiah’ are being replaced by the name of the second *khalifa*, but the name of the first *khalifa* is missing? This shows the real intention behind this proposal.”⁶

However, Mirza Mahmud Ahmad was undeterred and got this motion passed in a meeting of the Council of Trustees on 26 April due to the majority of the members having taken the *bai‘at* at his hand.⁷ When this happened, an announcement was published in *Paigham Sulh* of 5 May 1914 from Maulana Muhammad Ali, Dr Mirza Yaqub Baig, Dr Syed Muhammad Husain Shah, Shaikh Rahmatullah, Maulana Ghulam Hasan and Maulana Sadr-ud-Din, in which they clarified again the whole matter and announced:

“We declare with the deepest regret that Sahibzada sahib [Mirza Mahmud Ahmad] and his pledged followers, by removing the name of the Promised Messiah from the Rules, have not only given to a man who is not appointed by God the status of one sent by God, but have shown disrespect for the name of the Promised Messiah. ... Moreover, after destroying the foundations of the Anjuman and dismantling it in practice, ... two important funds, i.e., the zakat fund and the fund for the propagation of Islam, which during the life of the Promised Messiah and the *Khalifat-ul-Masih* [Maulana Nur-ud-Din] were in the control of the Anjuman, have been removed from the Anjuman’s treasury and placed in his complete charge.⁸ ... If legal action were taken, all this could be declared invalid and the Anjuman restored to

its original status. But since we do not wish to waste the Movement's energy and money on litigation, we issue this declaration to absolve ourselves from these moves, and we warn the community that there is still time to recover from stumbling. Everyone, whether they have entered into the *bai'at* or not, must compel Sahibzada sahib to leave the Anjuman in its original state, not to interfere in financial matters, and not to demolish the system which was created by the Promised Messiah himself, and which Hazrat *Khalifat-ul-Masih* [Maulana Nur-ud-Din] followed for six years. ... By this declaration we discharge our duty and clear ourselves of responsibility in the eyes of God, for it appears that taking legal action will do more harm than good.”⁹

It was under these circumstances that the Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha‘at Islam Lahore came into existence. The first meeting of its Council of Trustees was held on 3 May 1914. Maulana Muhammad Ali was elected as the Head (*amir*) of the community and President, and other office-holders were appointed. In all 59 members were elected as trustees, of whom fourteen were permanent life members.

It will have become clear from all these events that for one and a half months after the dispute Maulana Muhammad Ali and his associates kept on trying to maintain the unity of the community if at all possible. They even offered to accept Mirza Mahmud Ahmad as Head on condition that he would not become an autocratic leader in violation of the directions of the Promised Messiah because, firstly, this was against *Al-Wasiyyat* and, secondly, Mirza Mahmud Ahmad had invented the dangerous belief of calling all other Muslims as *kafir*. However, when Mirza Mahmud Ahmad went ahead to change the regulations of the Anjuman and assume all power himself, then it became unavoidable to separate from the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya and create the Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha‘at Islam at Lahore.

It may be added that the six members of the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya who joined the Lahore Ahmadiyya *Jama‘at*, i.e., Maulana Muhammad Ali and others, did not resign from the

Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya, Qadian. Two years later, the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya, now working as a body of the Qadiani *Jama'at*, served a notice on them to explain why they should not be expelled from its membership as they had ceased to attend its meetings, to do any work for it, to pay their subscriptions to it, and had created a separate Anjuman in Lahore, etc. They gave a detailed reply which was published in *Paigham Sulh* in August 1916. In it they wrote:

“The basis of the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya, Qadian, founded 1906, is *Al-Wasiyyat* of the Promised Messiah. Its regulations were formulated during Hazrat Mirza sahib’s life and published with his permission and approval, and the Anjuman operated according to them. Hazrat Mirza sahib wrote a codicil to this Will in 1907... in which he gave the clear verdict that the decisions of the Anjuman taken by majority of opinion were to be final, and after him no individual would have the power to issue or to annul its decisions.

You people have forsaken this basic principle, and in Rule 18 formulated by the Promised Messiah you have deleted his name and replaced it by the name of Mirza Mahmud Ahmad, and against the wishes of Hazrat Mirza sahib you have made one man, Mirza Mahmud Ahmad, supreme over the Anjuman. So after this action of yours, this does not remain the Anjuman based on Hazrat Mirza sahib’s *Al-Wasiyyat* and his codicil added to it. ... We being Ahmadis, and regarding it as our duty to honour the words of Hazrat Mirza sahib, consider it an insult to the Ahmadiyya Movement to participate in the activities of this Anjuman.

It is a misconception that this authority has been given to Mirza Mahmud Ahmad by majority vote in a meeting of the Sadr Anjuman... In a will in which its aims are implemented by the executors by majority, they cannot by majority nullify its objectives. ... As the Founder of the Anjuman, the Promised Messiah, has handed his conclusive writing to the Anjuman, penned

in his own hand, that after him no individual has the right to overturn the decisions of the Anjuman taken by majority of opinion, then for you to give this authority to one person among you constitutes nullifying the terms of the Will. ...

So we waited for a long time, hoping that you might find a way to rectify the situation, but when it became apparent that the income of the Sadr Anjuman and its duties are gradually being transferred to another body and matters are deteriorating day by day, we did not wish to leave the enforcement of our wills in your hands. So we cancelled the wills, and to fulfil the objective for which Hazrat Mirza sahib created the Sadr Anjuman we formed an Anjuman by the name of Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha'at Islam and made our wills in its favour.”¹⁰

Fate of Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya in the Qadiani Jama'at

Even after he was firmly established as *khalifa* in the Qadiani Jama'at, Mirza Mahmud Ahmad felt that the passing of the resolution mentioned above, by which his order became absolute and final over the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya in every matter, did not assure him of complete, unassailable power. In a speech in October 1925, therefore, he laid down a new system of administration, reducing the Council of Trustees of this Anjuman to an entirely subservient body.¹¹ At the outset of his speech 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.”¹²

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. His statement means that the Promised Messiah approved the way of working of the Anjuman which was devised by “others”, i.e., the Lahore Ahmadiyya founding members, without himself knowing that this would be harmful to the Movement, and now Mirza Mahmud Ahmad was going to rectify the Promised Messiah’s error! Moreover, while out of respect he would retain the *names* of the institutions created during the Promised Messiah’s time, he could completely overturn their nature and purpose!

There are several most 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 *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. What it means is that a body of members says that it would do so. However, the body which is entitled to say this, can also say that it shall not do so. For, the Anjuman which can pass the resolution that it shall obey the *khalifa* in everything, if ten years later it says that it shall not obey him, it is entitled to do so according to the rules of the Anjuman. Or if the Anjuman says that it will obey this *khalifa* in everything but will not obey another one, it has the right to do so according to its rules, as happened in the time of the first *khalifa*.”¹³

Here he has admitted that there is no mention of the concept or the institution of a personal *khilafat* in the basic principles of the Anjuman, upon which it was created by the Promised Messiah. He has also admitted that it remained within the Anjuman’s powers to revoke at any time its resolution, which he got it to pass in 1914, to follow the *khalifa*’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 *khalifa*.

Mirza Mahmud Ahmad went on to say:

“For the sake of the *khilafat* we had to make an unparalleled sacrifice. And that was that we sacrificed for its sake the old followers of the Promised Messiah, those who were called his friends, those who had a very close relationship with him. If this religious difference had not arisen between them and ourselves, they would be dearer to us than our own children because they included those who knew the Promised Messiah and those who were his companions, and had worked with him. ... 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 *Jama‘at*, we 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 *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.”¹⁴

This statement disproves the allegation made commonly by the Qadiani *Jama‘at* members that the split in the Movement in 1914 came about because Maulana Muhammad Ali was trying to become the *khalifa*, and having failed in that attempt he and his associates left and formed their own separate group. It shows that they left because they were opposed to the introduction of a *khalifat* system which, as Mirza Mahmud Ahmad says, “was not included in the basic principles of the *Jama‘at*”. Therefore Mirza Mahmud Ahmad and his supporters made the “unparalleled sacrifice” of losing the “old followers”, “friends” and “companions” of the Promised Messiah who “had worked with him”.

Mirza Mahmud Ahmad’s words that “by the stroke of the pen of ten or eleven men Qadian can at once become Lahore” show he is admitting that what makes the Lahore *Jama‘at* different from the Qadiani *Jama‘at* is that the Lahore Ahmadis hold the Anjuman to be supreme, and if this supremacy were again accepted in Qadian then Qadian would become Lahore. In view of this admission, it is false to allege that the Lahore Ahmadis separated from Qadian because Maulana Muhammad Ali failed to become the *khalifa* there. If that had been the reason for the split, then the only way Qadian could become Lahore would be if Qadianis accepted Maulana Muhammad Ali as their *khalifa*!

The final words in the above extract reveal the great fear entertained by Mirza Mahmud Ahmad that, as long as the Anjuman possessed the power, even just on paper, to overturn its previous resolution, he could not trust such an Anjuman even though it consisted entirely of members who had pledged themselves to his leadership and who were sincere in their pledge.

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 *khalifa* and his advisors”, the advisors would advise and the *khalifa* would decide, and this would be known as the decision of the Sadr Anjuman. The *Majlis-i Mu‘timidin* (Council of Trustees) would merely carry out the decision without question.

The admissions that can be seen in this speech, and Mirza Mahmud Ahmad's anxiety to remove all vestiges of authority from the Anjuman, show that the Lahore Ahmadiyya founding elders were absolutely right in holding that the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya, as created by the Promised Messiah, was the sovereign and supreme body for running the Ahmadiyya Movement. It is also seen that Mirza Mahmud Ahmad's greatest fear was that the Anjuman may re-assert its powers against him in future.

Khilafat

Khalifas of the Qadiani *Jama'at* have, over the years, made statements pointing out some fine and noble principles of Islam about spiritual leadership, but the same principles are plainly violated by them in their own concept of the *khilafat*.

1. In a speech at the December 1914 annual *Jalsa* of the Qadiani *Jama'at*, the first such gathering after he became *khalifa*, replying to objections to the Qadiani concept of *khilafat* raised by the Lahore Ahmadiyya *Jama'at*, Mirza Mahmud Ahmad declared:

“Foolish is he who says that a hereditary seat has been established. I say to such a one on sworn oath: I do not even consider it allowable that the son should succeed the father as *khalifa*. Of course, if God makes him His appointed one, then that is a different matter. Like Hazrat Umar, I also believe that the son should not be *khalifa* after the father.”¹⁵

Yet his own son succeeded him in 1965, and a hereditary seat of spiritual leadership is exactly what was established, as has been proven by the succession of later *khalifas* till now. Thus the Lahore Ahmadiyya pioneers were proved absolutely right, and not at all “foolish”, in raising this objection.

2. Not only in Urdu as above, but also in his English book *Ahmadiyyat or The True Islam*, first published in 1924, Mirza Mahmud Ahmad stated near the beginning:

“It is not necessary that the head of the Community should be, in any way, related to the holy founder of the

Movement, as, for instance, his first successor was not related to him either by blood or by marriage, nor, on the other hand, is it necessary, that the Head of the Community should not be related to the holy founder of the Movement, as, for instance, I have the honour to be his son.”¹⁶

However, it is now firmly established that none but a direct descendant of the Founder can be head of the Qadiani *Jama‘at*.

3. In a Friday *khutba* on the occasion of *Muharram*, delivered on 23 November 2012, their fifth *khalifa*, Mirza Masroor Ahmad quoted at length from an announcement issued by the Promised Messiah reprimanding an Ahmadi who had made a disrespectful statement about Imam Husain.¹⁷ The quotation given by Mirza Masroor Ahmad, if we translate it into English, begins as follows:

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

The Promised Messiah goes on to say, as quoted in this *khutba*:

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

Yet it is the most fundamental doctrine of the Qadiani *Jama'at* that a *khalifa* is appointed by Allah with His approval, and that once someone has become a *khalifa* it is incontrovertible proof that he has Allah's support to hold this office. Moreover, they regard it as absolutely essential that every member must enter into the *bai'at* of the *khalifa* and obey him unreservedly and unquestioningly, and they consider it a most grave sin for anyone to refuse to enter into his *bai'at* or to disobey him. However, as we read here, and listen from the mouth of the Qadiani *khalifa* himself, in the case of Yazid and Imam Husain it was the *khalifa* of the time who was the embodiment of wickedness and immorality, and it was the man who refused to pledge the *bai'at* to him who was a purified and chosen one of Allah.

It may be noted that the disrespectful statement about Hazrat Imam Husain, for which the Promised Messiah so strongly reprimanded those of his followers who dared to utter it, is exactly what members of the Qadiani *Jama'at* say commonly about Maulana Muhammad Ali: that because the Maulana did not enter into the *bai'at* of the *khalifa* of the time, he was therefore a sinner. We have already shown in chapters 3 and 4 that he was held in the highest esteem by both Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad and Hazrat Maulana Nur-ud-Din.

Notes to this chapter:

1. These two revelations were published in *Al-Hakam*, the first in the issue dated 17 December 1900 and the second in 17 August 1902.
2. For this summary, see *Paigham Sulh*, 31 March 1914, p. 2, col. 1.
3. *Paigham Sulh*, 31 March 1914, p. 2; and p. 4, col. 2.
4. *Paigham Sulh*, 2 April 1914, 4th page of the appendix.
5. *Paigham Sulh*, 12 April 1914, p. 2, cols. 2–3.
6. *Paigham Sulh*, 21 April 1914, 1st page of appendix.
7. The passing of this motion was also announced in the *Review of Religions*, which was now in the hands of the Qadiani *Jama'at*, in the Urdu edition, the April 1914 and May 1914 issues, inside of the front cover.
8. Mirza Mahmud Ahmad had directed that donations for the propagation of Islam as well as all other donations should be sent to him and would be spent only as determined by him.

9. *Paigham Sulh*, 5 May 1914, p. 1, cols. 1–2.
10. *Paigham Sulh*, 17 August 1916, p. 2–3.
11. This speech was published in *Al-Fazl* in instalments in late October and early November 1925. It is included in the collection of Mirza Mahmud Ahmad's writings entitled *Anwar-ul-'Ulum*, v. 9, number 9, page 125 to 146.
12. *Al-Fazl*, 31 October 1925, p. 3, col. 1; *Anwar-ul-'Ulum*, v. 9, number 9, p. 127.
13. *Al-Fazl*, 3 November 1925, p. 3, col. 1; *Anwar-ul-'Ulum*, v. 9, number 9, p. 132.
14. *Al-Fazl*, 3 November 1925, p. 3, cols. 1–2; *Anwar-ul-'Ulum*, v. 9, number 9, p. 132–133.
15. *Anwar-ul-'Ulum*, v. 2, number 7, p. 171.
16. *Ahmadiyyat or the True Islam*, by Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad, ch. 'History of the Movement', p. 6.
17. This announcement is in *Majmu'a Ishtiharat*, v. 3, pages 544–547. It is *Ishtihar* number 263, entitled *Tabligh-i Haqq*, published 8 October 1905.

Back to: *Refuting the Qadiani Jama'at Beliefs*