FINIALITY OF PROPHETHOOD
No prophet to appear after Holy Prophet Muhammad
from the writings of Hadrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad (d. 1908)
Mujaddid of 14th Century Hijrah, The Promised Messiah and Mahdi

To refute allegations that Hadrat Mirza did not believe the Holy Prophet Muhammad to be the last of the prophets, we give below, together with the date, Hadrat Mirza's unequivocal views on the matter. These extracts have been collected together in La Nabiya Bādi by Haifz Maulana Sher Muhammad, the outstanding missionary and scholar of the International Lahore Ahmadiyya Movement in the Fiji Islands - Ed.

IZALI ALIUM (P. 614):
"Ma kana Muhammad-un abad-In min r lako-n rasul Allah wa Khatam al-nabiyyin" (Muhammad is not the father of any of your men but the prophet of Allah and the last of the prophets -Ed.) This verse also clearly proves that after our Prophet (peace be upon him) no prophet will come to the world.

NISHAN-I ASMANI (P. 28):
I firmly believe that our Prophet (peace be upon him) is the Khatam al-anbiya and after him no prophet, old or new, will appear in this Nation.

KARAMAT AS-SADIQIN (P. 25):
I declare to the people that I swear by the Almighty Allah that "AND HE (the Holy Prophet Muhammad) IS THE MESSENGER OF ALLAH AND THE LAST OF THE PROPHETS" is my faith.

HAMMAT AL-BUSRA (P. 20):
Do you not know that God has declared our Prophet (peace be upon him) unconditionally to be the 'Khatam an-nabiyyin' and as an explanation of the verse quoted, our Holy Prophet said that there is not to be any prophet after him.

MAJMU'AH IJTIHADAT (Vol. II, P. 156):
All prophethoods, virtues and excellences ended with him (the Holy Prophet).

MAJMU'AH IJTIHADAT (Vol. II, P. 257):
It is a fabrication by Muhammad Hussain to attribute ... a claim of prophethood to us or say that we, heaven forbid, do not believe the lord of the Prophets, Muhammad Mustafa (peace be upon him), to be the Khatam al-anbiya.

ANJAM-I AJHAM (P. 27):
The fact is that ... our Holy Prophet is the Khatam al-anbiya and after him no prophet shall come, old or new.

KITAB AL-BARIYYA (P. 199, Foot-note):
The Holy Prophet had repeatedly said that 'no prophet shall come after me', and his saying, 'there is to be no prophet after me' was so famous that no one doubted its authenticity.

AYYAM-I SULH (P. 152):
Similarly, he (the Holy Prophet Muhammad) absolutely closed the door to the appearance of any prophet, old or new, by saying "la nabiyya ba'di".

ARABA'IN (No. 4, p. 6):
Our faith is that the Holy Prophet (Muhammad) is the Khatam of the prophets and the Holy Quran is the Khatam of heavenly Books.

We believe that our Prophet (peace be upon him who was the last prophet), brought the perfect Law.

TUHFAH GOLARWIYAH (P. 5):
Similarly, in verse ... (the Holy Quran) has terminated prophethood with our Prophet (peace be upon him).

MABFIZAT AHMADIYYA (PART V.):
Muhayyud-Din ibn Arabi wrote that the prophethood which brings a Law is no longer permitted but the other (prophethood without the Law) is allowed. But our belief is that every kind of prophethood has terminated.

continued on page 18
OUR BELIEFS AND AIMS

The Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha’at Islam Lahore is an international Muslim association (founded 1914) dedicated to the presentation of Islam by literary and missionary means. It believes that the world today, both non-Muslim and Muslim, badly needs to receive the true, original message of Islam. This is the message contained in the Holy Quran and the life of the Holy Prophet Muhammad - a message which is today hidden under misconceptions and wrong popular notions.

We strongly believe that the mission of Islam is to attract the hearts and minds of mankind towards the truth, through rational arguments and the natural appeal of Islamic teachings. Islam does not seek political control over countries, nor does it use force to compel people to become Muslim or obey its teachings.

In this age, the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement, Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad (d. 1908), uncovered and stressed certain vital aspects of Islamic teachings which had been forgotten over the centuries. He reminded the world that Islam is:

- International - God raised prophets in every nation, and Muslims believe in them all. Good people and truth may be found in any nation. No people are God’s favourite, not even Muslims, except those who do the most good.
- Tolerant - Gives full freedom to everyone to hold and practise any belief or religion. Preaching to be by argument and example, not force. Muslims must also respect internal differences of opinion.
- Rational - Religion to be studied in the light of reason and the ever-growing knowledge of mankind. Blind following disallowed and independence of thought granted.
- Non-sectarian - Every person professing the words ‘There is no god but Allah, and Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah’ must be regarded as a Muslim. No religious board empowered to hold inquisitions into a Muslim’s beliefs, or to expel self-professing Muslims from Islam.
- Peaceful - Condemns all use of force except in unavoidable self-defense. Teaches Muslims to live peacefully under any rule which accords them freedom of religion.
- Living - Worship is not a ritual, but provides living contact with a living God. God listens to man, answers his prayers, and speaks to His righteous servants even today as in the past.

Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad was a servant of Islam, with a mission to bring about the spiritual and intellectual triumph of the teachings of Islam over all forms of belief. He never claimed to be a prophet, but a God-sent mujaddid (reformer) within the long line of saints that arose in the history of Islam. He believed, and we believe, that after the Holy Prophet Muhammad - may peace and the blessings of Allah be upon him - no prophet can arise, whether a new one or one from the past.
II. ISLAMIC BELIEFS:

What is the basic teaching of Islam about God?
Islam teaches that there is one, and only one, God Who is the Creator and Controller of the entire world. He is unique in every respect, and nothing in the world bears any likeness to Him. He is the Knower of all things, and has full power over the whole of creation. He does not stand in need of anything at all, while everything is totally dependent on Him. He possesses all the perfect qualities, and man should worship Him, and Him alone.

Is there any name for God that Muslims use specially?
Yes. According to Islam, the ‘personal’ name of God is the Arabic word Allah. It is pronounced:
AL-LAH (as in Along) (LA is as in Large)
This is the comprehensive name of God, and means ‘the one Who possesses all the perfect attributes’. The names of God in other languages, such as God in English, or Khuda in Urdu, only convey some particular attribute of the Divine Being, and they are also used for others than God (as in god, gods, goddess, etc.) Allah, however, has only ever been applied to God Himself.

Does Islam give any arguments to prove the existence of God?
Yes, the Holy Quran gives three kinds of arguments on this point. Firstly, it refers us to the physical world which shows great order and arrangements, works according to laws, and where everything has a set purpose in the whole scheme of things. There is also immense beauty in nature which attracts man’s heart. Science is discovering more and more of these characteristics of the world all the time. So behind this highly purposeful and beautiful working of nature must be One, single Intel-
ligence of great beauty and attraction. Secondly, the Quran tells us about the close and deep connection between God and the inner nature of every person. There is an in-built desire in each and every person for something higher, and when in difficulties a person instinctively wants to call upon a Hidden Power to help him. Thirdly, and most convincingly, Prophets and men of God appeared in every nation in the world and showed their people the reality of God through their teachings and works. Just as most of us learn about science not by making all the discoveries by ourselves, but by accepting the work and evidence of eminent scientists, similarly the proof of the existence of God is provided by the lives of the great luminaries whom God sent all over the world for this very purpose.

Other religions also teach the existence of God. Is there any difference between their teaching and the Islamic concept of God?
Yes, there are some important differences. The first major difference is that Islam teaches the absolute one-ness of God, with Whom no one can Share in Divinity. No idol of stone, no religious or spiritual teacher, can possess some Divine power or attribute. Secondly, Islam teaches the highest conception of God, and does not accept any limitation to His power and knowledge, while other religions set limits to Him. For instance, Islam rejects the Hindu belief that God is not the Creator of matter and should, but exists alongside them. It also rejects the Christian doctrine that God cannot forgive sins without exacting punishment on someone (His ‘son’, as they hold). Thirdly, Islam refutes the idea that any human being, however great, was a ‘manifestation’ of God on earth, or a Divine incarnate.

What are the practical consequences of these three differences?
These differences magnify and elevate the position of man. Belief in the one-ness of God means that man should not worship or be a slave to anything in the world, such as idols of stone, forces of nature, heavenly bodies religious leaders, Kings, dictatorial systems, etc. So man is meant to conquer the world around him, not be afraid of it; and each person is meant to use his own brain and sense, not blindly obey someone else. Belief in the highest conception of God means that man’s own progress is not limited either. His knowledge and power, though infinitesimal as compared to God’s, can go on increasing. Rejecting the belief that a person can have been a ‘manifestation’ of God, means that one should look upon the great Founders of religions, not as ‘gods’ shrouded in mystery and possessing supernatural powers, but as mortal human beings who by their own lives and example showed others how to live.

Is there any other important distinctive feature of the Islamic concept of God?
Yes. Islam teaches that Allah is "the Lord (Rabb) of all the worlds". Allah is, therefore, not just the ‘god’ of the Muslims, nor the god of a particular race, religion or nation, but the only One God for the whole of mankind. As the Lord of all the nations He has not only provided means of physical sustenance for all the countries on earth, but also sent His guidance to every nation for their moral progress. He is equally just and loving towards every section of mankind, and has no favourite or chosen people, or rejected ones.

How does man stand in relation to God, according to Islam?
God has given man not only a body, but also a soul through which he can come into contact with his Creator. But whereas the body, like the rest of nature, is
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MUHAMMAD ‘ALI JINNAH

As they saw him

The Pakistan Society, in conjunction with the Pakistan Students’ Federation in Great Britain, held a meeting to honour the birthday of Qaid-i-Azam Muhammad ’Ali Jinnah on Friday 4th January 1957, at Overseas House, Park Place, St. James’s, S.W.1, at 5:30 p.m. H.E. Mr. Ikrarullah, The Pakistan High Commissioner, presided. Glowing tributes were paid to Qaid-i-Azam by Lord Pethick-Lawrence, Sir Frederick Bourne, and General Sir Douglas Gracey.

Fighter for country’s freedom

Lord Pethick-Lawrence, the Labour Government’s Secretary of State for India, in a reminiscent strain, recalled his contacts with the Qaid-i-Azam, throwing light on the working of his mind, on his high moral standards, and his contribution towards the sub-continent’s freedom. In the early twenties when he first had the occasion of meeting him, he was heart and soul with the Congress, thinking just in terms of the country’s freedom. Subsequently, when he occasionally met him in the Houses of Parliament, his main interest was the Indianisation of the Army for, as a far-sighted man, he visualized that when freedom came, the Indian Army must have trained personnel of its own to look after the country’s security. Still later, at the time of appointment of the Simon Commission and the series of Round Table Conferences that were called in London, the idea of partition never entered Jinnah’s mind and, as usual, his thinking was directed towards the objective of the country’s freedom as a whole.

Turning Point

The turning point in his thinking, Lord Pethick-Lawrence believed, came when the Congress Ministries, regardless of other political elements in the country, renounced Ministries. It began for the first time to dawn on his mind that the Congress being mainly a Hindu body, transfer of power to it would mean permanent domination of Muslims by Hindus. Muslims’ voice would carry no weight, and despite any paper safeguards in the Constitution, they would go permanently under subjection to Hindu majority.

In 1946, when he went to India as Secretary of State, recalled Lord Pethick-Lawrence, his main quest was: first, whether the time had come for power to be handed over to Indians; second, if so, to whom? Mahatma Gandhi and Congress wanted it to be transferred to the Congress. Mr. Jinnah and the Muslim League wanted its transfer to Hindus and Muslims separately. As Secretary of State he tried to negotiate to see if the two interests could be reconciled.

Gandhi and Jinnah

It would be an over-simplification to say, as some people thought, that if Gandhi and Jinnah could be brought together into something like what in these days is known as a summit conference, the differences could have been resolved. Mr. Jinnah had differences with Mr. Gandhi, but no personal animosity against him, and it was only reasonable to expect that if these two persons could be made to agree, the rest of the people would follow suit. This was, by and large, a correct summing up, despite the fact that there were many other stalwarts in the Congress, like Nehru, Azad, Patel and others, while on the League side, besides Mr. Jinnah, there were others like Liaquat Ali Khan to be counted with. Never the less, there was a fundamental difference in the outlooks of the two men.

Recalling these two topmost figures in the political
picture at the time, Lord Pethick-Lawrence observed that the only thing common between them was that both were astute lawyers. But for this, they were directly opposed in their outlooks. Gandhi entered politics through the gangway of religion, and imparted a religious touch to the whole of his politics. He had his principles of life, and very sincerely believed that if these could be observed by the people, politics could take care of itself.

Not so Jinnah. He was totally different in his outlook. He had a firm, well-set intellectual outlook, given to clear-cut modes of thought and methods of work. When once he gave his word, he kept it. Gandhi, being half in Congress and half out of it, was too elusive, and in dealing with him you never knew where you stood. No common ground could be found between them, and therefore the meetings could not succeed.

Paying tribute to Jinnah, Lord Pethick-Lawrence said he gave Pakistan shape, and very wisely accepted compromise, which was acceptable to the other side.

The country had a great future before it. It is up to the people what form and shape it may take. But whatever the future might hold for it, Jinnah, who worked and fought and won it, would always be remembered.

Radccliffe Award

Thanking Lord Pethick-Lawrence for the great tribute paid to the Qaid-i-Azam, and referring to his remark that the Qaid-i-Azam kept his word at all costs, the Pakistan High Commissioner, Mr. Ikramullah recalled an incident when he maintained that high standard of public life even when it meant a great loss to Pakistan. This was when the Radcliffe Award, against the basic principle of partition, gave the Muslim-majority District of Gurdaspur to India. The Qaid-i-Azam was pressed by his lieutenants to denounce the Award. "Do you want me to go back upon my word?" he retorted. He had given his word that the Award would be accepted, and it must be accepted. Had he turned down the Award, Gurdaspur, and for that matter Kashmir, would have been ours today. But he paid all that price rather than break his word.

Knew Nothing Petty

The next speaker, Sir Frederick Bourne, East Pakistan's first Governor, paid tribute to the Qaid-i-Azam's tremendous driving force, high sense of justice and fair play, and unbending determination. Anything petty made him angry. He had a complete belief in truth, and always stood for what he considered right and just. In the words of the poet, while he lived, he was the guiding star; when he died, even the children in the street cried.

Tolerance of Criticism

General Sir Edward Gracey, former Commander-in-Chief of the Pakistan Army, recalled the days when Jinnah visited Sandhurst in connection with the Indianisation of the Army and stayed three days there, collecting data, examining the officers. As a senior Indian military officer at the time he had to attend him, and assist him in his investigations. Once when, during his examination of the officers, his cross-examination became rather too legalistic, he reminded him that he was dealing with military officers. "Oh! I forgot," he said.

General Gracey recalled another incident illustrating for some time, so that he could conveniently shift to some other place. And what about the money (Rs. 600), he wrote, he had only just spent on re-equipping the servants' quarters? To his surprise, by the return post came a cheque for Rs. 600 from the Qaid-i-Azam.

Kashmir and Gracey

General Gracey removed the false impression in certain quarters that he was responsible for the loss of Kashmir to Pakistan, because he opposed the Qaid-i-Azam's orders to forthwith march the Pakistan Army into the State. The impression overlooked the military situation at the time, under which he gave the Qaid the advice he did. The Qaid himself did not know it. It was the time of the joint Indo-Pakistan Supreme Command, and the Army still functioned on the old pattern, when all military units were mixed ones, composed of all communities. There were no exclusive Muslim units. It would have been courting a double disaster to have started hostilities with such composition of the Army - the attack on Kashmir by such units would have been a blunder. To have left Pakistan's own security in the hands of these mixed units commanded mostly by anti-Pakistan officers would have been a still greater blunder. That is why he considered it his duty to oppose the idea and put the whole situation before the Qaid-i-Azam.

When the Army was finally divided, and the time came for the appointment of C.-in-C. of the Pakistan Army, he considered himself out of the question. Having opposed the Qaid-i-Azam, he could not dream of his choice falling on him. But the Qaid was too great for any such thoughts. "He (Gracey) is the man for me," he said, and he was appointed as C.-in-C.

Courage in Face of Death

Recalling the cool courage with which the Qaid-i-Azam faced death, General Gracey said when he was flown form Quetta, he knew he was a dying man. But he sent instructions that there should be no fuss about it, and he wanted no resubmissions. They were all worried about the impending event, and were anxiously watching what was to be done - the late Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan, the Secretary-General, Mr. Muhammad Ali, he continued on page 20
A REPLY TO JOHN GILCHRIST
By N. A. Faruqui
Lahore Pakistan

"THE QURAN AND THE BIBLE"
Which is God’s Word?

Under the above title, a controversy has been going on in South Africa between a Muslim Mr. Ahmad Deedat, and a Christian society for which Mr. John Gilchrist has written a booklet which has been sent to us for our comments. We have not had a copy of what Mr. Deedat had said. But we welcome the opportunity to comment on what Mr. John Gilchrist has said against the Holy Quran and in favour of the Bible.

Let us say at once that, according to the Holy Quran, Jesus Christ was a venerated prophet of God and he was given a revealed book called the "Injeel". But that book is not the present Bible which may contain some of the teachings revealed to Jesus but which does not itself claim to be the book revealed to Jesus. Instead of showing that the Gospels were the Word of God from their own testimony or that of history, Mr. John Gilchrist has only quoted the Holy Quran in his favour; in one breath, and then attacked it in the next. We will, God willing, show that the Holy Quran does not support the myth that the present Gospels are the Word of God, nor is Mr. Gilchrist's attack on the Holy Quran of any use to him.

BOOK OF GOD

A book of God must obviously itself say that it is a book of God. To be more explicit, such a book should itself say Who had sent it, why He has sent it, whom He has sent it to and how the book materialized from the unseen to the seen. In fact even the language of the Divine message should be known and not left to guess work.

To illustrate the above, I quote from the Holy Quran:

"And surely this is a revelation from the Lord of the worlds. The Faithful Spirit has brought it, on thy heart, that thou mayest be a warner, in plain Arabic language." (26:192-195)

which explains the Divine Messages fully.

"And believe in that which has been revealed to Muhammad" (47:2)

"Say: Whoever is an enemy to Gabriel (such as the Jews were), so surely he revealed it to thy heart by Allah's command, verifying that which is before it (i.e. previous revelations) and a guidance and glad tidings for the believers." (2:97)

The above quotations make it clear that the Holy Quran:

a) was sent down by Allah, the Lord of the worlds;
b) the agency employed was Gabriel, the Faithful Spirit;
c) which descends on the heart of the recipient;
d) the manner used was Revelation;
e) the same had been employed for sending previous revelations to all the prophets, which the Holy Quran, confirms;
f) the heart on which the Holy Quran was revealed was that of Muhammad (peace be upon him);
g) the language of the revelation was Arabic, selected because of all the human languages, it is most suitable for giving expression to the profound meanings of the final Divine message.

Does any of the Gospels mention any of these essential points? Not one! On the other hand they bear testimony on their faces of their being written by human beings who, as we will show later, are unknown people. The contents of the four Gospels, again, leave no doubt that they are conflict- ing accounts of the life-story of Jesus. But more of that later. Let us first answer the criticism levelled against the Holy Quran.

CRITICISM ANSWERED

Before we do so, let us make it clear that while the Christian Gospels themselves bear witness that they are not the revealed Word of God, as we will show later, Mr. John Gilchrist's criticism of the Holy Quran is not based on anything contained in that sublime Book but only on what other people have said, and even that is misrepresented and exaggerated unwarrantably.

SHI'AS AND THE HOLY QURAN

The first fault found by Mr. John Gilchrist in the Holy Quran is that "the Shi'ite Muslims claim that a whole Surah, the Suratu'n Nurain, is missing from the Quran." to give the impression that all Shi'as make that claim is an exaggeration, which is unwarranted. Even if, in the heated Shia-Sunni conflicts of the early centuries of Islam, some Shi'as said so, why is it that the missing Surah was not included by them in their copies of the Holy Quran which were in their own hands and from which they recited day and night? That this was not done shows that even those few Shi'as did not really believe in what they allegen. In all the fourteen centuries of Islam, there have been independent Shia kingdoms and countries which were free to do whatever they liked. Proof of such independence is that the Shia Muslims have openly held all their beliefs and tenets. They have practised Islam as they saw it. They have written freely about what they thought was right. How come that there is not a single case of Shia copy of the Holy Quran being different from the Sunni copies even in the smallest vowel point, let alone the main text? That is the miracle of the Holy Quran, and undeniable proof of the Divine promise made in the Holy Quran.
that it will be preserved for all time to come.

On this point let me quote Sir William Muir, a severe critic of anything he found objectionable, from his "Life of Mohammed": "The Shiias, indeed, of later times pretend that 'Usman left out certain suras or passages which favoured 'Ali. But this is incredible! When 'Usman's edition was prepared, open breach had taken place between the Omeyyads and the 'Alayites. The unity of Islam was unthreatened. 'Ali's pretensions were as yet undeveloped. No sufficient object can, therefore, be assigned for the perpetration by 'Usman of an offence which Muslims would have regarded as one of the blackest dye. Again, at the time of the recension there were still multitudes alive who had learnt the Quran by heart as they had heard it originally delivered; and copies of any passages favouring 'Ali, if any such passages ever existed, must have been in the hands of his numerous adherents, both of which sources would have proved an effective check upon any attempt at suppression. Further, the party of 'Ali, immediately on 'Usman's death, assumed an independent attitude and raised him to Caliphate. Is it conceivable that when thus arrived at power, they would have tolerated a mutilated Quran, mutilated expressly to destroy their leader's claim? Yet we find that they continued to use the same Quran as their opponents and raised not the slightest objection against it."

May we add here that:

a) Hazrat Ali was one of the dignitaries called in by Hazrat Usman for consultation before undertaking the copying out of the original prepared in Hazrat Abu Bakr's time. And Hazrat Ali was an approving party to the whole work.

b) Before Hazrat Usman was assassinated, and even afterwards when the campaign of maligning him continued to justify his assassination, not one of his opponents - however unscrupulous - uttered a word about anything wrong in the preparation of the copies of the original Quran by Hazrat Usman.

As we have said earlier, it is an unwarranted exaggeration to give the impression that all Shiias, at any time, believed that there was anything wrong with the copies of the Holy Quran prepared at the instance of Hazrat Usman. Maulana Muhammad Ali, the world-renowned translator and commentator of the Holy Quran says in his introduction to the 1917 edition: "The Shia, however, do not all believe that portions of the Holy Quran have been lost or that passages favouring Ali's claims were intentionally omitted by Zaid or 'Usman. The vast majority of them admit that the Holy Quran has been handed down to us in all its purity."

OPINIONS OF Shia SCHOLARS

It would be interesting to hear the learned Shiias themselves on this question. Tafsir Safi is an important Shia commentary on the Holy Quran. It was placed and taught in all Shia schools. The learned author, Mulla Muhsin thus denounces the ignorant Shiias who thought that certain portions of the Holy Quran were lost: "Certain men from among us and the Hashwia masses reported that the Quran had suffered loss and alteration. But the true belief of our friends is against this, and such is the belief of the vast majority. For the Quran is a miracle of the Holy Prophet and the source of all knowledge relating to law and all religious injunctions, and the learned Muslims have taken the utmost pains for its protection, so that there is nothing relating to its vowel points, its recital, its letters, and its verses, which they do not know. With such strong measures of protection and such faithful preservation of the Holy Book, it cannot be supposed that any alteration or loss could take place."

The learned author goes on to say: "Surely the Quran was collected and arranged in the lifetime of the Holy Prophet exactly as it is in our hands. All these facts show conclusively that the Holy Quran was complete and collected in the lifetime of the Holy Prophet, and it was not dispersed or scattered. It has been stated that those from among the Hashwia and Imamia sects (of the Shia) who hold a contrary view are nothing compared with the vast majority who hold the right view. It should also be borne in mind that the contrary view was held by some of the reporters who gave circulation to very weak and unreliable reports."

After this the learned author quotes the opinions of several learned Shiias, honoured and respected by the whole Shia world, who taught in clear words that "the Quran as sent down by God to His Prophet is exactly what is now between the two boards (i.e. between the covers of the written volume) and in the hands of the people."

We repeat that if any Shiias, however few, really believed that certain portions of the Holy Quran were missing, what was there to prevent them from inserting them in their own copies? The fact that the Holy Quran throughout the world even in the hands of the Shiias, is identical to the last letter or vowel point, is proof that it is miraculously preserved, possibly only at Divine Hands.

DESTRUCTION OF UNAUTHORIZED COPIES

The next criticism of Mr. John Gilchrist is that since, after the preparation of authorized copies of the Holy Quran, Caliph Usman ordered the destruction by burning of the unauthorized copies, there must have been serious differences or discrepancies to justify destruction by burning. And Mr. Gilchrist thought so highly of this criticism that he has repeated it more than
once.

This criticism should not have been made at all since the report on this point makes it clear that when the Muslim Empire reached its zenith in the time of Hazrat Usman, and non-Arabic speaking peoples came into the fold of Islam, differences only of pronunciation or readings of the Holy Quran arose. Even some non-Quraish tribes of Arabia pronounced certain words differently from the Quraish in whose language the Holy Quran was revealed. For instance, they pronounced the word hatta as atta. And this difference of pronunciation is common to all languages and all nations - even the English whose masses drop the h and pronounce horse asorse. Let us consider what happened in Hazrat Usman’s time. An authentic report narrated by Bukhari thus describes the circumstances: - Anas, son of Malik, relates that there came to Usman, Huzaifa who had been fighting with the people of Syria in the conquest of Armenia and with the people of Iraq in Azerbaijan, and who was alarmed at their variations in the mode of reading, and he said to Usmana 'O Commander of the Faithful! Stop the people before they differ in the Holy Book as the Jews and Christians differ in their scriptures.'

It is quite clearly stated that the differences in the far-flung corners of the empire were only of qira’at (i.e. recitation or the mode of reading). So they were not serious or substantial as in the case of the scripts of the Jews and Christians. But as remarked by Maulana Muhammad Ali, it was feared that if nothing was done to put a stop to the differences of readings they might after the lapse of a few generations develop into serious differences. The Companions of the Holy Prophet were so jealous of the sanctity and safety of the Holy Book that even in the Holy Prophet’s time, Hazrat Umar on hearing Hisham pronouncing cer-

tain words in a different way put Hisham’s own chador (wrapping cloth) round his ham’s neck and dragged him to the presence of the Holy Prophet. And in the time of Hazrat Usman differences of reading were leading to the charges of heresy by one party of Muslims against the other, as related by Maulana Muhammad Ali. So, to put an end to this evil and to the possibility of different readings eventually leading to different writings by irresponsible people, Hazrat Usman had authentic copies prepared of the Holy Quran and sent to all countries of the Muslim empire to serve as master copies for reference and rectification. The copies unofficially compiled previously by private persons were naturally ordered to be destroyed.

Such a simple and straightforward event has been distorted by the hostility of the critics of the Holy Quran for the purpose of fault-finding.

HAZRAT UMAR’S REPORT

The next fault found by Mr. Gilchrist in the Holy Quran is based on the following report attributed to Hazrat Umar uttered allegedly from the pulpit of the mosque at Madinah when he was Caliph: - "Surely God raised Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, with truth, and He revealed to him the Book, and there was among what was sent down upon him the verse relating to stoning; we read it, and guarded it, and understood it, and the Messenger of God may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, stoned and after him we also stoned. But I fear that when time lengthens with the people, a sayer will say: 'Surely we do not find stoning in the Book of God', and thus they will go astray by forsaking an injunction which God has sent down; and surely stoning is truly in the Book of God; punishment for the person who commits adultery, whether man or woman either after its having been proved by witnesses, or by the woman's conception or the confession of the accused." (Muslim: Kitabul Hudud). The above report must have wrongly been attributed to Hazrat Umar for the following reasons:-

a) The Holy Quran was put in the book form at the instance and on the insistence of Hazrat Umar, in the time of Hazrat Abu Bakr.

b) Hazrat Umar was one of the amanuensis who wrote down the Holy Quran in the time of the Holy Prophet. So he must have had a copy of what he wrote down.

c) After Hazrat Abu Bakr had agreed to the Holy Quran being put in the book form, it was Hazrat Umar who went to the pulpit and addressed the Companions of the Holy Prophet assembled in the mosque saying that all those who had any written portions of the Holy Quran should bring them along, with two witnesses to swear to the correctness of the writings. Such writings were checked with one another and with the hundreds of Quraa who had committed the whole of the Holy Quran to memory in its proper order in the time of the Holy Prophet himself.

d) The copy thus prepared had the approval of all the Companions of the Holy Prophet including Hazrat Umar.

e) The copy was kept in the custody of Hazrat Abu Bakr and on his death, it was taken over by Hazrat Umar himself.

f) It remained in his custody for ten long years. If there was anything missing in that copy why did Hazrat Umar not rectify the omission? He was a very powerful Caliph who promulgated major reforms. He was bold enough to remonstrate even with the Holy Prophet at the time of the Peace of Hudaibiyah when he thought that a mistake was being made. How is it that though the Holy Quran was
collected at his instance and he urged all Muslims to bring along any writings of the Holy Quran that they may have, he did not bring along his own writings containing the verse about stoning, for he was one of the scribes? Those who know anything about Hazrat Umar know full well that he was not the sort of man to utter merely a plaintive remark as attributed to him. He would have carried out the correction in the Holy Quran even if nobody had supported him; if he thought that what he was doing was right.

g) In the plaintive remark attributed to him he is alleged to have said 'we guarded it (the verse about stoning the adulterer)'. Is the long recital above of the opportunities he had to include the alleged verse in the Holy Quran, but his failure to do so, the way he guarded it? If he meant: 'we had memorized the verse in question why did we not quote it when referring to it?' And why did the hundreds of others who had memorized the Holy Quran in the time of the Holy Prophet not support him? If as alleged, stoning used to be done by the Holy Prophet and his Companions, why did no one of the latter stand up for Hazrat Umar's alleged stand?

h) Hazrat Umar scrupulously enforced the laws of Shariat (Muslim Law) to the extent of whipping his own son for drinking, as reported in another tradition. Did he ever require the stoning of any person guilty of adultery in his long spell as the most powerful Caliph of Islam in an extensive empire in which crimes including adultery were committed? The alleged remarks of Hazrat Umar cannot be accepted, particularly in the light of the clear provision in the Holy Quran that a person guilty of adultery should be given 100 stripes (which may he with a light cane, or a bunch of twigs or even with a shoe). It is a well-known principle that traditions (sayings or deeds) of the Holy Prophet himself must be looked at in the light of the Holy Quran for he never said or did anything contrary to the Quran. That test should be much more forcibly applied to any tradition attributed to a companion of the Holy Prophet - which Hazrat Umar was. Mr. Gilchrist must be aware that the scholars of Hadith (sayings or doing of the Holy Prophet and sometimes of his Companions) have set up carefully prepared standards of testing the veracity of a report. And they came to the conclusion that a number of traditions were forged by zindeeqs (i.e. those who profess Islam but are heretics or unbelievers at heart). A number of Jews who professed Islam as a matter expediency played this treacherous role quite a lot. The report attributed to Hazrat Umar (through Hazrat Anas allegedly) must have been forged to bring Islam into line with Judaism which provided for the stoning of adulterers.

LAST CRITICISM

Mr. John Gilchrist quotes the following tradition: "Ibn Shihab said: Kharejah-b-Zaid-b-Sabt say: I missed a verse from the (Surah) "Allies" (330) at the time when we copied (the correct translation of the Arabic word nasakh is to write) the compilation. I used to hear the Apostle of Allah read it. We searched it and found it with Khuzaaimah-b-Sabet al Ansari: 'Among the believers there are men who are true to the covenant which they made with Allah (33.23Q). So we introduced (the correct translation of the Arabic text is 'joined') it in its chapter in the script." (Al-Hadis, Vol. 3, p.709)

Based on the above report, Mr. Gilchrist says that this was after the copies had been made in the time of Caliph Usman from the original Quran collected in the time of Caliph Abu Bakr: therefore, the verse in question was not in the original copy: hence the Quran is not preserved.

This conclusion is based on a prejudiced version of the text. Mr. Gilchrist has alleged that the discovery of the verse in question took place after the copies had been made in the time of Caliph Usman, because the report occurs after the one relating to that copying. Actually the report, it is in two parts and is not one report as alleged by Mr. Gilchrist. The first part of which the narrator is Anas-b-Malik ends with the copying done in the time of Caliph Usman. The second part is by a different narrator named Ibn Shihab and relates to the original compilation of the Quran in the time of Abu Bakr. This is clear from the same volume III of Al-Hadis page 707 (i.e. only two pages earlier in which Zaid-b-Sabt himself narrates the same discovery of the verse in question at the time of the original compilation of the Quran in the time of Caliph Abu Bakr and its insertion in the original copy. So the verse was there when copies were made in the time of Caliph Usman, and it was not introduced later as misconstrued by Mr. Gilchrist. Those conversant with the books of Hadis know that those who wrote them repeat the same report again and again according to the requirements of the subject matter.

As already stated, the Holy Quran was assembled in one written book in the time of Caliph Abu Bakr for the first time, as it could not be assembled in one book while the Holy Prophet was alive and revelation was coming all the time. But it was committed to memory as a whole in the time of the Holy Prophet himself. When compiled as a book, Hazrat Abu Bakr, Umar and Zaid-b-Sabt (the scribe) required the written manuscripts, which were in bits and pieces prepared as and when revelation came down, to be produced. The fact that the verse in question was found only in one writing is due to the fact that the Holy Prophet used to call one scribe at a time - whoever was available. These written pieces,
supported by the sworn testimony of two witnesses, were checked with those persons who had memorized the whole Quran. It was from such memory that Zaid-b-Sabat was searching for the written copy which he eventually found with one of the scribes.

So we are afraid. Mr. Gilchrist's castle on sand collapses.

THE QURAN AND THE BIBLE

Before we pass on to discuss on its own merits, the Bible, we would like to answer the last chapter of Mr. Gilchrist's booklet in which he has tried to show the Holy Quran itself testifies to the Bible (both the Old Testament and the New Testament) being the Word of God. Before we examine the verses of the Holy Quran quoted by him to prove the Bible to be the Word of God, we would like to ask Mr. John Gilchrist whether he also accepts the Holy Quran (which he quotes in his favour) to be the Word of God?

As for us, we are enjoined by the Holy Quran to believe in all revelations sent down before the Holy Quran and they include the Torah and the Injeel. But the Holy Quran also said 1400 years ago that these revealed books (not reduced to writing until decades and even centuries later) are now corrupted if not lost altogether. And that we will show from a look at the two books now under discussion - the Old Testament and the New Testament - themselves. However, let us first consider what Mr. John Gilchrist has adduced in favour of the Bible from the Holy Quran to show that the former in its present form is the Word of God. He has quoted the following verses:

1. "And how do they make thee a judge and they have the Torah wherein is Allah's judgement? And yet they turn away after that! And they are not (really) believers." (5:43)

2. "And let the people of the Gospel (Injeel) judge by that which Allah has revealed in it. And whoever judges not by what Allah has revealed, those are the breakers of the covenant." (5:47)

3. "Say: O People of the Book you are not on anything (i.e. you have no legs to stand on) till you observe the Torah and the Gospel (Injeel) and that which was revealed to you from your Lord." (5:68)

4. "And if thou art in doubt as to that which We have revealed to thee, ask those who read the Book before thee." (10:94)

Arguing that the Torah and the Gospel, such as they were in the time of the Holy Prophet, are meant in these verses. Mr. Gilchrist says that these verses show that the Bible of the time was accepted by the Holy Quran as the revealed and authentic Word of God. We will show later that this is not so when we discuss the verses of the Holy Quran saying 1400 years ago that the Bible was interpolated and thus corrupted. But let us accept for the time being the interpretation placed on them by Mr. Gilchrist that the Bible, such as it was in the time of the Holy Prophet, is meant. But even so, the verses do not help Mr. Gilchrist.

What do they say after all? They call upon the followers of the Torah and the Gospel (Injeel) to judge by their revealed books, if they really believe in them. Commentators of the Holy Quran have said that the Jews of Madina used to bring their cases to the Holy Prophet for judgment because the laws of the Holy Quran were less severe than the laws of the Torah. The Quran says to them: If you do not believe in the Quran why do you want to be judged by it? Why do you not accept the punishments prescribed by the Torah, if you continue to be its followers?

And to the Christian friends, who believe in the Bible as a whole, the same question is pat. Why do you not let yourself be judged and governed by the Bible (Old Testament and the New Testament) if you continue to believe them to be the word of God? Are any laws in any Christian country made and administered according to the Bible? The answer is a seeping "NO".

To the Christian friends who are frightened by the severe laws of the Old Testament, we would like to draw attention that Jesus Christ clearly required his followers to submit to the Law laid down in the Old Testament when he said in his famous sermon on the mount: (Matthew : 5)

17. "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill.

18. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all are fulfilled.

19. Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven."

Are the Christian friends prepared to observe this clear injunction of their Saviour if they believe in the Gospel? That is what the Holy Quran's verses quoted by Mr. Gilchrist say. They do not show the authenticity of the Bible; on the contrary, they say, if you believe in it then observe it and be judged by the law so forcibly enjoined on you by your Saviour.

Jesus Christ particularly mentioned the prohibition of adultery in the Ten Commandments and carried its scope further when he said in the same sermon on the mount: "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, thou shalt not commit adultery: But I say unto you, that whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart." (Matthew, 5:27-28)

Is that why adultery is permitted
in various Christian countries (except rape, and adultery with a married woman which entitles the husband to civil damages): but the severe punishment of stoning to death required by the Law enjoined by Jesus Christ is nowhere prescribed? Is the recent legalization of sodomy and unnatural offences in various Christian countries a due compliance with the Word of God mentioned above?

Jesus Christ also said, while prohibiting divorce previously allowed by the Law: "It hath been said, Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement. But I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery: and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery." (Matthew 5:31-32)

Is the legalization of divorce (even on grounds other than adultery) in most, if not all, Christian countries, and of the remarriage of such divorced persons to others, due to compliance with the above?

Are the Christian Laws of any country in the world in compliance with Jesus' exhortation that his followers shall not resist evil but go along with it (Matthew 5:39-41).

Or, are most of the present-day Christian Laws throughout the world (whether on the question of divorce or on the question of dealing with evil) in conformity with the Holy Quran? If so, this is what the verses quoted by Mr. Gilchrist say: How do you come round to the laws brought by the Holy Prophet in the Quran and yet not believe in it? How do you refuse to obey the laws of your own Book and yet believe in it?

Only one verse, out of the verses quoted by Mr. Gilchrist, remains to be explained: "And if thou art in doubt as to that which we have revealed to thee, ask those who read the Book before thee." (10:94)

Taking "thee" to mean the Holy Prophet, Mr. John Gilchrist argues that the Prophet was asked to consult the People of the Book if he himself was in doubt about what was revealed to him. That is a complete misunderstanding of the verse in question. The Prophet is nowhere mentioned in this verse. On the contrary, the Beni Israel are mentioned before. And note the verse which follows: "And be not of those who reject the message of Allah, then thou wilt be of the losers." (10:95) No person in his senses can take the same "thou" repeated here to be the Holy Prophet. In any case, the whole history of the Holy Prophet shows that he was never in the slightest doubt about the revelation received by him, even when the promises of victory made therein looked absolutely impossible, and his sufferings and those of his followers knew no limit and no end. The Holy Quran is full of prohibitions addressed as "thou". Does it mean, God forbid, the Holy Prophet was even capable of committing any of the prohibited acts? That is utter nonsense when the Holy Quran gives the highest possible testimonials to the sublime character of the Holy Prophet, declaring him to be a perfect exemplar to all men for all time to come.

Someone can ask then what do the words "revealed to thee" mean in the same verse. The Holy Quran quite often speaks of the revelation of the Holy Quran having been given to all men, e.g. "We have revealed to you a Book" (21:10); or, the believers are stated to believe in "That which has been revealed to us." (2:136)

The doubt mentioned is about the fact of revelation itself. Revelation was always questioned when a prophet came, for the people at large could not see it coming. The Holy Prophet could not possibly be in doubt about the fact of revelation for he saw and heard the angel Gabriel, and witnessed the whole event. It is those who had never had any such experience who questioned it. They are told to ask those who read previously revealed Books, for the method of revelation of all Books was the same. And the testimony of 124,000 prophets known for their truthfulness and integrity was overwhelming evidence in favour of the fact of revelation.

CORRUPTION OF REVEALED BOOKS BEFORE QURAN:

Mr. John Gilchrist conveniently dismisses the verses of the Holy Quran which go against him by saying that they do not prove that the Torah and the Gospel, as they existed in the time of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, were not authentic and uncorrupted Word of God. The verses thus glossed over are discussed below seriati:

(1) "O People of the Book, why do you confound the truth with falsehood, and hide the truth while you know?" (3:70)

Mr. Gilchrist conveniently dismisses this verse by saying that it refers to the Jews who were "compounding their Scriptural truths with false beliefs." The verse certainly does not refer to Jews only. Throughout the section in which this verse occurs the words "People of the Book" and the Jews are nowhere mentioned specifically. It is well-known that the expression "People of the Book" is a general one and even when applied to the followers of the Bible it means the Jews as well as the Christians. In fact, three verses earlier, where alone the People of the Book are specified, it is stated: "Abraham was not a Jew or a Christian, but he was an upright Muslim, and he was not one of the Polytheists." (3:66). So that the Patriarch, the universally venerated father of all nations, was not a follower of either the Jewish religion or the Christian religion, but of Islam which was the religion of all Prophets. And he was the sternest
enemy of polytheists - which the Jews and the Christians had become.

Then a verse earlier, both the Jews and the Christians are addressed again: "O People of the Book, why do you dispute about Abraham, when the Torah and the Gospel (Injeel) were not revealed till after him?" (3:64)

And the next earlier verse, which opens the section by addressing the People of the Book, was read out by the Holy Prophet to the Christian Bishops of Najran, who came to him in a delegation.

Thus the whole of this section, including the charge of mixing up the truth with falsehood, is addressed both to the Jews and the Christians. And Mr. John Gilchrist cannot get away with his remarks that the charge applies to Jews only, and that, too, to a particular incident concerning them. If somebody later applies it to an incident of the Jews, it does not take away the generality of the charge. For instance, if the criminal law section of a code relating to forgery is illustrated in a law book by quoting a particular case it does not mean that the law was confined to it only.

(2) The second verse dismissed lightly by Mr. John Gilchrist by saying that it applies only to the Jews reads: "Woe then to those who write the Book with their own hands then say, this is from Allah, so that they may take for it a small price (gain). So woe to them for what their hands write and woe to them for what they earn." (2:79)

I reiterate that the "Book" means any revealed book, and not the Torah only. And the section in which this verse occurs opens with a reference to the crucifixion of Jesus Christ, and it also refers to the belief that hell-fire would not touch the people concerned except maybe for a few days. Some of the Jews may have had that faith, but the Christians as a whole believe firmly that faith in the crucifixion of Jesus Christ would save them from hell-fire; may be, if Jesus Christ went to hell for three days after his crucifixion, that would be the maximum for his followers, too. And the next verse (81) emphasizes that the evil earned shall condemn a person to hell. The next verse after that says that not only faith but faith leading to good deeds alone will take a person to heaven. Who does it apply to: the Jews or the Christians who believe that faith alone will save the followers of Jesus from hell-fire.

Then follows a gem of an argument from Mr. John Gilchrist. After saying that the above verse condemns most severely the interpolation of revealed books by their followers applies only to "the Jewish tendency to write their own traditions, only to quote them as Scripture." Mr. Gilchrist says that "Nowhere in the Quran is there any suggestion that the Scriptures of the Jews and the Christians, the Torah and the Gospel, as are said to be in their possession, are altered in any way." For such blatant throwing of dust into the eyes of the readers, we have no answer. If the verse in question does not speak of the revealed books before the Quran being corrupted by human hands, what on earth does it speak of? And that very much includes the Gospels, of which their own followers now affirm that heavy interpolation and corruption took place in them, as we shall discuss now. A sample may be quoted here from Reverend Professor Dummelow's "Bible Commentary" (p.xvi).

"To begin with, the writers or the Gospels report in Greek...the sayings of Jesus who for the most part spoke Aramaic... Not even in later centuries do we find that scrupulous regard for the sacred text which marked the transmission of the Old Testament. A抄ypist would sometimes put in not what was in the text, but what he thought ought to be in it. He would trust a fickle memory or he would even make the text accord with the views of the school to which be belonged"

ARE THE GOSPELS THE WORD OF GOD?

As already stated, the Holy Quran affirms that a revealed book named "Injeel" was given to Jesus who was an outstanding prophet, and his followers but that is not the present Gospels, which may, however, contain some part or parts of the original revealed book. The Christians, though not those who have done critical research on the Gospels, however, believe that the Gospels are the Word of God. Let us examine this point:

(a) It is common ground that the Book revealed to Jesus was not reduced to writing in his lifetime.

(b) As Jesus and his disciples spoke Aramaic, the book must have been in that language.

(c) No such book exists even today. The present Gospels were translated from Greek or Latin.

(d) A book not reduced to writing immediately, but transmitted by word of mouth by people for decades amounting almost to a century, is bound to suffer in such long transmission. It also suffers in translation, when the original text is not there and the translators do not hesitate to insert and interpolate their own ideas as the translators of Gospels did (vide Rev. Prof. Dummelow's comments quoted above).

(e) As a result there were as many as nearly 300 Gospels, differing fundamentally (for instance on the basic question whether Jesus was God incarnate or not), by the time Emperor Constantine was converted to Christianity in the 4th Century A.D.

(f) He was annoyed at so many Gospels preaching different basic creeds. He, therefore, assembled 300 Bishops who were the proponents of these Gospels, one for each, and required them to decide which one of these 300 odd Gospels was the Word of God.

(g) The Bishops could not agree on any one Gospel. As they could not get out of the assembly hall until they had decided the issue, they ultimately decided to put all the 300 Gospels under the table they sat around, and kneeled to pray to God that the real Gospel may rise to the top of the table. When they opened their eyes after praying, lo and behold there were 4 Gospels lying on the table! Since God could not have gone wrong, it is obvious that four of the Bishops took advantage of the closed eyes of their colleagues to put their own Gospels each on the table top. (h) Those are the four Gospels which we are now asked to believe were the ones revealed by God. How could these four mutually differing books be each called revealed? Although the Gospels of Mark, Matthew and Luke are supposed to be resembling each other, and are hence called Synoptic, the percentage of differences is about 50 percent. The Gospel of St. John is nearly 90 percent different from the other three Gospels. How could such varying Gospels be each called the revealed book of God given to Jesus Christ?

(i) In any case none of the Gospels claims to have been revealed to Jesus.

(j) It has been said that the evangelists (writers of the four Gospels) were inspired by God. Inspired in four differing and conflicting versions, one of which is nearly 90 percent different from the others?

(k) In any case, none of the four evangelists who wrote the Gospels claimed to be inspired or revealed to.

(l) And who were the evangelists? There is considerable difference of opinion about their identity.

(m) What is more, each Gospel claims to be only 'according to' so and so. That means that the four evangelists were not the authors but narrators.

(n) A look at the four Gospels shows that they are honest to goodness biographies of Jesus Christ. Biographies do not have to be revealed! They are accounts of what happened before the eyes of the people of the times.

(o) The ancient manuscripts, each (usually called a code or a version, of the Gospel) are so many that to name them would unnecessarily lengthen this article. They suffer from missing parts and other variations. As Reverend Professor Dummelow of Cambridge University, who was assisted by forty-two Christian divines and scholars in the preparation of his "Commentary on the Holy Bible", says (page xv) "the copyist of the Bible played freely with the text to insert what they thought should be written in or to adapt the text to the views of the schools to which they belonged. He adds: "In addition to the versions and quotations from the Christian Fathers, nearly four thousand Greek manuscripts of the New Testament were known to exist. As a result, the variety of readings is considerable."

(p) Another authority, Tucker, in his "History of the Christian in the Light of Modern Knowledge", narrating similar alterations and adaptations, says on p. 320: "thus Gospels were produced which clearly reflected the conception of the practical need of the community for which they were written. In them the traditional material was used, but there was no hesitation in altering it or making additions to it, or leaving out what did not suit the writer's purpose."

(q) One could go on endlessly quoting Christian scholars themselves on the Gospels, but that would tax the patience of the reader. We would like to close with the comment of Reverend Professor J.W. Donaldson on p. 156 of his book "The Christian Orthodoxy" where he discusses the claim that the New Testament containeth the Infallible Word of God, nay, is the Word of God" and concludes: "We see, therefore, by a mere statement of the reasoning used in support, that the hypothesis of an infallible literature is as baseless as the fabric of a dream... the question of inspiration of the New Testament is of dogmatic, not of historical, import." As William Greg says in "the Creed of Christendom", "The Gospels nowhere affirm or even intimate their own inspiration, a claim to credence which, had they possessed it, they assuredly would not have failed to put forward. Nor do the Apostolic writings bear any such testimony to them."

From the above two quotations of the Christian scholars themselves, it is clear that the claim that the Gospels are inspired is of later growth, is based on dogma, and is not historically correct.

CONCLUSION

Even if the Gospels contain some elements of the original revealed book undoubtedly given to Jesus, that book was in any case incomplete, serving only a temporary Divine purpose, as the Holy Quran and Bible both show. The Holy Quran says, "Hast thou not seen those who were given a portion of the Book? They are (now) invited to the Book of Allah that it may decide between them" (3:22); the differences having arisen because of the loss or corruption of the books revealed before the Holy Quran. The above is confirmed by no less a person than Jesus himself who said: "I have yet many things to say to you, but you cannot hear them now. Howbeit when he, the spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth; for he shall not speak of himself, but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak; and he will show you things to come. (John 16: 12-13)

Thus as Jesus himself told his disciples, "all truth" will be given by the prophet to follow him, which was no other than the Holy Prophet Muhammad. The Book continued on page 16
Both Islam and Christianity claim to be revealed religions. Jesus Christ declared that the message he was delivering was not his but God's: "I have not spoken of myself, but the Father which sent me, He gave me a commandment, what I should say and what I should speak." (John 12: 49) He described himself as "a man who has told you the truth, which I have heard from God." (John 8:40) In the same way it is claimed in the Quran that the revelation which came to the Prophet Muhammad was from the Lord of the worlds: "And this is truly a revelation from the Lord of the worlds. The faithful spirit has descended with it upon thy heart 'O Muhammad, that thou mayest be one of the warners.'" (The Quran 26:192-194) From this it follows that the truth of either religion depends on the accuracy with which the inspired words of its founder have been recorded and on the textual purity of its scripture. If the message which was revealed by God to a prophet has not reached us exactly as it was delivered, but has been misreported and altered, then to that extent that religion may be regarded as having deviated from the truth. It is, therefore, of the utmost importance to inquire how far the revelations of Jesus and Muhammad (peace be upon them) have been faithfully recorded in the Gospels and in the Quran respectively.

The Gospels

There are four Gospels included in the Bible - the Gospels according to Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. We come across many inspired sayings and discourses of Jesus in these Gospels. They were compiled between forty and eighty years after the departure of Jesus, on the basis of some earlier documents that have not come down to us. Biblical scholars have identified some of these lost documents as: (1) 'Q' (German 'Quelle' - source), a document which was originally written in Aramaic, but which reached the Evangelists in a Greek translation; (2) 'Urmarcus' (primitive Mark), an earlier draft of Mark's Gospel, written on the basis of Peter's discourses about Jesus; and (3) 'L', a collection of reports about Jesus used only by Luke. A comparison of the Gospels will show that their authors took considerable liberties with these early documents.

Mark

The first Gospel to be written was that of Mark. It was written at Rome at least forty years after the so-called crucifixion of Jesus. The Gospel in its present form is said to be an expanded version of Urmarcus. It is not possible to say whether Urmarcus was revised and expanded by Mark himself or by some other person. Dr C.J. Cadoux has the following to say about Mark's Gospel:

"It was written after Peter's martyrdom (65 C.E.), and at a time when Mark, who had not himself been a disciple of Jesus, apparently had none of the personal disciples of Jesus within reach by whose knowledge he could check his narrative. These circumstances of its composition account for the existence in it, side by side, of numerous signs of accuracy and a certain number of signs of ignorance and inaccuracy." (The Life of Jesus, p. 13)

Matthew

The Gospel of Matthew was written in Greek at Antioch about 90 C.E. Its author made use of at least two earlier documents - Q and Urmarcus. No independent scholar regards this as the work of Matthew, the apostle of Jesus. If Matthew wrote anything it must have been only Q. Regarding the liberties taken by the unknown author of this Gospel with the original material, C.J. Cadoux writes:

"But a close examination of the treatment he gives to his borrowings from Mark shows that he allowed himself great freedom in editing and embroidering his material in the interest of what he regarded as the rightful honouring of the great Master. The same tendencies are often visible elsewhere when he is producing Q or providing matter peculiar to himself. Anything, therefore, strictly peculiar to Matthew can be accepted as historical only with great caution." (ibid., pp. 14-15)

Luke

The third Gospel, the Gospel of Luke, was written somewhere in Greece about the year 80 C.E. It is an apologetic addressed to non-Jews. The writer, who was the friend and travel-companion of Paul, made use of at least three documents, two of these were identical with those used by the writer of Matthew's Gospel and the third was peculiar to himself. To quote Professor E.E. Kellet:

"Luke is a Greek writer, and writes like a Greek historian. In some cases, it is to be feared, he makes speeches of his own for his heroes; and a beautiful story seems true to him because it is beautiful ... The whole story is a popular legend, taken over and rewritten with deceptive charm by a man of Herodotean gifts." (A short History of Religions, p. 173)

John

The Gospels of Mark, Matthew and Luke are called "synoptic gospels" because they proceed on the basis of the same documents and have much in common. The Gospel of John is very different from these. The divinity and pre-existence of Jesus are expressly affirmed in this Gospel alone. It was written at or near Ephesus between the years 110 and 115 of the Christian era. No independent scholar regards it as the work of John, the son of Zebedee, who, according to
R.H. Charles, Alfred Loisy, Robert Eisler and other scholars, was beheaded by Agrippa I in the year 44 C.E., long before the fourth Gospel could have been written. The modern scholars not only question the historical value of this Gospel, but also reject the genuineness of the 'sayings' put by him in the mouth of Jesus. C.J. Cadoux writes:

"The speeches in the fourth Gospel (even apart from the early messianic claim) are so different from those in the synoptics, and so like the comments of the fourth evangelist himself, that both cannot be equally reliable as records of what Jesus said. Literary veracity in ancient times did not forbid, as it does now, the assignment of fictitious speeches to historical characters; the best ancient historians made a practice of composing and assigning such speeches in this way." (p. 16)

Remarks

The Gospels were composed after the early Christians had become divided into different factions. They were in fact written to propagate the special teachings of the various sects, and their authors showed no hesitation in tampering with the earlier documents and other traditional material regarding the life and teachings of Jesus to bring them in line with the views of their sects. To quote the Rev. T.G. Tucker:

"Thus Gospels were produced which clearly reflected the conceptions of the practical needs of the community for which they were written. In them the traditional material was used, but there was no hesitation in altering it or making additions to it, or in leaving out what did not suit the writer's purpose." (The History of the Christians in the Light of Modern Knowledge, p. 320)

The four Gospels included in the Bible were not the only Gospels written in the early centuries of Christianity. There were many more, including the Gospel of the Nazarenes, and the Gospel according to the Hebrews - three Aramaic works which were used by the Nazarenes (as the early disciples of Jesus were called), who denied the divinity of Jesus and regarded him only as a great prophet. Towards the end of the second century the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John were included in the canon and the rest were declared to be heretical or apocryphal by the church. Before they were canonized and accepted as scriptures, the Gospels did not have that sanctity which they have now and no one felt any compunction in altering them if anything contained in them did not suit his purpose or the purpose of his sect. Even after they were included in the canon and declared to be the word of God, changes continued to be made in them, as is clear from the early extant manuscripts.

Summary

In considering how far the four Gospels faithfully present the inspired message or Gospel of Jesus, we must bear in mind the following facts: (1) that no written copy was made of the inspired sayings of Jesus in his lifetime; (2) that the earliest records of the sayings of Jesus, which were made shortly after the departure of Jesus, have all been irretrievably lost; (3) that in the Gospels, which were written between 70 and 115 C.E. on the basis of some of those now lost documents, the material contained in them was handled rather freely, the evangelists feeling no hesitation in changing it for what they considered to be the greater glory of Christ or to bring it in line with the views of their respective sects; (4) that none of the evangelists had known Jesus or heard him speaking; (5) that the Gospels were written in Greek, whereas the language spoken by Jesus was Aramaic; (6) that they were written to propagate the points of view of the different factions and that they were chosen from many others which represented different viewpoints; (7) that for at least a century after they were written they had no canonical authority and could be and were actually changed by the copyists of the different sects to serve their own purpose; (8) that the earliest extant manuscripts of the Gospels - Codex Sinaiticus, Codex Vaticanus, and Codex Alexandrinus - belong to the fourth and fifth centuries and we can only guess how much the Gospels had been changed during the centuries of which no manuscript is available; (9) that there are considerable differences at many places among the various early manuscripts; and (10) that the Gospels taken as a whole are full of contradictions. These facts disclosed by distinguished Western scholars go to show that the Gospels of Jesus, by which we mean the message which Jesus had received from God, has not reached us in its original form. The four Gospels included in the Bible cannot be considered to be identical with the inspired Gospel of Jesus. The manner of their composition and the circumstances through which they have passed are such that they cannot be relied upon to give us true knowledge of what Jesus had said and taught. C.J. Cadoux sums up the position in these words in "The Life of Jesus":

"In the four Gospels, therefore, the main documents to which we must go if we are to fill-out at all that bare sketch we can put together from other sources, we find material of widely differing quality as regards credibility. So far reaching is the element of uncertainty that it is tempting to 'down tools' at once, and to declare the task hopeless. The historical inconsistencies and improbabilities in parts of the Gospels form some of the Christ-myth theory. These are, however, entirely out-weighted - as we have shown - by other considerations. Still, the discrepancies continued on page 19
THE RATIONALE OF PAKISTAN
By The Late Muhammad Munir
Chief Justice of Pakistan (Retd.)

The obvious reason for the separation from India of the region, that is now called Pakistan, were the irreconcilable differences between the two major communities inhabiting it. The 700 years of Muslim rule had created in the minds of the Hindus an aversion to Muslims. Even during this long period though unity of India as a country was substantially achieved, the two communities never became one nation.

Manu, the great Hindu Lawgiver, had introduced the caste system, dividing Hindu society into two distinct classes (1) the favoured twice born (dojanama) comprising the Brahmans, the Kashatriya and the Vaishyas; and (2) the low caste Sudras who were untouchable and had to do every kind of menial work. Though now untouchability has been banned by law and Gandhi mostly lived among the untouchables, naming them as Harijans, the caste distinctions still exist. The Muslims who settled in India hated such distinctions; they believed in equality, irrespective of birth, country of origin, race, creed or complexion.

The two nation theory on which Mr. Jinnah founded his argument for Pakistan does not require any explanation. Beverly Nichols, who considered Mr. Jinnah as the most important person in Asia, says in his book "The Verdict on India" that in the course of an interview with him Mr. Jinnah had said that the Muslim case could be put in five words "The Muslims are a nation", by reason of their history, their heroes, their art, their architecture, their music, their laws and jurisprudence being different from those of the Hindus. Questioned further whether he was thinking in terms of religion, his reply was "Partly but by no means exclusive-

ly". On another occasion, he said "Islam is not only a set of rituals, traditions and spiritual doctrines; Islam is a code for every Muslim, which regulates his life and his conduct in all aspects, social, political, economic, etc. It is based on the highest principles of honour, integrity, fairplay and justice for all. One God, equality and unity are the fundamental principles of Islam." (Fareed S. Jafri, "Pakistan's Growth of Ideology" - VII, Pakistan Standard, January 30, 1955).

Thus two communities were face to face with fundamental differences between them. As the authors of "Major Governments in Asia", Cornell University Press, remark at p. 377 of Chapter XLV of their book that "even though they lived together in one village and might see each other every day of their lives, Hindus and Muslims were never part of one community. They differed in religion, in morals, in diet, in dress, in education and in family laws. They did not eat in one another's house and their children did not intermarry. Under such circumstances, physical nearness bred suspicion, not comradeship." The Hindu by his tradition, history, philosophy, law, deep rooted prejudices, discrimination and intolerance stood quite apart from a Muslim. The great traveller Alberuni, who spent several years in India, sat at the feet of the learned Brahmans to learn Sanskrit and Hindu beliefs and customs, and visited all the important shrines to learn something more from them enumerates the differences between the Hindus and the Muslims in their religious beliefs, modes of worship, social behaviour, customs, language and dress and comes to this conclusion, that Hindus and Muslims were two different peoples having nothing in common except that they lived in the same country. On these differences was founded Quaid-i-Azam, M.A. Jinnah's argument of two-nation theory. It will be completely wrong to describe Mr. Jinnah as a communalist. He had been a prominent member of the Congress since the start of his career when he returned from England after completing his education and practising law for some time there. That enchanting songstress of India, Sarojini Naidu, and many others had described him as the harbinger of Hindu-Muslim unity. In order to keep India united in such a way as to save the Muslims from exploitation by the Hindus he had attended many Conferences, including Lord Wavel's Conference at Simla and the Round Table Conference. Like many other persons he was a member of the Congress as well as the Muslim League. And it was only when he found that the differences between the Congress and the Muslim League were irreconcilable and the Muslims were in real danger of losing their culture, which meant their domination by the Hindu, that he agreed to return from England in 1934 to lead the Muslim League in its struggle with both the British Government and the Congress. His Lucknow Pact, 14-point rejoinder to Nehru's Constitutional reforms and his agreeing to discuss matters with Gandhi, though nothing came out of this interview, all this shows that he was willing to compromise if by so doing he could save the Muslim interests. The Lucknow Pact is important in this, that the Congress had agreed to separate electorates which amounted to an admission that Muslims were a separate community and therefore the best course for the British was to divide and quit.

When Indian Ministries were in
office under the Government of India Act 1935 (1937-1939), no Muslim was taken in the Ministry unless he abandoned the Muslim League and joined the Congress. Dr. Ambedkar, spokesman of the untouchables, described this decision as "the political death of the Muslims as a free people." Having watched the administration of these Congress ministries the Quaid-i-Azam became more inflexible, had the Lahore Resolution passed by the Muslim League and in the subsequent critical days he became so obdurate over the issue of Pakistan that the Congress and the Viceroy had to abandon all hopes of any change on his part. He was the President of the Muslim League which was a virile and homogeneous body and the sole representative of the Muslims. He was in a position to sway the Muslims in one way or the other. Among the Hindus there were several capable leaders. "If Nehru died there was Rajgopalacharya or Patel to take his place. But if Jinnah goes, there was no one to replace him. And without him the League could completely run off the rails and charge through India with fire and slaughter. But so long as Jinnah was there, nothing like that would happen." (Beverly Nichols, "The Verdict on India").

Though the correctness of the theory of two-nations, which the Quaid-i-Azam made the foundation of his argument, is no longer in dispute, it will repay going back to the end of the 19th century and to refer to statement by Sir Syed Ahmad Khan which contains the argument for the political separation of a part of the sub-continent. Half a century before the Muslims raised their demand for a separate state in a formal Resolution, this far-seeing statesman had said: "Now suppose all the Englishmen were to leave India, then who would be the rulers of India? Is it possible that under these circumstances two nations -Muhammadans and Hindus- could sit on the same throne and remain equal in power. Most certainly not. It will be necessary that one of them should conquer the other and thrust it down. To suppose that both could remain equal is to desire the impossible and the inconceivable". (Richard Simonds, "The Making of PAKISTAN", 3rd ed. London, Fisher & Fisher, p. 31). Compare these words with what the Quaid-i-Azam himself said: "We are opposed to a united India Constitution with a Central Government, Federal or otherwise. We are opposed to this because it will mean our transfer from the British Raj to the Hindu. United India means a Hindu social and cultural majority dominating the Muslims whose civilization, culture and social structure of life is totally different." (Jamil-ud-din Ahmad, "Some Recent Speeches and Writings of Mr. Jinnah," published by Shiaikh Muhammed Ashraf, Lahore, 1947, p. 380).

It should be clear from what has been said above that the object of the struggle for Pakistan was for Musalmans to escape from the domination of the Hindu and fear of the destruction of their specificity, or of their absorption in the Indian nation. This object could only be attained if the Muslims succeeded in obtaining for themselves a territory over which they could set up their own Government. That is why the independence instrument, the Indian Independence Act, gave to both dominions full control over their affairs, including the right to secede from the Commonwealth and thus destroy all vestiges of a British connection. Though such were the powers of both the dominions, each new state accepted the status of a British dominion and thus retaining its connection with the British Crown by accepting a provision that the Crown would be represented by a Governor-General: to represent the Crown for the purposes of the Government of the dominion and to give assent on behalf of the Crown to the dominion legislation. The Act said nothing about the future form of Government or Constitution which it left to a Constituent Assembly which could frame any constitution for the country it liked. But to begin with, the Act, provided that each dominion would be governed under the Government of India Act, 1935, from which all vestiges of British sovereignty except the royal assent were removed. Thus Pakistan could make any constitution it liked, democratic, autocratic, oligarchic or religious. The whole issue on which the battle was fought was that of territorial independence of Muslims majority areas and their power to legislate for such areas.

A Reply To John Gilchrist continued from page 12

given to him is the only revealed book to claim: "THIS DAY HAVE I PERFECTED FOR YOU YOUR RELIGION AND COMPLETED MY FAVOUR TO YOU AND CHOSEN FOR YOU ISLAM AS A RELIGION." (5:30)

In the words of the Holy Quran (3:22) we invite our Christian friends to study the Holy Quran (Now translated into English by Maulana Muhammad Ali and other Muslims) without any preconceived prejudices. Therein will they find the Divine light and guidance not to be found elsewhere. Therein will man find peace within himself and without.
IDEOLOGY OF PAKISTAN
By the late Muhammad Munir

Ideology means the science dealing with the beliefs, notions and theories growing out of fundamental assumptions held by the members of a group; sometimes the member makes a conscious effort to acquire the right kind of idea; more often he accepts them unconsciously.

The concept of ideology arose in Europe as a result of the conflict of various systems of thoughts. It has found use as a means of discounting the arguments of an opponent as reflecting merely the conceptions or prejudices of his group. Thus Karl Marx argued that much religious and political thinking was ideological and served to protect capitalism.

Ideology, which is now a common word in English, is not used with reference to a country. I heard this word for the first time in 1953 when I was holding an inquiry into the Punjab Disturbances of that year and I formally incorporated it in the report regarding the three demands against the Ahmadis which were founded on the Objectives Resolution. Thereafter when I was a member of Ayub’s Cabinet in 1962 and the Political Parties Bill was under discussion a person moved an amendment to the bill proposing that no party would be formed the object of which was opposed to the ‘Ideology of Pakistan’. On this Chaudhry Fazal Ilahi who has recently retired as President of Pakistan, rose from his seat and objected that then "Ideology of Pakistan" shall have to be defined. On this the member who had moved the original amendment replied that the ideology of Pakistan was ‘Islam’, but nobody asked him the further question "What is Islam?"

The amendment to the bill was therefore passed as the member who supported the amendment was Maulvi Abdul Bari of Lyallpur who was a supporter of Ayub. Nobody can say anything to the contrary where Islam is mentioned.

Ayub was then in Karachi and I could contact him. When he returned I mentioned to him the incident and he remarked, "What will the world say about it all?"

A girl, named Mahwash, who is the daughter of a high officer at Islamabad and had stood first among the girl students in 1977 B.A. Examination, in the course of an interview with the representative of "Nawai-Waqt," had stated in reply to a question, whether in her view education should also be subjected to an ideology. Her reply was that the subordination of education to any ideology is to destroy the purpose of education. It was a correct reply if you understand the aim of education and the meaning of ideology. The object of education is to acquire knowledge, knowledge of everything, of the Universe, the remotest nebula, the dark spot of dead stars millions of light years beyond Pluto, light traveling at the speed of 186,000 per second, the mightiest of galaxies to the smallest particle of matter, knowledge of all that exists in the universe, the stars, the planets, of everything living or not living on earth, including man in all his activities and all life that is found on earth. Islam emphasizes the acquisition of knowledge. "Acquire knowledge even if you have to go to China for it", is one saying of the Prophet and "Seek knowledge from the cradle to the grave" is another great saying of the Prophet. In fact knowledge is a primary religious obligation of a Muslim. The Quran constantly urges Muslims to study nature, to investigate things to find out for themselves the orde with which God has created the universe. But knowledge has no limits. According to Franz Rosenthal's "Knowledge Triumphant, The Concept of Knowledge in Medieval Islam," (pp. 46-49) the various branches of knowledge had reached 150, according to another account of the 14th century it had jumped to 316. Now if you subordinate the acquisition of knowledge to any ideology, political, economic or religious, you reduce the field of knowledge to what the ideology teaches you because the ideology has to run through a groove or a defined channel and does not let you go out of it. Therefore it imposes Limitations on human intellect and on your activities.

To take an example, it used to be a Christian dogma for centuries that the centre of the planetary system is earth. Copernicus showed that the centre of that system is not the earth but the sun, and that the earth revolves round the sun. Galileo further illustrated this theory, but for this he was placed before an Inquisition tribunal for having propounded a theory which was opposed to the Christian ideology. Similarly the Christian belief used to be that the age of the creation of man is 4,004 years before Christ but Darwin and other scientists exploded this theory by scientific experiments by which it was shown that homo sapiens (man) inhabited the earth some 35,000 years ago. Now it has been found that man lived back half a million years - in the time of "Peking man".

Similarly I recently read the view of a Muslim contributor either in the "Nawai-Waqt" or some other Urdu Journal that students of geography should be taught that the earth is stationary and he claimed to have arrived at this result from verses of the Quran. Some old commentaries on the Quran place this globe on the horns of an ox whose shifting it from one to the other causes earthquakes. It is further standing on a fish. The embellishment of the
worldly heavens by the candles of the stars is another instance which the reader is asked to take literally. Now if an undergraduate comes across such passages he finds himself on the horns of a dilemma. He is commanded to believe them literally, ("Ever Universal Religion" by Muhammad Hussain Khan, p. 280) and not figuratively. There are certain verses in the Quran from which it may be inferred that the earth is stationary and flat like a floor and that the sky is material. (Hali, "Hayat-i-Javed", p.590). Other instances may be cited where the facts established by science may apparently bring the believer into conflict with what he believes, ultimately leading him to the old controversy between the Motazalites and the Asharites, between reasoned thought and blind faith. Ideally, one school of the traditionalists, believe no knowledge should be taught except that based on the affirmation, "God has said" and "The Prophet has said". This shows that every kind of ideology restricts the field of human knowledge and man's belief in any such ideology makes the society with such ideology static in a constantly changing world.

The Socialist and Communist countries have an ideology but that ideology places no restrictions on science, and as regards their economic and political ideology there is a large number of dissenters who leave the country rather than accept restrictions which the regime imposes on them.

The Quaid-i-Azam never used the words "ideology of Pakistan" but during the inquiry into the Punjab Disturbances I used the words "Ideology behind the demands" to explain the three demands against the Ahmadis. For fifteen years after the establishment of Pakistan, the Ideology of Pakistan was not known to anybody until in 1962 a solitary member of Jamaat-i-Islami for the first time used the words when the Political Parties Bill was being discussed.

(Taken from "From Jinnah to Zia" by the late Muhammad Munir, Chief Justice of Pakistan (Retd.).

---

**The Finality of Prophethood continued from inside front cover**

**LECTURE ON ISLAM AT SIALKOT (P.6):**

And prophethood terminated with him, not only in the sense of time but also because that all the attainments of prophethood ended with him.

**AL-WASIYYA (P.7):**

So all prophethoods are terminated with this prophethood (of the Holy Prophet Muhammad), for everything that has a beginning has an end.

**MALFUZAT AHMADIYYA (Vol. IX, P.78):**

... the guidance (given to the Holy Prophet Muhammad) was perfect, that is why the last of the Books, the Holy Quran, was revealed and the prophethood terminated with him (the Holy Prophet Muhammad).

**HAQIQAT AL-WAHY (a. P.141; b. Supplement, P.26):**

a) And (Allah) created Adam, revealed the Books and sent the prophets and the last of all Hadrat Muhammad (peace be upon him) was born who is Khatam al-anbiya.

b) Certainly our Prophet is the "Khatam al-nabiyyin" and the chain of messengers terminated with him.

**CHASHMAH MARIFAT (a. P.82; b. P.324):**

a) The era of the Holy Prophet's prophethood extends to the Day of judgment and he is the last of the Prophets.

b) We have written many times that it is a categorical fact that our Prophet was the last Prophet.

---

**New Year thoughts**

By: Capt. Abdussalam Khan

As the New year enters With its golden attire, It is time to take a pause And to inner thoughts retire.

I look back and am grateful That the sun has shone on my back for sixty years. That I have grown. From a tiny speck to a man full-blown

And every moment of my life, I've felt Thy Loving Hand, From the time I was a toddler And couldn't even stand, To my present state of dotage, Holding tight my hand.

In these eventful years, I've always seen Thy Face, In the heavens' starry orb. In the waterfall's race. In snow-Covered mountains, In the mighty seven seas, In flower-covered meadows, In the golden-leafed trees, In the birth of a baby, In a mother's loving face, In the 5mile of a child. In the lovers' embrace.

From behind these lovely veils I've seen Thy Face, As the time comes to cross I pray for Thy Grace, To meet You on the other side. O Lord-face to face.

As the old year dies And the new one is born, I say a silent prayer For a lovely golden dawn Make the coming new year A year of hope, Bless us with unity, May we hold to Thy Rope, Turn thy Face with mercy To this planet called the Earth. May it be filled with Thy Grace. With laughter, love and mirth!
bound to obey the laws of God, the soul is free to follow God's guidance or to reject it. The soul's development lies in willingly following the guidance God has revealed through His prophets.

According to Islam, each person's soul is "God's Spirit" which as been breathed into him or her. This means that man's soul has a special relationship with God, and man is capable of emulating the Divine attributes on his own small scale. God is unimaginably near to man's soul, nearer to it than even man himself. He knows a person's innermost thoughts, even those which the person himself does not consciously realize. In man's soul there is implanted love for God and yearning after God, and it cannot find complete contentment without God.

What are the other things the Holy Quran tells us about God? It tells us a great deal. Most frequently it calls God Rahmaan (Beneficent) and Raheem (Merciful). Rahmaan really means that God is so loving and generous that He has granted man innumerable blessings as gifts without any effort on man's part. God is Raheem means that He is merciful so that when man makes the effort to use his God-given bounties for good purposes, God helps him to succeed. For instance, God has given man all sorts of physical resources in this world, without any effort on his part. When man tries to exploit these resources for the good, God makes him successful. The Holy Quran also tells us that God is Forgiving, Affectionate, Supreme, Just, very close to each person, and knower of his thoughts and deeds.

What is the purpose of believing that God possesses these attributes?

So that man can try to acquire and display the same kind of qualities in his life. God is the Rabb (the Provider and Fostener of the whole world), so man should try to provide for others. God is Rahmaan, and so man too should take the initiative in doing good to other people. God is Raheem, and so man should help and encourage those who are doing good. God is All-Knowing, All-Seeing, and Wise, so man, too, should try to perfect his knowledge and acquire wisdom. Believing in the Divine attributes also stops one from harming others for personal gain. A person who truly believes God to be his Rabb (Provider) knows that He will always look after him, and so such a person would never try to take someone else's due. A person who truly believes that God is all seeing and All-Knowing would know that he could never hide any bad deed, however secret, from God.

---

**History of the Gospels continued from page 14**

and uncertainties that remain are serious - and consequently many moderns, who have no doubt whatever of Jesus' real existence, regard as hopeless any attempt to dissolve out the historically true from the legendary or mythical matter which the Gospels contain, and to reconstruct the story of Jesus' mission out of the more historical residue." (pp. 16-17)

Collection of the Quran

On the other hand, there is no such doubt about the Holy Quran. It contains nothing but the revelations received by the Holy Prophet, Muhammad. The revelations came to him in fragments, from time to time. As soon as he received any, he used to communicate it to his disciples and ask them not only to write it down but also to commit it to memory. On each such occasion he indicated in a precise manner the place to which the revelation belonged. Thus the complete Quran was committed to writing and also preserved in the memories of hundreds of persons in the lifetime of the Prophet.

After the passing away of the Holy Prophet, Hazrat Abu Bakr, the first Caliph, charged Zaid ibn Thabit with the task of collecting all the revelations in the form of a book. As long as the Holy Prophet was alive and the possibility existed of a fresh revelation coming to him, this could not be done. But immediately after the demise of the Holy Prophet, Zaid ibn Thabit prepared a complete written copy of the Quran on the basis of the manuscripts which the disciples had written at the Prophet's direction and the memories of those who had learnt it by heart.

At the order of Usman, the third Caliph, seven copies of Zaid's codex were prepared and sent to the different centers of the by-then vast Islamic world. One of these copies is still in existence at Tashkent. The Czarist government of Russia had published it with a facsimile reproduction; and we see that there is complete identity between this copy and the text otherwise in use all over the world. The same is true of the other extant codices of the Quran, complete or fragmentary, dating from the first century of the Muslim era.

From the time of the Holy Prophet to our own time, the practice of learning the whole of the Quran by heart has continued unbroken, and the number of huffaz can now be counted in the world by hundreds of thousands. The result is that no scholar, Eastern or Western, Muslim or non-Muslim, has ever cast any doubt on the purity of the text of the Holy Quran. Even such an unfriendly critic as Sir William Muir, writing in the last century, says about the Quran: "There is probably in the world no other book which has remained twelve centuries with so pure a text." (The Life of Muhammad, Introduction, p. 18)
Muhammad ‘Ali Jinnah as they saw him
continued from page 4

A Great Leader

Begum Ikramullah, thanking the three distinguished Englishmen, said they had seen different facets of the Qaid’s character, and it was a great test of his greatness that they were all so impressed by him. So all Pakistanis can proudly say of him: “This man of sterling virtues was our leader.” Character was indeed destiny in the Qaid-i-Azam’s case, observed the Begum, and all that he got, he got by force of character.

THUS SPOKE THE HOLY PROPHET PEACE BE UPON HIM

Acquire knowledge, it enablith its possessor to distinguish right from wrong; it lighteth the way to Heaven; it is our friend in the desert, our society in solitude, our companion when friendless; it guideth us to happiness; it sustaineth us in misery; it is an ornament amongst friends and armour against enemies.

Erratum

Due to an oversight, our OCT/NOV 1987 issue was published as Vol. VII No. 7.
Please read this as: Vol. VIII No. 1

ARE WE AS WISE, OR LESS WISE, THAN OUR PROGENITORS?
MONKEY BUSINESS
(with apology to Darwinians)

“Three monkeys sat in a coconut tree,
Discussing things as they’re said to be,
Said one to the other, Now listen, you two,
There’s a certain rumor that can be true,
That man descended from our noble race;
The very idea is a damn disgrace.
No monkey ever deserted his wife,
Starved her babies and ruined her life;
And you’ve never known a mother monk
To leave her babies with others to bunk,
Or pass them on from one to the other
Till they scarcely know who is their mother.
And another thing you will never see,
A monk build a fence round a coconut tree,
And let the coconuts go to waste,
Forbidding all other monks a taste.
Why, if I’d put a fence ‘round the tree,
Starvation would force you to steal from me.
Here’s another thing a monk won’t do,
Go out at night to get on a stew,
Or use a gun or club or knife,
To take another monkey’s life.
Yes, man descended, the confounded cuss,
but brother, he didn’t descend from us.”

Story of Another Cheque

Thanking General Gracey, the High Commissioner recalled the incident of another cheque. During the Cabinet Mission negotiations at Simla, the Qaid-i-Azam was supposed to be the guest of the Government of India, and when these were over, they sent him a cheque, saying it covered his bare personal maintenance, and the Government was not responsible for the extra expenditure he may have incurred. The Qaid thankfully returned the cheque, saying the Government of India need not contribute towards his maintenance.

Mr. Ikramullah said the Qaid looked upon British officers who stayed to serve Pakistan as Pakistanis and trusted them as mush as Pakistani officers.
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MUHAMMAD THE GREATEST MAN OF HISTORY

"If greatness of purpose, smallness of means, and astounding results are the three criteria of human genius, who could dare to compare any great man in modern history with Muhammad? . . . Philosopher, orator, apostle, legislator, warrior, conqueror of ideas, restorer of rational dogmas, of a cult without images; the founder of twenty terrestrial empires and of one spiritual empire, that is Muhammad. As regards all standards by which human greatness may be measured, we may well ask: Is there any man greater than he?"

—Alphonse de Lamartine in *Histoire de la Turquie*

QUR'AN, THE GREATEST SPIRITUAL FORCE

"It is the one miracle claimed by Muhammad—his standing miracle, he called it—and a miracle it is."

—Bosworth Smith

"Never has a people been led more rapidly to civilization, such as it was, than were the Arabs through Islam. . . . And to it was also indirectly due the marvelous development of all branches of science in the Moslem world."

—*New Researches* by H. Hirschfeld

"Here, therefore, its merits as a literary production should, perhaps, not be measured by some preconceived maxims of subjective and aesthetic taste, but by the effects which it produced in Muhammad's contemporaries and fellow-countrymen. If it spoke so powerfully and convincingly to the hearts of his hearers as to weld hitherto centrifugal and antagonistic elements into one compact and well organized body, animated by ideas far beyond those which had until now ruled the Arabian mind, then its eloquence was perfect, simply because it created a civilized nation out of savage tribes, and shot a fresh woof into the old warp of history."

—Dr. Steingass, *Hughes' Dictionary of Islam*

THE BEAUTIFUL CHARACTERISTICS OF ISLAM

"I have always held the religion of Muhammad in high estimation because of its wonderful vitality. It is the only religion which appears to me to possess that assimilating capacity to the changing phases of existence which can make itself appeal to every age. I have studied him—the wonderful man—and in my opinion far from being an anti-Christ, he must be called the Saviour of Humanity. I believe that if a man like him were to assume the Dictatorship of the modern world, he would succeed in solving its problems in a way that would bring it the much needed peace and happiness. I have prophesied about the faith of Muhammad that it would be acceptable to the Europe of tomorrow as it is beginning to be acceptable to the Europe of today."

—George Bernard Shaw