



The Light — London edition

June 2006

The Lahore Ahmadiyya monthly magazine from U.K.

Contents:

- | | |
|---|---|
| • At a debate in the U.S.A. about the cartoons 1 | • Our beloved Prophet Muhammad 6 |
| • Correspondence with a descendant of 'Shakir'
by Zahid Aziz 2 | • An English publication of Qadiani Jama'at 7 |
| • More on miracle of numbers 6 | • Benazir Bhutto mentions "Muhammad Ali" 8 |

Published from London by: **Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha'at Islam Lahore (U.K.)**
The first Islamic Mission in the U.K., established 1913 as the Working Muslim Mission
Darus Salaam, 15 Stanley Avenue, Wembley, HA0 4JQ (U.K.)
Centre: 020 8903 2689. President: 020 8524 8212. Secretary: 01753 692654.
E-mail: aail.uk@gmail.com ♦ website: www.aail.org/uk

Next Meeting at Darus Salam:

Date: **Sunday 4th June 2006**

Time: **3.00 p.m.**

Topic: ***Attaining Closeness to Allah
through Prayers***
by **Dr Mujahid Ahmad Saeed**

Regular activities:

Darus-i Quran and Hadith:

Every Friday at 2.30 p.m.

Meetings of the Executive:

First Sunday of every month at 2.00 p.m.

Meeting of the Jama'at:

First Sunday of every month at 3.00 p.m.

At a debate in the U.S.A.

by **Rashid Jahangiri, M.D.**

[Note: Our friend Rashid Jahangiri, who is very enthusiastic in propagating Islam and the viewpoint of our Movement in the U.S.A., has sent us a report which we reproduce below.]

On February 27, 2006 a debate, *How Far is Too Far?*, over the cartoons controversy was hosted by The Free Library of Philadelphia. A few days before this *The Philadelphia Inquirer* reproduced the infamous Danish cartoons of the Holy Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him). I believe this is the only major newspaper in U.S.A. to reproduce them.

The debate was in a huge hall, packed with an audience, mostly Caucasian Americans, i.e. Jews and Christians. And I believe my wife and I were the only Muslims among the audience (as there were no comments by any attendee who acknowledged being a Muslim or sounded like a Muslim). I got the chance at the end to make a few comments when the microphone was handed to me. I covered and replied to all the major comments made by non-Muslim panel members and audience. I was able to make my comments in an unfriendly environment without any fear, as I followed Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad's approach. I was neither apologetic about Islam and Muslims nor I took the other extreme approach. Hazrat Mirza *sahib's* approach was simple: The best way to convince the opponents of Islam and spread Islam in the West is to

play according to the rules of the game established by them.

The Panel included: *New Yorker* Cartoon Editor Bob Mankoff, *Daily News* cartoonist Signe Wilkinson, Temple journalism Professor Karen Turner, Dr. Shams Inati, Professor of Islamic Theology at Villanova (she is a Christian, originally from Egypt), and Daisy Khan, Executive Director of the American Society for Muslim Advancement.

Briefly my points were:

1. The Prophet Abraham had two sons, Isaac and Ishmael. Among Isaac's progeny is Moses and among Ishmael's progeny is Muhammad. So, I consider these cartoons to be anti-Semitic and the publication of these cartoons should be declared an anti-Semitic act and newspapers should be stopped from publishing this anti-Semitic material. Both Mr. Mankoff and Ms. Wilkinson were not expecting such a comment, and the expressions on their faces acknowledged it.

2. Muslims revere Prophets Moses and Jesus the same as they revere Prophet Muhammad. So a Muslim will never make cartoons of revered personalities of Jews and Christians.

3. In almost every Muslim country there are political movements whose leaders are *Mullahs* (Muslim equivalent of Rabbis). These politicians assert that their political agenda is synonymous with Islam, and to oppose them is to oppose Islam itself. Despite this the newspaper cartoonists in Muslim countries, including Pakistan, make their cartoons. If newspapers in Muslim and Arab countries make cartoons of Jewish Rabbis who represent a Zionist political movement, this does not justify the European newspapers' decision to publish cartoons mocking Prophet Muhammad. Newspapers should not compare apples to oranges. This comment was in response to an audience member who made a comment about cartoons of Jewish/Israeli Rabbis published in an English language daily in Saudi Arabia.

4. Muslims love the Prophet Muhammad more than they love their own fathers. And they know details of his life more than they know about their fathers as well. And as they know that whatever these cartoons are presenting is not true, so it hurts every Muslim including the moderate ones. European public should not alienate this moderate and peaceful Muslim majority.

5. In Islam, the death penalty is reserved only for a murderer, and even in that case the victim's family is encouraged to forgive and spare the life of the perpetrator. So all these so-called *fatwas* to kill

the author and the publisher of these cartoons have no religious value and no legal value. They are all non-sense and I condemn them. But at the same time we should not ignore human nature. Those who are madly in love cannot think rationally, their statements are not rational, and their actions are not rational. And this is true not only of Muslims but all over the world, including the United States. Muslims are madly in love with their beloved, i.e. Prophet Muhammad. So, all these so-called *fatwas* are nothing more than "matters of the heart". This comment was in reply to a member of the audience who referred to *fatwas* issued by some Muslims.

I thank Allah for providing me an opportunity to defend the honour of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, in the presence of an educated non-Muslim audience.

Correspondence with a descendant of 'Shakir'

Shakir identified by further research

by Dr. Zahid Aziz

In October 2005 the U.K. Jama'at published an Information Bulletin electronically, written by myself after some research, entitled *Shakir's Quran translation — blatant plagiarism of the first edition of Maulana Muhammad Ali's translation*. This was in connection with the widely-available English translation of the Quran attributed to the name M. H. Shakir which has been in circulation in print since the early 1980s and later became probably the most widely accessible English translation of the Quran on websites, including reputable academic websites. At the beginning of my article I summed up the position as follows:

"A comparison shows the Shakir translation to be an entire and wholesale plagiarism of the first, 1917, edition of the English translation of the Holy Quran by Maulana Muhammad Ali, with alterations in a few places to reflect more traditional interpretations. Even these alterations have not been made consistently and have obviously been forgotten to be done in some places."

In the second half of the article I attempted to discover further about the identity of 'Shakir' by collating all published information that I could locate. The only specific information available on some book distributors' websites described Shakir as an Egyptian Judge with some connection to Al-

Azhar University who died in 1939. However, I was able to show that:

“It is abundantly clear that the Egyptian Shakir to whom this translation is attributed could not possibly have translated the Quran as he was opposed on religious principle to translating the Quran into any language. ... it is most probable that M.H. Shakir is merely a fictitious name, and the name of the Egyptian judge Shakir has no connection with this translation.”

The article is available at the following webpage: www.ahmadiyya.org/movement/shakir.htm

Surprise communication

Beyond this, I was unable to identify Shakir any further. It was both surprising and exciting, therefore, to receive an e-mail on 7th March 2006 from one Sadiq Hassan which began as below:

“ I read your article about the translation of the Quran by Shakir and am offended and disgusted. If the Quran [translation] had some things in it that contradicted basic Islamic principles, you would have a responsibility to caution Muslims, but instead the article seems to be written as ‘this guy was a fraud, the translation is fine in the sense that it is accurate but (a) he couldn’t have written it, and (b) it was written poorly when things don’t make sense.’

M. Shakir was my great-grandfather, the paternal grandfather of my mother. ”

The writer then went on to defend and explain the changes that I had mentioned:

“ Just because someone has translated a Quran similarly to someone else does not make it plagiarism. You said that the names of the Prophets are given in their transliterated form rather than their English form, which I find excellent.

You show the weakness in this essay when you say: “It is rather amusing to find that in certain places *similar changes have not been made*, due most likely to an oversight!” This is rather pathetic. If you can’t draw links to plagiarism you are implying that Shakir ‘forgot’ to plagiarize. Do you see how ridiculous your statement is.

You also say: “Plagiarised works usually show inconsistencies of this kind. Plagiarists often fail to find all the places in the text which need amendment to give the work their own identity.” This is false. I have explained the reasons for the word meanings being differentiated above. ”

He then offers information about the identity of Shakir:

“ His real name was Mohammedali Habib. He took on Shakir as a pen name. In the article you seem to indicate Mohammedali being two words. We still have this name in our family, and it is still very much one word.

You ask: “The question arises here that if the man named here did actually produce this translation, then why did it not appear in print till *forty years after his death?*”

Reason: His family chose to publish it after his death. He gained a serious illness when he was not yet done translating. He prayed to Allah for time to finish, and *mashallah* he finished translating the Quran and then passed away within 2 weeks.

The one statement I do agree with is this: “It is abundantly clear that the Egyptian Shakir to whom this translation is attributed could not possibly have translated the Quran.”

The man who translated the Quran was Mohammedali Habib from Karachi, Pakistan. I will now copy the exact extract from the Quran that has been published.

The late Mr. Mohammedali Habib was well known throughout the country (Pakistan) for having devoted his life to the cause of humanity. He with his brothers founded many educational and benevolent institutions, the most important being Masoomen Hospital. This translation was completed by him on the 14th Shaban and the very next day he suffered a severe heart attack and passed away on the 20th of Ramadhan, i.e. 30th March 1959.

This Egyptian story is completely fabricated. If you want further proof, I have access to the original version of the Quran that this man’s family printed, and I am in contact with the four of his children that are still alive, one of which is my grandfather.

I hope that we can fight together for justice and truth in Islam. ”

Reply

Below is my reply to this e-mail.

“ It was a pleasant surprise to receive your e-mail and I have read it thoroughly. However, you do not refer anywhere in it to my main conclusion set out at the beginning as well as the end of my article that: The English translation of the Quran purported to have been done by one M. H. Shakir has been plagiarised from Maulana Muhammad Ali’s translation of 1917.

There is also an article by Dr. A. Nihamathullah entitled ‘Translating the Holy Qur’an. Is There An Ultimate Translation Of The Qur’an?’, found on several websites, within which the author writes that, according to A.R. Kidwai, M.H. Shakir’s translation is “an example of blatant plagiarism in that about 90% of this English translation has been verbatim copied from Muhammad Ali Lahori’s English translation of the Quran.”

I am surprised that you say nothing regarding my main conclusion.

You have defended the alterations that I listed as having been made in Shakir from Maulana Muhammad Ali’s 1917 edition. However, I was not attacking these changes! I am merely indicating the changes made in Shakir’s translation from Maulana Muhammad Ali’s 1917 edition. In other words, Shakir is copying Maulana Muhammad Ali’s 1917 edition and making a few changes in it here and there.

My further point about these changes being inconsistent is absolutely right. In the cases that I cited, Shakir has changed the meaning in one place but in the other he has retained Maulana Muhammad Ali’s meaning. It is glaringly obvious that Shakir is making changes in Maulana Muhammad Ali’s translation, and has not been able to do it consistently.

As you say, “This Egyptian story is completely fabricated”, but the world deserves to know who made the fabrication and why did they link the Egyptian judge with this translation?

At the end of your e-mail, you rightly refer to the need to fight for justice and truth in Islam. The first step towards justice and truth in the case we are discussing would be for the publishers of the Shakir translation to acknowledge publicly that it is mostly a word-for-word copy of Maulana Muhammad Ali’s 1917 edition with certain changes made by Shakir of the kind I discussed in my article.”

Further exchanges

Sadiq Hassan’s reply to my e-mail repeated some of his earlier irrelevant points, but he did ask me to provide a website link where he could read the 1917 edition of Maulana Muhammad Ali’s translation. He also wrote:

“... hypothetically, even if it is a plagiarist copy, what is the need to publicize it? The Prophet has said that you should always cover others’ faults for the betterment of society.”

I responded to this, on 15th March, by sending him the website link to the page at www.aail.org from where the 1917 edition can be viewed online. Also answering his point quoted above, I wrote:

“... one of the reasons to publicise the Shakir plagiarism is simply to show how much other Muslims have benefitted from the work of Maulana Muhammad Ali. If Shakir had himself stated in a Preface that his translation was based on Maulana Muhammad Ali’s work, that would have been at least honest.

You say that the Holy Prophet taught Muslims to cover the faults of each other. Does it mean that if a Muslim passes an examination by largely copying the answers written by another candidate, and claiming those answers to be his own work, then Muslim society should cover that fault? Shakir is claiming that he produced the translation and consequently that he possesses the capability and scholarship to translate the Quran. That is a false claim, made worse by the fact that it is done in connection with the Holy Quran.”

In his reply dated 16th March, Sadiq Hassan wrote:

“ I just received information from my family and I have the following clarifications:

1) M.H. Shakir did not speak Arabic. He supervised the translation of the Quran which was done by a group of people

2) The aim of his translation was to make the Quran easier to understand by removing words such as ‘thee’.

If someone cheats on a test, they are doing it to help themselves and they are ‘stealing’ from society if you will — they may get into a better university etc. However, M.H. Shakir didn’t get any additional recognition from this Quran — it wasn’t even published until after his death. This does not apply in this case as M.H. Shakir’s aim was to allow more people to understand the Quran — and this is what was achieved.”

To this I replied on 17th March as follows:

“ Thank you for the interesting information that you have discovered. These facts, that Shakir did not know Arabic and he ‘supervised’ a group of people, show that it is even more misleading to call Shakir as the translator than I had written in my article. The readers of this translation should have been given this information in a preface.

Readers are entitled to know of the capability of a translator to do the work. In this case Shakir is

falsely passing off Maulana Muhammad Ali's great scholarship as his own.

Your second point is absolutely wrong that the aim of Shakir was to remove words such as 'thee', simply because he has not at all done so! In the 1917 translation, Maulana Muhammad Ali, as he tells us in his Preface, did not use the word 'thee' when it refers to a human being but used it only when it refers to God. Exactly the same is found in Shakir's work.

You say that Shakir did not get any personal recognition through this plagiarism. But his work has received recognition. And there is such a thing as posthumous recognition, which many great people received who didn't get it when alive, and Shakir is getting the same quite falsely and by deception. I have seen reviews praising the quality of the language of the 'Shakir translation'. What they are actually, unknowingly praising is the quality of Maulana Muhammad Ali's 1917 translation.

Lastly, I am pleased to note that you are not disputing that the Shakir work is a word-for-word copy of Maulana Muhamamd Ali's 1917 edition except for the differences I pointed out."

In reply to my point that it is entirely misleading to call Shakir as the translator, Sadiq Hassan made the following bizarre claim:

"I haven't seen any works that call him the translator, but since most publishing companies require an author, his name was the best since he supervised every single word of how the translation was put together."

I pointed out in response that the most widespread edition of Shakir, published by Tahrike Tarsile Quran Inc, of Elmhurst, New York, says on the title page: "*Translated by M.H. Shakir*". Similarly, on the well-known Muslim texts website at the University of Southern California, known as USC-MSA, three translations of the Quran are available. It is stated under acknowledgements: "We also wish to thank M. H. Shakir for *his translation* of the Quran".

Sadiq Hasan also wrote in the same message:

"Please forgive me, but I have not had a chance to look at the link you sent me with the translation, as I am currently on vacation. I will, however, get back to my home town on Sunday and I will look at it then, and compare the two works."

So I asked him to reply whenever it was convenient for him. That was on 18th March. After waiting for six weeks I sent him this reminder on 1st May:

"I wonder if you have yet been able to compare the Shakir translation with the 1917 edition of Maulana Muhammad Ali's translation, since your last e-mail to me of 18th March. I had earlier given you the link where the 1917 edition can be read online. After you have done the comparison, please let me know if you still consider my article to be inaccurate; and if so, in what way.

Do please also let me know if you still stand by your first sentence in your first e-mail to me, which was as follows: 'I read your article about the translation of the Quran by Shakir and am offended and disgusted.' "

Up till now, 15th May, I have not received any response from Sadiq Hassan to this reminder, while during our earlier exchange he was replying within one day. We can only surmise that his family members have advised him to discontinue this communication.

As a result of this contact the mystery of who was Shakir became a little clearer. The conclusion in my earlier article, that "it is most probable that M.H. Shakir is merely a fictitious name, and the name of the Egyptian judge Shakir has no connection with this translation", was proved entirely right. We also discovered that this Shakir was Mohammedali Habib of Karachi who, himself knowing no Arabic, "supervised" this translation.

Shakir identified

It occurred to me to pursue further the above information about Shakir. This further investigation has shown that this **Mohammedali Habib was the founder of the famous Habib Bank of Pakistan** (d. 1959). He was a well-known figure in the financial and political circles of Indian/Pakistani Muslims before and after Partition. You can read about him on the website of a business organization called the 'House of Habib' by visiting the page: www.hoh.net/aboutus.htm and scrolling to the lower section entitled 'Mohammed Ali Habib, The Builder'.

We have no wish whatsoever to detract from the renown and regard in which Mr Habib is held for his services to the cause of Pakistan before and after Partition. We only wish that those who, twenty years after his death, published the translation sponsored by him, had indicated on their publication that this translation was entirely dependent on the 1917 work of Maulana Muhammad Ali. ♦

More on miracle of numbers

In our January issue we published an article commenting on, and refuting, the notion that the number of times that certain words occur in the Quran (for example, 'man', 'woman', 'month', 'day') has been designed to provide a miracle. Our valued friend Reza Ghafoer Khan of Suriname wrote to us the following e-mail in this connection:

"I read your article *An alleged 'miracle' in the Holy Quran* about the occurrence of certain words in the Quran. Today I came across another example of this in some Islamic magazine. It says that the earth surface consists of 71% of water and 29% of land. The word *bahr* (sea) occurs 32 times in the Quran and the word *barr* (land) 13 times. This sums up to 45. And 32/45 is 71% and 13/45 is 29%.

Another miracle? By the way, the real miracle of the Quran is the reforming influence it has on man. See how it transformed a barbaric Arabic nation into a civilized, pious one."

In this case also, the argument of these people fails in the same way as for the other words like 'man' and 'woman', as shown in our article.

Firstly, there is another word for 'sea' in the Quran and that is *yamm*. Take the following two close verses about the Egyptians and the Israelites:

7:136: "So We exacted retribution from them and drowned them (Pharaoh's armies) in the sea."

7:138: "And We took the Children of Israel across the sea."

The same sea is mentioned but the word for it in 7:136 is *yamm* and in 7:138 it is *bahr*. So this means the occurrences of *yamm* should be counted as well, and there are several other occurrences of *yamm* as meaning 'sea' in the Quran, for example in 20:78, 20:97, 28:40.

Secondly, the word *bahr* occurs in the plural as well. In 31:27 we read:

"And if all the trees in the earth were pens, and the sea with seven more seas added to it (were ink), the words of Allah would not be exhausted."

Here the first 'sea' is *bahr* and the second 'seas' is the plural *abhur*. Here they count 'sea' but not 'seas'.

The word *bahr* also occurs in the dual form *bahrain* 5 times. They do not count those occurrences in their theory. If they were to do so, would they count each occurrence of this dual word *bahrain* as being one or as two!

Similarly, *barr* is not the only word meaning 'land'. There is also the word *balad*, meaning 'land', as for example in 7:58 as follows:

"And the good land — its vegetation comes forth (abundantly) by the permission of its Lord. And that which is inferior — (its herbage) comes forth but scantily."

In the verse 31:27 quoted just above, 'earth', for which the Arabic word is *ard*, refers to the land mass of the earth as opposed to the sea. Likewise in 32:27 the same word *ard* means dry land:

"See they not that We drive the water to a land having no herbage..."

But of course these occurrences of 'land' are not counted in their theory.

Our beloved Prophet Muhammad (s.w.s.)

A poem by Bushra Ahmed

Pure of heart, mind, body and soul,
Really understanding overall.
Of a meek and mild nature,
Pleasantly he had a wonderful face.
He gave beautiful and inspiring talks.
Effortlessly he did good and was truthful,
Tolerant of all and of the poor very mindful.
Most people loved him and cared about him.
Under an umbrella of protection they kept him.
Have we all learnt from him,
Are we following him, Nations?
Mindful of all his actions,
Moreover a brilliant military strategist,
And he fought for God with his own bare hands.
Dutiful to Allah in every way.
So take heed of him everyday.
Worry not about little things,
So prepare for your approaching Deen.

A recent English publication of the Qadiani Jama'at

Meant to refute our Movement's beliefs

An Urdu book entitled *Nubuwwat-o-Khilafat* was published by the Qadiani Jama'at in 1966, consisting of four speeches made by four of their leading religious scholars at a meeting presided over by their then Head Mirza Nasir Ahmad. The speakers attempted to refute the views of the Lahore Ahmadiyya Movement where they differ from the Qadiani Jama'at on the issues of prophethood and *khilafat*. This has now been translated into English and published in February of this year under the same Urdu title.

In the Foreword to the translation, the reason for producing it is stated to be that, although the Lahore Ahmadiyya group is “a very tiny fraction” among the believers in the truthfulness of the Promised Messiah, but:

“they present themselves as the mainstream of his followers and misquote the writings of the Promised Messiah on Internet and in their publications.” (p. xv)

We certainly present ourselves as the group that holds the *correct* beliefs about the claims of Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. If, in this critic's view, this amounts to presenting ourselves as the “mainstream followers”, then we could ask him whether, when the Qadiani Jama'at presents itself as holding correct beliefs *vis-a-vis* the general Muslims, they are claiming to be “mainstream Muslims”. As to “misquoting”, we know of no such instance, and if any were pointed out we would correct them. What is clear from this statement is the discomfiture of the Qadiani Jama'at at our presentation of the real claims of the Promised Messiah in a way that conforms with logic, reason and consistency.

The Foreword goes on to state:

“They may be under the impression that by this tactic, they will appease the non-Ahmadi Muslims — especially in Pakistan. They should remember that this tactic has failed them during the last ninety years.”

The very fact that this Qadiani writer is using the words “non-Ahmadi Muslims” shows that it is his Jama'at that is appeasing them! For, the doctrine of the Qadiani Jama'at regarding other Muslims, which caused the Split in 1914, was that “all those so-called Muslims ... wherever they may be, are *Kafirs* and outside the pale of Islam, even though

they may not have heard the name of the Promised Messiah” (*The Truth About the Split*, by the Second *Khalifa* Mirza Mahmud Ahmad, pages 55–56). But since the first anti-Ahmadiyya agitation in Pakistan of 1953–54 they have, at least publicly, retreated from this position, no doubt to “appease the non-Ahmadi Muslims — especially in Pakistan”.

This Foreword may be said to contain another example of “appeasing” the general Muslims. Above the chapter title occurs the familiar Islamic invocation rendered into English as follows:

“In the name of Allah, the Gracious, the Merciful. We praise Him and invoke His blessings upon His Noble Messenger.”

In the 1966 original Urdu book (where there is no Foreword) the same invocation occurs at the head of the first speech but it contains the additional words: *wa 'ala 'abdih il-Masih il-Mau'ud*. With these words added, the above invocation becomes:

“... We praise Him and invoke His blessings upon His Noble Messenger and upon His servant the Promised Messiah.”

Is the addition of the Promised Messiah now dropped to “appease the non-Ahmadi Muslims”?

The critic says in the Foreword that our “tactic” has failed. Has any tactic of the Qadiani Jama'at worked in this respect? Their strategy in 1970 of openly supporting a certain political party in the elections in Pakistan backfired disastrously, and directly led to the subsequent laws against Ahmadis and their persecution from 1974 onwards. While accusing us of compromising the true Ahmadi beliefs to appease other Muslims, the Qadiani Jama'at itself has been involved, again and again, in political alliances and deals with other Muslim political groups.

According to the Qadiani Jama'at the reason why we do not accept Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad as prophet is to please other Muslims and win their favour. But the fact is that opposition to him by other Muslims arose in 1891 when he declared that he was the Promised Messiah, while denying that he claimed to be a prophet. The Qadiani Jama'at admits that we, the Lahore Ahmadiyya Movement members, accept the claims which he declared in 1891, the claims which provoked the bitterest opposition against him. The change in his claim, as alleged by them, to declare himself as prophet, is said to have been made ten years later in 1901. But we do not find historically that in 1901 there was any increase at all in the hostility against him. Thus it is simply false propaganda to allege that we are trying to appease other Muslims by not accepting

him as prophet, when in fact we accept the very claims that aroused opposition against him.

It is later stated in the Foreword:

“We sincerely advise all members of this group to faithfully accept the Promised Messiah as he claimed to be on the basis of Divine revelation an *Ummati Nabi* — a Prophet subordinate to the Holy Prophet and within his *ummah*.” (p. xvi)

It is never explained by the Qadiani Jama‘at how one goes about accepting him as prophet. To accept the Holy Prophet Muhammad a person must, of course, recite the *Kalima*, and that declaration is made during every prayer. As far as we know, the Qadiani Jama‘at does not require its followers to declare any *kalima* acknowledging Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad as *rasul-ullah*. They should explain in what manner, at which function and how often does one need to declare the prophethood of the Promised Messiah.

Refutation of book in one short statement

If our critic wants to see a rejoinder to this book, he need look no further than the front page of his own Qadiani Jama‘at Urdu organ *Al-Fazl International*, dated 21 April 2006. The extract from the talks of the Promised Messiah published there begins with a short statement which we translate as follows:

“29 September 1905, before noon. A man asked the question: ‘Will a *mujaddid* come after you?’ He [the Promised Messiah] replied:

What is wrong with a *mujaddid* coming after me? The prophethood of Moses had come to an end, and that is why his chain of successors (*khalifas*) ended with Jesus. However, the dispensation of the Holy Prophet Muhammad will last till the Day of Judgment. Therefore, *mujaddids* will arise in it till Judgment Day. As long as the Day of Judgment withholds its destruction, it does not matter that someone else should come. We most certainly do not deny that good and righteous people will continue to come, and then all of a sudden the Day of Judgment will come.”

This settles that till long after 1901 Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad’s claim still was that he was one of the *mujaddids* of Islam and that he was a *khalifa* of the Muslim *Umma* as the *mujaddids* are. It entirely refutes the Qadiani doctrines that he was a prophet and that his successors are *khalifas* of the Muslim *Umma* in the manner of the early caliphate.

Benazir Bhutto mentions the interpretation of the Quran by “Muhammad Ali”

There is a current series of programmes on a new Sky TV channel, *Raj TV*, owned by a Pakistani in the U.K., in which the well-known Pakistani writer on Islam and academic Dr Akbar S. Ahmad is interviewing leading Muslim figures in the Islamic world. The title of the series is *Around the Muslim World in Sixty Days*. In a part of his programme broadcast on Monday 8th May 2006 the interview was with the former Pakistan Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto. During the interview there was one exchange of particular interest for us. It is quoted below, word for word, from a video recording that we made. The dots ... are used to indicate pauses.

Akbar Ahmad:

“Now if I were to ask you which are the three books that you think should be compulsory reading for the young Muslim generation, which books would you recommend?”

Benazir Bhutto:

“It’s very difficult to tell people what particular books to read because ages change ... ”

Akbar Ahmad:

“What inspired you ... any age, any book, ... you know, something that moved you.”

Benazir Bhutto:

“Well, I always found, ... what was ... you’ve got to help me with his name ... Muhammad Ali ... was he the one who did the interpretation of the Quran?”

Akbar Ahmad:

“Yes, yes, yes, Yusuf Ali.”

Benazir Bhutto:

“Yusuf Ali. I thought his interpretation was a useful book.”

Our comment

The name which Benazir Bhutto recalled, while trying to remember whose interpretation of the Quran she would recommend, was “Muhammad Ali”. There is no justification at all for Dr Akbar Ahmad to interject and tell her that what she meant was “Yusuf Ali”.