

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

By K. M. Uthman, Rangoon.

1. What is the difference between fate and predestination? And why Muslims have to believe in the latter and not in the former?

A. Fate signifies that man's endeavours are fruitless. Whatever is to happen must happen no matter what man does. This is entirely wrong. The knowledge and will of man do certainly contribute towards shaping future events.

Predestination is pre-measurement. The Almighty God has given certain attributes to each and every thing He has created. These characteristics cannot change. Man must work in obedience to these attributes if he wishes to avoid injury and harm.

2. When we agree that not even a blade of grass moves without His will, then how is a murderer responsible for his sin?

A. Everything that happens is known to the Omniscient. It is also true that He has complete control over everything. Had he willed, he would have made man's nature in such a way that man would be unable to commit sin. However He has not willed so but has given man free-will to act as he likes. A murderer is responsible for his act because had he chosen to act aright, he would not have committed the sin. Responsibility of action comes through granting of freedom of will together with the knowledge of sin.

3. My friend, a follower of H. H. The Aga Khan, says that they recite Kalima as "La ilaha illallah, Ali valiulla." Then how the Kojas are Muslims?

A. The published statement of the leader H. H. The Aga Khan is that they recite the Muslim *Kalimah*, *La ilaha illallah Muhammad-ur-Rasulullah* which we have already reproduced in one of the issues. In face of it anything to the contrary must be ascribed to the ignorance or the fanatical zeal of an individual.

4. What is the meaning of saying "Man is the proto-type of God"?

A. Man possesses in him all those attributes that have been given to God, though in an imperfect form. Those who are blessed with Divine Communion evolve these attributes to a high degree.

5. What is the difference between a Mujadid and a Prophet?

A. A prophet has an independant status of his own. He receives the prophetic form of revelation through the medium *Gabriel*. He has the authority to repeal or abrogate any of the laws of *Shariat* in practice before him. A *Mujaddid* on the other hand has no independant status of his own. He must be a follower of a previous prophet whose authority in matters of

Shariat he cannot challenge. Though a *Mujaddid* is also blessed with the granting of Divine Communion yet his revelation is not of the authoritative form, containing new rules of guidance for mankind. His revelation on the contrary is of the non-prophetic type not having been received through the medium of *Gabriel* and pertaining only to certain interpretations of the already existent *Shariat* and to prophecies about future events. The *Mujaddid* is thus only a faithful servant of the law of *Shariat* of the prophet whom he follows. It is on this account that whereas the denier of a prophet is *Kafir*, that of a *Mujaddid* still remains within the fold of the faith. *Kufr* technically signifies the denial of some Divine law and as a *Mujaddid* brings no new law, his denier does not reject any such law and is therefore within the fold of the faith. It is however true that the deniers of *Mujaddid* reject the Divine interpretation of the law and are not granted the opportunity to truly serve the cause of their dear faith.

6. Can a true follower of our prophet Muhammad (may peace and blessings of Allah be on him) become a prophet like himself?

A. No. The Master and the servant, the follower and the one who is followed cannot become equal. Granting of Divine Communion is no distinctive feature of a prophet whose only distinguishing characteristic is his independant status. The state of *فناء الرسول* or 'self-annihilation in the personality of the Holy Prophet' is a different affair, where the follower sees nothing of his own personality. It is a metaphorical way of expressing the stage of complete and perfect following.

Ahmadiyya Movement day by day.

(How others see it?)

DEAR SIR,

Received your letter and books, on my arrival, with thanks. I have been to Calcutta with my wife who has been suffering for a long time.

I have gone through 'The Fundamentals of the Teachings of Islam' and 'The Prophet of Islam.' As one reads these two books one gets an insight into the Religion of Humanity. I call Islam 'The Religion of Humanity.' These books are written by scholars who explain abstruse subjects very lucidly and to the point.

If Ahmadiyyah movement stands for what I read here, then the day is not far off when the whole India, nay the world, is sure to resound with Allah-ho-Akbar. Cannot all the Muslims unite in a league? All Muslims are one, under God, with the Prophet Mohammad. there is no and there should be no difference among Muslims of whatever parties they may belong to. Unity amongst the Muslims will bring pristine glory back to Islam. Unity amongst the Muslims will be a preaching itself. United Muslims will be glory to Islam and alluring and captivating to non-Muslims as then the Non-Muslim world will see Islam in its right perspective.

In conclusion, I regret I am very late to reply to your letter.

S. B. GHOSH.

ADVENT OF THE PROMISED MESSIAH.

In the Spirit and Power of Jesus.

Ibn-i-Maryam.

(By MIRZA MASUM BEG, B.A., CHANBA STATE.)

Charge.

The Holy Prophet has stated quite positively that *ابن مريم* the selfsame prophet of the Israelites, shall descend from Heaven in person, in the last ages, to serve the cause of Islam :

كيف انتم اذ انزل ابن مريم فيكم واهل منكم
'what shall be your condition when Ibn-i-Maryam shall descend among you, and he shall be an *Imam* from amongst yourselves?' Mirza Sahib's mother was not named *مريم*. Hence the falsity of his claim of being *مسيح*, the Promised Messiah.

The above is the last resort of a vanquished foe of Hazrat Mirza Sahib. Puerile as the argument is on the very face of it, I have seen 'bearded babies' urging it on with the pertinacity of strong-headed children. Poor fellows! standing upon a slippery ground they make nice of no vile hold to stay them up.

Jesus Precluded.

The concludent phrase *ابن مريم* is too clear, to an unbiased mind, to need any comment. The Promised *ابن مريم*, it is so easy to understand, shall be your *imam* from amongst yourselves. In other words, he shall be from amongst the Muslim nation, and no foreigner. But Jesus Christ, it is no gainsaying the fact, belonged to a foreign race, the Israelites, and had been raised exclusively for the reformation of that people. He is therefore entirely precluded from this prophecy. In fact the two little words *ابن مريم* put out of question all non-followers of the Holy Prophet of Arabia. Still the stark and stiff sticklers of the letter wouldn't have it, *ابن مريم* they must perceive with their own eyes, precisely the same Israelite prophet of yore, descending from the clouds, gorgeously attired in purple raiment, and adroitly balancing his weight upon the wings of two angels.

Jewish Mentality.

When Jesus Christ laid forth his claim, he was terribly opposed by the Jews. The rabbies and pharisees denounced him, for it was written in the Book that Elias must first descend from Heaven. Jesus, with all his prophetic might, explained to them that it was a metaphorical statement, which simply meant that a man 'in the spirit and power of Elias' would be raised. And pointing to John the Baptist, prophet Jesus said, 'Elias is come already, and they knew him not, but have done unto him whatsoever they listed.' (Matt. 17:10-13; Luke 1:17). But all was in vain. The unfortunate Jews obstinately tickled to the letter of the Law, and eventually

became *مغضوب عليهم*, as the Holy Quran has put it that is 'those upon whom wrath is brought down.'

The musalmans of this age have obviously stepped into the shoes of the Jews. And how painfully the Holy Prophet (on whom be pence and the blessings of God) must have felt when he said, a time shall come upon my people when they shall follow, every inch, in the footsteps of the Jews and the Christians, so much so that if they went into the hole of a lizard, my people shall also do the same. Both Bukhari and Muslim have recorded this tradition :

لتتبعن سنن من قبلكم شبرا بشبر وذراعا بذراع حتى يوسلوا حجر صب لسلكتموه قلنا يا رسول الله اليهود والنصارى قال نعم -

Wrong Assumption.

To put the objection into its hypothetical form: If a claimant to Divine Messengership bears not the very name wherewith the previous scriptures spoke of him, he is an imposter and must not be accepted. What a lamentable ignorance of the sacred literature these people suffer from! The Holy Prophet said of himself:

قال اسمي في التوراية احيى لى احيى لى عن النار واسمى في الزبور العا حى معا لى الله بى عبدة الا واثان واسمى في الانجيل احمى و فى القران محمد لى محمى و اهل السماء والارض

that is, my name in the *Torah* is *احيى*, for I shall deliver my people from the fire of hell; in the *Zabur*: I am known as *ما حى*, for God has obliterated unbelief through me; the Gospel calls me *احمد* and *محمد* the Holy Quran, for I have been held in high esteem both by the dwellers of the earth and the Heaven.' (Kanzul Amal vol. 6, page 116). Why should you then be hard upon these unbelievers—the Jews, the Christians, and the idolaters, and call them *Kafirs*? They accepted not our Prophet for the simple reason that he bore not the name recorded in their scriptures.

Different Names of an Apostle.

The hypothesis, it is now but obvious, is radically wrong. An Apostle of God is endowed with different names. On the earth he is known by the name which his parents give him; in the Heaven he bears other specific appellations in accordance with his spiritual attributes. Commenting upon the verse

مبشرا برسول ياتى من بعدى اسمه احمد

(61:6) writes *جلالين*, the famous commentary of the

of the Holy Quran:

وخص احمد بالذکر دون محمد: مع انه اشرف السموات صلی
 علیه وسلم لوجوه الاول کونه مذکوراً فی الانجیل بهذا الاسم
 لئلا نئی کونه محمداً فی السماء به—(جلاد ۴ صفحہ ۱۹۵)

that is, 'why the name احمد has been mentioned in this verse, in preference to the name محمد although the latter, of all the names of the Holy Prophet, is the most exalted. There are many reasons for this. Firstly, the Holy Prophet was known by this name in the Gospel; secondly, احمد was his *Heavenly name*, hence a special mention of it has been made.'

Tropical Sense.

When a strong spiritual likeness exists between two persons, the name of one may tropically be given to the other. It is a very common fact of sacred terminology. A few instances:

The Holy Quran.—Mary, mother of Jesus, has been called اخت هارون in the Holy Quran (19: 28) i.e. 'Sister of Aaron.' Prophet Aaron was a brother of Moses, and lived many hundred years before Mary. But there existed a spiritual similarity between the two. Both belonged to the priestly class, and were godly persons. She has not been called sister of Moses, for priesthood was an exclusive prerogative of the descendants of Aaron.

The Hadith.—(i) The Holy Prophet has said:

(کنز العمال جلد ۲ صفحہ ۱۹۳)

ما من بنی الاله نظیر من امتی و ابو بکر نظیر ابراہیم و عمر
 نظیر موسی و عثمان نظیر ہارون و علی بن طالب نظیر ی
 و عن سرہ ان تنظر الی عیسی بن مریم فلینظر الی ابی
 ذر الغفاری۔

'All the prophets who appeared on this earth, have each his like in my followers; Abu Bakr is the like of Abraham, Umar, of Moses, Usman, of Aaron, and Ali, son of Talib my own: and one who wishes to see Jesus, son of Mary, may look at Abn Zar Ghaffari.'

(ii) Abu Sufyan was at first a terrible opponent of the Holy Prophet. He parleyed with Heraclius to stem the rising tide of Islam. Bukhari has recorded at length the talk that transpired between them. Abu Sufyan failed to inveigh the King, and come away disappointed, and said to his friends:

حین اخرجنا لقتل امرأ من ابی کبشہ انه ینتافہ ملک
 بنی اصفہ

'To-day the son of Abi Kabsha has succeeded in his mission, for even the King of Bani Asfar fears him.' Abu Sufyan calls the Holy Prophet کبشہ ابن ابی کبشہ notwithstanding the fact that he was ابن عبد اللہ why? کبشہ ابن ابی کبشہ was a unitarian. He believed in the Oneness of God, and hated idolatry. Such a belief, in a polytheistic country like Arabia of his day, was nothing short of gross heresy کبشہ ابن ابی کبشہ was

railed at and ridiculed. The same happened with the Holy Prophet. Hence Abu Sufyan calls him ابن کبشہ in a metaphorical sense.

The Muslim Saints.

(i) Hazra Sayyad Farid-ud-Din Sahib writes in his book رسالہ سپہ سالار on page 16.

من عیسیٰ ان چرخ کز ماہ گزر کر دم
 من موسیٰ ان طور م کالہ در بین زندست
 I am Jesus of the Heaven who has gone even above the moon; I am Moses of that Sinai where God. Most High has taken His abode.'

(ii) Hazrat Maulana Jalal-ud-Din:

عیسیم لیکن ہر اذکو یافت جان—از دم من او بماند جاو دان
 شد ز عیسیٰ زندہ لیکن باز مردشاد آنکہ جان بدین عیسیٰ سپرد
 (د فتر ۴ صفحہ ۸۸)

'I am Jesus, but everlasting is the life which I infuse The dead quickened by Jesus Christ died again, but blessed is he who has consigned his life to this Jesus.'

(iii) Hazrat Khawaja Muin-ud-Din Chishti.

دم بدم روح اکتدس ا ندر صغینے ہے دم
 من نمے گویم من مسیحی ثانی شدم
 'The Holy Ghost inspires Muin-ud-Din every moment. I do not say but I have become the second Jesus.'

(iv) Wali ulla Hafiz Shah Niaz Ahmad:

احمد ہاشمی علم عیسیٰ مریمی علم
 'Ahmad Hashmi (i.e. the Holy Prophet) I am: and Jesus son of Mary I am.'

Hazrat Mirza Sahib.

Why fret and fume and stamp the ground if Hazrat Mirza Sahib has been called Ibni-Maryam. And here was a reason for this. 'Every *Mujaddid* is granted light to serve the cause of Islam in such manner as is conducive to the greatest good considering the requirements of his own time. When we consider what was the great need of our time it becomes clear as daylight that the spread of the Christian religion all over the world, and especially the attacks of that religion on Islam, had created the need for some great inspired champion of the Muslim religion, who should establish the superiority of the religion of Islam over the religion of the Cross. And as the errors which he was required to blot out had a connection with the name of the Messiah, it was necessary that a Messiah should arise to remove that.' Hence the *Mujaddid* of this century was called a Messiah. He himself puts this point very tersely in a couplet.

چون مرا نورے پئے قوم مسیحی دا داند
 مصاحت را این مریم نام من پنہا نہ اند

As I have been granted a light for the sake of the people of a Messiah, the son of Mary is therefore the name which I have been granted.'

This is the whole truth about the advent of a Messiah or a son of Mary among the Muslims.

THE YOUNG ISLAM.

Friday, 15, May 1936.

Law of Might.

ارعبيت من اتخذ له هوه انا انت ترون عليه و كيدا
ام تعسب ان اكثر هم يسمعون او يعقلون ان هم الا لا تعام
بل هم اضل سبيلا (الفرقان)

"Have you seen him who takes his low desires for his god? Will you then be a protector over him?"

Or do you think that most of them do hear or understand? They are nothing but as beasts; nay they are straying farther off from the path."

—(Ch. 25 V 43, 44).

With a feeling of deep shock and pain the world has heard of the fall of the innocent state of Abyssinia. The words in which Mussolini has glorified his barbaric victory must cause but little surprize to a world thoroughly acquainted with the hypocritical character of modern culture. 'Victory of civilization over barbarism' is the expression Mussolini has applied to the tyranny and aggression by a powerful nation in crushing the freedom of a poor innocent race. Nothing could be more false, more hollow and more hypocritical than this cry of the Italian dictator.

The law among the brutes is the law of might. Among primitive races the same law holds good. The more advanced a civilization, the more the regard for justice and equity and the more the safe-guarding and protecting of the rights of the poor and the weak. The criterion for the advancement of a civilization is the degree of protection it can afford to the weak and the helpless.

Judged by this simple criterion, modern civilization appear to be definitely approaching the primitive age of the cult of brute force. One has so often heard this law of might being defended by some modernists on the plea that such is the course of nature 'the bigger fish in the ocean devours its smaller and weaker neighbours.' This is an admission that man exactly resembles the lower animals, having nothing sublimer and higher in him. But when Mussolini used his phrase he meant by civilization, the advancement of a race in equipping itself with modern scientific instruments of warfare and with the amenities of life modern science has provided, while barbarism implies with him lack of possession of such equipment. Perhaps to most of us such a notion may seem strange. When however the true state of affairs as prevailing in actual life

to-day is realised; it will be seen that the world at large is generally a victim of such an attitude. Superiority in frank or wealth or at the most in matter of intellect is regarded as the criterion of greatness.

The moral and spiritual advancement of an individual or race nowhere is reckoned as a factor in its progress. Mussolini is therefore not alone in his claim of being advanced. He may only be a degree more 'advanced' than others in making such wonderful and unique advancement man is only one step behind the beasts of jungle where the natural law of the cult of brute force finds its full play.

The glimmer and glitter of the world as the intellect of man has made it to be, goes a long way towards deceiving the unwary. A superficial and simple man is at once deluded to believe that the real happiness and progress of man lies in his advancement in the material and intellectual domains. It is a delusion and a mirage. And so did the Holy Prophet with his deep spiritual insight foretell and forewarn of an age which he termed as the advent of *Dajjal*. The word is from Arabic root *Dajal* which means deceit.

What delusion can be greater than the one under which man is suffering to-day, measuring the greatness of civilisation by the possession of worldly equipment? What civilisation could be more deceitful than the one where brute force forms the sole criterion for domination? The Holy Prophet, may peace be upon him, did not only prophesy of the appearance of such a civilisation but he also at the same time prescribed a remedy for it. The message of Islam—that complete, perfect and well balanced code of life which gives the due place to each and every latent instinct in man's nature—must be unveiled. Contrast Mussolini, the product of modern culture with Abu-Bakr, the first caliph of Islam. With the former greatness lies in crushing the poor and the weak and in self glorification while with the latter the first duty of a civilised government is to protect the rights of the weak. "The great and powerful among you is the weak with me until I take away what is due from him. The weak and poor among you is the powerful and great with me until I have restored what is due to him." These were the memorable words with which the first caliph of Islam laid the foundations of unsurpassed civilisation. Here is food for thought for the irreligious and atheist. Is there to be any distinction between civilisation and barbarism

protecting the weak and the poor in one case and crushing and exploiting them in the other? Materialism and irreligiosity have signally failed to maintain it. Let religion, its complete and perfect form, as taught by the Book of Quran be the order of the day. The experiment is not a new one. Thirteen hundred years have gone by when it was put into practice with the result that man was elevated to the heights of angels, unlike modern civilisation where man is shaking hands with the beasts. Is there any wonder that countries which to-day are producing Mussolinis and Hitlers, the great eponents of the law of might, may witness to-morrow the rise of saints like Ghazalis and Razis Muslims, who believe in the wonderful ways of the Almighty and who are convinced of the fulfilment of the Holy Prophet's prophecies, may not deem it strange. A servant of Islam has already appeared to herald the mighty change and the heavenly light of the rising Sun of Islam from the West is already dissipating the darkness of the night of materialism and irreligiosity. Let him who has eyes perceive it! Let him who has the heart participate in the glorious task!!

DOUBLE NUMBER

Friends will kindly note that the two issues for June will be published together, about the middle of the month. Contributors are requested to send their articles within a fortnight.

Owing to a technical objection by the postal authorities, we regret that the issues of the month of May could not be posted in time.

WE DO ALL KIND OF HIGH CLASS
PRINTING AND BINDING, ETC., IN
THE MOST MODERN STYLE
WE GUARANTEE SATISFACTION.

MILTON PRESS,

BRANDRETH ROAD,

Ram Gali No. 3.

LAHORE.

(Continued from page 1.)

Suffice it to say that hundreds of signs have been shown whose extraordinary nature is so clear that anyone who considers their evidence with a calm and dispassionate mind cannot fail to be convinced of their truth. In many cases the evidence is written. I give here only one instance. The Barahin-i-Ahmadiyya is one of the Promised Messiah's works, published in four parts from 1880 to 1884, long before he claimed to be the Messiah. At that time he was an unknown man. In this book he published revelations which he asserted to be from God in which it was prophesied that time would come when he would be made known in the world and when people would flock to him from all quarters. Thus: "Thou art to me as my unity and oneness, so the time has come when thou shouldst be assisted and made known among all people..... And I will make many people follow and obey thee and will make thee a guide to them. We will inspire people from heaven that they may assist thee. People will flock to thee from distant corners of the world and assistance will come to thee from deep distant paths. It is, therefore, meet that thou shouldst not turn away from them or get tired of them because of their vast numbers but receive them with kindness and courtesy.....God will procure for thee the companions of the mat, and what knowest thou who the companions of the mat are. Thou wilt see tears flowing from their eyes, and they will say, 'O Lord, we have heard the voice of one who invites people to faith in God.'" These are some of the prophecies published twenty-five years ago in a book which had a wide publication at the time and is even now in the hands of friends as well as foes. At a time when the recipient of these revelations was alone, having no followers or admirers, when he was even unknown except to a very few persons who resided in the same village with him, he received information from a source which he asserted to be Divine foretelling, not only that he would live for many days, but also that he would be made known in the whole world, that he would have a vast number of followers, that people would come to see him from distant places, and that some of his followers would take up their abodes with him who in the Divine revelation are called the companions of the mat. All these wonderful disclosures of the future could not be made by a man. A mortal cannot even say that he would live for a day more, but also a wonderful course of that life which appeared the most improbable of all things at that time. There are many inconsiderable persons who would laugh at the mention of Divine revelation, but can they show anything comparable to this wonderful disclosure in human knowledge? These are serious matters and should not be passed over lightly. How deep are the secrets of the future revealed in these words, yet how clearly and definitely they are foretold and how clear by conclusive is the evidence for them.

(Review of Religion 1905.)