

The Criterion for Religions

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF RELIGIONS
ON THE BASIS OF
NATURAL CRITERIA

**Ḥaḍrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad
of Qadian**

The Promised Messiah and Mahdi^{as}
Founder of the Ahmadiyya Muslim Jamā'at

ISLAM INTERNATIONAL PUBLICATIONS LIMITED

معیار المذاهب

The Criterion for Religions

English rendering of *Mi'yārul Madhāhib*

© Islam International Publications Ltd

First Urdu edition: 1895

Many Urdu Editions Published Since

First English Edition Published in UK in 2007

Published by:

Islam International Publications Ltd
Islamabad
Sheephatch Lane
Tilford, Surrey
United Kingdom GU10 2AQ

Printed in UK at:

Raqeem Press
'Islamabad'
Tilford, Surrey GU10 2AQ

Cover Design by: Adnan Rashid

ISBN: 1 85372 863 2

About the Author

Born in 1835 in Qadian (India), Ḥaḍrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, the Promised Messiah and Mahdi^{as}, remained dedicated to the study of the Holy Quran and to a life of prayer and devotion. Finding Islam the target of foul attacks from all directions, the fortunes of Muslims at a low ebb, faith yielding to doubt and religion only skin-deep, he undertook vindication and exposition of Islam. In his vast corpus of writings (including his epoch-making *Brāhīn-e-Ahmadiyya*), his lectures, discourses, religious debates etc., he argued that Islam was a living faith and the only faith by following which man could establish contact with his Creator and enter into communion with Him. The teachings contained in the Holy Quran and the Law promulgated by Islam were designed to raise man to moral, intellectual and spiritual perfection. He announced that God had appointed him the Messiah and Mahdi as mentioned in the prophecies of the Bible, the Holy Quran and *Aḥādīth*. In 1889 he began to accept initiation into his Community which is now established in one hundred and seventy-six countries. His eighty books are written mostly in Urdu, but some are also in Arabic and Persian.

After his demise in 1908, the Promised Messiah^{as} was succeeded by Ḥaḍrat Maulawī Nūr-ud-Dīn^{ra}, Khalīfatul Masīḥ I. On the death of Ḥaḍrat Maulawī Nūr-ud-Dīn^{ra} in

1914, Ḥaḍrat Mirza Bashīr-ud-Dīn Mahmood Ahmad^{ra}, who was also the Promised Messiah's^{as} Promised Son, was elected as Khalīfa. Ḥaḍrat Mirza Bashīr-ud-Dīn Mahmood Ahmad^{ra} remained in office for nearly fifty-two years. He died in 1965 and was succeeded by his eldest son, Ḥaḍrat Hafiz Mirza Nasir Ahmad^{rh}, the Promised grandson of the Promised Messiah^{as}. After seventeen years of meritorious service he passed away in 1982. He was succeeded by his younger brother, Ḥaḍrat Mirza Tahir Ahmad^{rh} as Khalīfatul Masīḥ IV who, having led the Community to its present strength and global recognition, passed away on the 19th April, 2003. Ḥaḍrat Mirza Masroor Ahmad Khalīfatul Masīḥ V^{at} is the present head of the Community and enjoys the distinction of being the great-grandson of Ḥaḍrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad^{as}.

Publishers' Note

Mi'yārul Madhāhib (written by the Promised Messiah^{as} and published in 1895), makes a detailed comparison of the major religions of the world from the standpoint of reason and human nature. It discusses at length why other religions, particularly Christianity and Hinduism, fail to present the Perfect and Omnipotent God as proclaimed by Islam. The Promised Messiah^{as} says:

Islam's understanding of God is very simple and clear, and is in keeping with human nature. Even if the books of all other religions were to disappear, along with all of their teachings and concepts, God, towards Whom the Holy Quran leads, would still be clearly reflected in the mirror of the laws of nature, and His Might and Wisdom shall be found glowing in every particle.

This book has been translated into English by Qāḍī M.J. As'ad and revised by Chaudhry Muhammad Ali, Wakīlut Taṣnīf, Rabwah. Chaudhry Sahib was assisted by Mr. Zulqarnain, Raja A. Mannan, Usman Ahmad Ghumman and Dr. Azizur Rahman. We are also grateful to Mirza Anas Ahmad Wakīlul Ishā'at Rabwah and his team specially Sayyed Mansoor Ahmad Bashir, Mr. Shahid Mahmood Ahmad and Mr. Shaikh Naseer Ahmad for transliteration of the text and preparing the index.

Please note that the words in the text in normal brackets () and in between the long dashes—are the words of the Promised Messiah^{as} and if any explanatory words or phrases are added by the translator for the purpose of clarification, they are put in square brackets [].

The name of Muhammad^{sa}, the Holy Prophet of Islam, has been followed by the symbol ^{sa}, which is an abbreviation for the salutation *Ṣallallāhu ‘Alaihi Wasallam* (may peace and blessings of Allah be upon him). The names of other Prophets and Messengers are followed by the symbol ^{as}, an abbreviation for ‘*Alaihissalām* (on whom be peace). The actual salutations have not generally been set out in full, but they should nevertheless, be understood as being repeated in full in each case. The symbol ^{ra} is used with the name of the Companions of the Holy Prophet^{sa} and those of the Promised Messiah^{as}. It stands for *Raḍī Allāhu ‘anhu/‘anha/‘anhum* (may Allah be pleased with him/with her/with them). th stands for *Raḥimahullāhu Ta‘ālā* (may Allah have mercy on him). ^{at} stands for *Ayyadahullāhu Ta‘ālā* (may Allah, the Mighty help him).

In transliterating Arabic words we have followed the following system adopted by the Royal Asiatic Society.

- | | |
|---|--|
| ا | at the beginning of a word, pronounced as <i>a, i, u</i> preceded by a very slight aspiration, like <i>h</i> in the English word 'honour'. |
| ث | <i>th</i> , pronounced like <i>th</i> in the English word 'thing'. |
| ح | <i>h</i> , a guttural aspirate, stronger than <i>h</i> . |
| خ | <i>kh</i> , pronounced like the Scotch <i>ch</i> in 'loch'. |
| ذ | <i>dh</i> , pronounced like the English <i>th</i> in 'that'. |
| ص | <i>s</i> , strongly articulated <i>s</i> . |
| ض | <i>d</i> , similar to the English <i>th</i> in 'this'. |
| ط | <i>t</i> , strongly articulated palatal <i>t</i> . |

- ظ z̤, strongly articulated z.
- ع ‘, a strong guttural, the pronunciation of which must be learnt by the ear.
- غ gh, a sound approached very nearly in the r 'grasseye' in French, and in the German r. It requires the muscles of the throat to be in the 'gargling' position whilst pronouncing it.
- ق q, a deep guttural k sound.
- ء ’, a sort of catch in the voice.

Short vowels are represented by:

- a for — (like u in 'bud');
- i for — (like i in 'bid');
- u for — (like oo in 'wood');

Long vowels by:

- ā for — or َ (like a in 'father');
- ī for ِ — or — (like ee in 'deep');
- ū for ُ — (like oo in 'root');

Other:

- ai for ِ — (like i in 'site')♦;
- au for ُ — (resembling ou in 'sound').

Please note that in transliterated words the letter 'e' is to be pronounced as in 'prey' which rhymes with 'day'; however the pronunciation is flat without the element of English diphthong. If in Urdu and Persian words 'e' is

♦ In Arabic words like شيخ (Shaikh) there is an element of diphthong which is missing when the word is pronounced in Urdu.

lengthened a bit more it is transliterated as 'ei' to be pronounced as 'ei' in 'feign' without the element of diphthong thus 'ع' is transliterated as 'Kei'. For the nasal sound of 'n' we have used the symbol 'ń'. Thus Urdu word 'میں' is transliterated as 'meiń'.*

The consonants not included in the above list have the same phonetic value as in the principal languages of Europe.

We have not transliterated Arabic words which have become part of English language, e.g., Islam, Mahdi, Quran**, Hijra, Ramadan, Hadith, ulema, umma, sunna, kafir, pukka etc.

For quotes straight commas (straight quotes) are used to differentiate them from the curved commas used in the system of transliteration, ‘ for ع, ’ for ء. Commas as punctuation marks are used according to the normal usage. Similarly for apostrophe normal usage is followed.

Publishers

* These transliterations are not included in the system of transliteration by Royal Asiatic Society. [**Publishers**]

** Concise Oxford Dictionary records Quran in three forms—Quran, Qur’an and Koran. [**Publishers**]

**A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF RELIGIONS ON THE BASIS OF
NATURAL CRITERION AND SOME COMMENTS ON THE BE-
NEVOLENCE OF THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT**

In my opinion none could have a better opportunity of evaluating and judging the truth of a religion and of differentiating between right and wrong, than the people of our land—the Punjab and India. The first blessing of God Almighty in this regard is that our country happens to be under the British Government. It would indeed be extreme ingratitude on our part not to be grateful to this benevolent Government from the depth of our heart. By virtue of its blessed presence we have such privilege of inviting people to Islam and communicating its message as not even a king has ever enjoyed before us. Because this knowledge-friendly Government allows us such freedom of expression as is not to be found in any other existing government. Is it not strange that while we are free to preach Islam in the streets of London, it is not possible for us to do the same in the Holy Mecca! Not only has this Government given freedom to publish books and preach one's religion to one and all, but has also taken upon itself to help every sect by spreading the knowledge of modern sciences and arts. Thus, through education and training it has opened the eyes of a whole world. In addition to this favour, which in it-

self is no small achievement, this benign Government protects our lives, honour and property with all sincerity and to the best of its ability. It is also providing us with the benefits of the freedom for which many a true well-wisher of mankind passed away thirsting before now. Yet another favour of the Government, which is of even greater value, is that it wants to transform wild savages and so-called humans into wise and scholarly people through different disciplines of education. We find that through sustained efforts on the part of this Government those who almost lived like animals and beasts have now partaken something of humaneness, knowledge and understanding. As a result, most minds and hearts are now radiant with such light as is gained from the acquisition of knowledge. It is as if the expansion of information has changed the world all at once. However, just as light can pass through a glass and water cannot, similarly, the light of knowledge has indeed entered hearts and minds but the pure and truth-oriented water of sincerity has not yet entered people's hearts to nurture the plant of the soul and to yield good fruit. But the Government is not to blame. The fact of the matter is that the conditions which inspire true spirituality are either extremely rare or completely non-existent. Curiously enough, with the progress of knowledge, cunning and deceit seem to be

on the rise and seekers after truth are confronted with overwhelming doubts. Simplicity of faith has all but disappeared and philosophical thinking, which is unaccompanied by religious knowledge, is exerting such a poisonous influence on the newly educated people as to pull them towards atheism. The truth is that it is exceedingly difficult for people to escape this influence without the help of religious knowledge. Therefore, pity be upon the person who has been left to the mercy of such schools and colleges without any knowledge of religious truths and verities. We can of course say that this courageous Government, which is so sympathetic to mankind, has cleansed with its own hands the wasteland of the hearts of our people and cleared them of wild shrubs and bushes, and from all kinds of weeds that had grown thick and tall and had covered up the soil underneath. Naturally the time has now come for the seed of truth to be sown in this soil and to be irrigated by heavenly water. Fortunate indeed are those who have come so close to this heavenly rain with the help of this blessed Government. Muslims should look upon the presence of this Government as a gift of God, and genuinely try to obey it so that they become an example for others. Can the reward of goodness be anything but goodness? Is it not obligatory to repay goodness with goodness? Everyone should reflect over this and dis-

play his innate goodness. Islamic Shariah does not teach us to forego the rights of others and to waste their favours. Therefore, not hypocritically, but genuinely, one should obey this benevolent Government, for God has established it as the first and foremost means for spreading the light of our faith.

The second means available in our country to assess the truth of religions is the profusion of printing presses, for such books as lay buried in the earth were again brought back to life through them. So much so, that even the Vedas of the Hindus has come out dressed in new pages. In other words, it has been re-born, and the tales invented by the fools and the rabble have been exposed.

The third means is the opening of the channels of communications, the establishment of an efficient postal system, and the conveyance of books from far off countries to our land and vice versa. All these means, which, by the grace of God, have now been made available in our country, and from which we are freely benefiting, are instrumental in searching for the truth. All these benefits have been received through this kind and well-meaning Government and we pray for it from the bottom of our hearts.

It may be asked as to why such a civilized and wise Government associates itself with a religion that dei-

fies a man and thus detracts from the self-evident, eternal and immutable glory of the true God? The answer to this question can only be that, unfortunately, monarchs and kings are so preoccupied with running the affairs of the state that it consumes all their faculties of thought and reflection. Preoccupation with national interests does not let them attend to the affairs of the hereafter. Hence such continuous and relentless absorption in worldly pursuits undermines the spirit of recognizing the Almighty and of seeking out the truth. Nevertheless, I am hopeful that He will guide this courageous Government towards the right path. Our prayer for this Government is as much for its worldly prosperity as for the hereafter. No wonder therefore if we do witness the effect of this prayer.

In this day and age, while so many means are available to distinguish between truth and falsehood, three major religions in our country are in the field confronting one another. Each follower of these three faiths claims that only his faith is right and true, and, strangely enough, none of them is ever inclined to confess that his faith is not based on the principles of truth. But I cannot believe that the hearts of our opponents can, even for a moment, agree with the claim they make with their tongues. The hallmark of a true religion is that even before we advance arguments in its favour, it is, in its very essence, so bright and resplen-

dent that against it all other religions appear to be enveloped in darkness. A wise person can clearly understand this argument only when he concentrates on the essence of a religion, leaving aside all the specious arguments that are offered in its favour. That is to say, as he makes comparison between different faiths on the basis of their approach to recognizing God, and does away with all extraneous arguments in favour of any particular religious dogma, he comes to recognize the religion which possesses the intrinsic light of truth, and which has the ability to draw hearts towards itself purely because of its manner of Divine recognition. In this context I have already spoken of three religions, namely Ārya, Christianity and Islam. If we wish to present the true picture of these three faiths, it would be as follows:

The Ārya religion has a 'God' whose godhood cannot function independently on the strength of His inherent power and might, for all His hopes are pinned on existents which are not His own creation. While it is impossible for man to comprehend the extent of the powers of the True God, the powers of the god of the Āryas can be counted on fingertips. He is a Parmeshwar [God] of such meagre resources that the limits of all His powers have already been defined, and the utmost one could say in His favour would be that, like a mason, he can only put together things that are coeter-

nal with Him. But if it is asked whether He personally contributes anything to it, the answer would be in the negative. Thus, the maximum extent of His power consists only in joining together existing souls and tiny material particles that are as eternal and necessary as His own being and over the creation of which He has no influence whatsoever. It is, therefore, difficult to explain why at all such eternal entities need a Parmeshwar since they themselves and all their properties are self-existent. Moreover, their ability to combine with one another is also innate and their mutual pull and attraction has existed since eternity. All their characteristics, resulting from their synthesis, are similarly self-existing. One fails to understand how the existence of such a defective and powerless Parmeshwar can be justified. And what is there to distinguish Him from everything else except that He is more clever and intelligent! There is no doubt that the Parmeshwar of the Āryas lacks the infinite powers that are the hallmark of Divine perfection. As ill luck would have it, this imaginary Parmeshwar failed to attain the absolute perfection which is a must for the full manifestation of Divine glory. Another misfortune is that, except for a few pages of the Vedas, there is no way of recognizing Him through the laws of nature. Because, if it is true that souls and material particles, along with all of their properties, attractions, characteristics, intellects, cogni-

tions and consciousness are self-existing, then common sense sees no need for any external being to bring them together. The reason is that in such a case it would be impossible to explain why things—which have been their own creator since all eternity, and which contain within themselves such properties as are necessary for their mutual connection—stand in need of someone else to bring them together, when they don't even need Parmeshwar for their existence, their faculties or their characteristics. The fact is that joining souls and material bodies to their qualities is also a kind of synthesis. Thus, it proves that just as these eternal entities stand in no need of any creator for their existence or for their properties, similarly they do not need any assembler to combine them with one another. It would be the height of folly to admit that such entities do not need any external being for their existence, their properties and their mutual connection, and then to claim, in the same breath, that some entities do need an external being to combine them. This would be a claim without any argument. Thus, in view of this doctrine, it becomes exceedingly difficult to prove the very existence of Parmeshwar. None can be more unfortunate than the one who relies on such a Parmeshwar, who, because of His limited power, does not have sufficient means even to prove His own existence. So much for the divine powers of the

Parmeshwar of the Hindus! But when we come to his moral qualities, we find them inferior even to those of humans. We find that a kind-hearted person forgives, time and again, such offenders as seek his pardon with humility and contrition. And many a time, due to his generous nature, he shows kindness even to those who do not deserve it. But the Āryas confess that their Parmeshwar is bereft of both these moral qualities. In their view, each sin is the cause of millions of reincarnations and there is no possibility of deliverance until and unless a sinner receives his full quota of punishment by going through countless reincarnations. Furthermore, according to their belief, it is utterly futile to hope that repentance, contrition and seeking forgiveness will save a person from rebirth, or that his return to the truth will save him from the punishment of his past errors of word and deed. On the contrary, it is inevitable that one must pass through countless reincarnations, and there is no way to avoid them. Also, Parmeshwar is not wont to grant pardon through grace or generosity, and anything pleasant or any bounty that is given to man or animal is only the fruit of some previous incarnation. What a pity, that though the Āryas are so proud of Vedic principles, this false teaching has not been able to subdue their conscience. In my frequent meetings with some members of this sect I have often experienced that just as they are mortified at the

mere mention of *Neug*¹, they are also extremely embarrassed when asked why the divine and moral powers of the Parmeshwar are so limited that even his Godhood cannot be proven on the basis of reason, and because of which the unfortunate Āryas have been deprived of eternal salvation. The quintessence and the truth about the Parmeshwar of the Hindus is that he is extremely weak and pitiable with regard to his divine and moral powers. Perhaps this is the reason why, in the Vedas, worship of Parmeshwar has been left out, and stress has been laid on the worship of fire, air, moon, sun, and water, and every reward and favour has been sought from these objects. It would indeed be a mistake for the Āryas to rely on their Parmeshwar, for he cannot lead them anywhere while he is himself deprived of all powers and leads his life in frustration. What I have written should be enough for anyone to visualize the true picture of the Parmeshwar of the Hindus.

Next comes Christianity, whose adherents vociferously and exaggeratedly believe their 'God', whom they call Jesus Christ, to be the true God. Here is the

¹ *Neug* forms an integral part of the teachings of Āryas—a sect of Hinduism. According to this doctrine, if a woman's husband is absent or is sterile, it is obligatory for her to have extramarital sex in order to bear an offspring.
[Publishers]

profile of the 'God' of the Christians: He was an Israelite born of Mary, daughter of Jacob, and departed from this transitory world at the age of thirty-two. When we reflect how, at the time of his arrest, he could not attain his desire even though he prayed all night, and with what ignominy he was apprehended, and how, as the Christians say, he was drawn upon the cross and died crying 'Eli, Eli'², a shudder all at once runs through us: how can we call such a person the Almighty whose prayer was not accepted by God, and who, after being continuously beaten and harassed, met his death in a state of disappointment and frustration? Just imagine the spectacle of Jesus Christ being sent to Herod after remaining in captivity in the court of Pilate. Is it in keeping with Divine glory that after being arrested, handcuffed and shackled he was sent off to Galilee under the custody of a few troopers, suffering their rebukes, and moving from one prison to another in such ignominy? Pilate wanted to release him if only he could show a miracle, but he could show none. Thus Pilate was left with no choice but to return him to prison and hand him over to the Jews, who did not waste any time doing away with him.

² Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani? That is to say, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?—Matthew, 27:46 [**Publishers**]

Readers may now judge for themselves whether these are the signs of the true God! Can any pure conscience ever accept that the Creator of heaven and earth, Who is the Omnipotent, and possesses limitless powers, should end up so unfortunate, weak and miserable that mischief-makers should trample him under their feet? If anyone worships such a 'God' and relies upon him, it is up to him. But the truth is that if you compare the God of the Christians even with the Parmeshwar of the Āryas, and weigh his power and might, he will still be found wanting in comparison. For although the supposed Parmeshwar of the Āryas has no power to create anything, they still say that at least he has the power to combine things that already exist. But Jesus of the Christians could not demonstrate even this much power when the Jews drew him on the cross and said, 'If you now save yourself, we will believe you.' And yet he could not save himself though it was no big task; all he had to do was to combine his spirit with his body. The poor man failed to do even that. Thereafter his apologists spun the tale that he was resurrected in the sepulchre. Unfortunately, they did not realize that the Jews had wanted him to come back to life right before their eyes. Since he could not come back to life before their eyes, nor did he meet them after his resurrection from the sepulchre, what proof is there for the Jews, or any

researcher for that matter, that he did indeed come back to life? In the absence of any such evidence, even if one were to assume that the corpse somehow went missing in the sepulchre, it would not prove that he had in fact come back to life. The best that could reasonably be asserted with any degree of certainty is that someone who wished to show a miracle must have stealthily whisked the body away. There have been many people in this world whose followers believe that their corpses had disappeared and that they had gone to heaven along with their bodies. Will the Christians accept that it might well have been so? Look at the episode of Baba Nanak Sahib. One million and seven hundred thousand Sikhs unanimously believe that he went bodily to heaven after he died. This belief is not only unanimous but is recorded in authentic books, which date back to the time of the occurrence. Now, will the Christians accept that Baba Nanak Sahib has indeed gone to heaven with his earthly body? The pity is that the Christians are quick to invoke reason in respect of other people, but they do not allow it to come within touching distance of their own absurdities. If only the Christians wished to be just, they could readily understand that the arguments of the Sikh gentlemen about the disappearance of Baba Nanak Sahib's body and his going to heaven with his physical frame are more cogent and worthy

of attention than their own gilded lies, and are, without doubt, stronger than the so-called arguments of the Gospels, for they were simultaneously recorded in Bala's *Janam Sākhī*, whereas the Gospels were chronicled many years after the time of Jesus. Baba Nanak Sahib's episode has yet another advantage: The miraculous power attributed to Jesus seems an attempt by the disciples to hide the mortification they had to suffer before the Jews. After drawing Jesus on the cross, the Jews had wanted him to show a miracle by coming down alive from the cross; if he did so, they would believe him. But since Jesus could not get down from the cross, his disciples were greatly embarrassed and cut a sorry figure before the Jews. In order to hide their shame they must, therefore, have had recourse to some subterfuge, which would help them escape the sarcasm, ridicule and laughter of the simple-minded. It is, therefore, quite reasonable to believe that they may have played this trickery in order to wipe this stigma off their faces, and might have removed Jesus' body from one grave to another under the cover of night—as indeed they have been accused of doing—and then, being the only witnesses to their own claim, started propagating that Jesus has risen from the dead just as the Jews had demanded of him, and that he had forthwith gone to heaven. The Sikhs, on the other hand, didn't face any such difficulties on

the occasion of Baba Nanak Sahib's demise. No adversary ever accused them of such trickery nor did they have to resort to deception. Nor, for that matter, did anyone cry out—like the Jews had done in the case of Jesus^{as}—that the corpse had been stolen. It would have been more plausible if Christians had held such a belief about Baba Nanak Sahib rather than Jesus. To hold such a belief about Jesus is a plain concoction and reeks of fabrication.

The one last excuse, which is offered for the suffering and crucifixion of Jesus, is that, being 'God', he was crucified so that his death might redeem the sinners. The possibility that God too can die is yet another invention of the Christians, even though they brought him back to life and raised him to the Throne. To this day they are under the false notion that he will come back to this world to sit in judgement, and that the body he was given after his death shall remain with him forever by virtue of being 'God'. But this 'God' incarnate of the Christians, who, according to them, has tasted death once already, and is made up of blood, flesh, bones and all the other organs, is no different from Avatars of the Hindus who are being gleefully disowned by the Āryas nowadays. The only difference is that while the Christian 'God' was born only once from the womb of Mary, daughter of Jacob, the Hindu god Vishnu, with a view to warding off the

sins of the world, allowed himself to wear the stigma of birth as many as nine times. But the episode of the eighth birth, as reported, is of particular interest. It is said that when the earth was overpowered by the wicked, Vishnu took birth at midnight from the womb of a virgin as an Avatar and delivered people from the sins that had pervaded the world. Although this story conforms to the Christian taste, the Hindus were more prudent, for, unlike the Christians, they took care not to crucify their Avatars, nor did they consider them to be accursed. There are certain hints in the Holy Quran which clearly indicate that the Brahmans of ancient India were the ones who first invented the concept of deifying a human being. Thereafter the Greeks borrowed these beliefs from the Hindus. Finally, it was the lot of the Christians to gorge themselves on the filth of this detestable belief held by the first two peoples. The Hindus, however, hit upon another fanciful idea which had not occurred to the Christians. Hindus consider it to be the ancient law of the Eternal God that whenever the world got filled with sin, their Parmeshwar could think of no other stratagem than to let himself be born into this world to redeem mankind. This did not happen once but has always been happening whenever the need arose. The Christians on the other hand—though they believe that God is Eternal and His existence has no beginning, no matter

how far we may go back in time, and that He has been the Creator and Lord of the worlds since eternity—they at least do not believe that He has eternally been crucifying His darling sons for the sake of mankind. Rather, they say that it was only recently that He hit upon this stratagem, and that the ageing father has only now thought of saving others from punishment by having His son crucified. It is clear that once one accepts that God is eternal and timeless, one must also accept that God's creation has always existed in one form or the other, and that because of the eternal manifestation of the God's eternal attributes a whole universe has at times been disappearing into the realm of non-existence and, at times, one universe has been appearing in place of another. Furthermore, no one can count how many universes God has withdrawn from the world and replaced them with others. God Almighty, in fact, points to this ever-existing generic universe when He says in the Holy Quran that He created the Jinn before He had created Adam. Despite self-evident proof that the universe must be timeless in nature, the Christians have yet to produce a list showing the number of times that the 'Son of God' was drawn upon the cross in the countless universes, each isolated from the other. While it is evident, in accordance with the principles of the Christian faith, that no one except the son of God is free from sin, we

would like to know what arrangements were made for the salvation of the creatures who lived before the time of our own Adam and who had no connection whatsoever with the present human race. Was it this same son who was crucified time and again for their salvation, or was it some other son who would accept the cross for the sake of earlier creations? To the best of my judgement, I believe that if there can be no redemption without crucifixion, then the God of the Christians must have possessed countless sons who would have been useful in such endeavours now and then, and each one of them must have been crucified in his own good time. Hence, it would be futile to expect any good from a God whose own youthful sons continued to die.

During the debate at Amritsar I also raised the following question. The Christians claim that their 'God' does not wish anyone to die in sin, let them, therefore, tell us what arrangements this 'God' has made for the salvation of the evil spirits mentioned in the Gospels?³ Did any Son of God come to the

³ Note: It is evident from the teachings of Islam that even devils can become believers. Thus, our lord and master the Holy Prophet^{sa} said, 'My Satan has become a Muslim.' In short, every human being is accompanied by a devil. The devil of one who is pure and saintly does become a believer. But the pity of it is that Jesus' devil would not believe; on the contrary, he planned to mislead Jesus and took him up on a mountain and showed him

world to lay down his life for the sins of the devils or to stop them from sin? If no such arrangement was made, it would prove that the 'God' of the Christians has always been pleased to burn the devils—who, according to the Christian belief, outnumber even the sons of Adam—in the everlasting fire of hell. Since no such son ever existed, the Christians were forced to admit that their 'God' created devils only for hell. Thus, ever since they have pronounced the Son of Mary to be 'God', the poor Christians find themselves in all sorts of troubles. I do not believe that even a day passes when their own souls do not look at this belief with contempt. Another predicament they face is that, upon investigation, no final cause can be ascertained as to why he was crucified, nor was any useful purpose served by his crucifixion, for there can be only two possibilities:

all the kingdoms of the world and assured him that he would give him all these things if he worshipped him. In fact, these words of the devil contained a great prophecy and also were a pointer towards the fact that when the Christian people prostrate before him they will be given all the kingdoms and riches of the world. And so did it come to pass. Those whose master claimed to be God and yet followed Satan—i.e., went along with him—little wonder, therefore, that they prostrated before Satan. In short, the Christian riches and kingdoms are the result of their prostration before Satan. It is quite clear that, in keeping with satanic promise, the kingdoms of the world were given to the Christians only after they had prostrated before him. [Author]

(1) The first is that the ultimate reason for the crucifixion of 'the son' was to encourage his followers to commit sins, and to freely spread sinfulness, impiety and every kind of evil with the help of Atonement. This position is obviously untenable for it is the way of Satan, and I do not believe that anyone in the world would opt for this sinful path or consider the founder of such a faith to be pious who has thus induced the common man to indulge in sin. Experience shows that such beliefs are only held by those who are deprived of true faith and morality, and wish, for their own selfish motives, to cast other people into a life of sin as well. They are in fact like the roadside fortune-tellers who lure and deceive passers-by, and by charging a paltry sum, reassure the poor fools in comforting tones that fortune is about to smile on them. Pretending to be true scholars they closely study the lines on people's hands and their facial features, as if looking for certain signs. After turning the pages of a book, which is placed there expressly for this trickery, they assure the client that his great star of fortune is about to shine; and that he will very probably become the king of a country or at least a minister. The people who are intent on making a person 'the recipient of divine favours' despite his chronic impurities, are like the alchemists who, when they come across a simpleton who also happens to be

rich, try to cheat him with their bragging. After talking a while of this and that, they begin to criticize earlier alchemists, calling them liars and scoundrels and swindlers. They go on in this manner and finally say, 'Gentleman! during the course of fifty or sixty years of my life every claimant to alchemy that I have come across was a liar, but my late mentor was a genuine alchemist. He gave away tens of millions of rupees in charity, and I was lucky to have served him for twelve years and was duly rewarded.' On hearing of 'reward' an ignoramus blurts out: 'In that case, old man, you must have learnt the formula of alchemy from your mentor.' At this the old man frowns and says a little angrily, 'Shut up, young man, or else thousands will gather around me; I am trying to hide from the people.' The ignorant are easily taken in by these few remarks. The game is thus ensnared and ready for slaughter. He takes the victim aside and tells him in a secretive manner, 'It is only your good fortune that has brought me here across thousands of miles. I myself cannot understand why this hard heart of mine has softened for you. Now, hurry up! Go home and fetch gold jewellery worth ten thousand rupees, your own or borrowed, and it will multiply ten fold overnight. But, beware, don't let anyone know about me. Make some other excuse for it.' The long and short of it is that after getting hold of the jewel-

lery these people simply disappear, and the simpletons who were hoping for ten fold multiplication are left bemoaning their fate. This is the retribution for the greed, which is carried to its limits by ignoring the law of nature. But what I have heard is that such swindlers have to declare all those before and after them to be frauds, bandits, villains, liars and ignorant of the formula. Similarly, Christians too seem unable to establish their bona fides until and unless they have declared all the holy Prophets^{as}—from Adam^{as} onwards—to be sinners and evildoers.⁴

(2) The second possible reason why this pitiable son should have been crucified is that those who believe in his crucifixion may be saved from every kind of sin and wickedness, and that the appetites of their baser selves may not be allowed to find expression. Unfortunately, this condition turns out to be as much against decency and as manifestly false as the first one. If it is assumed that genuine faith in the Atonement of Jesus has the particular quality of making a true believer angelic, after which not even the thought

⁴ Woe betide the reason and understanding of the Christians whose attempt to turn Jesus into God was of no avail to the person of Jesus! On the contrary, they were responsible for humiliating him in the eyes of the righteous. It would have been better had they offered alms for the elevation of his soul and had prayed for his well-being in the hereafter. What was the good of deifying a handful of dust! [Author]

of sin ever crosses his mind, then it will have to be posited about all the earlier Prophets^{as} that they did not truly believe in the crucifixion of Jesus and in Atonement, for, as alleged by the Christians, they crossed all the limits in evildoing; some among them indulged in idol-worship, while some committed unlawful murder and some were guilty of incest with their daughters. Jesus' grandfather David, in particular, was guilty of every evil. In order to satisfy his lust he got an innocent person killed by subterfuge, sent for his wife through procuress, got her drunk and committed adultery with her. He wasted a lot of money on immoral pleasures and throughout his life kept as many as hundred wives, which in itself, according to the Christians, amounts to adultery. Strangely enough, the Holy Ghost continued to descend upon him everyday and the Psalms continued to be revealed rapidly, yet neither the Holy Ghost nor belief in the Atonement of Jesus could prevent him from immoralities and he ultimately died steeped in these vices. What is even more strange is that Atonement couldn't even save the maternal and paternal grandmothers of Jesus from illicit sex, though it could not but smear the pristine purity of Jesus' nature, particularly when there were as many as three such grandmothers. Thus one 'revered' maternal grandmother of Jesus, who in one sense was also his

paternal grandmother, was Rehab, the harlot, i.e., a prostitute. (See Joshua 2:1) The second maternal grandmother, who, in one sense, was also a paternal grandmother, was named Tamar. She was a woman of easy virtue like professional prostitutes. (See Genesis 38:16-30) Another maternal grandmother of Jesus, who in one sense was also a paternal grandmother of his, is known by the name of Bath-Sheba. She was none other than the 'pious' one who committed adultery with David.⁵ (See 2 Samuel 11).

Now, the maternal and paternal grandmothers must obviously have been apprised of Jesus' Atonement and they must have believed in it, for the Christians believe as a matter of principle that earlier Prophets^{as} and their followers were given the same teaching of Atonement and that they were redeemed only because of this belief. Now, if it is supposed that Jesus' crucifixion saves one from sin, then Jesus' maternal and paternal grandmothers should have been saved from adultery and illicit sex. It would similarly follow that while the

⁵ Note: Our lord and master the Holy Prophet^{sa} says: In the long chain of my mothers, beginning with my own mother and going back right up to Eve, no one along the line was adulterous or of loose morals, nor was any male along the line adulterous or of bad morals. But according to the Christian's own belief, the birth of their God is contaminated with the blood of three adulterous women, whereas what is written in the Torah regarding the offspring of adulterous women is no secret. [Author]

Prophets^{as}, despite believing in the 'suicide' of Jesus—as the Christians profess—could not save themselves from immoralities, and nor could the Jesus' grandmothers do so, it conclusively proves that such false Atonement cannot save anyone from carnal desires, nor could it save Jesus himself. Look how he followed Satan,⁶ while it was most unbecoming of him to do so. Perhaps it was because of this that he was filled with such remorse that when someone hailed him as 'good'

⁶ Note: Present day European philosophers, despite being Christians, do not accept that Satan lured Jesus and took him up on a mountain, for they do not believe in the embodiment of Satan. In fact, they don't believe in Satan's existence at all. However, regardless of what these philosophers think, one objection is certainly valid, that had this episode taken place in the mountains inhabited by the Jews and on the paths they frequented, then, of a necessity, not only Jesus but many Jews would also have seen that particular Satan. And without doubt, Satan would not have looked like ordinary humans but would have appeared as a bizarre creature, likely to amaze the onlookers. Thus, if Jesus had really seen Satan in the conscious state, it is inevitable that thousands of Jews would have done so as well, and a crowd would have gathered. But nothing of the kind happened. European researchers, therefore, cannot accept it as an objective phenomenon. On the other hand, it is because of such absurd fantasies—including the claim of Jesus' divinity—that they salute the Gospels from a safe distance. Recently a European scholar has expressed the following opinion about the Gospels of the Christians. He says that all that is required to convince a sensible person that the Gospels are the creation of the human mind—and a wild creation at that—is simply to ask him to read it. This gentleman further says, 'Read the Gospel as an ordinary book, remove the blindfold of reverence from your eyes, drive away the spectre of fear from your heart and free your mind of superstitions; if you study the Gospel having done all this, you will wonder how you could, even for a moment, have considered

he stopped him and said, 'Do not call me good.' How indeed could a person who accompanied Satan dare call himself good? What is certain is that Jesus, on account of his own thinking and for other reasons, avoided calling himself good. Alas! today the Christians not only declare him to be good but have raised

the author of this ignorance and inequity to be a wise and righteous person.' Similarly, many philosophers who are well-versed in the sciences, look down upon the Gospel with disdain, and have become disgusted with these unholy teachings,^a since belief in them is a matter of great shame for a reasonable person. For instance, there is the false story of the father who is full of wrath and wants to destroy everyone, and then there is the son who is most benevolent and has averted the insane wrath of his father from the people by having himself drawn on the Cross. How can the poor European scholars bring themselves to believe in such absurd tales? Similar is the naivety of the Christians for having divided God into three persons: one who always retains the human form and whose name is the 'Son of God'; the second is the one who shall always retain the shape of the dove and whose name is the 'Holy Spirit'; and the third is He at Whose right hand the son has seated himself. How can a sensible person accept such Trinity? But the fact that Jesus accompanied Satan is no less ridiculous in the eyes of European philosophers. It is only after a great effort that they put forward the interpretations that these experiences were the product of Jesus' own mind. At the same time they also believe that such repulsive thoughts cannot be born of a sound and healthy mind.

contd ...

^a Note: The higher status a Christian attains in philosophy the more disillusioned he becomes with the Gospel and Christianity. So much so, that a Christian lady has recently published a pamphlet repudiating the Christian doctrine. The condition of Muslim philosophers, on the other hand, is quite the opposite. Avicenna—who is reputed to be the dean of philosophers, faithless and an apostate—writes at the end of his book *Ishārāt* that, although there is no philosophical evidence in favour of physical resurrection, and the reverse is the case, we still believe in it because the Truthful Messenger, i.e., the Holy Prophet^{sa} has affirmed it. [Author]

him to the status of God! Thus, Atonement failed to benefit even the person of Jesus himself. Pride and vanity, which are the root cause of all evil, seem to have fallen to the lot of Jesus, for after arrogating

Many people have learnt, on the basis of personal investigation, that this is how epileptics are wont to experience the presence of the devils. They describe their experiences in exactly the same manner, and say that Satan took them to such and such places and showed them such and such wonders. I recall that about thirty-four years ago, I saw Satan in a dream standing somewhere looking dark and ugly. At first he turned his attention towards me, but I slapped him on the face and said, 'Be off, Satan! I have nothing to do with you.' He then went off with another person whom he persuaded to accompany him. Now this was a person I knew. I then woke up and, on the same day, or sometime later, the person I had seen in the dream and whom Satan had taken along with him became afflicted with epilepsy. This convinced me that the companionship of Satan is to be interpreted as a sign of suffering from epilepsy. Thus it is indeed an extremely delicate point and a very clear and reasonable conclusion that Jesus did, in fact, suffer from epilepsy. That is why he used to see such dreams. The fact that the Jews accused him of performing such tasks with the help of Beelzebub supports this opinion and is quite convincing, for Beelzebub is another name for Satan. The Jewish imputation also seems correct and plausible for the added reason that, although those who are possessed by Satan and whom Satan begins to love may not rid themselves of their own epilepsy, they are able to cure others of it. Since Satan loves them and doesn't wish to part with them, he fulfils their wishes and for their sake rids others of satanic diseases. Invariably such 'witch-doctors' are addicted to alcohol and other unclean concoctions and are alcoholics and gluttons of the first order. Sometime ago there used to be a man who suffered from fainting fits, and it is said that he had the ability to exorcise evil spirits out of others. Thus, this episode of Jesus accompanying Satan is a positive proof of epilepsy. We have many other supporting reasons, which need not be elaborated at this point. We trust that Christian scholars who already support our viewpoint will not disagree with the present argument. However, such of the uninformed priests as choose to disagree, have to prove that the episode of Jesus accompanying Satan was one that took place in a state of full conscious-

Godhood to himself he has labelled all other Prophets^{as} robbers, bandits and unclean people, despite own confession that he was not good. It is pitiable that the too much arrogance ruined his entire condition. No decent person ever denigrates earlier Divines, but he has dubbed the holy Prophets of God as marauders and highwaymen. His tongue is ever ready with words such as 'sinful' and 'adulterous'. He never spoke about anyone with courtesy or reverence. And why should he! Was he not the Son of God!

When we go on and look at the effect Jesus' Atonement had on the hearts of his disciples, and whether they gave up sin after having believed in it, true piety seems to be as good as missing. Though they had al-

ness^a and was not the result of any epileptic or related disease. But they must produce reliable witnesses who should give an eyewitness account. Moreover, the descent of the dove and its saying: 'Thou art my beloved son', also seems to show that it was indeed a fit of epilepsy, which caused such hallucinations. The fact is that a dove is white in colour and so is phlegm, which is basic to epilepsy. Thus phlegm appeared to him in the shape of a dove. And the dove's remark, 'Thou art my son', seems to imply that an epileptic is, in a sense, the son of epilepsy. Indeed, in medicine epilepsy is known as *Ummus Şibyān*, i.e., the mother of children. At one time all four of Jesus' real brothers submitted an application to the government of the time to the effect that Jesus had lost his sanity and that something must be done about him. In other words, he should be consigned to the judicial lock-up for appropriate treatment, in accordance with the law of the land. This application is yet another proof that Jesus had lost his sanity due to epilepsy. [Author]

^a The question is, who were the people that saw Jesus in the company of Satan? [Author]

ready believed when they learnt about the crucifixion, yet the result was that Peter cursed him to his face when he was arrested and the rest took to their heels. Not a single one of them was left with the light of faith in his heart. What became of the abstinence from sin from then to this day, can easily be born out by the testimony of European researchers themselves. In Europe, according to them, illicit sex is so rampant that thousands of illegitimate children are born every year in London alone; and such foul European scandals have lately been published, that the less said of them the better. Consumption of alcohol has increased to such an extent that liquor shops, if they were placed in a line, would extend for miles. People have bidden farewell to worship and are immersed in worldly affairs and worldly pleasures day and night. All these facts prove that those who believe in Jesus' crucifixion have not been able to desist from sin.⁹ Rather, just as a torrent of water devastates surrounding villages after the bursting of a dam, so is the plight of those who believe in Atonement. I know that the Christians would

⁹ Note: If crucifixion of Jesus was a voluntary act it would be tantamount to suicide or an accursed death. If he was crucified against his will, there could be no redemption. Also, Jesus could not describe himself as good, for people knew that he was a known drunkard and this misconduct seems to have been there since the beginning and not something that developed after his claim to divinity. Hence his claim to divinity can only be an evil consequence of alcoholism. [Author]

not like to debate this point at length, for when Jesus' Atonement could not stop even the Prophets^{as}—who were visited by angels—from sin, how on earth can it restrain traders, merchants and dry-brained priests from sinful deeds? This, in short, is the condition of the 'God' of the Christians.

The third faith, as against the two we have discussed, is Islam. Islam's understanding of God is very simple and clear, and is in keeping with human nature. Even if the books of all other religions were to disappear along with all their teachings and concepts, God—towards Whom the Holy Quran leads—would still be clearly reflected in the mirror of the laws of nature and His might and wisdom shall be found glowing in every particle. In short, the God of Which the Holy Quran speaks, does not rule His creation merely by force, but consistent with the Quranic verse,

أَلَسْتُ بِرَبِّكُمْ ط قَالُوا بَلَىٰ ۗ ۱۰

each and every particle, by its very nature and spirit, is subject to His command. Every being is drawn towards Him, and not a single particle is devoid of this attraction. This proves that He is the Creator of everything, for the light of the heart testifies that the magnetism which draws everything towards Him un-

¹⁰ Am I not your Lord? They say, Yea.—Al-A'raf, 7:173 [Publishers]

doubtedly comes from Him. The Holy Quran refers to this in the verse,

إِنْ مِنْ شَيْءٍ إِلَّا يُسَبِّحُ بِحَمْدِهِ¹¹

i.e., everything is glorifying His holiness and singing His praises. Why would all things be attracted towards God, if He was not their Creator? A thinking person will acknowledge that this attraction is a result of some kind of latent relationship. Hence, if this relationship is not due to the fact that God is the Creator, then let some Ārya explain what the Vedas and other books have to say about the nature of this relationship and what is it called? Is it indeed true that God is only exercising His authority over everything by force, and that the things themselves have no innate quality or urge to incline towards Him? God forbid. This is not at all true, for even to think so is not only stupidity, but even amounts to depravity. Alas! the Vedas of the Āryas, by rejecting God's power of creation, have refused to accept the spiritual bond on which depends the natural urge of each object to obey. Since they were far removed from profound spiritual knowledge and understanding, they have remained unaware of the true philosophy that all bodies and souls have a natural bond with the Eternal

¹¹ Banī Isrā'īl, 17:45 [Publishers]

Being and that His dominion is not based on affectation and coercion. Rather, every existent, impelled by an inner urge of the soul, lies prostrate in worship before Him, because each miniscule particle is His creation and is steeped in His limitless favours. It is a pity that the followers of all the opposing religions, out of their own parsimony, have tried to forcibly hold back the vast river of Divine Might, Grace and Holiness. This is why their imaginary deities have been tarnished with a variety of stigmas like weakness, unholiness, affectation, and unjustified wrath and tyranny. But Islam nowhere blocks the rapid currents of God's perfect attributes. It does not, like the Āryas, preach the doctrine that souls and constituent particles of the earth and the heavens are their own creators, and that Parmeshwar, for some unknown reason, rules over them just like a Raja. Neither does it teach like the Christian religion that God was delivered from the womb of a woman like a human being. Not only did he feed on menstrual blood for nine months and inherit his share of blood, bones and flesh from a sinful body that was heir to the nature of promiscuous women like Bath-Sheba, Tamar and Rehab, but he also suffered the travails of childhood diseases like measles, smallpox and teething. He wasted a large part of his life as an ordinary human being and it was only when he was

nearing his death that he remembered his divinity. Since it was a mere claim and was not accompanied by divine powers, he was apprehended as soon as he made the claim. Islam, on the other hand, considers the True and Glorious God to be free from all such shortcomings and unclean states, and it considers Him to be far above the kind of wild wrath in which He finds no way of forgiving His servants until and unless He has put the noose around their neck. With regard to the existence and attributes of God Almighty the Holy Quran teaches the true, pure and perfect understanding that His might, grace, majesty and holiness are limitless. From the point of view of Quranic teaching, it is an abominable sin to say that the manifestations of Divine might, greatness and grace stop short of a particular point or that on arriving at a particular juncture His infirmity holds Him back. On the contrary, all His powers are operating under the immutable law that, except for matters as are against His holiness, His exalted station and His perfect attributes, or happen to contravene His unvarying promises, He can do whatever He wills. For instance, you cannot say that He can kill Himself by His perfect might, for it goes against His eternal attributes of *Hayyī* and *Qayyūm*.¹² This is

¹² *Hayyī*: The Living. *Qayyūm*: The Self-Subsistent. [Publishers]

because He has already demonstrated by His word and deed that He is Eternal, Everlasting, Immortal and Immune from death. Similarly you cannot say that He enters the womb of a woman, feeds on menstrual blood and after staying there for about nine months and weighing a kilo or so, is delivered weeping and crying via the vaginal passage of a woman, eats bread, defecates, urinates and bears all the hardships of this transient life, and in the end, after suffering the agonies of death, leaves this transitory world. This is because all these matters signify loss and deprivation and are inconsistent with His eternal glory and absolute perfection.

It should also be kept in mind that according to Islamic belief, God Almighty alone is the Creator of all existents—souls and bodies. All are His creation and to Divine providence alone do they owe their existence. As such, it is also a part of the Quranic doctrine that just as God Almighty is the Creator and Originator of everything, so is He the real and true Sustainer of all existents. In other words, the existence of all things depends upon His existence and His existence is as life for everything. If we posit His non-existence, it would *ipso facto* mean the non-existence of everything. Thus, His presence is a must for the survival and stability of each and every existent, but the Āryas and the Christians do not hold

this belief. As for Āryas, they do not consider God to be the Creator of souls and bodies, nor do they believe that He has such a relationship with all things as would prove them to be the result of His might and a reflection of His will. Instead, from their belief in the permanent nature of things, one gets the impression that they consider everything to be eternal in its own right, with neither beginning nor end. Since they consider all existing things to be no longer within God's authority nor dependent on His power for their existence, therefore, they become so alienated from Parmeshwar of the Hindus that even if we suppose Him to be dead, the souls and bodies would be none the worse for it. This is because their Parmeshwar is just like a mason, and just as bricks and mortar do not exist by virtue of the mason's personal power, so as to be completely dependent upon his existence, similar is the case of all existents vis-à-vis the Parmeshwar of the Hindus. Just as the death of the mason does not mean that all the buildings he has built in his lifetime will also collapse, similarly the death of the Parmeshwar will not necessarily result in any harm to other things, for he is not their Sustainer.¹³ If He is their Sustainer,

¹³ That which has not been created with the help of Providence, does not need it for its survival either. [Author]

then He must also be their Creator, because objects which do not need God for their creation do not need Him for their survival either. Neither can the 'God incarnate' of the Christians be their Sustainer in view of their beliefs. This is because it is necessary for a Sustainer to be nearby, while Jesus, the 'God' of the Christians, is evidently no longer here on earth. Were he present on earth, he must have been visible to people just as he was during the time of Pilate and in his country. Now that he is no longer present on earth how can he be the Sustainer of the people of the earth? As for the heavens, he does not even sustain them; how can he be present in all the heavens when his bodily height was a mere six or seven feet? When we address God Almighty as the Lord of the Throne, it does not mean that He is a physical being with a body, or that He is in need of a Throne. Rather, the Throne signifies the holy and lofty station, which relates equally to this world and to the hereafter. To say that God Almighty is seated on the Throne amounts to saying that He is the Lord of both the worlds. Just as a man sitting at a height or in a lofty palace commands the view on the right and the left, similarly, figuratively speaking, God Almighty is believed to be seated on the loftiest Throne from Whose sight nothing is hidden, whether of this world or of the other world. Yes, of course,

for laymen this station is described as being up above. Since God is in fact above all, and everything lies prostrate at His feet, His Being has affinity with upwardness, for He alone is above, below whom lie both the worlds. He is like the highest point from which two branches of the two glorious worlds emanate and each branch consists of thousands of worlds. Of these no one has any knowledge except Him, Who is firmly established on the highest point known as '*Arsh* [Throne]. In visible or external terms too, the loftiest height one could possibly conceive of, and which is the highest point of both the worlds, is known in shariah as '*Arsh*. This height, on account of its being perfect and all-inclusive, belongs to God. Thus, it points to the fact that all blessings originate from Him and to Him everything returns. All creation worships Him and He transcends all in His Person, attributes, and excellences. The fact is that the Holy Quran describes Him as being Omnipresent. For instance, it says:

أَيَّمَا لُتُوًّا فَتَمَّ وَجْهَ اللَّهِ^{ط14}

i.e., withersoever you turn, there will be the face of God. It also says:

¹⁴ Al-Baqarah, 2:116 [Publishers]

هُوَ مَعَكُمْ أَيَّنَ مَا كُنْتُمْ¹⁵

i.e., He is with you wheresoever you may be.

Again it says:

نَحْنُ أَقْرَبُ إِلَيْهِ مِنْ حَبْلِ الْوَرِيدِ¹⁶

And We are nearer to man than even his jugular vein.

This constitutes the specimen of these three teachings.

Peace be on whosoever follows the guidance.

==| The End |==

¹⁵ Al-Ḥadīd, 57:5 [Publishers]

¹⁶ Qāf, 50:17 [Publishers]

Index

A

Adam^{as} — 17, 19

Alcohol

abundance of, in Europe — 29

Amritsar — 18

'Arsh — 37

Ārya belief

countless reincarnation are must — 9

everything is eternal — 35

God cannot be recognized through laws of nature — 7

God cannot grant pardon — 9

moral qualities of God are inferior to human — 9

Neug — 10

power of God of Ārya is limited — 6

stress is on worship of natural phenomena — 10

true picture of, — 6

Āryas — 6, 10, 12, 15, 31, 35

Atheism

philosophical thinking without religious knowledge causes, — 3

Atonement

couldn't prevent David of immoralities — 23

couldn't redeem Jesus' grandmothers — 24

couldn't stop anyone from sin — 30

Avatars — 15

B

Baba Nanak Sahib — 13

bodily ascent of, and Jesus compared — 13

Sikhs also believe in his bodily ascent — 13

Bath-Sheba — 24, 33

Beelzebub — 27

Brahmans — 16

British Government, the

benevolence of — 1

is sympathetic to mankind — 3

Muslims should obey, — 3

reason that why, deifies a man — 4

benign attitude of, a mean for spreading the light of faith — 1

C

Christianity

Gods of Christians' and Āryas' compared — 12

Jesus Christ is believed to be God — 10

Christians — 6, 12, 15, 18, 19, 22-26, 30, 35

believe that God also can die — 15

trinity — 26

Crucifixion, the

all earlier Prophets^{as} did not believe in, — 23

first possible reason of, to encourage sin — 20

of Jesus has not saved his believers from sin — 29

second possible reason of, to save the believers from sin — 22

D

David^{as} — 23

Deifying human

Christians borrowed from Greek — 16
Greeks borrowed it from Hindus — 16
Quranic hint that Brahmans invented the concept of deifying a human being — 16

Devils

can become believers — 18

Divinity of Jesus

being 'God' his crucifixion might redeem the sinners is just an excuse — 15
Did Jesus redeem devils? — 18
who redeemed creatures before Adam^{as} — 17

Dove

descent of, to Jesus^{as} was also a fit of epilepsy — 28

E

Epilepsy

is known as '*Umm-u-Şibyān*' — 28
Jesus suffered from, — 28
phlegm is basic to, — 28

Europe — 29

European philosophers

deny story of Satan luring Jesus — 25

European researchers

reject the Gospels as well — 25

Eve — 24

Evil

pride and vanity are root cause of all, — 27

G

God — 1, 4-6, 10-12, 15, 18, 19, 22, 24, 26, 27, 30, 31, 34, 38
comparison of Aryan and Christian, — 15

throne of, signifies holy and lofty station — 36

God of Āryas

his worship left out of vedas — 10
is not a true Sustainer — 35
lacks infinite powers — 7
moral qualities — 9
no way to recognize through laws of nature — 7
Permashwar only joins souls and bodies — 6
Parmeshwar is just like a mason — 35

God of Christianity

is not their Sustainer — 36
went through all the travails of life — 33

God of Islam

Creator of everything — 31
does not go against His eternal attributes — 33
every particle obeys and is drawn towards Him — 31
God is Omnipresent — 37
meaning of Lord of '*Arsh*' — 37
must be near while Jesus is not so — 36
True Sustainer of all existents — 34
understanding of, is in keeping with human nature — 30

Gospels — 14, 18, 25

Philosophers look down upon, with disdain — 26

Greeks

borrowed the idea of deifying from Hindus — 16

H

Hindus — 4, 9, 15, 35

Holy Ghost — 23

Holy Prophet^{sa}

all his ancestors were chaste —
24

Holy Quran — 16, 30, 31, 33, 37
Holy Spirit — 26

I

Illicit sex
rampant in Europe — 29

India — 1, 16

Islam — 1, 6, 18, 30, 32
does not block rapid currents of
God's perfect attributes — 32

J

Jesus^{as}
cannot be God because

1. was imprisoned persecuted
and sued by Romans — 11
2. was unwillingly hanged by
the Jews — 11
3. couldn't show any miracle
— 11
4. was born line a human
being — 11

his real brothers believed him to
be insane — 28

immorality of grandmothers
of, — 24

no proof of, resurrection — 13

phlegm appeared to, in shape of
dove — 28

profile of, — 10

suffered from epilepsy — 28

Jews — 11, 12, 25

what proof is there for, if they did
not see Jesus alive — 12

accusation of, that Satan helps
Jesus^{as} — 27

L

London — 1, 29

M

Mary — 11, 15, 19

**Means for spreading the light of
faith**

1. benign attitude of British
governement — 2
2. channels of communication —
4
3. printing press — 4

Mecca — 1

Muslims — 3

N

Neug

a dogma of Ārya religion — 10

P

**Parmeshwar — See also God of
Āryas**

Peter — 29

cursed Jesus^{as} — 29

Phlegm — 28

Pilate — 11, 36

Printing presses — 4

Punjab — 1

Q

Quranic verses

أَكْسَتْ بِرَبِّكُمْ قَالُوا بَلَىٰ (7:173) — 30

إِنَّ قَوْمَ عَادٍ كَانُوا كَافِرِينَ (17:45) — 31

أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا قَاتِلُوا كُفْرَكُمْ وَجَاهُ اللَّهِ

38

هُوَ مَعَكُمْ أَلَا إِنَّكُمْ لَعِنَاءٌ (57:5) — 38

نَحْنُ أَقْرَبُ إِلَيْهِ مِنْ حَبْلِ الْوَرِيدِ (50:17)

— 38

R

Rehab — 24, 33

Religion, a true

draws hearts towards God — 6
resplendent when compared with
other religions — 5

S

Satan

, 's companionship in dream
means suffering from epilepsy
— 27
Beelzebub is another name for,
— 27
the Promised Messiah^{as} slapped,
in dream — 27
Jesus' dreams show he suffered
from epilepsy — 27
story of, luring Jesus^{as} — 26
Christians' interpretation of the
story of, luring Jesus^{as} — 26
other investigations about story
of, luring Jesus^{as} — 27
possessed by, can cure others but
not themselves of epilepsy —
27
story of, luring Jesus^{as} contained
a prophecy — 19

Shariah — 4

Sikhs — 13

Son of God — 17, 18, 26, 28

T

Tamar — 24, 33

Throne of God

signifies holy and lofty station —
36

Torah — 24

Trinity — 26

is naivety of Christians — 26

U

Umm-u-Şibyān — 28

V

Vedas — 4, 7, 31

refused spiritual bond between
God and His creation — 31

Vishnu — 16

Hindu God — 15

was born of a virgin , delivered
people from sin — 16