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RESURRECTION

Satan creates many doubts and the most dangerous doubt that arises in the mind of man and makes him a loser in this world and in the hereafter is with regard to the life after death. A great source of virtue and righteousness, in addition to other means and sources, is belief in the hereafter. When a person regards the hereafter and all that concerns it as a mere tale or story, then it may be taken that he has been rejected and has lost both worlds. The fear of the hereafter makes a person anxious and afraid and drives him to the true fountain of understanding. True understanding cannot be achieved without the fear of God. Remember, therefore, that the arising of doubt concerning the hereafter puts faith in danger and makes a person’s end uncertain (Malfuzat, Vol. I, pp. 51-52).

According to the Holy Quran, there are three states of existence. The first is the world, the name of which is the first creation and the house of earning. In this world a person earns good or ill. There is progress in good in the hereafter, but that is through the pure grace of God. It has nothing to do with a person’s effort.

The second state of existence is called barzakh (Purgatory). In Arabic idiom barzakh is that which is situated between two things. As this state of existence lies between the first creation and the resurrection, it is called barzakh. This expression has always been used for the intervening state. It thus is a great testimony in support of the existence of the intervening state....

Barzakh is the state when the temporary human formation is dissolved and the soul and the body are separated from each other....Though this mortal body is separated from the soul after death, yet in the intervening state every soul is temporarily invested with a body so that it might experience the result of its actions. That body is not like the earthly body, but is prepared from light or darkness according to the actions of each person. It might be said that in that state a person’s actions serve as his body. In the Word of God, this is mentioned several times and some bodies are described as bright and some as dark, which are prepared from the light or from the darkness of actions. This is a mystery but is not beyond reason. A perfect person can acquire a bright body in this very life, apart from his earthly body, and there are many illustrations of it in the state of visions. It is difficult to explain this to a person whose mind is not keen, but those who have some experience of the state of visions would not look upon a body which is prepared from actions with wonder or incredulity, but would appreciate this explanation.

continued on page 13
OUR BELIEFS AND AIMS

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

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

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

International - God raised prophets in every nation, and Muslims believe in them all. Good people and truth may be found in any nation. No people are God’s favourite, not even Muslims, except those who do the most good.

Tolerant - Gives full freedom to everyone to hold and practice any belief or religion. Preaching to be by argument and example, not force. Muslims must also respect internal differences of opinion.

Rational - Religion to be studied in the light of reason and the ever-growing knowledge of mankind. Blind following disallowed and independence of thought granted.

Non-sectarian - Every person professing the words ‘There is no God but Allah, and Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah’ must be regarded as a Muslim. No religious board empowered to hold inquisitions into a Muslim’s beliefs, or to expel self-professing Muslims from Islam.

Peaceful - Condemns all use of force except in unavoidable self-defense. Teaches Muslims to live peacefully under any rule which accords them freedom of religion.

Living - Worship is not a ritual, but provides living contact with a living God. God listens to man, answers his prayers, and speaks to His righteous servants even today as in the past.

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

Mr. Martin, Let the whole truth be known to your Co-believers!

Mr. Walter Martin, the author of 'Kingdom Of The Cults' has added a Chapter to his book which reads, 'Islam: The Message Of Muhammad.' This book has been published by BETHANY HOUSE, 6820 Auto Club Road, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55438 and we have a copy of this chapter on Islam with the courtesy of our American Muslim brother Mr. Abu Huraira (Sgt. H.H. Booker).

At the very outset of this chapter the learned author acknowledges that 'Islam is not a cult', and the reason of including Islam in his book on Cults in his own words is, 'the West has experienced an unanticipated invasion--Islam. Mosques are springing up in many 'Christian' areas, and if you live in a city, you probably live near some. Unfortunately, most Christians understand very little about Islamic teaching and are afraid to be witness to them. This chapter will help you prepare to talk with the Muslim you meet.'

It is not understood how the votaries of a religious Order which stands for gaining converts all over the world through propagation and directs billions of dollars towards this end annually from Europe and America, consider the presence of the people belonging to another religious order as an 'unanticipated invasion' except that they may be laboring under the notion of 'the propagation of Religion' as their exclusive prerogative. Measuring from the success that Islam is achieving in gaining converts to its ranks all over the world one can safely say that, had the Muslims directed even one hundredth of the resources both in men and material compared to those which are spent by the Christian world annually in its propagation of Christian beliefs, Islam would emerge as the most numerical religious community in the world.

We are quite in agreement with the learned author when he writes, 'most Christians understand very little about Islamic Teaching'; and Chapter 16 of his book which he has written about Islam quite clearly confirms this assertion. After reading one cannot but discover that most ironically Mr. Martin, the self-assumed expert on Islam who deemed fit to write this chapter as a prescription for his Christian brothers, is no exception to the ignorance about Islam unless of course one was to presume that he intentionally set out to misinform his co-believers about Islam. We do not believe that he could have intended this sort of self-deception as it would run afoul of his object of writing this chapter. Hence the safe and most plausible conclusion will be that he, too, like other Christians, understands or even knows very little about Islam. How, we will see presently.

On page 365 of his book (Chapter 16) Mr. Martin writes about the Quran:

"The Quran contains 114 revelations, each composing one Surah, or Chapter. The shortest revelations appear first, the longest ones last."

Now this statement reveals that Mr. Martin has not even seen the Quran or else he could not have written that the shortest Surahs appear first, the longest ones last. The following statistics as to number of verses contained in the first and last ten Surahs respectively of the Quran will bear out our conclusion:

First ten Surahs of the Quran with their number of Verses in each Surah:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surah</th>
<th>Number of Verses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7 Verses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>286 Verses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>199 Verses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>177 Verses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>120 Verses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>166 Verses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>206 Verses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>75 Verses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>129 Verses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>109 Verses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Last ten Surahs of the Quran with their number of Verses in each Surah:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surah</th>
<th>Number of Verses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>5 Verses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>4 Verses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>7 Verses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>3 Verses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>3 Verses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>3 Verses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>5 Verses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>4 Verses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>5 Verses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>6 Verses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above statistics suffice to shed light on the expertise of our Mr. Martin, the self-styled expert on Islam.

Again on page 366 under the title 'God' Mr. Martin writes:

"The Islamic God is unapproachable by sinfull man. He is so Perfect and so Holy He can only communicate with mankind through a progression of angels and prophets."

That Allah is unapproachable by a sinful man is a wholly untrue statement. If a Christian was ever to come to us with this prescription of Mr. Martin, we will immediately confront him with Verse 186 of Surah 2 which reads:

"And when my servants ask thee concerning Me, surely I am nigh. I answer the call of the caller when he calls upon Me. So they should hear My Call and believe in Me that they may walk in the right way."

Further the Quran is full of the word 'Taubah' which means repenting and God's inclining towards those who repent is a writ large in the teaching of the Quran. The Quran not only provides guidance to sinners in getting rid of the sins but also guides them on a path by treading on which they can attain to such spiritual heights as to become Aulia Allah, i.e. the friends of God. Further, Mr. Martin's statement that, 'He can only communicate with Mankind through a progression of angels and prophets,' too, is not the whole truth. It is only one of the three modes of God's Revelation to man given in the Quran. A person who is in receipt of communication from God is called a Mulham and a Muhaddath. Hundreds of thousands of 'Mulhamoon' and a large number of Muhadathoon in Muslim Ummah are known to Muslims who are a clear proof of God's communication to persons other than prophets and through modes other than through angels. During this century the Founder of the Ahmadiyyah Movement is a Muhaddath who challenged that if anyone has any doubt as to God's speaking to or communicating with His Servants then he should come and stay with him to personally experience whether God speaks to His men or not. It was as a result of his prayers that the False claimant to Messiahship in U.S.A., Rev. Dr. Dowd died a disgraceful death.

On the same page of his book Mr. Martin further writes:

"The Muslim God is a God of Judgment, not grace; a God of wrath rather than love. The Muslims' desire is to submit to the point where he can hold back the Judging arm of Allah and, perhaps, through the capricious whim of Allah, inherit eternal life in an earthly paradise of gluttony and sexual gratification. Muslims have no concept of a God as a loving and compassionate Father."

Nothing can be more beyond truth than this statement by Mr. Martin. This further confirms that he has not even opened the Quran's what to speak of reading it. Any one who had the chance of opening even the first page of the Quran can not miss the first verse of the Quran which introduces Allah as a Gracious and Merciful Being. It reads: 'BismAllah Al-Rahman Al-Rahim.' With the name of Allah the most Gracious, the most Merciful. For understanding how a Muslim perceives his God we quote from a Muslim author, namely Maulana Muhammad Ali, M.A.L.L.B. He writes in his 'Islam the Religion of Humanity':

"Among the numerous sublime attributes of the Divine Being to which the Holy Quran gives expression, the attribute of mercy occupies the highest place. It is with the names Al-Rahman..."
ISLAM AND CHRISTIANITY
By Mrs. Ulfat Aziz-us-Samad
Part 1, continued from previous issue

Chapter 3
The Doctrine of Islam and Christianity

Christianity, as understood and believed by the Christians of both the Roman Catholic and the Protestant persuasions, has been summarized in the doctrines and statements of the Three Creeds—namely, the Apostles’ Creed (c. third century C.E.), the Nicene Creed (fourth century) and the Athanasian Creed (c. sixth century). The fundamental doctrines of Christianity are 1) the Trinity, 2) the Deity of Jesus, 3) the Divine-sonship of Jesus, 4) the Original Sin, and 5) the Atonement.

The religion of Islam has no place in it for any of these dogmas. It believes in the Oneness of God (i.e., the Single Person of God) as against the Triune God of Christianity. It considers the Christian deification of Jesus to be a reversion to paganism. According to the Quran, Jesus was not the incarnation of God but a Prophet or Messenger of God, and, like all other prophets (including the Prophet Muhammad), he was every bit a human being. Islam also rejects the Divine-sonship of Jesus. He may be called a son of God in the sense in which all righteous and merciful human beings may be called the children of God, but not in a literal or unique sense. In the same way Islam rejects the dogmas of the Original Sin, the Vicarious Sacrifice and the Atonement as being contrary both to reason and to the Divinely-inspired teachings of Jesus.

The fundamental doctrines of Islam are 1) the unity and goodness of God, 2) the belief in the Prophets raised by God in all the nations of the world, 3) the belief in the Revelations sent down by God to the Prophets to guide human beings to and along the path of truth and righteousness, 4) the sinlessness of man at birth and his capacity for unlimited moral and spiritual progress (through belief in God and by sincerely and faithfully putting into practice the inspired teachings of the prophets), 5) the personal accountability of every man for his actions, 6) the life after death, and 7) the equality and universal brotherhood of man.

The Trinity

Though Christians declare faith in one God, yet they also affirm that there are three separate persons in the Godhead—Father, Son and Holy Spirit—each one of whom is God: the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Spirit is God. The Athanasian Creed states:

"There is one Person of the Father, another of the Son, another of the Holy Ghost. But the Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost is all one: the Glory equal, the Majesty co-eternal. Such as the Father is, such is the Son, and such is the Holy Ghost. The Father uncreated...the Father eternal, the Son eternal, the Holy Ghost eternal...So the Father is God, the Son is God and the Holy Ghost is God; and yet there are not three Gods, but one God...For like as we are compelled by the Christian truth to acknowledge every Person by Himself to be God and Lord, so we are forbidden by the Catholic religion to say, there are three Gods or three Lords."

The doctrine of the Trinity is obviously self-contradictory. If there are three separate and distinct Persons and each is by himself God, then there must be three Gods. Christianity recognizes the impossibility of reconciling the belief in the three Persons of the Godhead, each one of whom is by himself God, with the oneness of God, and hence declares the doctrine of the Trinity to be a mystery, in which a man must have blind faith. This is what the Rev. J.F. Groot writes in his book Catholic Teaching:

"The Most Holy Trinity is a mystery in the strictest sense of the word. For reason alone cannot prove the existence of a Triune God; Revelation teaches it. And even after the existence of the mystery has been revealed to us, it remains impossible for the human intellect to grasp how the Three Persons have but one Divine Nature."

And this is what the Protestant author of What The Bible Teaches writes:

"The Bible teaches not only that there is one God, but also that there are three persons in the Godhead—Father, Son and Holy Spirit. This is a mystery to the human mind, but although it cannot be understood, it can be believed because God's Word says it is so." (An Emman's Correspondence Course).

However, in another book published by the Emman's Bible Correspondence School we find the following on the same subject:

"The doctrine of the Trinity is not spelled out in the Bible, but it is the only logical solution to seeming contradictions therein."

It would not be irrelevant to point out that the "contradictions", referred to by the above author, appeared in the Bible as a result of the efforts on the part of Paul and the Fourth Evangelist to deify Jesus after his passing away. However, the Christian Church has not resolved the contradiction between the oneness of God and the Trinity of Divine Persons in the Godhead; it has merely declared it to be a mystery which must be accepted blindly by the believers.

Strangely enough, Jesus Christ himself never even mentioned the Trinity. He knew nothing at all about there being three Divine Persons in one Godhead. His conception of God was in no way different from that of the earlier Israelite prophets, each one of whom had preached the pure, unadulterated monotheism. The doctrine that God is in three persons, each one of whom is by himself God, would have been strongly condemned by them as a compromise with polytheism. Jesus merely echoed the earlier prophets when he said:

"The first commandment is, 'Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God, the Lord is one; and you shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind, and with all your strength.'" (Mark 12:29-30).

He believed in One God: One Divine Person and One Only:

"You shall worship the Lord your God and Him only shall you serve." (Matthew 4:10). And this is eternal life, that they know Thee the only true God." (John 17:3)

The theologian Johan B. Hygen, Professor at the University of Oslo, admits that the doctrine of the Trinity is found nowhere in the Bible:

"Most theologians today recognize that this doctrine (i.e., the Trinity) is not found in the Bible. The most conservative Region Printer even says that it is altogether useless to look for it there."

The fact is that the doctrine of the Trinity was coined by the Christians about three centuries after Jesus. The four Gospels, written between 70 and 115 C.E., contain no reference to the Trinity. Even Paul, who made Jesus into a Divine Saviour and imported many foreign ideas into Christianity, knew nothing of the Triune God. The New Catholic Encyclopedia (bearing Nihid Obstant and Imprimatur, indicating official Church approval and doctrinal soundness of its contents) admits that the doctrine of the Trinity was unknown to the Christians of the early centuries of the Christian era and
that it was formulated in the last quarter of the fourth century:

"It is difficult in the second half of the twentieth century, to offer a clear, objective and straightforward account of the revelation, doctrinal evolution and theological elaboration of the mystery of the Trinity. Trinitarian discussion, Roman Catholic as well as other, presents a somewhat unsteady silhouette. Two things have happened. There is the recognition on the part of energotes and Biblical theologians, including a constantly growing number of Roman Catholics, that one should not speak of Trinitarianism in the New Testament without serious qualification. There is also the closely parallel recognition on the part of historians of dogma and systematic theologians that when one does speak of an unqualified trinitarianism, one has moved from the period of Christian origins to, say, the last quarter of the 4th century. It was only then that what might be called the definitive Trinitarian dogma for three persons became thoroughly assimilated into Christian life and thought."5

A little later the same Encyclopaedia says even more clearly:

"The formulation "One God in three persons" was not solidly established into Christian life, and its profession of faith, prior to the end of the fourth century. But it is precisely this formulation that has first claim to the title the Trinitarian Dogma. Among the Apostolic Fathers, there had been nothing even remotely approaching such a mentality or perspective."6

So the doctrine of the Trinity was not taught by Jesus Christ; it is nowhere found in the Bible (both the Old and the New Testaments); it is completely foreign to the mentality and perspective of the early Christians; it became the part of the Christian faith towards the end of the fourth century!

Rationally considered, the dogma of the Trinity is also unsound and untenable. It is not only beyond reason, it is repugnant to reason. As we said earlier, the belief in three separate and distinct Persons, each of whom is by himself God, is incompatible with the oneness of God. If there are three distinct and separate Persons, then there must be three distinct and separate Substances, for every person is inseparable from his own substance. Now if the Father is God, then unless the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are three distinct Nothings, they must be three distinct substances, and, consequently, three distinct Gods. Furthermore, the three Divine Persons are either infinite or finite. If infinite, then there are three distinct Infinites, three Omnipotents, three Eternals, and so three Gods. If they are finite, then we are led to the absurdity of conceiving of an Infinite Being having three finite modes of subsisting or of three persons who are separately finite making an infinite conjunction.

The doctrine of the Trinity was developed as a consequence of the delification of two creatures, Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit, and their association with God as partners in His Godhead. As explained by some Christian apologists, it amounts to the separate personification of three attributes or functions of God. Howsoever we may consider it, it is a regression from revealed and rational theology to mythology. For, at the root of all mythologies lies the irrational tendency of the human mind to deify great men and personify non-personal forces and attributes and to present them as Divine Persons.

Islam preaches the pure and simple unity of God. It rejects, not only the plurality of gods, but also the plurality of persons in Godhead. It is free from all forms of anthropomorphism and mythological fancies. It affirms the uniqueness of God and declares that He has no partners in His Godhead. He is one in substance and one in person. He is self-existing; the self-sufficient One, on whom all depend and who depends not on anyone. He is the creator and sustainer of all, the All-Good, the Almighty, the All-Knowing, the All-Wise, the All-Loving, the All-Merciful, the Eternal and the Infinite. Nothing can emanate from Him and become His equal and partner in His Godhead. Says the Quran:

"Say: He, God, is One. God is the one on whom all depend. He begets not, nor is He begotten, and none is like Him." (Chapter 112) "He is God besides whom there is no God: the knower of the unseen and the seen; He is the Loving-kind, the Merciful. He is God, besides whom there is no God; the Sovereign Lord, the Holy One, the Source of peace, the Granter of security, Guardian over all, the Mighty, the Supreme, the Possessor of every greatness. Holy is God, far above that which they associate with Him (as partners in His Godhead). He is God alone, the Creator, the Maker, the Fashioner; His are the most beautiful names. All that is in the heavens and the earth declare His glory, and He is the Mighty, the Wise (59:22-24). "So be careful of your duty to God, for God is oft-returning to mercy (Acceptor of repentance, Effacer of sin), Most Merciful." (49:12)

The Deity of Jesus

The second Christian dogma is that of the deity of Jesus. The Nicene Creed, adopted by the First Council of Nicaea (325 C.E.) and revised by the First Council of Constantinople (381 C.E.), states:

"I believe in...one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God. Born of the Father before all ages. God of God, Light of Light, true God of true God. Begotten not made; being of one substance with the Father; by whom all things were made."

Christians (Roman Catholics, Protestants, and also Orthodox) believe that Jesus Christ is God from all eternity, the Second Person of the Holy Trinity, that nearly two thousand years ago he chose to appear in a human body and was born of the Virgin Mary, becoming thereby perfect God and perfect Man—i.e. God-Man or God-Incarnate.

The author of Catholic Teachings writes in this connection:

"The teaching about Christ's divinity which is to be found in so many places of Scripture, has always been proclaimed by the Church as one of the most important truths of Catholic faith. The Council of Nicaea, which was the first General Council after the persecutions, solemnly condemned Arius who contended that Christ was not God but a creature."7

The Protestant author of The Truth of Christianity has the following to say on this subject:

"Evidently then this expression, The Son of God, meant to him (i.e. John), and therefore presumably to other New Testament writers who use it frequently, that Christ was truly God—God the Son—my Lord and my God—in the fullest and most complete sense."

The Christian belief, according to R.E. Harlow of the Emmans Bible School, is that "Christ is distinct from the Father, but He also is God," that he has all the attributes which God also has, and that even when incarnate in a human body, he was omnipotent, omniscient, etc.8

This doctrine, that Jesus was God, also has no support of the words is that Jesus strongly disclaimed even divine goodness, let alone Godhead. Here are his own words:

"Why do you call me good? No one is good but God alone" (Mark 10:18).

He spoke of God as "My Father and your Father, my God and your God" (John 20:17), showing that he stood in the same relation to God as any other man; he was a creature of God.

In his agony on the cross, Jesus cried out: "Eli, Eli, lamar sabach-thani?" that is,
Jesus is declared to be the incarnation of Logos, this personified Reason or Word of God, through whom all things were made. John considered him to be the first emanation from God, but not the equal of God. He derived all his knowledge and power and authority from God, and his greatness lay in revealing the Father and doing the will of the Father. During the second and third centuries the different Christian factions held different views of Christ, but in the fourth century the triumphant Catholic Church suppressed all the other views and formulated the Nicene Creed in which Jesus was said to be 'God of God, Light of Light, true God of true God' and since in incarnation 'Perfect God and Perfect Man.'

However, reason refused to accept a man who was born of a woman, suffered from human wants, ignorance and limitations, and gradually grew in stature, power and wisdom from the actual being of another human being, as God. To put human limitations upon God and to believe in his incarnation in a human body is to deny the infinite and perfection of God. The dogma of the Incarnation was taken over into Christianity, like several other dogmas, from paganism. In the pre-Christian mythologies we often read of the hero being regarded as God. The Hindus of India were today worship their ancient heroes, Rama and Krishna, as incarnations of Vishnu, the second person of the Hindu Divine Trinity. Islam has saved its followers from the superstition and blasphemy of taking a man for God by repudiating the doctrine of the Incarnation. The Quran rejects the divinity of Jesus:

'They surely disbelieve who say: 'God is the Messiah, son of Mary.' The Messiah himself said: 'O children of Israel, worship God, my Lord and your Lord' (5:72).

According to the Sacred Book of Islam, Jesus was a Prophet of God—sinless, pure and godly, like all other Prophets—but a human being and nothing more. It is significant to see that among Christians themselves, there are growing bodies like the Unitarians and the Free Churchmen, who deny that Jesus at all regarded himself as being more than human. Among some accredited members of the Church of England, too, the doctrine of the Divinity of Jesus is being given an interpretation which is more and more in conformity with the teachings of Islam. Recently a book, entitled The Myth of God Incarnate, written by seven leading British Bishops, was published from England. In it the distinguished authors state on the basis of sound evidence that Jesus in his lifetime did not lay claim to

"My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" (Matthew 27:46). Can anyone imagine these words coming out of the mouth of God? Here we have the words of a helpless man, crying in his agony and despair to his God and Creator.

The Christian theology declares that Jesus was Perfect God and Perfect Man at the same time. Now God is Omnintept whereas the power and capability of man are limited; God is Omnintept, whereas man has strictly limited knowledge; God is perfect, whereas man is imperfect. If Jesus was God-Man, then he must have been all-knowing as well as limited in his knowledge, allmighty as well as limited in his power and capability, perfect as well as imperfect at one and the same time, which is clearly absurd. R.E. Harlow says that even when he was incarnate in a human body Jesus was Omnintept and omniscient. The sayings of Jesus and the recorded incidents of his life, however, do not support this view. Jesus candidly admitted the limitations of his own power and knowledge, declaring that God alone was allknowing and all-knowing: "I do nothing on my own authority but speak thus as the Father taught me" (John 8:28), "I can do nothing on my own authority; as I hear, I judge, and my judgement is just, because I seek not my own will but the will of Him who sent me" (John 5:30), "For I have not spoken on my own authority; the Father who sent me has Himself given me commandment who to say and what to speak" (John 12:47), "But of that day and that hour no one knows, not even the angels in heaven, nor the Son, but only the Father" (Mark 13:32). In fact, he frankly acknowledged his own inferiority to the Father, who alone was God: "The Father is greater than I" (John 14:28).

The divinity of Jesus is sometimes advanced in the Christian apologetic literature on the strength of his reported miracles. But Jesus himself confessed that he performed the miracles with the help of God: "It is by the finger of God that I cast out demons" (Luke 11:20). He always prayed to God for his Help before Performing a miracle and thanked Him for helping him after performing it. Besides: Jesus was not the only prophet to have performed miracles, similar miracles were, according to the Bible, performed by other prophets as well. Naaman was cured of leprosy by Elisha (2 Kings 5:1-14), Jacob got his eyesight when Joseph put his hands on his eyes (Genesis 44:4-6, 30); a handful of meal in a basket and a little girl in a curse were increased by Elijah to feed a family for many days (Kings 17:12-15). Jesus walked on the sea, but the elements obeyed the orders of others also. Moses stretched out his hand over the sea and made it obey, and the waters were divided (Exodus 14:21-22).

The greatest miracle of Jesus is said to be the raising of a dead man to life. According to the Bible, however, this very miracle was performed by at least two earlier prophets. The soul of a dead child "came into him again and he revived" by the words and miraculous acts of Elijah (1 Kings 17:20-24). Elijah also brought back a dead child to life (2 Kings 4:32-37). Moreover, according to Jesus, even false prophets could perform miracles. On the other hand, Jesus could do no "mighty work" where there was unbelief (Mark 6:5-6).

The fact is that Jesus never claimed to be "God of God, Light of Light, true God of true God," but only a messenger or prophet of God. He was a man to whom God had revealed His message for the guidance of other man. To give his own words:

"Jesus said to them, "If you were Abraham's children, you would do what Abraham did, but now you seek to kill me; a man who has told you the truth; which I heard from God" (John 8:39-40). And this is eternal life, that they know 'Thee to one true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent" (John 17:3).

These words of Jesus prove conclusively 1) that there is only one Divine Person, and that Jesus knew nothing of the Trinity ("Thee the only true God"), 2) that Jesus laid no claim to Godhood or divinity, for he referred to a person other than himself ("Thee") as the "only true God," 3) that Jesus, claimed only to be a messenger of God ("a man who has told you the truth, which I heard from God," "Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent").

Like the Trinity, the doctrine of the deity of Jesus also was invented long after Jesus. In fact the scholars have traced the various stages through which Jesus was progressively deified. In Q, the first written record of the sayings and deeds of Jesus, he was regarded as a Prophet of God to the children of Israel, a human being and nothing more. He faithfully observed the Law of Moses and advised others to do the same. In Mark's Gospel we find a deliberate attempt to idealize and glorify him and to attribute many miracles to him, but for Mark also, Jesus was a man and not a God-incarnate. This process of glorification was to take a step further in the Gospels of 'Matthew' and 'Luke'. In the letters of Paul we find Jesus being presented as a sort of divine being, the heavenly Son of God and the Lord and Saviour of man. But even for Paul, Jesus is not God in the full sense; he is not co-equal with the Father or of the same substance as the Father. In John's Gospel
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divinity and that he was promoted to divine status through pagan and other influences. The Christians in the early years of the Christian era. In the Preface to the book, its editor, John Hick, Professor of Theology at Birmingham University and a member of the United Reform Church, writes:

"In the nineteenth century, Western Christianity made two major new adjustments to important enlargements of human knowledge. The writers of this book are convinced that another major theological development is called for in this last part of the twentieth century. The need arises from growing knowledge of Christian origins, and involves a recognition that Jesus was (as he was presented in Act 2:21) 'a man approved by God' for a special role within the divine purpose, and that the later conception of him as God incarnate, the Second Person of the Holy Trinity living a human life, is a mythological or poetic way of expressing his significance for us. This recognition is called for in the interests of truth; but it also has increasingly important practical implication for our relationship to the people of the other great world religions."¹¹

Later in the book, in the chapter "Jesus and the world Religions," he writes:

"It is clearly literally meaningful to say that Jesus was a man, part of the genetic stream of human life; finite in intelligence, information and energy; and conditioned by a particular cultural and geographical milieu."¹²

The Islamic view is that the prophets were all human beings. God chose them from among men and revealed Himself and His message to them for the guidance of men. Only a human prophet can be a guide and model for human beings. The prophets had the same nature as other men; they faced the same temptations and problems as other men face, and they overcame them with the means available to all human beings. A God-incarnate or an angel cannot be a guide and model for men; as the Quran says:

"Nothing prevents people from believing; when the guidance comes to them, except that they say: 'Has God raised up a mortal to be a Messenger?' Say: Had there been in the earth angels walking about secure, God would have sent down to them from heaven an angel as Messenger." (17:94-95).

The prophets one and all, led a virtuous and sinless life in total submission to God and harmony with the will and purpose of God. They not only conveyed to men the message revealed to them by God but also served as exemplars and models of godliness, by themselves practising what they preached. The Prophet Muhammad declared:

"I am only a mortal like you. It is revealed to me that your God is one God, therefore follow the straight path to Him and ask His forgiveness" (41:6).

The Divine Sonship

The Christian apologists often refer to the Biblical verses in which Jesus has been described as the "Son of God" in support of the Christian doctrine of the Deity of Jesus. They maintain that Jesus was the Son of God in an exclusive or unique sense. However, this dogma also is not in harmony with the sayings and teachings of Jesus. In the Bible this expression has been used for many other prophets. For instance, David has been called the Son of God in the Book of Psalms. This is what David says:

"I will tell of the decree of the Lord: He said to me, 'You are My son, today I have begotten you' " (The Psalms 2:7).

After David, Solomon also was described by God as His Son:

"He shall build a house for My name. He shall be My Son, and I will be His Father, and I will establish his royal throne in Israel forever" (1 Chronicles, 22:10).

In the Bible this very title was given by God to Israel also as we read in the second book of Moses:

"And you shall say to Pharaoh, "Thus says the Lord, Israel is my first born son" (Exodus 4:22).

The fact is that in the Bible the phrase "Son of God" means nothing more than a man's nearness to God, one whom God loves. Jesus Christ himself spoke of all those who had love and compassion for their fellow-men and lived in peace with them as "Son of God." Is this not what Jesus says in the following beautifully words?

"But I say to you, love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you, so that you may be sons of your Father who is in heaven" (Matthew 5:44-45). "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called sons of God" (Matthew 5:7).

These words should leave no doubt in the mind of anyone as to what this expression meant for Jesus. With the phrase "Son of God" having been frequently used in the Bible for several earlier prophets, and Jesus himself explaining what this phrase meant, there seems no justification for regarding Jesus as the Son of God in any special or unique sense. If at any time he referred to himself as the Son of God, it was no doubt in the same sense in which Adam, Israel, David and Solomon had been called the Sons of God before him and in which he himself had described those who had endeared themselves to God by their goodwill and compassion for their fellowmen as "Sons of God." The fact is that the expression which Jesus used most often for himself was the "Son of Man", which shows that he regarded himself as a human being and nothing more. This is what the Rev. R.J. Campbell writes in this connection:

"His favorite self-designation was Son of Man. Much has been said and written about this choice of title, but it does not seem to have excited any wonderment in his followers, nor is there any obscurity in his use of it. It was an Old Testament phrase used of a prophet as representative of a particular age and people, and as the Vehicle of God's message thereto."¹³

Jesus, then, was a man and a prophet or messenger of God, who had extraordinary love for God and compassion for fellow-men and who, by attuning his will to the will of God, had come as close to God as a son is to his father. The Holy Quran accepts Jesus as a great Prophet of God but rejects the Christian dogma that Jesus was God, the Second Person of the Divine Trinity, and the Son of God in a literal or unique sense. Says the Quran:

"And they say: 'God has taken to Himself a Son.' Glory be to Him! Rather, whatever is in the heavens and the earth is His. All are obedient to Him" (2:116).

"It beseeches not God that He should take to Himself a son. Glory be to Him! When He decrees a matter He only says to it, 'Be', and it is (19:35).

Reason is again on the side of Islam. Henri Bergson, the great French philosopher, writes that no being from whom another being can emanate and exist as a separate individual and become his equal and partner can be regarded as perfect. To attribute a son to God would, therefore, be a denial of the perfection and uniqueness of God. (Creative Evaluation, page 16)

The Doctrine of the Atonement

The Bible states that when God created Adam and Eve and placed them in the Garden of Eden, He forbade them to eat the fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil. But they disobeyed God and ate the forbidden fruit. Thus they became sinners. The Christian view is that the sin of Adam and Eve is inherited by all their children: "Every man is born sinful, with an utterly depraved nature. Sin being an offence or outrage against God, the requirement of God's holiness and justice is that expiation or reparation
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RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS OF HUSBAND AND WIFE

Mutual relation of husband and wife. As already stated, the mutual relation of husband and wife is described in the Holy Quran as one of closest union: "He it is Who created you from a single being, and of the same did He make his mate, that he might find comfort in her" (7:189). The same idea is elsewhere very beautifully described in different words: "They (your wives) are an apparel for you and you are an apparel for them" (2:187). The closest union of two souls could not be described more aptly. Yet Islam is a practical religion and it does not shut its eyes to the hard realities of life. It describes the home as a unit in the greater organization of a nation as a whole, and just as in the vaster national organization there is somebody to exercise the final authority in certain cases, so the smaller organization of home cannot be maintained without a similar arrangement. Hence the husband is first spoken of as being a "ruler over the people of the house" and the wife is then described as "a ruler over the house of her husband and his children." The home is thus a kingdom in miniature, where authority is exercised by both the husband and the wife. But unless one of them is given a higher authority, there would be chaos in the kingdom. The reason for giving the higher authority to the male parent is thus stated in the Holy Qur'an: 'men are the maintainers of women because Allah has made some of them to excel others and because they spend out of their property' (4:34). It means that the husband provides maintenance for the wife, and also that he has a final charge of the affairs of the home, thus exercising authority over the wife when there is need for it. It is the man who can be entrusted with the maintenance of the family, and therefore it is he who must hold the higher authority.

A division of work. The functions of the husband and the wife are quite distinct, and each is entrusted with the functions which are best suited for his or her nature. The Holy Qur'an says that God has made man and woman to excel each other in certain respects. The man excels the woman in constitution and physique, which is capable of bearing greater hardships and facing greater dangers than the physique of woman. On the other hand, the woman excels the man in the qualities of love and affection. Nature, for her own purpose of helping in the growth of creation, has endowed the female among men, as well as the lower animals, with the quality of love to a much higher degree than the male. Hence, there is a natural division as between man and woman of the main work which is to be carried on for the progress of humanity. Man is suited to face the hard struggles of life on account of his stronger physique; woman is suited to bring up the children because of the preponderance of the quality of love in her. The duty of the maintenance of the family has therefore been entrusted to the man, and the duty of bringing up the children to the woman. And each is vested with authority suited to the function with which he or she is entrusted. Modern civilization is ultimately coming round to the opinion that the true progress of humanity demands a division of work, and that while the duty of bread-winning must be generally left to man, the duty of the management of the home and the bringing up of the children belongs to the woman. Hence it is that men are spoken of as being the maintainers of women, and women as rulers over the household and the children.

Women not excluded from any activity in the sphere of life. This division of work is only the general rule; it does not mean that woman has entirely been excluded from other kinds of activity. A study of the hadith literature shows that, notwithstanding her right position in the home, as the bringer up of children and manager of the household, woman took interest in all the national activities of the Muslim community. The care of the children did not prevent her from repairing to the mosque to join the congregational prayers, nor was this care an obstacle in her way to join the soldiers in the field of battle, to perform a large number of duties, such as the carrying of provisions, taking care of the sick and the wounded, removing the wounded and the slain from the battlefield, or taking part in actual fighting when necessary. One of the Holy Prophet's wives, Zainab, used to prepare hides and to devote the proceeds of the sale to charitable work. Women also helped their husbands in the labour of the field, served the guests at feasts and carried on business; they could sell to and purchase from men, and men could sell to and purchase from them. A woman was appointed by the Caliph 'Umar as superintendent of the market of Madinah. But these were exceptions. The proper sphere of the woman was the house and care of the children.

Rights of husband and wife. The family concern must be kept going by husband and wife in mutual co-operation. The husband is mainly required to earn for the maintenance of the family, and the wife is responsible for the management of the household and the bringing up of the children. The rights of each against the other are therefore centered in these two points. The husband is bound to maintain the wife according to his means, as the Holy Qur'an says: "Let him who has abundance spend out of his abundance, and whoever has his means of subsistence straitened to him, let him spend out of that which Allah has given him; Allah does not lay on any soul a burden except as far as He has granted it the means" (65:7). He must also provide for her a lodging: "Lodge them where you lodge according to your means" (65:6). The wife is bound to keep company with her husband, to preserve the husband's property from loss or waste, and to refrain from doing anything which should disturb the peace of the family. She is required not to admit any one into the house whom the husband does not like, and not to incur expenditure of which the husband disapproves. She is not bound to render personal service such as the cooking of food, but the respective duties of the husband and wife are such that each must always be ready to help the other. The wife must help the husband even in the field of labour if she can do it, and the husband must help the wife in the household duties. Of the Holy Prophet himself, it is related that he used to help his wives in many small works of the household, such as the milking of the goats, patching his clothes, mending of shoes, cleaning the utensils and so on.

Stress laid on kind treatment towards wife. The Holy Qur'an lays the greatest possible stress on kindly and good treatment towards the wife: "Keep them in good fellowship" and, "treat them kindly" is the oft-recurring advice of the Holy Qur'an (2:229, 231:4:19, etc.). So much so that kindness is recommended even when a man dislikes his wife, for "it may be that you dislike a thing while Allah has placed abundant good in it" (4:19). The Holy Prophet laid equally great stress upon good treatment of a wife. "The most excellent of you," he is reported to have said, "is he who is best in his treatment of his wife." "Accept my advice in the matter of doing good to women," is another hadith. In his famous address at the Farewell Pilgrimage, he again laid particular stress.
on the good treatment of women: "O my people! You have certain rights over your wives and so have your wives over you... They are the trust of Allah in your hands. So you must treat them with all kindness."

DIVORCE

Marriage and divorce, though marriage, according to Islam, is only a civil contract, yet the rights and responsibilities consequent upon it are of such importance to the welfare of humanity, that a high degree of sanctity is attached to it. But in spite of the sacredness of the character of the marriage tie, Islam recognizes the necessity, in exceptional circumstances, of keeping the way open for its dissolution. With the exception, perhaps, of the Hindu law, the necessity of divorce has been recognized by all people. The right of divorce according to the Jewish law belongs to the husband who can exercise it at his will. The Christian law recognizes the right of divorce only when there is faithlessness on the part of either of the parties, but the divorced parties are precluded from marrying again. According to Hindu law, marriage once performed can never be dissolved. Islam effected several reforms in divorce. It restricted the husband's right to divorce while recognizing the wife's right to it.

Divorce is permitted under exceptional circumstances. The Arabic word for divorce is talq which carries the literal significance of freeing or the undoing of a knot. Both from the Holy Qur'an and the Hadith it appears that, though divorce was permitted, yet the right could be exercised only under exceptional circumstances. Holy Prophet has reported to have said: "Never did Allah allow anything more hateful to Him than divorce." According to a report of Ibn 'Umar, he said: "With Allah the most detestable of all things permitted is divorce." Elsewhere, divorce is thus discouraged: "If you hate them (i.e., your wives), it may be that you dislike a thing while Allah has placed abundant good in it" (4:19).

Remedies are also suggested to avoid divorce so long as possible: "And if you fear a breach between the two (i.e., the husband and the wife), then appoint a judge from his people and a judge from her people; if they both desire agreement, Allah will effect harmony between them" (4:35). It was due to such teachings of the Holy Qur'an that the Holy Prophet declared divorce to be the most hateful of all things permitted. And it is due to this that, in spite of the facility with which it may be effected, divorce takes place only rarely among the Muslims, as compared with the large number of divorces in Christian countries. The mentality of the Muslim is to face the difficulties of the married life along with its comforts, and to avoid the disruption of the family relations as long as possible, turning to divorce only as a last resort.

Principle of divorce. From what has been said above, it is clear that not only must there be good cause for divorce, but that all means to effect reconciliation must have been exhausted before resort is had to this extreme measure. The impression that a Muslim husband may put away his wife at his mere caprice, is a grave distortion of the Islamic institution of divorce. But though the Holy Qur'an refers to several causes when divorce may become necessary, it does not enumerate all of them, nor does it strictly limit them to specified cases. In fact, if the different nations of Europe and America, who profess the same religion, are at the same level of civilization and the same stage of advancement, and have an affinity of feeling on most social and moral questions, cannot agree as to the proper causes of divorce, how could a universal religion like Islam, which was meant for all ages and all countries, for people in the lowest grade of civilization as well as those at the top, limit those causes which must vary with changing conditions of humanity and society?

The principle of divorce spoken of in the Holy Qur'an, and which in fact includes to a greater or less extent all causes, is the decision no longer to live together as husband and wife. In fact, marriage itself is nothing but an agreement to live together as husband and wife, and then either of the parties finds him or herself unable to agree to such a life; divorce must follow. It is not, of course, meant that every disagreement between them would lead to divorce; it is only the disagreement to live any more as husband and wife. In the Holy Qur'an such disagreement is called shiqaq (from shaaqaq meaning breaking into two). But not even the shiqaq entitles either party to divorce, unless all possibilities of agreement have been exhausted. The principle of divorce is, therefore, thus described in the Holy Qur'an: "And if you fear a breach between the two, then appoint a judge from his people and a judge from her people; if they both desire agreement, Allah will effect harmony between them; surely Allah is Knowing, Aware" (4:35). And further on, it is added: "And if they separate, Allah will render them both free from want out of His amleness, and Allah is Ample-giving, Wise" (4:130).

This verse gives us not only the principle of divorce, which is shiqaq or a disagreement to live together as husband and wife, but also the process to be adapted when a rupture of marital relations is feared. The two sexes are here placed on a level of perfect equality. A 'breach between the two' would imply that either the husband or the wife wants to break off the marriage agreement, and hence either may obtain a divorce when the parties can no longer pull on in agreement. In the process to be adopted, both husband and wife are to be represented on a status of equality; a judge has to be appointed from his people and another from her people. The two are told to try to remove the differences and reconcile the parties to each other. If agreement cannot be brought about, a divorce will follow.

It will be seen that the principle advanced here in the matter of divorce is an all-inclusive one. All causes of divorce are subject to the condition that one of the parties cannot pull on with the other. For instance, the husband is impotent, or one of the parties has a disease which makes him or her unfit for sexual relations. In such cases justice would demand a divorce, but only when the party entitled to it wants it. If both are willing to live in marital agreement, in spite of the defects in one of them, no power on earth can effect a divorce; but if the aggrieved party finds that she or he is unable to live in marital agreement with the other, it would be a case of shiqaq or breach of the marriage agreement. Similarly, if the husband is imprisoned for life, or for a long period, or if he is absent and no news can be had of him, or if he is maimed for life and is unable to provide maintenance for his wife, it will be a case of shiqaq if the wife wants a divorce; but if she does not, the marriage will remain. In case the husband is aggrieved in a similar manner, he has the option of taking another wife.

The shiqaq or breach of the marriage agreement may also arise from the conduct of either party; for instance, if either of them misconducts himself or herself, or either of them is consistently cruel to the other, or, as may sometimes happen, there is incompatibility of temperament to such an extent that they cannot live together in marital agreement. The shiqaq in these cases is more express, but still it will depend upon the parties whether they can pull on or not. Divorce must always follow when one of the parties finds it impossible to continue the marriage agreement and is compelled to break it off.

At first sight, it may look like giving too much latitude to the parties to allow them to end the marriage contract thus, even if there is no reason except incompatibility of temperament, but this much
is certain, that if there is such disagreement that the husband and the wife cannot pull together, it is better for themselves, for their offspring and for society in general that they should be separated than that they should be compelled to live together. No home is worth the name wherein instead of peace there is wrangling; and marriage is meaningless if there is no spark of love left between the husband and the wife. It is an error to suppose that such latitude tends to destroy the stability of marriage, because marriage is entered into as a permanent and sacred relation based on love between a man and a woman, and divorce is only a remedy when marriage fails to fulfil its object.

Wife's right of divorce. It will have been seen that the Holy Qur'an places the two parties on a perfect level of equality in all the dimensions of divorce. His care is for the woman even clearer still. The wife of Thabit ibn Qais is reported to have come to the Holy Prophet and said, "O Messenger of Allah! I do not find fault in Thabit ibn Qais regarding his morals or faith but I cannot pull on with him." The Holy Prophet said, "Wilt thou return to him his orchard (which he had settled upon her as a dowry)?" On receiving a reply in the affirmative, the Holy Prophet sent for Thabit and ordered him to take back his orchard and divorce his wife. This is sufficient to show that the wife had the right to claim divorce on those very grounds on which the husband could divorce his wife.

The right of the wife to claim a divorce is not only recognized by the Holy Qur'an and Hadith but also in Fiqh. The technical term for the wife's right to divorce by returning her dowry is called khul', and it is based on the hadith already quoted, and the following verse of the Holy Qur'an: "Divorce may be pronounced twice; then keep them in good fellowship or let them go with kindness; and it is not lawful for you to take any part of what you have given them unless both fear that they cannot keep within the limits of Allah. Then if you fear that they cannot keep within the limits of Allah, there is no blame on them for what she gives up to become free thereby" (2:229). By keeping "within the limits of Allah" here is clearly meant the fulfillment of the object of marriage of the duties imposed by conjugal relationship.

The dowry is thus a check on the party who wants the divorce; if the husband wants to divorce the wife, the wife shall have the dowry; if the wife wants the divorce, the husband is entitled to the dowry. But it is the judges spoken of in 4:35, and referred to here in the words "if you fear that they cannot keep within the limits of Allah," that shall decide whether the husband or the wife is responsible for the breach and which of them is entitled to the dowry.

The wife is also entitled to a divorce if the husband is missing, or maqṣūd al-khabar, which means that he has disappeared and cannot be communicated with, because, though there is no shiqq in this case, yet the husband is unable to fulfill his marital obligations. There is no definite statement in the Holy Qur'an, or Hadith, to show how long the wife should wait in such a case, but four years waiting is required by Imam Malik. The view of Imam Ahmad ibn Hanbal and the Shi'a view agree with Malik. This is a reasonable view. Bukhari has a chapter on the Maḳṣūd, in which there is no hadith of the Holy Prophet relating to the subject proper, but the view of Ibn al-Musayyab is quoted, according to which when a person becomes mad in the sense of fighting, his wife shall wait for a year, and a report is added relating to Ibn Mas'ud who searched for the husband of a maid-servant of his for one year and then treated him as maḳṣūd, and this was not the case of a man lost in fighting. Under present conditions when communication is so easy, one year would be a sufficient period of waiting for the maḳṣūd.

Husband's right of pronouncement of divorce. Though the Holy Qur'an speaks of the divorce being pronounced by the husband, yet a limitation is placed upon the exercise of this right. The following procedure is laid down in clear words: "And if you fear a breach between the two, then appoint a judge from his people and a judge from her people; if they desire agreement, Allah will effect harmony between them" (4:35). "And if they separate, Allah will render them both free from want out of His amleness" (4:130). It will be seen that in all disputes between the husband and the wife, which it is feared will lead to a breach, two judges are to be appointed from the respective people of the two parties. These judges are required first to try to reconcile the parties to each other, failing which divorce is to be effected. Therefore, though it is the husband who pronounces the divorce, he is as much bound by the decision of the judges as is the wife. This shows that the husband cannot repudiate the marriage at will. The case must first be referred to two judges and their decision is binding. The Caliph 'Ali is reported to have told a husband which he thought had the sole right to divorce that he would have to abide by the judgment of the judges appointed under this verse. The Holy Prophet is reported to have interfered and disallowed a divorce pronounced by a husband, restoring the marital relation. It was no doubt a matter of procedure, but it shows that the authority constituted by law has the right to interfere in matters of divorce. The only question is as to the procedure to be adopted when the Muslims are living under non-Muslim rule. In such a case, if no Qadzi has been appointed by the authorities, the appointment of the judges shall be in the hands of the Muslim community, and it may exercise that right in any way it likes. Failing even such arrangements the parties may come to an agreement between themselves. If, therefore, a Muslim government or the Muslim community makes any rules laying down the procedure of divorce and placing such limitations upon the husband in matters of divorce as are not inconsistent with the principles laid down by the Holy Qur'an, it would be quite Islamically allowable.

The 'iddah or waiting period. The final breaking off of marital relations is discouraged in many other ways and every chance is afforded to the parties to maintain the conjugal tie, even after differences have arisen leading to divorce. Every divorce must be followed by a period of waiting called the 'iddah: "O Prophet! when you divorce women, divorce them for their 'iddah (prescribed or waiting time)" (65:1). The 'iddah is about three months. "And the divorced women should keep themselves in waiting for three courses" (2:228). In the case of women who do not menstruate, the 'iddah is three months (65:4), and in the case of pregnant women, the waiting period is till delivery. The 'iddah among other purposes serves the purpose of affording the parties a chance of reconciliation. Though they are divorced, yet they still live in the same house, the husband being plainly told not to expel the wife from the house in which she has been living unless she is guilty of misconduct, and a similar advice is given to the wife not to leave the house (65:1). This injunction clearly aims at restoring amicable relations between the parties and minimizing chances of the attenuation of differences. If there is any love in the union, its pangs would assert themselves during the period of waiting and bring about a reconciliation.

Divorce is revocable. In fact, reconciliation is recommended in plain words when, speaking of the 'iddah the Holy Qur'an says: "And their husbands have a better right to take them back in the meanwhile if they wish for reconciliation" (42:228). Every divorce is thus an experimental, temporary separation during its initial stages and by making the parties live together, every chance is afforded to them to re-establish conjugal relations.
Even after the period of waiting has passed away, the two parties are allowed, even encouraged, to remarry: "And when you have divorced women and they have ended their term of waiting, do not prevent them from marrying their husbands, when they agree among themselves in a lawful manner; with this is admonished whosoever among you believes in Allah and the last day; this is more profitable and purer for you. 'And Allah knows while you know not." (2:225).

Remarriage of the divorced parties is thus encouraged and recommended as being more profitable and purer for the parties. The condition is also laid down that such a revocable divorce, allowing reunion of the parties, can be pronounced twice: "Divorce may be pronounced twice, then keep them in good fellowship or let them go with kindness." (2:229). Thus the revocable divorce, the talaq raji'i in the terminology of the jurists, can be pronounced twice.

Irrevocable divorce. After the first divorce, the parties have the right to reassert their conjugal relations within the period of waiting, and to remarry after the waiting period is over. A similar right is given to them after a second divorce, but not after a third. Before Islam, however, while the husband had no right of divorce, the husband was uncheckered license to divorce the wife and to reassert his conjugal rights during 'iddah as many times as he pleased. This had demoralized the whole institution of marriage. Islam not only gave the wife a right of divorce but also checked the husband's license to divorce as often as he liked, by declaring that revocable divorce could be given only twice: "Divorce may be pronounced twice; then keep them in good fellowship or let them go with kindness." (2:229).

It was thus laid down that, after the second revocation or remarriage, the parties must make their choice either to live together as husband and wife forever, or to separate forever, never thinking of reunion. Hence, if even the second experiment failed and the parties were separated by a divorce for the third time, this was an irrevocable divorce, or talaq ba'lin, in the terminology of the jurists.

Effect of irrevocable divorce. It is clear from what has been stated that irrevocable divorce is the very rarest of things that can happen among Muslims. When a man and a woman have found by two experiments that they cannot live together as husband and wife, it is absurd on their part to think of remarriage again. Hence, the Holy Qur'an lays down that they shall not remarry after the second failure of the reunion, except in one case: "So if he divorces her (the third time), she shall not be lawful to him afterwards until she marries another husband; then, if he (the second husband) divorces her, there is no blame on them both if they return to each other (by marriage), if they think that they can keep within the limits of Allah." (2:230). Thus the one case in which marriage with the first husband is allowed, after being divorced for the third time, is that in which a marriage has been contracted with a second husband and that, too, has proved a failure.

Tahall or halalah. Tahall or halalah, which means legalizing or making a thing lawful, was a pre-Islamic practice. When the wife was divorced irrevocably, by thrice pronouncing the divorce formula, and the husband wanted to take her back again, she had first to marry a third person on condition that he would divorce her after having sexual connection with her. This was called halalah. It is a mistake to confound the halalah with the marriage spoken of in the verse quoted under the previous heading. The Holy Prophet cursed those who resorted to this practice, his words being: "The curse of Allah be on the man who commits halalah and the man for whom the halalah is committed." The Caliph 'Umar is reported to have said that if there were brought to him two men who took part in the practice of halalah, he would treat them as adulterers.

Procedure of divorce. Divorce may be given orally, or in writing, but it must take place in the presence of witnesses: "So when they have reached their prescribed time, then retain them with kindness or separate them with kindness, and call to witness two women or two men whose justice you appreciate, from among you, and give upright testimony for Allah." (65:2). Whatever the actual words used, they must expressly convey the intention that the marriage tie is being dissolved. As to whether a divorce would be effective under certain circumstances, there are differences among the various schools of jurists. Evidently intention is as necessary a factor in the dissolution of marriage as in the marriage itself; but while some recognize that divorce is ineffective if given under compulsion or influence, or in a state of intoxication, or in anger or jest, or by mistake or inadvertence, others hold it to be ineffective in some of these cases and effective in others.

Zihar. The word zihar is derived from zahr meaning back. An Arab in the days of ignorance would say to his wife, anti 'alayya ka-zahre ummi, i.e., thou art to me as the back of my mother. This was technically called zihar. No sooner were these words pronounced then the relation between husband and wife ended as by a divorce, but the woman was not at liberty to leave the husband's house and remained as a deserted wife. One of the Muslims, Aus ibn Samit, treated his wife Khahla in a similar manner. The wronged woman came to the Holy Prophet and complained of her husband's ill-treatment. The Holy Prophet told her that he was unable to interfere. She was thus disappointed, and it was then that he received the following revelation: "Allah indeed knows the plea of her who pleads with them about her husband and complains to Allah, and Allah knows the contents of both of you; surely Allah is Hearing, Seeing. As for those of you who put away their wives by likening them to the backs of their mothers, they are not their mothers; their mothers are no others than those who gave them birth; and surely they utter a hateful word and a falsehood" (58:1,2). The man who resorted to this practice was ordered to free a slave, or, if he could not find one, then to fast for two successive months and if unable to do that, to feed sixty poor people (58:3,4).

Li'an. The word li'an is derived from la'nah meaning curse. Li'an and mula'nah signify literally mutual cursing. Technically, however, the two words indicate that particular form of bringing about separation between the husband and the wife in which the husband accuses the wife of adultery but has no evidence to support the accusation, while she denies it. The li'an is suggested in this case as the means of bringing separation between husband and wife, for whether the accusation is right or wrong, it is in the interests of both to get separated. The procedure is laid down in 24:6-9.

Charitable view of divorce. Divorce is looked upon as a necessity in marital relations, under the varying human conditions, irrespective of moral turpitude on the part of husband or wife. The Holy Qur'an takes the most charitable view of the necessity for divorce, and therefore recommends as much kindness towards women in the case of divorce, as in that of marriage. Again and again stress is laid on this point: "Divorce may be pronounced twice; then keep them in good fellowship or let them go with kindness (ihsan)"); (229); "And when you divorce women and they reach their prescribed time, then either retain them in good fellowship or set them free with liberality." (65.2). Thus woman is to be treated with equal kindness and generosity, whether she is a sharer in a man's weal or woe as wife, or one from whom he has been compelled to part company. Marital differences, like other differences, may be as often honest as not, but the Holy Qur'an recommends that the most charitable view of them should be taken.
and Al-Rahim that every chapter of the Holy Book opens. The words Beneficent and Merciful convey to the English reader of the Holy Quran only a very imperfect idea of the deep and all-encompassing love and mercy of God as indicated by the words Al-Rahman and Al-Rahim. My Mercy encompasses all things," says the Holy Quran (7:156). Hence, the Messenger who preached this conception of the Divine Being is rightly called in the Holy Quran "a mercy to all the nations" (21:107). Again God is the Author of all that exists. A denial of His power of creation would have given a death-blow to the very loftiness and sublimity of the conception of Divine Being. Here is but one description of His attributes:

"He is Allah besides Whom there is no God, the Knower of the unseen and the seen. He is the Beneficent, the Merciful. He is Allah besides Whom there is no God, the King, the Holy, the Author of peace, the Grantor of security, Guardian over all, the mighty, the Supreme, the Possessor of greatness, Glory be to Allah from that which they set up (as false gods)! He is Allah, the Creator, the Maker, the Fashioner; His are most beautiful names. Whatever is in the heavens and the earth declares His glory; and He is the Mighty, the Wise (59-22-24)."

Can any honest person, after reading these verses of the Quran, assert that a Muslim does not have a concept of a God of grace, love and mercy? As against the Christian concept of God as a Father, the Quran teaches the concept of Rabb which is very instructive and suggestive. It conveys not only the idea of fostering, bringing up or nourishing, but also that of regulating, completing and accomplishing. According to Raghbi's dictionary of the Quran, "Rabb signifies, the fostering of a thing in such a manner as to make it attain one condition after another until it reaches its goal of completion." This Rabb is the author of all existence, who has not only given to the whole creation its means of nourishment but has also beforehand ordained for each a sphere of capacity, provided the means by which it continues to attain gradually to its goal of perfection, i.e. conversion of inherent potentialities into actualities. Thus the Quran presents a much loftier and sublimer concept of Rabb compared to Father.

We will deal with the blasphemous statements like, "the Muslim's desire is to submit to the point where he can hold back the Judging arm of Allah," and "inherit eternal life in an earthly paradise of glutony and sexual gratification" when we deal with his next statement about 'sin and salvation'. This is where the articles are interrelated.

Mr. Martin makes an entirely untrue statement when he writes on page 366, "Sin and Salvation in Islam is associated with two concepts: works and fate (Kismet)." As a matter of fact, Muslims do not believe in fate or Kismet nor is there any mention of fate (Kismet) or predestination in the Quran. Instead the Quran uses the word 'qadar' which means 'measure'. Western critics of Islam in their quest after maligning Islam have not desisted even from distorting the meanings of Arabic words. Hughs, for example, in his 'Dictionary of Islam', in an effort to dump predestination or fatalism on the Quran has wrongly translated two Verses of the Quran. He translates Verse 49 of Surah 54 as, "All things have been created after fixed decree;" and he translated Verse 2 of Surah 87 as, "The Lord hath created and balanced all things and hath fixed their destinies and guided them." Now the translation of 'qadar' (occurring in Verse 49 of Surah 54) by 'fixed decree' and that of 'qaddara' (occurring in Verse 2 of Surah 87) by, 'he hath fixed their destinies' is opposed to all Arabic usage. The wish of Mr. Hughs here has taken the place of rules of interpretation. In fact, 'qadar' or 'taqdir' according to Raghbi's Dictionary of the Quran means the making manifest of the measure (Kammiya) of a thing, or simply 'measure'.

Considering 'qadar' or 'taqdir' as an absolute decree of good and evil, an idea which Mr. Martin seems to be dumping on Islam, is neither known to the Quran nor to Arabic Lexicology. This idea is due only to a complete misunderstanding of the nature of good and evil. Maulana Muhammad Ali, M.A.L.L.B, in his "The Religion Of Islam" explains it beautifully. He writes:

"God created man with certain powers which he can exercise under certain limitations, and it is the exercise of these powers in one way or another that produces good or evil. For instance, God has gifted man with the power of speech, which he can use either to do good or evil to humanity, either to tell a truth and say a good word, or to utter falsehood and slander. Similarly, man has been endowed with numerous other powers which may be used either for good or for evil... The same act may be a virtue on one occasion and evil on another. A blow struck in self defense or in defense of a helpless man is right, and a blow struck aggressively is wrong. Hence evil is also called Zulm, which, according to lexicologists, means the placing of a thing in a place other than that which is meant for it, either by falling short or by excess or by deviation from its time or its place (Raghbi). Thus the use of a power in the right manner, or at the right moment, or in the right place is a virtue and its use in a wrong manner, or at a wrong moment, or at the wrong place is a vice... It may, however, be added that God is recognized by the Quran as the first and ultimate cause of all things; but this does not mean that He is the Creator of the deeds (works) of man. He has, of course, created man; He has also created the circumstances under which he lives or acts; but still He has endowed man with a discretion to choose how to act, which he can exercise under certain limitations, just as all his other powers and faculties are exercised under limitations and in accordance with certain laws. Thus it is said in the Quran: "The truth is from your Lord; so let him who please believe and let him who please disbelieve" (18:29). And as he can exercise his discretion or his will in doing a thing or not doing it, he is responsible for his own deeds and is made to suffer the consequences... A great deal of misunderstanding exists as to the relation of the Divine will to the will of man. All the faculties with which man has been endowed have emanated from the great Divine attributes. Yet all human attributes are imperfect, and can be exercised only under certain limitations and to a certain extent. God is All-Seeing and All-Hearing; man also sees and hears, but these attributes in him bear no comparison to the Divine attributes of seeing and hearing, being only imperfect and miniature images of the perfect and infinite attribute of the Divine Being, even as the reflecting mirror of human nature is a far inferior and imperfect replica of the very same reason, man's exercise of these attributes is also subject to certain limitations and laws. Man's knowledge of things, his exercise of power over things and his exercise of his will in relation to things stand on a par. All these are subject to limitations and laws. Man's will stands in the same relation to the Divine will as his other attributes to the attributes of the Divine Being. He can exercise it under limitations and laws, and there is a very large variety of circumstances which may determine his choice in each case. Yet it is not true that the choice to exercise it has been taken away from him; and the fact is that, notwithstanding all the limitations, he is free to exercise his will, and, therefore, though he may not be responsible to the same extent for every thing and in all cases -- and a variety of circumstances must determine the extent of his responsibility, which may be very small, almost negligible, in some cases, and very great.
in others -- yet he is a free agent and responsible for what he does."

The above quotation from Muhammad Ali's book should suffice to bring home the teachings of the Quran as to the evil and good deeds and as to the Will of God and freedom of exercise of will of a man as to choose to act in any manner and to face the consequences of his actions. Islam does not teach that sin can be inherited nor does it allow that some one else, even though he may be son of God or God Himself, may pay for the crimes or evil deeds of others. Every person according to Islam is born sinless and sin one acquires after birth from his environment. Since man according to Islam is not born in sin, therefore, he does not stand in need of any redemption. Redemption in any case is not only absurd but obnoxious to the good sense of a Muslim as he cannot imagine for a moment that God can be arrested by human beings, or he can be dragged to the Cross by any person or that God can be put to death by any human being or that God can take birth through the womb of a woman. All these acts are blasphemies to God and a mockery of the Supreme Being which a Muslim cannot put up with. Human Society is in a constant process of progress and a religion or belief in God should, as a matter of fact, assist and help him in this process. Expressing belief in redemption does not contribute in any way in the progress of human society in this world. Man needs religion which guides him to lead a clean and successful life in this world, therefore, a religion which concerns itself only with next world falls short of man's spiritual needs in this world. Belief in redemption is, in fact, based on denial of the attributes of Mercy and forgiveness in God. It presents the idea of a God who is bound by laws and must punish for sins even if the sin is inherited, thus negating the idea of forgiveness and mercy in God. There could not have been a better occasion for showing mercy to one and forgive him when that person is supposedly being punished for the sins committed by his ancestor. To a Muslim, therefore, Redemption appears contradicting the Omnipotence of God as it renders Him simply a slave of laws—a judge who is not equitable and merely fulfills the word, not the spirit of law. A Muslim's perception of God is of a Merciful Being Who is the Creator and Author of everything in the Universe including man and Who is most Beneficent that He out of Beneficence and Grace provided everything, without any ones asking, that is necessary for the sustenance, development and progress unto perfection; and Who out of His boundless Mercy rewards man manifold for the proper use of his faculties and things on which God has granted sovereignty in the universe; for He created man in His own Colors and appointed him as His Successor in the Earth. Since man has been created in the Colors or Image of God, therefore, to believe that man is born in sin amounts to saying that God, too, is sinful. A Muslim cannot imagine for a moment to hold such a blasphemous view about God. This not only amounts to being highly thankless but also highly insolent and rebellious. Further, a Muslim views salvation through Redemption as a highly irrational belief in as much as that, if it be true, then one has no option but to believe that all human beings, including the Messengers of God raised amongst Bani Israil, like Jacob, Joseph, Moses, David, Solomon, etc. etc. (peace be on all of them) who were born prior to birth of Jesus, are for sure destined to Hell, as none of them expressed belief in Trinity and Redemption.

In fact, salvation from sin through working the potentialities of good in him and subjugating the potentialities of evil doing, both of which are inherent by nature in him, is the first step on the spiritual journey of a Muslim in this world. Since God has created man in his own colors, therefore, love of God is innate in man. When man, on account of this innate love, seeks God with all sincerity, then His pleasure becomes the end object of man's life and existence. The heart of such a spiritual wayfarer is filled with only one sentiment—the love and pleasure of His beloved, God. Such love then begets love and the loving God then allows communion to this man, Reveals Himself to him and informs him about the unseen when He deems fit. Thus Redemption, even if one was to take it true for the sake of argument, falls much short of the spiritual expectations of a Muslim.

As to the reference of 'earthly paradise of glutony and sexual gratification' we let the statistics speak for themselves. The present state of lust for worldly life and acquisitions, the sexual licentiousness in all its worst forms which is prevalent in Europe and America, the societies which derive their moral values from Christianity and on account of which Mr. Martin himself calls them 'Christian areas', is the net product of the Christian beliefs. Not even one hundredth of this 'earthly paradise of glutony and sexual gratification' is experienced by the Muslim world.

Mr. Martin also writes on page 367 of his book, 'Holy war (Jihad) used to be a condition of faith, and early Muslims believed it was their sacred duty to murder anyone who would not embrace the one true faith.' Here, too, he is misleading his co-believers into the world of his fantasies. Jihad is one teaching of Islam which is grossly misrepresented and misunderstood by the Western Christian authors, and resolutely is grossly misunderstood by the common man in the West. Jihad means exerting oneself in the cause of religion or truth. Thus, any effort which one puts in for the furtherance of the cause of the Religion from Allah, whether through pen, spoken word or through Arms, within the limits prescribed by Allah, is Jihad. The proper word for raising Arms or war is 'Qital' which forms one small part of Jihad. 'Qital' is not an offensive war. According to the Quran, permission to fight was granted to Muslims against those who had waged war against them, 'Qital', therefore, is a permission to defend themselves when attacked and not to attack others to seek their conversion to Islam.

The very location of the Battle Fields of Battles fought during the life time of the Holy Prophet Muhammad suffice to prove that Muslims were defending themselves. Although from present standards and concept of warfare, a pre-emptory offensive, too, is considered defensive and Israel is constantly indulging in it every other day, which U.S.A almost invariably defends as non-aggression.

The presence of Christian and Jewish societies in the early Muslim State during the lifetime of the Prophet Muhammad, peace be upon him, should suffice to give lie to Mr. Martin's claim that 'early Muslims believed it was their sacred duty to murder anyone who would not embrace the one true faith'. Had Mr. Martin's assertion been true, then the well known Christian Deputation from Najran (Yemen) would not have travelled to Medina to debate religious beliefs with Prophet Muhammad. The fear of death would have kept them from it. Quite contrary to Mr. Martins false allegations, the Quran and Prophet Muhammad made belief in all Messengers of God, including Prophet Jesus Christ, a necessary part of the beliefs of Islam, and set such standards of tolerance of difference of beliefs and freedom of conscience, the height and sublimity of which is not yet touched by any other society in the world. He allowed the Christian Deputation of Najran to hold their Sunday Church in the Nabwi Mosque in Medina. He ordered the Muslim army to not to destroy any Synagogue or Church nor to stop Rabbis and Christian Priests from performing their religious functions. He allowed the Jewish community residing in Medina, in
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This body which is created from actions becomes a source of the recompense of good and evil in the state of barzukh. I have experience of this matter. I have often, in a state of complete wakefulness, met some dead persons in a vision and I have observed the bodies of some wicked and misguided persons which were so dark as if they had been compounded of smoke. I am personally acquainted with this condition and I affirm emphatically that as God Almighty has said, everyone is bestowed a body after death which is either bright or dark. It would be a mistake to seek to prove these fine truths through the agency of reason alone. It should be realized that as the eye cannot demonstrate the taste of something sweet and the tongue cannot see anything, in the same way, the knowledge of the hereafter which is gained through visions cannot be tested by reason. God Almighty has appointed separate means for the perception of that which is hidden. Then seek everything through its proper means and you will find it.

It should be remembered that in His Word God has described as dead those who are involved in vice and misguidance and has described the virtuous as alive. The meaning of life of those who are heedless of God, for instance, eating and drinking and following their passions are cut off and they do not partake of spiritual sustenance. Thus they are truly dead and will be alive only to suffer punishment. This is indicated in the verse: The portion of him who comes to His Lord a sinner is hell; he shall neither die therein nor live (20:75). But those who love God Almighty do not die on death as they carry their sustenance with them.

Barzukh is followed by a state of existence which is called resurrection. At that state God's Light, Hanul and Harul, good, bad, righteous or disobedient, will be bestowed a body. That day has been appointed for the perfect manifestation of God when every person shall become acquainted fully with the existence of His Lord and shall arrive at the extreme point of his recompense. No one need wonder how God will accomplish this for He has power and does whatever He wills, as He has said:

"Does not man see that we have created him from a mere sperm-drop? Then he becomes a persistent disputor; he invents explanations concerning Us and he forgets the process of his own creation. He asks; Who will quicken the bones when they are decayed? Tell them: He Who created them the first time will quicken them. He knows well every type of creation...Has not He Who created the heavens and the earth the power to create the like of them? Yea, and he is indeed the Supreme Creator, the All-Knowing. His power is such that when He intends a thing, He says concerning it, 'Be', and it is. Thus Holy is He in Whose hand is the kingdom over all things. To Him will you all be brought back (36:77-84). Ismail Usul ki Philosophy, pp. 88-93)."

Islam sets forth the high philosophy that everyone is bestowed a body in the grave which is necessary for the perception of delight and torment. We cannot say from what material that body is prepared. This mortal becomes naught and no one has observed that which comes alive in the grave. The earthly body is often cremated or is preserved in museums and is kept outside a grave for long periods. If this body were to come alive, people would observe it and yet the Holy Quran affirms that a dead person comes alive. One has, therefore, to accept that a dead person is revived with a body which we cannot see. May be that body is created from the imperceptible qualities of this body.

After that body is bestowed, human faculties are revived as this second body is much finer than the first body. It experiences visions very widely and all the realities of the hereafter become visible to it as they are. Wrongdoers then suffer not only a physical torment, but also a torment of despair. Thus it is an agreed principle of Islam that the torment or comfort of the grave is also inauspicious as experience has affirmed that the spiritual faculties of man do not manifest themselves without a body (Kitabul Bariyah, pp. 70-71).

The hereafter is a reflection of this world, and the consequences of faith and disbelief that appear spiritually in this world would be demonstrated physically in the hereafter. God, the Glorious, has said: He who is blind in this world shall be blind in the hereafter (17:73). We should not be surprised at this and should reflect how spiritual matters are personified in a dream and the matter is even more surprising in a vision when spiritual matters take on physical shape before our eyes. Very often in complete wakefulness one meets those souls who have passed away from this world, and they appear in their original bodies wearing the clothes of this world and they talk and the holy ones out of them convey news about the future, by God's command, and those news are fulfilled in fact. Often in complete wakefulness a sweet drink or some fruit which is very delicious comes to hand in a vision. This humble one has experience of all this. I have personal experience that some delicious food or fruit or sweet drink comes into view and is put into one's mouth by a hidden hand and one enjoys its delicious taste while one continues to talk to other people and one's senses continue to work. This is not at all imagination, but is a specimen of the creation of God concerning Whom it is said that He has knowledge of every type of creation (36:80). This is testified to in every age by those who possess insight. Why should one wonder at the personified creation which will be seen in the hereafter when the scales of deeds would be beheld and the narrow bridge will be seen and many spiritual matters will take on physical forms? Is it beyond the power of Him Who has shown this system of personified creation in this world to those who possess insight to exhibit it in the hereafter also? These personifications have a relationship with the hereafter. When this personified creation is demonstrated to purify people in this world, which is not a place of manifestation of complete cutting asunder, why should it not become visible in the hereafter which is a state of complete and perfect cutting asunder from the world. It should be remembered that all those wonders of which a veiled one reads in the verses of the Holy Quran, which relate to the hereafter, are disclosed in visions to a person possessing insight, in this very world. Those whose insight does not penetrate to the reality wonder at these statements and often objections arise in their minds with regard to them that all these matters appear to them opposed to truth and reason, such as the sitting of God Almighty on His Throne on the Day of Judgment, the standing of angels in rows, the weighing of deeds in scales, the crossing of the narrow bridge by people, the slaughtering of death like a sheep after the Judgments, the appearance of deeds like handsome or ugly people and the flowing of streams of milk and honey in paradise, etc. (Mafloozat, Vol. III, pp. 61-62).

The condition of a person after death is nothing new. It is a clear representation of his life in this world. The condition of a person's beliefs and actions, righteous or unrighteous, is hidden inside him in this world and its poison or antidote influences him in a secret way. In the life after death all these will become manifest. One experiences a sample of it in dreams. In a dream, one observes the conditions which prevail at the time in one's body. When one is heading towards high fever, one beholds fire and flames of fire in one's dream and when one is about to suffer from influenza, one finds oneself in water in a dream. Whatever disorder one's body is ready for is personified in one's dreams. The same is the case in the life after death. As a dream produces a change inside us and demonstrates our spiritual condition in a physical form, the same will happen
in the life after death and our deeds and their consequences will be physically demonstrated and whatever we carry with us from this world in a hidden manner will all appear openly on our countenances on that day. As a person views diverse forms of personifications in a dream and never imagines that they are personifications, but believes them to be realities, the same will happen in the life after death. God Almighty will demonstrate a new power of His the personifications. As that power is perfect then, even if we do not describe it as personification, it would be true to say that it has a new creation through the power of God. God Almighty says: No one knows what bliss is kept hidden from them (32:18). Thus God describes those bounties as hidden, no specimen of which is found in the world. It is obvious that the bounties of the world are not hidden from us and that we are well acquainted with milk and pomegranates and grapes, and we always eat them. This shows that those bounties will be of a different type and will have nothing in common with these except the name. He who considers paradise as a collection of worldly bodies wholly misunderstands the Quran (Isami Usul ki Philosophy, pp. 82-84).

The Holy Quran divides into three the conditions that one encounters after death and there are three Quranic insights about the hereafter.

The first is that the Holy Quran repeatedly states that the hereafter is nothing new but that all its spectacles are the reflections of this worldly life, as it is said: Every person's doings have We fastened firmly to his neck, and on the Day of Judgment, We shall place before him a book which he will find open wide. (17:14) This means that the hidden effect of a person's actions will be displayed on the Day of Judgment in the shape of an open book. The word bird has been here used metaphorically for deeds. For every deed, good or bad, flies away like a bird and its labour or its delight disappears and only its foulness or fineness remains in the hearts.

It is a Quranic principle that every action has its hidden impress. Every action of a person attracts Divine action corresponding to it which preserves the quality of that action and does not let it disappear. Its impress is inscribed upon the heart and the countenance and the eyes and the hands and feet. This is the hidden record of actions which will be made manifest in the life to come.

At another place it is said with regard to those who are admitted to paradise: Keep in mind the day when thou wilt see the believing men and believing women, their light running before them and on their right hands (57:13); that is to say, the light of faith which is bestowed in a hidden manner upon the believers will on that day be seen openly running before them and on their right hands. At another place the wicked have been addressed:

The desire of increase in worldly possessions beguiles you until you reach the graves. You will soon come to know the vanity of your pursuits; again, you will soon come to know how mistaken you are. If you only knew with the certainty of knowledge, you would surely see hell in this very life. But you will see it with certainty of sight in the life to come, and then you will surely be called to account, on that day, in respect of the worldly favours conferred on you (102:1-8) (Isami Usul ki Philosophy, pp. 86-88).

The second insight which the Holy Quran has set forth with regard to the life after death is that in the hereafter all those matters that were spiritual in this world will be physically personified whether in the state of bazzukh or in the state of resurrection. One of the relevant verses is: He who is blind in this life shall be blind in the hereafter and even more astray (17:73). This means that the spiritual blindness of this world will be felt physically in the other world. At another place it is said: Seize him and fetter him; and cast him into hell, and bind him with a chain the length of which is seventy yards (69:31-33). These verses show that the spiritual torment of this world will appear in physical form in the hereafter. The collar of worldly desires which had bent a person's head towards the earth will appear manifestly in the second life. In the same way the chain of worldly desires will be seen round the feet. The burning sensation of worldly desires will be seen as a fiercely flaming fire. A disobedient person has inside of him a hell of worldly desires and feels the burning of that hell in his failures. When he is cast away from his mortal desires and is confronted with eternal despair, God Almighty will cause this despair to appear to him as physical fire. As He has said: A curtain will be drawn between them and that which they desire (34:55). This will be the root of the torment. The direction to bind him with a chain the length of which is seventy yards is an indication that a disobedient one often attains the age of seventy years. Very often he is granted seventy years of active life leaving out of account his childhood and his extreme old age. The miserable one passes these seventy years caught in the desires of this world and does not wish to be free of this chain. Thus God Almighty says that the seventy years that he passed in his devotion to the world will be personified in the hereafter as a chain the length of which will be seventy yards, each yard corresponding to a year. It should be remembered that God Almighty imposes no distress from Himself upon a person, but confronts him with evil deeds. At another place it is said: Proceed towards a shelter which has three sections, neither affording shade nor protecting from the blaze (77:31-32). In this verse by the sections are meant the wild and the animal and the speculative faculties. These three faculties, of those who do not cast them into the moral mould and do not co-ordinate them, will be manifested on the Judgment Day as if they are three branches without leaves which can afford no protection from the blaze in which they will burn. Concerning the dwellers of paradise it is said: Call to mind the day when thou wilt see the believing men and believing women with their light running ahead of them and on their right hands (57:13); that is to say, the light of the believers that is hidden in this world will be manifested running ahead of them and on their right hands.

IN THE HEREAFTER SPIRITUAL CONDITIONS WILL BECOME VISIBLE

Another verse says: Call to mind the day when some faces will be bright and some faces will be gloomy (3:107). At another place it is said: The Garden promised to the righteous has rivers of water that is not corrupted; and rivers of milk of which the taste changes not; and rivers of wine full of delight for those who drink; and rivers of pure honey (47:16). At this place it is clearly stated that paradise may be understood as having endless streams flowing with these things. The water of life which a person possessing insight drinks spiritually in this life will be present overtly in the life to come. The spiritual milk of which he drinks spiritually like a suckling babe in this world, will be seen openly in paradise. The wine of the love of God with which he was spiritually inebriated in the world will be made manifest in paradise in streams. The honey of the sweetness of faith which one possessed of insight swallowed spiritually in the world will be felt and observed in the shape of streams in paradise. Every dweller of paradise shall display a spiritual condition openly in his rivers and his gardens and on that day God Himself will emerge from behind the veils for the dwellers of paradise. In short, spiritual conditions will be no longer hidden but will become physically visible.
THERE WILL BE CONTINUOUS PROGRESS IN HEAVEN

The third insight is that in the hereafter there will be unending progress. God Almighty has said: The light of those who have believed in Him will run before them and on their right hands. They will pray: Lord, perfect our light for us and forgive us, surely Thou hast power over all things (66:9). Their supplication for the perfection of their light indicates that their progress will be unlimited. They will attain one perfection of light and will then behold another, and will consider their previous perfection as deficient and will supplicate for a second perfection, and when they attain that they will behold a third stage of perfection and seeing that they will belittle their previous excellences and will desire that stage of perfection. This desire for progress is indicated by the expression: Perfect our light for us. In this way, an ever-growing system of progress will continue which will never suffer decline. They will not be expelled from paradise but will advance forward every day and will not move back. A question arises that having entered paradise, why should they seek forgiveness as their sins will have been forgiven? The answer is that the primary meaning of maghribat is the suppression and covering up of an imperfect condition. Dwellers of paradise will desire to obtain perfection and to be sunk altogether in light. On beholding the second condition they will find their first condition defective and they will seek to have it suppressed. Then beholding a third perfection, they will desire with regard to their second condition that it should be suppressed and hidden. Thus they will desire unending maghribat.

This is the same istighfar which some ignorant ones make the basis of criticism of the Holy Prophet, peace be on him, but it will now be clear that this desire for istighfar is the pride of man. A person who is born of woman and does not make istighfar his habit is an insect and not a man, is blind and not seeing and is foul and not pure (Islami Usul: ki Philosophy, pp. 94-99).

EDITORIAL - from page 12

case of a criminal trial when they committed any crime, a choice of being tried under their own Jewish Laws or Islamic laws. Christians and Jews were allowed to exercise their rights under their Civil Laws in matters like marriages, inheritance, adoption, gifts, wills, etc. It will not be out of place to mention here that even today the most advanced democratic states in Europe and America do not grant this freedom of exercise of Personal Laws to Muslims residing in their areas, and even to other religious communities. Umar, the second Caliph, appointed a Christian to the post of his personal Advisor on the financial matters of the Islamic State. The same Umar travelled all the way from Medina to Damascus to fulfill the desire of the Christians of that City to sign in person the Terms of the Surrender of the City. On signing the agreement, he handed back the keys of the city to its previous Christian Chief, let him remain the chief of the city and honored the Bishops of the City and not only let the Christian Churches function as usual, but also allowed them to collect revenue for meeting their expenses. Both facts and history give lie to the assertion of Mr. Martin that early Muslims considered it their sacred duty to murder everyone who did not embrace their religion.

Persecution on account of differences of belief is an evil which took birth and flourished in Christian Europe. The Jewish community residing in Europe over centuries has been subjected to persecution by the European Christians. Not only that, European history is blood-stained on account of killing of one sect of Christians at the hands of other Christian sects. After the conquest of Spain from Muslims, the Christian Rulers completely exterminated Muslims from Spain through mass massacres and compulsive conversions. Probably to console themselves for these extremely inhuman and barbarous acts on their part, the Christians keep coining false stories about Islam and Muslims.

INJUNCTIONS AND GUIDELINES OF THE QUR’AN

BY HAFEEZ-UR-RAHMAN KHAN, BAR-AT-LAW.

PILGRIMAGE

1. God says...it is no sin during pilgrimage to the House or a visit to it to go round Al-Safa and Al-Marwah...like the pre-Islamic pilgrims used to do). II:158

2. Allah says, there is a fixed season for pilgrimage. II:189.

3. These verses contain the command to perform pilgrimage--and the directions with regard to it. II 196-197.

4. These verses also contain directions as to what you may or may not do while on pilgrimage. II:196-97.

5. These verses also contain the directions as to what you should do if you cannot perform pilgrimage. II: 196-197.

6. Allah says pilgrimage to the House is a duty for him who can find a way to it (it is not an unconditional obligation; it is incumbent only on those who are able to undertake a journey to it). III:97.

7. Allah says, do not kill wild game while on pilgrimage. These verses also state, what should those who intentionally kill, do for expiation. V:1,95.

8. Allah says you may go hunting (after pilgrimage) after leaving the sacred area. V:2.

9. Allah says, hunting on the sea and eating sea-food is allowed during pilgrimage but hunting on land is forbidden during and so long as one is on pilgrimage. V:96.

10. On the day the people were assembled for the great pilgrimage (Hajj-e-Akbar which is a reference to 9th or 10th Dhul-Hajjah) an announcement was made from Allah that He and His messenger were free from any treaty obligations to the idolators except those who had not failed the Muslims in anything and had not backed up any one against Muslims. IX:3-4.

11. Allah asked Abraham to proclaim pilgrimage to the House in Mecca. XXII:27

12. This verse mentions the sacrifice (on pilgrimage) of cattle--to eat yourself and to feed the poor. XXII:28-33.

13. Allah says the people may end their unemptness after pilgrimage. XXII:29.

14. Allah says not the flesh, nor the blood of sacrificed animal reaches Allah, but to Him is acceptable the observance of duty on your part. XXII:37.

(To be continued in next issue)
ISLAM AND CHRISTIANITY
continued from page 6

must be made for every sin before man can be allowed to enter the Kingdom of Heaven. "God cannot and will not allow a single sin to go unpunished." Now, according to Christianity, the penalty of sin is death; God demands the shedding of blood to forgive sins: "Without the shedding of blood there is no forgiveness of sins" (Hebrews 9:22). But the blood that God will accept as a penalty or compensation for sin must be of a sinless man, and all men are sinners. As the original sin, being directed against God, was of infinite proportion, it demanded infinite recompense. "So Jesus Christ, the Son of God, came from Heaven to atone for the sins of men by his bloodshed on the cross: "Through Christ's death and resurrection, this salvation has been provided, to God's complete satisfaction. As Christ willingly hung upon the cross, He assumed the full liability of our guilt and sin, bore our sins on His own body and died as a substitutionary sacrifice on behalf of sinners. All God's judgement against sin fell on Him, and all God's righteous claims against the sins were fully satisfied by Christ's death on our behalf. The death and blood of Christ clears every man who accepts him as a Lord and Saviour of all his sins, original (inherited) as well as acquired. But those who do not believe in him and his death on behalf of man shall burn forever in the fires of hell. "To the sinner, who dies without accepting God's atonement, God's only remedy for sin (the vicarious sacrifice and blood of the Lord Jesus Christ), there awaits in addition the certainty of Eternal Punishment."

Thus, the Christian scheme of salvation has three parts: 1) That Adam's original sin is inherited by all the human race; every child is a sinner by birth, having an utterly depraved nature; 2) That the requirement of God's justice is that no sin should be allowed to go unpunished; 3) That Jesus Christ suffered and died on the cross for the sins of men to satisfy God's outraged justice; and that only those who believe in his vicarious sacrifice on their behalf and accept him as their Lord and Saviour will obtain salvation and enter the Kingdom of Heaven.

The Original Sin

Regarding the first part of the Christian scheme of salvation, the Original Sin and the sinfulness of all men, the author of the Catholic Teaching writes:

"Scripture teaches us that Adam's sin passed unto all men (our Blessed Lady excepted). For in the words of St. Paul: 'Therefore as by the offence of one (Adam) unto all men to condemnation; so also by the justice of one (Christ) unto all men to justification of life. For as by the disobedience of one man (Adam) many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one (Christ) many shall be made just' (Romans 5:18,19). These words make it plain that all men have inherited Adam's sin."

And that is what a fundamentalist Protestant writer, R.E. Harlow, says on the same subject:

"Adam's sin was personal, and because of it all men inherit a sin nature and have his sin imparted to them. For us today the order is the opposite. We have the inherited sin nature and hence we sin personally. We are not sinners merely because we sin, but we sin because we are sinners."

Like many other Christian beliefs, the doctrine that all men have inherited Adam's sin and are sinners by birth also finds no support in the sayings of Jesus or of the prophets who had come before him. They taught that every man was responsible and accountable for his own actions and that the sin of one man will not be imputed to another man. The children will not be punished for the sins of the father. It is written in the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah:

"In those days they shall no longer say: 'The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge.' But every one shall die for his own sin; each man who eats sour grapes, his teeth shall be set on edge."

The Prophet Ezekiel also rejected the dogma of the Original Sin in almost the same words:

"The word of the Lord came to me again: What do you mean by repeating this proverb concerning the Land of Israel, 'The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge?' As I live, says the Lord God, this proverb shall no more be used by you in Israel. Behold, all souls are Mine; the soul of the father as well as the soul of the son is Mine: the soul that sins shall die. If a man is righteous and does what is lawful and right—if he does not eat upon the mountains or lift up his eyes to the idols of the house of Israel, does not defile his neighbour's wife or approach a woman in her time of impurity, does not oppress any one, but restores to the debtor his pledge, commits no robbery, gives his bread to the hungry and covers the naked with a garment, does not lend at interest or take any increase, withholds his hand from iniquity, executes justice between man and man, walks in My statutes, and is careful to observe My ordinances—he is righteous, he shall surely live, says the Lord God...The son shall not suffer for the iniquity of the father, nor the father suffer for the iniquity of the son; the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon himself, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon himself. But if a wicked man turns away from all his sins which he has committed and keeps all My statutes and does what is lawful and right, he shall surely live; he shall not die."

That Jesus himself regarded children as innocent and pure and not as sinners by birth, having an utterly depraved nature, is clear from his reported sayings:

"Let the children come to me, do not hinder them; for to such belongs the kingdom of God. Truly, I say to you, whoever does not receive the kingdom of God like a child shall not enter it." (Mark 10:14-15).

Islam rejects the dogma of the Original Sin and regards the children as pure and sinless at birth. Sin, it says, is not inherited. It is something which a man acquires for himself by doing what he should not do and not doing what he should do. Rationally considered also, it would be the height of injustice to condemn the entire human race for the sin committed thousands of years ago by the first parents. If a man sins because he is a sinner by birth, having an utterly depraved and sinful nature, then he is not responsible for his sins and deserves no punishment for them. As a matter of fact, sin is a willful transgression of the law of God, of the law of right and wrong. The responsibility—or blame for it must lie only on the person committing it, and not on his children.

Man is born with a free will, with the inclination and capacity to do evil and also to fight against it and do good. It is only when as a grown-up man, capable of distinguishing between right and wrong, makes a wrong use of his freedom and falls a prey to temptation, then he becomes guilty of sin. That many men and women have resisted and conquered evil inclinations and lived their lives in harmony with the will of God is clear from the sacred records of all nations. The Bible itself mentions Enoch, Noah, Job, Joseph, John the Baptist and many others as being perfect and upright and among those who feared God and eschewed evil.

It is nothing short of misanthropy to consider children to be sinners by birth. How unreasonable and hard-hearted a person can become by believing in the dogma of the inherited sin is shown by the theological dictum of St. Augustine that all unbaptized infants are doomed to burn eternally in hell. Till recently, the unbaptized children, when they died, were not buried on consecrated grounds in Christendom, because they were believed to have died in original sin. The very basis of
the doctrine of the Atonement, that is the belief in the Original Sin, having been found to be wrong on the authority of both reason and Jesus Christ, the superstition of dogma built on it must ipso facto be wrong. But let us consider the Christian scheme of salvation a little further.

**God's Justice**

The second part of the Christian scheme of salvation is that God's justice requires that 'the penalty of sin must be paid. God must punish sin.' If God were to pardon a sinner without exacting the penalty of sin, it would be a denial of His justice. The Rev. W. Goldsack writes in this connection:

"It should be as clear as daylight to anyone that God cannot violate His own laws. He cannot forgive a sinner without first inflicting the full measure of punishment. If He acted otherwise, who would call Him just?" 19

This view shows complete ignorance of the nature of God. God is not a mere judge or king. He is, as the Quran describes Him, "Master of the Day of Judgement." He is not only Just, but also Merciful and Forgiving. If He finds some good in a man or sees that he is sincerely repentant, having the desire and resoluteness to conquer his own evil impulses, then He may forgive his failings and sins altogether. This can be by no stretch of imagination be called a violation of His justice. After all, the only right motive or reason for punishing a man is to check evil and reform the offender. To punish a person for his past transgressions, even after he has repented and reformed himself, is a sign of vengeance and not of justice. A God whose 'justice' demands the meting out of the full measure of punishment for every fall and sin of man is no better than Shylock. The God of the Quran—the Creator and Sustainer of all the worlds—is the God of love and mercy. He judges a man on the basis of his intention and efforts. If He prescribes a law and a way and demands obedience, it is not for His own benefit, but for the benefit of mankind. If He punished a man for his transgressions and sins it is not for His own satisfaction, as the Christian theology proclaims, but to check evil and purify the sinner. When a man commits a sin, he does not harm God, He harms his own soul. Hell itself is like a hospital, where the spiritually and morally ill—those suffering from the discourses of selfishness, malice, hatred, falsehood, dishonesty, greed, impurity, etc.—are cured by the fire of remorse and distress. But those who have the persistent urge to do good and the sincerely repentant will find God ever-ready to forgive their failures and sins without punishing them or any other person on their behalf. It is wrong to say that God must punish sin. True repentance erases sin, in the sight of God. Is this not what the Prophet Ezekiel declared in the verses of the Bible that we have quoted above? And is this not what Jesus taught in His beautiful parables of the Lost Sheep, the Lost Coin and the Prodigal Son? Jesus taught us to pray in these words: "Forgive us our debts, as we also have forgiven our debtors" (Matthew 6:12). And He added: "For if you forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father also will forgive you; but if you do not forgive men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses" (Matthew 6:14-15). He also said: "Those who are well have not need of a physician, but those who are sick; I have not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance" (Luke 5:31-32). "There will be more joy in heaven over one sinner who repents then over ninety-nine righteous persons who need no repentance" (Luke 15:7). Forgiveness of a sinner after inflicting the full measure of punishment on him, or on some other person on his behalf, is no forgiveness at all. God can and does forgive the shortcomings and sins of those who are trying their best to eschew evil and do good, and of the sincerely repentant, without punishing them or any other person on their behalf—and this is not a violation of God's justice. In fact, this alone is true forgiveness. Thus, we read in the Quran:

"Say: O my people, who have acted extravagantly against your own souls, do not despair of the mercy of God; for God forgives the sins of many. For He is the Forgiving, the Merciful. So turn to your Lord repentant and submit to Him before there comes to you the chastisement, then you will not be helped" (39:53-54). "And whoever does evil or wrongs his own soul, then asks forgiveness of God (and reforms himself), will find God Forgiving, Merciful. And whoever commits a sin, commits it only against himself. And God is All-knowing, Wise" (4:110-111).

**Vicarious Sacrifice**

The third part of the Christian scheme of salvation is that Jesus suffered and died vicariously in place of the sinners to give satisfaction to God's outraged justice, and that no one can obtain forgiveness of sins and gain salvation and eternal life except by believing in Jesus Christ as His Lord and Saviour and accepting his vicarious or substituting sacrifice on his behalf. This is what we read in the First Epistle of St. Peter:

"For as must as you know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold...but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot." 20

And this is what modern Christian writers (a Roman Catholic and a Protestant) have written:

"Since Christ, God and man, has taken upon Himself our sin (by His death on the cross) in order to atone for them by giving satisfaction to God's outraged justice, He is the Mediator between God and man. 21 On the cross He bore our sins, took our place, endured all the judgement due to our sins, and by His death, satisfied all God's demands against the sinner. God has indicated His acceptance of the substitutionary sacrifice of His Son by raising Him from the dead." 22

This dogma is not only a denial of the mercy of God but also of His justice. To inflict the full measure of punishment and demand the price of blood in order to forgive the sins of man is to show a complete lack of mercy, and to punish a man who is not guilty for the sins of others is the height of injustice.

The Christian apologists try to defend the dogma of the Vicarious Sacrifice by saying that Jesus Christ willingly suffered death to pay the penalty for the sins of men. To this our reply is: First, it is historically incorrect to say that Jesus had come to die willingly and deliberately for the sins of men. We read in the Bible that He did not wish to die on the cross. For, when he learnt that his enemies were plotting against his life, he declared that his "soul was exceedingly sorrowful unto death". He asked his disciples to keep watch over him, to protect him from his enemies, and he prayed to God: "Abba, Father, all things are possible to Thee; remove this cup from me; yet not what I will, but what Thou wilt" (Mark 14:36). Commenting on this, the author of *The Messianic Psalms* (An Emissary Correspondence Course) writes the following:

"Here is our blessed Lord pleading with His Father, while His three favoured disciples, a stone's throw away, sink in sleep. It is not that He feared that Satan would overwhelm and slay Him, as some have deduced, but rather He is speaking as a man. He has borne heavy trials and tremendous physical burdens. His humanity cried out for life, and naturally shrank from a termination of that life in the midst of His days." 23

Secondly, we fail to see how the suffering and death of one man can wipe out the sins of other men. It seems something like the physician breaking his own head to cure the headache of his Patients. Even if the innocent person is willing to become
a scapegoat for other persons, it would still be wrong and unjust to lay the innocent in place of the guilty. The Christian apologists sometimes compare the penalty of sin to the debt of money that one man owes to another, and the payment of the penalty of sin by Jesus on behalf of the sinners of the debtor on the latter's behalf. This analogy is totally wrong. The taking of the life of a man as a punishment cannot be compared to the payment of a debt of money. Life is something organic to a man, whereas money is something external to him, something which he possesses as an object extraneous to and apart from him. Money may be paid be one man on behalf of another. But if the penalty is in the form of death, it cannot be inflicted on an innocent person in place of the guilty person. The idea of substitutionary or vicarious sacrifice is absolutely unjust and inhuman.

Thirdly, the idea that shedding of blood is necessary to appease the wrath of God has come into Christianity from the primitive man's image of God as an all-powerful demon, who had to be propitiated by bloody sacrifices. We see no connection at all between sin and shedding of blood. What is necessary to wash away sin is not the shedding of blood, but repentance, remorse, constant struggle against evil inclinations and desires, the performance of good and kind deeds, and the determination to carry out the will of God as revealed to us through the Prophets. The Quran says, "There does not reach God their flesh nor their blood, but to Him is acceptable righteousness on your part" (22:37).

The doctrine of the Atonement makes the First Person of the Godhead into a blood-thirsty tyrant in order to demonstrate the self-sacrificing love of the Second Person. To a dispassionate student, the sacrifice of the Second Person appears as much misplaced and purposeless as the demand of the First Person is cruel and sadistic.

Arthur Weigall makes the following significant comment on the doctrine of the Atonement:

"We can no longer accept the appalling theological doctrine that for some mystic reason a propitiatory sacrifice was necessary. It outrages either our conception of God as Almighty or else our conception of Him as All-loving. The famous Dr. Cranbrook believed that for the purpose of this sacrifice 'Christ suffered dreadful pains inflicted by God,' and this, of course, is a standpoint which nauseates the modern mind and which may well be termed a hideous doctrine, not unconnected with the sadistic tendencies of primitive human nature. Actually, it is of pagan origin, being, indeed, perhaps, the most obvious relic of heathendom in the Faith."

The Christian scheme of salvation is not only morally and rationally unsound, but it also has no support of the words of Jesus. Jesus may be said to have suffered for the sins of man in the sense that, in order to take them out of darkness into light, he incurred the wrath of the hardened fanatics and evildoers and was persecuted by them. But that does not mean that his death was an atonement for the sins of others and that only those who believe in him as their Saviour and accept his vicarious sacrifice on their behalf will be forgiven and saved. Jesus had come to rescue men from sin by his teachings and the example of his godly life, and not by deliberately dying for them on the cross and offering his blood as a propitiation for their sins. When a young man came and asked him: 'Good Master, what must I do to inherit eternal life?' he mentioned nothing about faith in him as the Redeemer or his vicarious sacrifice for the sins of men. His reply was the same as that of every other prophet of God; he said:

"Why callest thou me good? There is none good, but one, that is, God. But if thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments."

"Keep the commandments"--that, according to Jesus, was the way to eternal life. Salvation could be gained by believing in God, eschewing evil and doing good and kind deeds, and not by making Jesus the scapegoat for one's sins and believing in his so-called substitutionary atonement.

The doctrine of the Atonement is unsound, for (1) man does not inherit Adam's sin and is not born in sin, 2) God's justice does not demand penalty for every sin; it is not correct to say that sin must be punished before God can forgive the sinner, 3) the idea of vicarious or substitutionary sacrifice is unjust and inhuman. By sinning we do not harm God, but ourselves. The stain of sin on our souls can be removed, not by the suffering and death of any other person, but by our own repentance, turning away from evil and doing good. And so, when Adam, after the act of disobedience, repented and submitted himself completely to God, his sin was forgiven. Neither is the sin of Adam inherited by the children of Adam; nor was it necessary for Jesus to suffer and die to atone for the original and other sins of Adam's race. The truth is that Jesus did not die on the cross at all.

Islam rejects the doctrine of the Atonement. It declares that the forgiveness of sins cannot be obtained by the suffering and sacrifice of any other person, but by the grace of God and our own sincere repentance and persistent efforts to fight against evil and do good. Says the Quran:

"That no bearer of burden bears another's burden, and that man can have nothing but what he strives for, and that his striving will soon be seen. Then will he be rewarded for it with the fullest reward; and that to thy Lord is the goal" (53:38-42).

"Whoever goes aright, for his own soul does he go aright; and whoever goes astray, to its detriment only does he go astray. And no bearer of burden can bear the burden of another." (17:15).

Islam promises salvation and eternal life to all those who believe in God and do good deeds:

"Nay, whoever submits himself entirely to God and he is the doer of good to others, he has his reward from his Lord, and there is no fear for such nor shall they grieve" (2:112).

The healthy balance Islam insists upon between Faith and Works, writes Duncan Greenless, "was a needed corrective to the doctrine that a God's suffering has magic power to take away our sins if we declare belief in it. The great trend in the modern West towards Unitarian belief and Theism is largely due to the influence of Islam as Europe's nearest neighbors...Islam has always stood manfully against priestcraft, magic, fetishism, and the worship of the dead and of the saints. Thus it has been a strong force working towards same religion."

Islamic---A Rational Religion

We have examined above the basic doctrines of Christianity. Our study has led us to the conclusion that the doctrines of the Trinity, the Divinity of Jesus, the Divine-Sonship of Jesus, the Original Sin and the Atonement are neither rational nor in conformity with the teachings of Jesus. These dogmas were formulated long after Jesus, as a result of pagan influence. They show that the Christianity of the various churches is not the religion of Jesus.

Islam is a revival and restatement of the religion of Jesus and of all other prophets. The religion revealed to the prophets of the different nations was the same, but in the course of time it was misinterpreted, because mixed up with superstitions and false beliefs, and degenerated into magical practices and meaningless rituals. The conception of God, the very core of religion, was debased by a) the anthropomorphic tendency of making God into a being with..."
a human form and human passions, b) the association of other persons with the one and only God in the Godhead (e.g., the plurality of gods in Hinduism, and the Trinity of persons in the Godhead in Christianity), c) the deification of the angels (e.g., the Devas in Hinduism, the Yozatag in Loroastrianism, and the Holy Spirit in Christianity), d) the mystification of the prophets: making them into the incarnations of God (e.g., Jesus Christ in Christianity, the Buddha in Mahayana Buddhism, and Rama and Krishna in Hinduism), e) the personification of the attributes of God: into separate Divine Persons (e.g., the Christian Trinity of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, the Hindu Trimurti of Brahma, Vishnu and Shiva, and the Amesh Spentas of Loroastrianism). The Prophet Muhammad criticized these irrational theologies and restored to its pristine purity the conception of God as the One Self-existing Reality, the Creator and Sustainer of all the worlds, the Loving-kind, the Accepter of Repentance, the Effacer of sins, the All-Merciful, the All-Forgiving, the All-good, the Holy, the Omniscient, the Omnresent, the Eternal, the Infinite. He purged religion of all superstitions, false beliefs and meaningless rituals, widens its scope to make it a source of inspiration and guidance to the entire human race, and united the peoples of all races, colours and nations into one Faith and one Universal brotherhood.

Islam is a religion without mythology. Its teachings and doctrines are simple and rational. Its appeal is to human reason and conscience. The truth of the Islamic doctrine of the Unity and Goodness of God is brought home to us by the study and contemplation of the cosmos, where we find the all-pervading unity behind the manifest diversity, by the experiences of the mystics of all religions and nations, by the teachings of all the prophets, and finally by the apologies of the Trinitarians, who, despite their belief in three Divine persons, declare that there is but one God. The truth of the other Islamic doctrines follows logically from the belief in the unity and goodness of God. If there is only one God, then all human beings are the creatures of the same God and are equal in His sight—and hence, the Islamic belief in the equality and brotherhood of all men. If God is the Creator and Nourisher of all the worlds, He must provide not only for the physical needs of man, but also for his moral and spiritual needs, by revealing to man the path of truth and righteousness—and hence, the Islamic belief in Divine Inspiration. Moreover, Divine Inspiration must come wherever and whenever needed, and for revealing His messages, God must choose men who are completely devoted to truth and are leading a godly and sinless life, men who can serve as perfect models for other men and inspire them to follow the true path—and hence, the Islamic belief in the Prophets of all the nations. And finally, if God is the God of Goodness and His plan of creating the world and making man a free moral agent is not frivolous and meaningless, then there must be the Life-after-death, where men may reap the fruits of their beliefs and actions and continue their blissful journey to God and in God—and hence, the Islamic belief in the Hereafter.

The famous Italian Orientalist, Dr. Laura Veccia Vaglieri, writes the following about the universal and rational spirit of Islam in her book *An Interpretation of Islam:*

"The Arabian Prophet, with a voice which was inspired by a deep communion with his Maker, preached the purest monotheism, to the worshipers of fetish and the followers of a corrupt Christianity and Judaism. He put himself in open conflict with those regressive tendencies of mankind which lead to the association of other beings with the Creator.

"In order to lead man to a belief in one God, he did not delude them with tales of happenings which deviate from the normal course of nature—the so-called miracles; nor did he compel them to keep quiet by using celestial threats which only undermine man's ability to think. Rather, he simply invited them, without asking them to leave the realm of reality, to consider the universe and its laws. Being confident of the resultant belief in the one and indispensable God, he simply let men read in the book of life. Muhammad Abdul Meer Ali both state that Muhammad was content to appeal to the intuitive conscience of the individual and to the intuitive judgement of man."

After quoting some relevant verses from the Holy Quran, the learned author continues:

"Thanks to Islam, paganism in its various forms was defeated. The concept of the universe, the practices of religion, and the customs of social life were each liberated from all the monstrosities which had degraded them, and human mind was made free of prejudice. Man finally realized this dignity. He humbled himself before the Creator, the Master of all mankind... "The spirit was liberated from prejudice, man's will was set free from the tics which had kept it bound to the will of other men, or other so-called hidden powers. Priests, false guardians of mysteries, brokers of salvation, all those who pretended to be mediators between God and man and consequently believed they had authority over other people's will, fell from their pedestals. Man became the servant of God alone and towards other men he had only the obligations of one free man towards other free men. While previously there were social differences, Islam proclaimed equality among human beings. Each Muslim was distinguished from other Muslims not by reason of birth or any other factor not connected with his personality, but only by fear of God, his good deeds, his moral and intellectual qualities."

Islam is the universal message of unity—the unity of God, the unity of all religions, the unity of the prophets of all the nations, and the unity of all mankind.

---

**Footnotes**

7. ibid., p. 299.
14. What the Bible Teaches (An Emmanus Correspondence Course), published by Emmanus Bible School, Oak Park, Illinois (USA); Chapter 4 ("Sin"). 6-7 ("The New Birth"). 8 ("Salvation").
DOES CHRISTIANITY FORBID POLYGAMY?

By M.A. Sorma

It has often been asserted that Christianity interdicted polygamy, and made monogamy obligatory on all. Nothing can be farther from the truth.

Ameer Ali, speaking of the general prevalence of polygamy among all nations, remarks:

"And so it was understood by the leaders of Christendom at various times that there is no intrinsic immorality or sinfulness in plurality of wives, One of the greatest Fathers of the Christian Church (St. Augustine) has declared that polygamy is not a crime where it is a legal institution of a country, and the German reformers, even as late as the sixteenth century, allowed and declared valid the taking of a second or even a third wife, contemporaneously with the first, in default of issue, or any other cause", (Ameer Ali, Life and Teachings of Muhammed, p. 220, and also Ameer Ali, Mahomedan Law, vol. ii. p. 23).

When Christianity made its appearance in Rome, history shows that polygamy was recognized and the early Christian Emperors seem to have admitted its validity. Says Ameer Ali:

"The Emperor Valentinian II, by an

edict, allowed all the subjects of the empire, if they pleaded, to marry several wives, nor does it appear from the ecclesiastical history of those times that the Bishops and the heads of the Christian Churches made any objection to the law. Far from it; all the succeeding Emperors practised polygamy, and the people generally were not remiss in following their example. Even the clergy often had several wives. This state of the laws continued until the time of Justinian, when the concentrated wisdom and experience of thirteen centuries of progress and development in the arts of life (combined with the Semitic influences not only on the two religions, but also of those great jurists who preeminently belonged to that race) resulted in their embodiment in the celebrated laws of Justinian. But these laws owed little to Christianity, at least directly. The greatest adviser of Justinian was an atheist and a pagan. Even the prohibition of polygamy by Justinian failed to check the tendency of the age. The law represented the advancement of thought; its influence was confined to a few thinkers, but to the mass it was practically a dead letter". (Ameer Ali, Life and Teachings of Mohammed, pp. 222-3).

John Milton, the great English poet, discussing the merits and demerits of polygamy, observed:

"In the definition which I have given (i.e. of marriage) I have not said, in compliance with the common opinion, of one man with one woman, lest I should by implication charge the holy patriarchs and pillars of our faith, Abraham, and the others who had more than one wife at the same time, with habitual fornication and adultery, lest I should be forced to exclude from the sanctuary of God as spurious the holy offspring which sprang from them; yea, the whole of the sons of Israel, for whom the sanctuary itself was made. For it is said (Deut. xxiii. 2): "A bastard shall not enter into the congregation of Jehovah, even to his tenth generation." Either, therefore, polygamy is a true marriage or all children born in that state are spurious; which would include the whole race of Jacob, the twelve holy tribes chosen by God. But as such an assertion would be absurd in the extreme, not to say impious, and as it is the height of injustice, as well as an example of most dangerous tendency in religion, to account as sin what is not such in reality, it appears true that, so far from the question respecting the lawfulness of polygamy being trivial, it is of the highest importance that it should be decided". (Milton, A Treatise on Christian Doctrine, pp. 231-2).

A study of certain texts in the Bible clearly admits the lawfulness of polygamy.

For instance:

(a) "If he take him another wife, her food, her raiment, and her duty of marriage shall he not diminish". (Exod. xix. 10).

(b) "And I gave thee (David) thy master's house, and thy master's wives into thy bosom, and gave thee the house of Israel and of Judah; and if that had been too little, I would moreover have given unto thee much and such things". (2 Sam. xii. 8).

Milton argues that the wives of Saul, given to David by the above text, were the virgins in the house of Saul, and therefore David did not commit incest, since Saul was his father-in-law. (Milton, op. cit. pp. 238-9).

(c) "King's daughters were among thy honourable women: upon thy right hand did stand the queen in gold of Ophir". (Psa. xiv. 9).

(d) "And Joash did that which was right in the sight of the Lord all the days of Jehoiada the priest". (2 Chron. xxiv. 2).

(e) "And Jehoiada took for him two wives; and he begat sons and daughters". (2 Chron. xxiv. 3).

From a consideration of the above texts and others from the Bible, Milton argues:

"On what grounds, however, can a practice be considered dishonourable or shameful which is prohibited to no one even under the Gospel? For that dispensation annuls none of the merely civil regulations which existed previous to its introduction. It is only enjoined that elders and deacons should be chosen from such as were husbands of one wife, (1 Tim. iii. 2, and Titus i. 6). This implies, not that to be the husband of more than one wife would be a sin, but in that case the restriction would have been equally imposed on all, but that in proportion as they were less entangled in domestic affairs they would be more at leisure for the business of the Church. Since, therefore, polygamy is interdicted in this passage to ministers of the Church alone, and that not on account of any sinfulness in the practice, and since none of the other members are precluded from it either here or elsewhere, it follows that it was permitted, as above said, to all the remaining members of the Church, and that it was adopted by many without offence". (Milton, op. cit., pp. 240-41).
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"If greatness of purpose, smallness of means, and astounding results are the three criteria of human genius, who could dare to compare any great man in modern history with Muhammad? . . . Philosopher, orator, apostle, legislator, warrior, conqueror of ideas, restorer of rational dogmas, of a cult without images; the founder of twenty terrestrial empires and of one spiritual empire, that is Muhammad. As regards all standards by which human greatness may be measured, we may well ask: Is there any man greater than he?"

—Alphonse de Lamartine in *Histoire de la Turquie*

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

—Bosworth Smith

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

—*New Researches* by H. Hirschfeld

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

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

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

—George Bernard Shaw