

Vol. IV.

No. 3.

# THE REVIEW OF RELIGIONS

MARCH 1905.

Digitized by Khilafat Library

---

## CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
POLYGAMY ... ..	83
THE NECESSITY OF POLYGAMY ... ..	84
THE FEELING FOSTERED BY THE ARYA SAMAJ ...	95
UNION OF JUDAISM AND CHRISTIANITY ...	102
A CHRISTIAN GOVERNMENT AND THE MUHAMMA- DANS ... ..	110
REVIEW ... ..	117
AN EXHORTATION ... ..	119

---

QADIAN,

DISTRICT GURDASPUR, PUNJAB, INDIA.

---

Annual Subscription ... Rs.4. | Single Copy As. 6.

---



# THE REVIEW OF RELIGIONS.

VOL. IV.)

MARCH 1905.

(No. 3.

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

لنحمدہ ونصلی علی رسولہ الکریم

## Polygamy.

### POLYGAMY AND ADULTERY.

Polygamy is unfortunately one of the words whose very sound is so offensive to European ears that they cannot enter upon a discussion of this subject with a dispassionate mind. The strong prejudice against polygamy is a great impediment in the formation of a calm judgment in the way of those who have been taught from their birth to look upon this institution as a most horrible evil. It is strange that while the West is practically indifferent to the black crimes of fornication and seduction, and looks upon these evils as ordinary occurrences in civilized life, its hatred for polygamy knows no bounds. A wonderful contrast is brought to light when we see on the one hand the leniency of the West for adultery and seduction, and look on the other at its increasing stringency against polygamy. While the slightest punishment is deemed too great for the former, the heaviest is regarded too slight in the case of the latter, and fine, imprisonment and proscription are all considered as justifiable means for the extirpation of polygamy. It is for the detractors of polygamy to explain this anomaly in their conduct. If we were asked to state our opinion, we would venture to say that the great stringency of the regulations against polygamy has made adultery more bearable than it ought to have been. The course of nature cannot be prevented, and therefore the stopping of the legal means must lead to illegal ones, and hatred for right at last generates a love for wrong. While, therefore, we would do our best to give our reasons for the necessity of the permission of polygamy, we



hope to be informed of the reasons for which polygamy is regarded as a more horrible evil than adultery or seduction. We would divide this subject into three heads, the necessity of polygamy, its sanction in Islam, and the refutation of objections against it.

## 1.—THE NECESSITY OF POLYGAMY.

OBJECTS OF MARRIAGE. Polygamy or more properly polygyny is as much a necessity of human nature as marriage itself, though not of so universal a nature. While monogamy must remain the rule, the exception of polygamy cannot be dispensed with without doing evil to human society. The institution of marriage is designed to guard the interests of human society. It is designed, for instance, to prevent the promiscuous mixing of the two sexes, to bring about the object of procreation while preserving the knowledge of parentage, to preserve the happiness which a man can have in the company of woman and lastly to inspire holy feelings into a man and to prevent impurity from entering into his ideas. The last mentioned object is really the most important of all and therefore we would consider it first of all.

THE INNATE DESIRE OF  
MAN FOR WOMAN.

The desire which man has for woman and *vice versa* is a requirement of human nature. It is this desire which fulfilled through the sacred institution of marriage becomes the holy feeling of love and the basis of the purest affections that spring in human heart, while the same desire fulfilled independently of the sacred tie of marriage is the root from which the basest evils spring. Through marriage, therefore, a man attains to purity of ideas and through marriage many of the evil inclinations are kept back. It should be borne in mind that the desire to which we have referred above, is a desire placed by nature in all human beings, and it is a most serious error to regard it as a base passion. It is the illegal or improper gratification of this desire that makes it an evil, but the desire itself has been placed in humanity by the hand of God and is therefore intended to bring about some noble objects in the life of man. The early Christians had a misconception regarding this desire and it was for this reason that their views on marriage were erroneous. For a long time it was



thought that this innate desire in man was a base desire and hence marriage was hated and celibacy was regarded as the perfection of humanity. There is nothing more untrue than that. The perfection of humanity consists not in the total suppression of this desire for this is doing violence to human nature, but in its gratification in a proper manner, i.e., through marriage. No faculty which has been placed in man by the hand of God is in itself a thing which should be hated or condemned: it is always the abuse of these faculties that is pernicious to human society and which must, therefore, be looked upon as an immorality.

#### MARRIAGE.

Marriage then is an institution which provides for the legal gratification of the desire which man and woman have for each other. Our first consideration in the present discussion is, therefore, the adopting of means which should provide for a proper gratification of the innate desire of man for woman, and the institution of marriage should be so regulated as to place within the reach of every man the proper means of the gratification of this desire and not to give him any occasion for its improper gratification. Considered from this point of view, the polygamous marriage is as much a necessity of human nature, though in exceptional cases, as the monogamous marriage. Cases would arise and do arise when a man would stand in need of another wife, and if the laws of marriage are not so framed as to provide for these exceptional cases whenever and wherever they may arise, they are defective. Such exceptions are not moreover rare, and no one can deny their existence throughout the whole world. No civilized country is free from them, and in monogamous countries the need is as clearly felt as in polygamous countries. But this need is supplied in the latter by the sacred institution of polygamy, while in the former the prohibition of polygamy leads to adultery and to various other evils.

#### CHRISTIAN WRITERS ON POLYGAMY.

The necessity of polygamy has been admitted even in Christian countries, and it is for this reason that in spite of the strong prejudice against this practice which distorted notions of marriage have created many writers had the moral courage to write in defence of polygamy. Says Davenport in his "Apology": "Many works have been published



in defence of polygamy even by writers professing Christianity. Bernardino Ochinus, General of the Order of Capuchins, published, about the middle of the sixteenth century, dialogues in favour of the practice, and about the same time appeared a treatise on behalf of a plurality of wives; the author, whose real name was Lysarus, having assumed the pseudo one of Theophilus Aleuthes. Selden proves, in his 'Uxor Hebraica,' that polygamy was allowed not only among the Jews, but likewise among all other nations. But the most distinguished defender of polygamy was the celebrated John Milton."

PIETY IS A NEED OF  
POLYGAMY.

We will now consider some of the more prominent causes which necessitate polygamy as a means for the gratification of the innate desire of man for woman. First of all is piety. Some men are by nature endowed with greater power of manhood than is the case with ordinary men and hence one wife is not sufficient for them. If they are not allowed to take a second wife, it is inevitable that they would fall into evil ways. As stated above, adultery is one of the evils which destroys the purity of human heart and generates a poison in it, and therefore it is essential that some remedy should be pointed out as a safeguard against the evil in such a case. That such cases would arise cannot be doubted for a moment. In the case of women there are intervals of menstruation courses, about a week in every month, ~~during which the wife is unable~~ to perform certain obligations of family life. And while no woman is free from such disability, it does not attend the male sex. Again besides these regular periods of disability, there are other circumstances in family life attending women which disable them from the performance of certain duties towards their husbands. For instance there is the state of pregnancy, at least its advanced stage, during which a woman should refrain from sexual connection for the sake of her own health and that of the foetus. This disability attends the woman for several months, and even after delivery she is unfit for a long time to attend to her conjugal obligations. Now during all these periods while there are natural barriers against the arising of the natural desire for man in the heart of woman, there is no such barrier in the male sex. While we are prepared to admit that the majority of men would not stand in need of another wife during such intervals



of the disability of the wife, no sensible person can deny that there are also men who have greater power and stronger passions which are by no means to be condemned, who would go astray if they were not allowed legal means for the gratification of those innate desires during such intervals. Let any detractor of polygamy suggest a better remedy for such cases and we would admit the uselessness of polygamy. But as long as such cases must arise, and as long as no other remedy is pointed out, the permission of polygamy must meet with the approval of every well-wisher of humanity. For, the only other course open in the absence of polygamy is adultery, the evils of which are universally admitted. If it be said that such men should be forced to remain content with one wife only, we would say this would be indirectly leading them into adultery. When nature has endowed them with stronger powers, some way must be pointed out to them for the exercise of those powers which are given by none other than God Himself. It would be as unreasonable to tell them that they should not take more than one wife as to force an impotent man who is deprived by nature of the desire for woman, to have a wife and fulfil the obligations of a husband. But just as there are in God's creation those who are deprived of the power of manhood, so there are others who are endowed with an abundance of it, and a universal law must look to their convenience as much as to the convenience of the majority. However small their minority, some provision must be made for them, and the only provision that can be made is to allow them to have more than one wife. This is, therefore, a strong reason why polygamy should be permitted.

NOT AN EVIL BUT A REMEDY AGAINST EVILS. It would appear from the above that polygamy instead of being an evil is a strong safeguard against evil and the true way to piety. This to our mind is the strongest need of polygamy. The truth of this argument is also clear from several other considerations. In the first place it would be seen that adultery prevails to a far greater extent in countries where polygamy is prohibited than in countries where it is sanctioned. This is a fact admitted by even the Christians, for the most zealous supporters of Christianity have had to admit that the Muhammadan countries are far above the Christian countries in respect of chastity. The growth of a polygamous sect in Christendom in the last century



has cast further light upon the truth of these remarks. It is admitted by the Christians that when polygamy was practised in Mormondom, adultery was almost unknown in comparison with its prevalence in the neighbouring states. Testimony to this effect was produced in our last when writing on Mormonism. It was further shown that the statistics of illegitimate births in Europe and other Christian countries revealed a terrible reign of adultery there. Secondly, the lives of most great men admittedly pure, show that they practised polygamy. Instances of this are seen in all countries. The great prophets of Israel were most of them the practisers of polygamy. Among the Hindus too many of the great *rishis* had a plurality of wives, and this at a time when India was at the height of its civilization. Now these great men were sacred teachers of humanity who taught the purest and noblest rules of morality, and enjoined their followers to observe rules of conduct which should keep off evil ideas from their hearts. So great was their love for God and their love for truth and piety that for His sake and out of a desire to spread purity upon earth, they underwent all sorts of persecutions and willingly sacrificed their own interests to the welfare of society. They looked upon adultery as a most horrible crime, and to them there was no other crime of so heinous a nature as adultery. Purity of heart was the one thing upon which they laid stress. It is very remarkable that men so alike in their characteristics and yet so different as regards the ages and countries in which they appeared, could all have regarded polygamy as a safeguard against evil, and adultery as the greatest evil that could affect human society. In fact the concurrent testimony of the righteous of all ages and countries proves with clearness that polygamy is a sacred institution that guards society against the horrible evil of adultery.

**PHYSIOLOGICAL REASONS.** Davenport argues the necessity of polygamy from another point of view and we quote his argument in his own words. Thus he says: "With respect to the physiological reasons for polygamy, it has been observed by the celebrated Montesquieu that women in hot climates are marriagable at eight, nine or ten years of age; thus, in those countries, infancy and marriage almost always go together. They are old at twenty. Their reason, therefore, never accompanies their beauty. When beauty demands the empire, the want of reason forbids the claim; when reason is obtained, beauty is



no more. These women must necessarily be in a state of dependence; for reason cannot procure in old age, that empire which even youth and beauty combined could not bestow. It is, therefore, extremely natural that in these places . . . polygamy should be introduced." From these remarks made by an unprejudiced critic of Islam, it is clear that apart from considerations which prevail in every society, polygamy becomes especially a necessity in hot climates. And we may further add that in all climates, old age overtakes women sooner than men. The genital powers of men, therefore, generally last longer than those of women, and in certain cases polygamy would be a necessity in all countries and among all people. A law, therefore, cannot be of universal application which prohibits polygamy, for such a law would require men whose powers are preserved to old age to fall into the evil of adultery or do violence to themselves.

#### REASONS OF THE EX- CESS OF FEMALES.

These are the necessities of the male sex which can be only provided for by polygamy.

But the female sex itself very often stands in need of the permission of polygamy. Hundreds of thousands of men are cut off every year in this or that part of the world in the wars which take place between different nations, while the life of not a single female is lost on that account. The unfortunate struggle of England with the Boers in South Africa and the Russo-Japanese war are two recent instances which show how many thousands of men are taken away. These occurrences which must take place so long as the world exists, and which are in fact a necessity of national existence, bring about a preponderance of the female sex over the male sex. Even if we suppose that this preponderance is only temporary, and that when the surplus number of females has died out, an equality of the sexes is again brought about, still it is necessary that some provision for the surplus number of females should be made so long as it exists. But unless we open the way of polygamy for them, and allow them to be taken as wives by men who are already married, many of them would fall into the evil of adultery. We do not mean to say that every female thus widowed or left unprovided for, must necessarily be married. All that we desire to say is that some way must be left open to them if they desire to enter into conjugal relations, and except polygamy there is no other such way.



PREPONDERANCE OF THE  
FEMALE OVER THE MALE  
SEX IN EUROPE.

It is necessary to refer in this connection to the great preponderance of the female over the male sex in many of the European countries. The excess of the females over the males was in the Census of 1901, in England 1,082,619 (there being 1,069 females to every thousand males); in Scotland, 125,698; in Ireland, 61,068; giving a total of 1,269,385 females in excess of males in Great Britain. And to these figures must be added the loss of the English in Transvaal. France showed in 1896 an excess of 423,703 females over the males. The returns of the Census of Germany for 1900 show a total population of 56,367,178 in which the ratio of females to males is 1,052 to 1,000, giving an excess of 887,648 females over males. In Sweden in 1901 there were 122,870, in Spain in 1897, 457,262, and in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy in 1890, 644,796 more females than males. Now we ask, what provision does European law make for these nearly four millions of women who being in excess of males can not contract marriage relationships in a system which prohibits polygamy? Should not the laws which govern mankind be according to their needs? The law which prohibits polygamy tells at least four million women of Europe to go against their nature and to feel no desire for man. But since that is impossible, the result would be that they will take to illegal means, and thus the laws prohibiting polygamy would promote adultery, and this is clear from the statistics of illegitimate births.

THE OBJECT OF COM-  
PANIONSHIP.

Another object for which marriage is designed is companionship. If then from whatever cause a man's wife ceases to be a true companion, he must be allowed to take another companion. If for instance she is affected with any malady which disables her permanently or for long intervals to continue the conjugal relations, the husband must be allowed to contract a second marriage. The conditions of human life are varying and so are the circumstances which would necessitate the taking of a second wife. We do not deny that such cases do not arise very often, but at the same time it must be admitted that when they do arise, as arise they must in every human society to a greater or less extent, there is no remedy except polygamy. Polygamy is also an effective check against divorce in many cases. It cannot be



questioned that nature has endowed women with charms, and these are not without their use in the union of man and woman. That the union may be blessed and happy, the wife must be the possessor of charms which serve as an attraction to her husband. If there is no attraction in the woman or if the attraction ceases to exist, the object of marriage would fail, and unless the husband is in such cases allowed to take another wife, the life of the pair would be a miserable life. Either the husband would try to get rid of her by some underhand means, or if he cannot do it, he would probably fall into evil and seek illegal connections and company. For when the company of the wife cannot give him the necessary pleasure, he must seek that pleasure elsewhere. In such cases polygamy would be an excellent remedy and would turn a miserable household into a happy one.

#### PROCREATION.

The object of procreation also sometimes fails in a monogamous marriage and polygamy is thus necessitated. The wife may be barren and so varied are the circumstances which give rise to this disease in women, that women affected with it are by no means rare. In many cases it may be irremediable. In such cases the marriage is not fruitful. There is no cause at all for the putting away of the wife and there may be even strong love between the parties. The only way open to a man in such a case in order that he may be able to beget children, is to contract a second marriage. Besides the reasons specified here, there are many other circumstances which give rise to the necessity of polygamy, but it is impossible to detail them all. For instance, a man may marry a woman out of compassion for her forlorn condition, or again reasons of political and social alliance with certain tribes and families might impel a man to such a course, or any other circumstance may render it necessary.

#### EVILS RESULTING FROM THE PROHIBITION OF POLYGAMY.

The harms arising from the absence of polygamy are too many to be enumerated here. Polygamy being in exceptional cases a necessity of human nature, its prohibition has done lasting harm. The prevalence of adultery in countries where polygamy is prohibited is too manifest a fact to be noticed at any length. Besides this great evil, the absence of this institution has many a time entailed the loss



of human life. Many occurrences have taken place where a husband, being unsatisfied with his wife has thought murder to be the only way of getting rid of her. Henry viii of England is a well-known instance. In short, if we cast a glance at history, and consider the needs of the generality, polygamy is seen to be an institution whose absence is productive of great corruption and many difficulties. Polygamy is necessary for the purification of hearts, as well as to raise the condition of womankind generally. In civilized countries there are thousands of women who are looked upon too abject and vile to be considered human beings, but it is never thought that the only thing which can elevate their condition and make them honored mothers and respected wives is polygamy. It is not their fault that they give themselves up to adultery: it is the fault of the law which does not allow them to seek honorable marriage connections according to the polygamous marriage system. Polygamy is a great check against prostitution. It enables both men and women to practise virtue, but its prohibition leads both sexes into the terrible evil of illegal and promiscuous intercourse like beasts.

REASONS FOR POLYGAMY ARE REASONS AGAINST POLYANDRY.

It is sometimes said that the reasons which necessitate polygamy necessitate also polyandry. This is not true. The chief reason which calls for the legality of polygamy condemns polyandry. Polygamy, we said, is needed because men naturally endowed with stronger powers may find themselves unable to observe continence during the intervals in which the wife is attended with certain disabilities which render her unfit for conjugal relations, as the monthly courses and the state of pregnancy. Now no such disability attends the male sex. The alleged equality of the two sexes has no foundation in facts. Had any one of these disabilities been transferred to man which the civilization of Europe has not yet succeeded in doing, then indeed the question would have been worth discussing why a woman should not need two husbands in certain cases. The disabilities have all been placed by nature on the side of woman and hence nature itself condemns polyandry while it favors polygamy. Another important reason stated for the necessity of polygamy was that the object of procreation may be assisted. Now a man with two or three wives can raise children from the different

بعض النساء  
لا يقدرن على  
الاحتجاب



wives. But can polyandry effect the same object? Would a woman with more than one husband be able to bear more children than a wife with one husband? This is another great distinction between the males and the females and while this distinction shows the need of polygamy, it condemns polyandry. While we have many instances in history of men with two or three wives having as many scores of children, no instance is recorded of a wife with two or three husbands having borne a greater number of children than a woman with one husband. On the other hand it must be admitted that polyandry destroys the fruitfulness of woman and this is a fact which no one can deny. Thus while polygamy assists the object of procreation, polyandry retards it and thus strikes at the root of the institution of marriage. Moreover, in a polygamous family, the knowledge of parentage is as clear as in a monogamous family. Every child can trace his descent to a particular father and a particular mother, and thus the purity of descent is preserved, this also being an object sought to be effected by the institution of marriage. But in the case of polyandry, the father would be quite unknown and thus all knowledge of descent would be lost. Now the three great objects of marriage, viz., piety, procreation and knowledge of parentage are directly assisted by the institution of polygamy, and thus its need is proved to all reasonable men, while polyandry strikes at the root of all these objects and hence it is opposed to the institution of marriage.

POLYANDRY SHOWS A  
CRUDE IDEA OF MARRI-  
AGE.

It should moreover be borne in mind that polyandry has never been practised by any civilized nation of the world or taught by any inspired teacher who founded a religion. And further wherever polyandry has been practised the form of it is a sufficient testimony to the crudeness of the idea of marriage among that people. The only cases of polyandry are where a woman is regarded as the common wife of all the brothers. This shows that the wife was regarded not as a wife in the sacred institution of marriage, but as the common property of the brothers like their sheep, oxen, lands and houses. The wife in a polyandrous marriage has never had in fact any status. It was not out of any need that polyandry was practised, but out of the crude idea unguided by the light of inspiration that the woman was a part of the property of the household. As an institution



needed for the welfare of society, polyandry has never been practised by any nation in the world and even semi-civilized nations have condemned it. It is quite absurd to bring forward this savage institution as being a parallel to polygamy. The institution of polygamy takes its birth after true notions of marriage have been conceived as a help in the attainment of the objects which marriage has in view. It in fact makes up for the deficiencies of the monogamous marriage system. When the monogamous marriage fails to bring about the objects for which marriage is designed, the polygamous marriage is allowed. Such is the significance of polygamy in Islam as we would show later on.

**THE DISTINCTION WHICH NATURE HAS KEPT.** From what has been said above, it is clear that God has so created man and woman as to make it possible that the union of one man with two or three women should be productive of good to society, but it is quite impossible that the union of one woman with two or three men should be productive of any good. The latter course is on the other hand productive of mischief and harm to society. This distinction which nature has kept between man and woman speaks volumes. It indicates clearly that nature has no objection to a man possessing more than one wife, but that it does not bear the idea that a woman should have more than one husband. Had polygamy been as objectionable as polyandry, nature would not have kept such a distinction. It should have placed both sexes in the same position and would not have favored one to the exclusion of the other. This shows that God intended that polygamy should be permissible while He never intended polyandry for the welfare of human society.

**AGREEMENT OF THE PROPHETS OF GOD.** This is the reason that the prophets of God saw with the light of inspiration that polygamy should be permitted in human society while no inspired teacher of mankind ever thought of legalizing polyandry. Had the permission of polygamy been due to their imperfect and crude ideas regarding the institution of marriage, the same crudeness would have required a legalization of polyandry. But such was not the case. It was the soundness of their ideas with regard to the true use



fulness of the institution of marriage which led them to legalize polygamy and condemn polyandry. It is sometimes thought that Jesus forbade polygamy. This is a false assertion. Not a single word is to be found in the four Gospels prohibiting polygamy. Had Jesus thought that the institution was an evil, why should he not have said it. Polygamy was prevalent at the date of his appearance among the Jews, and it even appears that the marriage of Mary with Joseph was a polygamous marriage, but Jesus did not utter a single word casting censure upon this practice. He could have regarded it either as legal or illegal. That he did not consider it illegal is clear from the fact that he did not utter a single word against it. The conclusion is, therefore, inevitable that he considered polygamy a legal form of marriage, and this supports our contention that every prophet of God has sanctioned polygamy. Had there been any evil in this practice, the religious teachers of mankind could not all have been unanimous in legalizing it. The remaining two headings proposed for discussion would be considered in the next issue.

*(To be Continued.)*

## The Feeling fostered by the Arya Samaj.

PROSECUTIONS AGAINST  
SAMAJ WRITERS.

It grieves us to see that the Arya Samajis fostering a deplorable feeling of animosity by its controversial writings which are couched in the most scurrilous and offensive language. So bitter and violent are its abuses that many peaceful communities have been obliged to resort to courts of justice for the punishment of the daring offenders. But even prosecutions have not proved an effective deterrent. The tone of the Samaj instead of being softened by these unfortunate experiences is growing more and more violent day by day, and its bitter and scurrilous attacks upon names held sacred by different communities, bespeak a bad taste for controversies which seems to have taken root in the Samaj. It moreover appears that the leaders of the Samaj, if not in sympathy with these scurrilous writings, have not got the influence with which to check the over-zealous members and tell them that the course they have taken is wrong.



RELIGIOUS CONTRO-  
VERSIES.

In fact, the writings of the Arya Samaj afford an instance of the deplorable element that is growing in the religious literature of India, though in abusiveness they beat all record. The controversial literature of this country is stocked with writings many of which are indicative only of the irreligion of their writers. All through the controversies of the Arya Samaj would be discovered a vein of something like a contempt for true religion and purity of heart. Deep and weighty questions which would show the truth or falsehood of a religion are not touched, and the whole erudition of the writers is spent in making additions to the abusive vocabulary of the language. Such controversies please the ignorant for a while and abusive words are in fact indulged in to pander the religious prejudice of the masses and to win applause for a moment. They have not brought any gain to the Arya Samaj, while the injury they have done is enormous. They have widened the gulf which already existed in the heterogeneous elements of the population of India, and thus have fanned the fire, which was about to be smothered, again into a flame. We are far from proposing a check upon the religious liberty of India which is one of the greatest blessings of God upon this people, but it is the duty of the people to make a right use of this liberty.

## THE REAL QUESTION.

To us it appears that in the present struggle for existence made by the various religions, the real question which must ultimately decide the contest is not a very complicated one. But it is ignored because of the failure to find a satisfactory answer to it. The result is that every unnecessary point is taken for discussion while the essential question remains untouched in this great excitement. A pestilent class of controversialists has grown up which is engaged day and night in turning over the pages of books to swell the lists of objections against this or that religion. What is their aim in this, it is difficult to say. If all that a religion can show is that it can find certain objections against another, its own truth is not demonstrated thereby, nor we think is the absolute falsehood of the other conclusively settled in this way, unless the objections are aimed at fundamental principles, which is rarely if ever done. Ordinarily what happens is this, that the partisans of each sect consider the objections against other religions to be valid and those found against themselves to be futile, while an atheist would consider



all to be equally valid. And yet if a religion actually succeeds in proving the futility of all the objections against it, this fact will not alone be a conclusive proof of its truth, for the aim and end of religion is not simply to teach certain doctrines against which no objection may exist. The most important object which religion must bring about consists in its effect upon the lives and conduct of those who follow it. There are many true things we say in the world, but they do not all exercise a healthy influence upon our lives.

#### PROOF OF DIVINE EXISTENCE.

The aim and end of religion is that attaining a union with the Divine Being; a man's life may be purified from all sorts of evils. For this it is necessary that a man should have a true and certain knowledge of God, for if he has not obtained a true and certain knowledge of the existence of the Divine Being, he cannot seek any connection with Him. Now all the arguments deduced from reason or from a contemplation of nature do not in the first place lead to a perfect certainty in the existence of the Divine Being, and such arguments are not in the second place the property of a particular religion for they exist independently of any religion. A religion, therefore, which depends only upon this material for the proof of the existence of God and for giving a knowledge of Him, cannot claim to be a religion from God, however reasonable or unobjectionable its other doctrines may be, for it does not give any fresh knowledge of God or any fresh proof of His existence and goes no further than what the reason of man has discovered. Moreover as the proof afforded by reason is not perfectly conclusive, such a religion could only come from an imperfect source and not from the Almighty who is perfect. The first thing then to be seen about a religion is whether it goes further than human reason and reveals a certain and conclusive proof of the existence of God. Let every religion show the way it reveals and it is the first point that must be decided in the present religious struggle.

#### PRACTICAL EFFECT.

If the mode pointed out above were to be adopted, many religious sects would have to beat retreat even at this very point. But many claimants would still remain and, therefore, the question shall have to be further considered what is the effect upon the lives of the followers of a true religion of the knowledge of God which they possess and of the certainty in His existence which they have.



to. For it cannot be doubted that if a man believes with perfect attained certainty in the existence of God and has a true knowledge of the Divine Being, he cannot walk in a path which he knows to be the path of Divine wrath. Let the heart once realize the certainty that there is an all-powerful and all-knowing God who knows the deepest secrets of the human heart; and it cannot entertain an evil idea. The second point in the course of a religious discussion is, therefore, whether a religion which claims that the true way of attaining to a knowledge of God and to a certainty of His existence is revealed in it, can show the effect of such Divine knowledge and certainty upon the lives of its votaries. For, if no follower of a religion has attained to the spiritual height of being perfectly free from sins, it would follow that such a religion cannot make its votaries attain to a union with God, and hence to it is not known the way by walking in which a man can attain to a true knowledge of God and a certainty in His existence. Many of the claimants would thus fall off in the second stage of this discussion.

#### FINAL ISSUE.

The question would not however be finally settled even by the above consideration, for many would claim the purity of life, and it would not be easy to reject their claims by concrete examples. Moreover there would be many deeds as to which there would not be an agreement among the various contenders, whether they are to be regarded as sinful or not. There must, therefore, be some criterion by which we can test the sinlessness of a person; in other words, there must be some such criterion by which we can test the truth of a religion. For it cannot be imagined that the all-wise God has ordained that there should always be a confusion as to which is the true religion. Truth and falsehood could not have been left in the same condition. If Almighty God has willed that men should walk in the true path, there must be some characteristics distinguishing truth from falsehood. In short, it cannot be denied that there must be some criterion which should make it clear to the seeker after truth which is the true religion and which the false, and this would settle finally the great struggle of the various religions and give a verdict in favour of one to the exclusion of all others. The most important question to be settled accordingly is, what is the criterion of a true religion, and which is the religion which possesses this criterion while all others are devoid of it. When this point is settled, we at once get



to the truth without the abuses and scurrilities that are debasing the modern controversial religious literature of India.

**THE CRITERION.** The criterion of a true religion is that it should be able to show heavenly signs at any time in its history. That every religion made this claim, and distinguished itself by this characteristic, at its birth, can not be denied. But if such a criterion distinguished truth from falsehood at one time, it could not have ceased to do so at another time. Therefore, we should apply the same criterion to test the true religion, the religion which can purify the lives of its followers, in the present religious struggle. That in applying this criterion we are treading on sure ground is apparent not only from the fact that the different religions possessed it at their birth when they were free from errors, but it is also the only way in which a true and certain knowledge of God can be attained, this being the admitted object of every religion. The contemplation of nature and the deductions of reason do not create in the mind of a man that certainty with regard to Divine existence which is necessary to keep him away from sin. In fact, to

~~that evil conventional not inferior to which it degenerated and~~  
less God reveals Himself in a supernatural way or through heavenly signs. The real question is then very simple and very brief. To find out the true religion we have to see which is the religion which can show heavenly signs. When we come to this ground, we find only one claimant and that is the faith of Islam, not the corrupt faith of this generation, but the true and living Islam as taught and preached by the Promised Messiah. No one has ever come forward to cope with him in this respect, and the Arya Samaj which is making so much noise has itself seen such a heavenly sign in the death of one of its leaders, Pandit Lekh Ram, who died several years ago in accordance with a prophecy published long before by the Promised Messiah.

**DHARMPAL'S TAHZIB-UL-ISLAM.**

While the Arya Samaj is unable to show that it possesses the only criterion of a true religion, it is engaged day and night in preparing a controversial literature which is of the lowest type. There are conversions taking place daily in India, but conversion to the Arya Samaj is on account of its rarity regarded as a strange thing by the advocates of the Samaj. Some time ago a gentleman misnamed Abdul



Gafur by his parents, accepted the doctrines of the Arya Samaj and called himself Dharmpal. As an excuse for this conversion, he published a book containing over a hundred objections against the religion of Islam. The objections were refuted by some Muhammadans and this has enraged the objector. He appears in the public now in a book which he calls the *Tahzib-ul-Islam*, and if his character is to be judged from this book, it cannot claim any reverence. He indulges in abuses and scoffings of the grossest type which may or may not be indicative of the influence of the new doctrines which he has accepted. Religious questions are treated with levity, but in addition to this, the book is full of gross and contemptuous blasphemy and of the harshest abuses and contumelies against the Holy Prophet. It opens with the words : " Who is the greatest deceiver in the world?" and the answer given is that a greater deceiver than *thugs*, thieves and scoundrels of every sort, the greatest deceiver in the world, is Allah, the God of Muhammadans." The thoughtless author then goes on mockingly to say : Is Allah the head of thieves, is he the chief of robbers, the guide of foxes, the chief of beasts, the leader of birds, the *guru* of *thugs*, the agent of shopkeepers, dust, stone, brick, camel, elephant, ox, or horse ? (see page 5 of *Tahzib-ul-Islam*). But this is by no means the worst of what he says. From beginning to end the book is full of worse blasphemy than this and the inconsiderate author writes without the least regard to any law of the country or any rule of decorum. He has not only no respect for the name regarded as the most sacred name by sixty-three millions of his Majesty's subjects, but in fact sets all the laws at defiance which require the different communities of India not to wound the religious feelings of each other. We do not think the legislative body ever meant that such gross abuses should be uttered under the name of just criticism. If ever a disturbance is caused between two communities, living peacefully with each other, such writers would be responsible for it. We wish some true well-wisher of the Arya Samaj had warned the reckless author of the rancour he is causing to spring between the Hindus and the Muhammadans. We may overlook all his severity towards those who refuted his objections, but the language he uses in speaking of what is held sacred by the Muhammadans, inflicts the severest wounds upon every Muhammadan heart. The Arya Samaj has in this writing reached the climax of scurrility and has left no stone unturned



to injure the feelings of the Muhammadan community. On page 309 of this book, the Holy Prophet is described in the most scurrilous words which we have ever heard, and the word *Muallim-ul-malakoot* (the arch-fiend) is used concerning him. Which Muhammadan is there whose heart-strings are not rent asunder on hearing such words?

#### THE DUTY OF THE SAMAJ.

We ask, what would the Arya Samaj gain by causing this breach between two nations? We are not aware if converts to other religions follow this course. Some Christian converts followed this offensive course for some time, but they did not go so far. Converts to Islam are by no means few, but there is a marked difference between their writings and those of the inconsiderate Arya convert. Only the other day, Dr. Nishi Kanta Chattopadhyaya, late Principal, Hyderabad College, and late Professor of History in the Maharaja's College Mysore, accepted the faith of Islam, and gave his reasons for doing so in two lectures, now printed in the form of pamphlets, entitled "Muhammad, the Prophet of Islam," and "Why have I accepted Islam." Read these two pamphlets from beginning to end and you would not find a single offensive word. It is the principles of a religion which should be attacked and not persons. It is the duty of the Samaj leaders to express their disapproval of this offensive writing, so that there may be no ill-feeling in the hearts of the Muhammadans against the Arya Samaj as a community. For, we must repeat that it is not mere severity in a controversy that is to be met with in Dharmpal's book. Mere severity if not attended with abuse and clear intention to injure the feelings is a thing which should often be excused, for heat in a controversy often leads to harsh expression. But this book is full of abuses of the grossest type. Any one who reads only the list of contents given in the beginning of the book, will be convinced that the book outsteps the limits not only of a decent but even of a harsh controversy. To compare the Muhammadan God to a worm, to *satan* and to a *bhangî* (*chukra* or sweeper), (page 69, 138, 210,) to call the Muhammadan paradise as *chakle se bhi badtar*, (worse than a brothel) (page 218), to scandalise a chaste woman (Mary) in language which even a Jew would have felt ashamed to utter (page 306): these are only two or three examples of the abuses, confumelies and scandals of which the book is full from beginning to end. We dare to assert that even a conscientious Arya cannot read two or three pages of the book without a shudder being caused to him.



# Union of Judaism and Christianity.

**HISTORICAL VALUE  
OF APOCRYPHAL GOS-  
PELS.**

Dr. Samuel Krauss, one of the contributors to the Jewish Encyclopædia and Professor, Normal College, Budapest, in Hungary, contributes an article to the "New Era," a Jewish Magazine, suggesting a possible unification of the Jews and the Christians if both nations give up their peculiarities. The article is headed "Jesus in History and Legend," and the writer tries in the course of sketching out a life of Jesus from Jewish and Christian sources to vindicate the Jews of the charges brought against them by the Christians. At first the various sources from which an outline of the life of Jesus can be drawn are considered, and it is shown how scanty and untrustworthy is the material for a life of Jesus. The four canonical Gospels are taken for what they are worth, an imperfect record of a very imperfect tradition, as is admitted by the Christians. Accordingly to this legendary source are added the forty or more so-called Apocryphal Gospels. The reason of attaching to them the same historical value is thus given: "So long as the four canonical Gospels were considered as competent witnesses, the parallel apocryphal Gospels could be simply disregarded, but to-day when the canonical Gospels have been proved to be legendary and unreliable, we have no criterion by which to separate these two classes of works. Barely two or three years ago the German scholar Conrady showed in a noteworthy work that the apocryphal childhood Gospels are valuable sources worthy of serious consideration, and that the more prestige the apocryphal Gospels gain, the the more the canonical Gospels lose. In view of this state of affairs, is there a single event in the life of Jesus that may pass unchallenged as true?" Besides these Christian sources, the Jewish sources, scanty as they are, are also taken into consideration.

**JEWISH STORIES OF  
JESUS' BIRTH.**

The hatred of the Jews against Jesus is a well-known fact, but Dr. Krauss, though not altogether free from it, seems to have overcome the hereditary feeling to a very great extent. It is, however, still discernible in his writing. He admits in the commencement that "Jesus, the sublime, pious man



was born among us." And again : " If the church had not falsified every thing pertaining to Jesus, his name to-day would be not the terror, but the greatest pride of the Jews. If the Church had declared those doctrines to be authoritative which Jesus really taught, a great part of the ideal of the prophets of Israel and at the same time the ideal of its greatest son, Jesus, would have been realized. For he belonged to us ; he felt that he was sent to us ; he wanted to teach us and make us happy." There is a clear admission in these words of the truth of Jesus as a prophet towards the Israelites. But notwithstanding this, much importance is given in the article to the false stories attaching illegitimacy to the birth of that righteous prophet of God. These stories are not credited with historical truth, and it is even admitted that the object of the Jews in laying stress upon the illegitimacy of Jesus was no other than to throw discredit upon his claim to Messiahship and " saying disagreeable and discreditable things about him." But notwithstanding all these admissions, the writer is not unwilling to believe in the truth of these false stories. For he says : " While an unprejudiced scholar will regret these signs of religious fanaticism, he is confronted with the question whether a statement which is used as a weapon of hatred is *eo ipso* invented. May not the version of the Gospels, which is not above suspicion in various respects, also have been invented ? And what would happen if the Church, which cannot indefinitely maintain either the doctrine of the immaculate conception or that of the divinity of Jesus, were confronted with the possibility that in regard to the birth of Jesus the non-evangelical witnesses were right ? Would the teaching of Jesus become thereby less precious and less adapted for the foundation of a great Church ?" These reflections are opposed to the writer's own views expressed in the same article. If Jesus is really to be taken as a righteous prophet of God, as the writer is really willing to do, the falsity of all such stories follows as a matter of course. The writer cannot be unaware of how the Old Testament regards a bastard. In Deut. 23 : 2, we read : " A bastard shall not enter into the congregation of the Lord ; even to his tenth generation shall he not enter into the congregation of the Lord ?" Could the same God, who revealed this law, bestow prophethood on one whom He knew to be illegitimate. This verse moreover shows what was the object of the Jews in inventing these false stories ; they were



simply meant to falsify his claim to Messiahship. While it is true that a "man's greatness is not dependent on the circumstances surrounding his birth or his descent," it is also true that Almighty God never chooses a man to be His messenger in whom such defects are to be found. It appears from this how strong is the Jewish belief in these false stories which cast a slur upon the birth of Jesus. But the thing is that he cannot be regarded as a true prophet of God unless the purity of his birth is recognised first. This was the object which the Holy Quran had in view when saying that Jesus was "a soul from Him ;" that is to say, no impurity, as asserted by the Jews, attached to his birth.

**JEWISH STORIES OF JESUS' YOUTH.** In connection with the youth of Jesus the paucity of fact is admitted even by the Christians. In fact, nothing at all is known of the thirty years or more of his life previous to his entering upon his ministry. One or two anecdotes are to be found in the canonical Gospels. Nor is the Talmud utterly silent, though what it states, does not appear to be creditable. Dr. Krauss refers to one incident: "A similar statement is found in the Talmud. Here Jesus appears as the pupil of Rabbi Joshua ben Perachja, with whom he fled into Egypt when king Jannai was persecuting the rabbis. Subsequently, when both returned to Palestine and Jesus displayed an eye for feminine beauty, the incensed rabbi repudiated him ; thus it came about that Jesus preached apostacy from the religion of Israel." This story seems to have been invented at a later period when Christianity made a departure from Judaism of which it was really an offshoot, as is evident from the words quoted above. It is remarkable that such stories should have been invented concerning other prophets of God also, showing that all opposers of the prophets had a similar bent of mind.

**THE MOSAIC LAW.** The more important question, however, which can bring about a union between Judaism and Christianity, is the question of the teachings of Jesus. The important question which Dr. Krauss proposes for solution is whether Jesus claimed to be really the founder of a new religion. And he gives the following answer :—" Even the Gospels though they represent a certain phase



of the development of Christianity, and are, therefore, more or less anti-Jewish in spirit, do not dare to assert openly and definitely that Jesus abrogated the Mosaic law, leaving the exegetes in the dark as to the exact opinion of the evangelists on this point. A rational critic is able to gather one fact only from the Gospels, whatever their religious colouring may be, that Jesus was a Jew like other Jews, even that he was a rabbi like other rabbis, and that he pretended to be this and nothing else." In fact, the sayings of Jesus do not contain a single word which can show that he abrogated, or proposed an abrogation of, the law of Moses. Matthew reports him to have said: "Think not that I came to destroy the law and the prophets; I came not to destroy but to fulfil." (Matt. 5:17). The Talmud making this quotation from the sayings of Jesus makes it clearer: "I am not come to take anything away from the law of Moses, nor am I come to add anything to the law of Moses." This was what he meant by fulfilling the law. Similarly the Gospel to the Hebrews records that when the question was put to Jesus, "Master, what good must I do in order to live?" he replied: "Fulfil the law and the prophets." These instances are quoted as showing that Jesus never meant to make a departure from the Mosaic law. In practice too he observed the Jewish ordinances, and we are told that "there are really only two incidents in the life of Jesus to indicate that he did not follow the customs obtaining at that time in Judaism." But they are both very insignificant. One of these is his permission to pluck ears of corn on the sabbath, and the other is his neglect to observe the custom of washing hands before meals. But it is shown that this action and omission were infringements not of the law of Moses, but of the rabbinical regulations.

**CULPABILITY OF THE JEWS.** In the matter of the trial and crucifixion of Jesus, Dr. Krauss tries to exonerate the

Jews and lays the whole blame upon the shoulders of Pontius Pilate, the Roman Governor. Apart from the circumstance that the only available evidence rebuts such a conclusion, his allegation does not appear to be probable. The mere fact that many false claimants to Messiahship, in the words of Dr. Krauss "many dreamers like this one," were put to death by the Romans before and after Jesus does not make it probable that Jesus too met the same fate at similar



hands. The contemporaries of Jesus did not regard him with the same respect as some of the advanced Jews might hold him to-day. They considered him an heresiarch and an impostor. But we do not say that in condemning and opposing him, they had no excuse in their hands. They stumbled at the outward significance of certain prophecies as many are stumbling even to-day. They believed in right earnest that Elijah would appear before the advent of the true Messiah and would be a co-worker with him, and their belief in this matter was based on plain words of Divine revelation. But as Elijah did not descend from heaven, they thought the claim of Jesus to be false. The explanation given by Jesus, that John, the Baptist, had appeared in the spirit and character of Elijah in fulfilment of the prophecy, was not accepted by them. They made the same mistake as many are making to-day who expect that Jesus himself would come back, while the prophecy of his re-advent has been fulfilled like the prophecy of the second advent of Elijah, by the appearance of one in his spirit and character. In short, the Jews would not listen to any argument until Elijah himself came back, though now after two thousand years being disappointed of the coming of Elijah, they are prepared to look upon Jesus as a righteous prophet of God. But they were not in such a mood at that time. They laid the most serious charges against him and his mother, and persecuted him in the same manner as every other prophet of God was persecuted. Crucifixion also was one of the means by which they thought they could prove him to be an impostor. Hence their exertions day and night to bring him to a speedy end by means of disgraceful death on the cross.

#### PROPOSED UNION.

The important point to see now is how a union of Judaism and Christianity can be brought about. Dr. Krauss makes the following proposal at the end of his article: "It may be presumptuous if we, Jews, who are so insignificant a minority, approach the great and powerful Christian Church with the demand to make concessions to us. . . . . Then we together would find our joy in the splendid Jesus, we would proudly recognise him as our own, we would look upon him as the greatest son of Israel. Since he cannot be a God, let him be a man, but a man apart and above all other men. Some years ago several Jewish authors, including the present writer, received a set of ques-



tions from America asking for opinions on Jesus and suggesting the eventual union of Judaism and Christianity. We, Jews, have everything to lose if we give in; our individuality, our existence, our mission. If Christianity will give up its peculiarities, we will give up our own; then we shall become in the words of the Bible, one people. This is my answer to the idea of unification proceeding from America." It is easy to understand what is meant by the peculiarities of Christianity; these are evidently its departures from the fundamental doctrines of Judaism, the unity of God and the doing of righteous deeds. Christianity then must give up its doctrines of trinity and atonement which it is already doing, the more sensible Christians having already got rid of these errors. But what Dr. Krauss means by the peculiarities of Judaism, is difficult to understand. He must mean, if he means anything, that the law of Moses should not be observed by the Jews, for no other peculiarity of that people can be discovered which can separate them from the Christianity thus modified. In fact this proposal for union indicates the present tendency of the two nations in the sphere of religion, *viz.*, the tendency of Christianity to free itself from the errors of atonement and trinity, and the tendency of Judaism to abrogate the Mosaic law which was meant only for a particular people at a particular stage of their history and is not suited for all men at all times. These are the peculiarities of these two nations and their unsuitability for the advanced condition of mankind is a fact admitted by both nations. But when these peculiarities of these two religions are taken away, the new religion that we thus get, is no other than Islam itself, for while it dismissed the erroneous beliefs of trinity and atonement on the one hand, thus re-establishing the pure doctrine of unity, it abrogated the Jewish law on the other and thus gave a purer religion to mankind. The proposed union of Judaism and Christianity therefore gives us a pleasure inasmuch as it is a step towards the recognition of the truth of Islam.

WHO FIRST CORRECTED  
THESE ERRORS?

If the union between Judaism and Christianity were actually effected upon the principles proposed, the world would lie under a deep obligation to the man by whose efforts this object would be brought about. Such would be the thoughts of many well-wishers



of humanity. But how often is the world blind to such obligations! Many a time has it turned against its benefactors, and has shut its eyes against the good which they intended to do. In the sandy deserts of Arabia arose a benefactor, the greatest benefactor we should say, of mankind and warned both the Jews and the Christians of their respective errors, but his word was not heeded. He told the Jews that they were in error in regarding Jesus as an impostor, and in casting aspersions on him and his mother by laying the most horrible accusations against them, and further that the law of Moses was a temporary law and was not meant for all ages. He told the Christians that they were in error in looking upon Jesus as God or as the son of God, and that he was only a man like other men with this distinction that he was also a prophet of God. He judged both parties guilty of excess, the one in condemning and the other in exalting Jesus, saying يا هـل ا لكتب لا تغلوا فـى دـنكم "O people of the Book! overstep not bounds in your religion," the Christians having overstepped the bounds in regarding a man as a God and the Jews in regarding a prophet as an impostor. The Holy Quran also adjudged the Jews guilty of slandering Mary, the mother of Jesus, and thus showed the falsehood of the stories which attributed illegitimacy to Jesus.

#### AN ASTONISHING CIRCUMSTANCE.

The remarkable thing about the statements made in the Holy Quran regarding Jesus is that they were seemingly made by a man who did not possess any book-learning. It is a story of thirteen centuries when there was no material upon which to base criticism. No investigation was made by the Holy Prophet into the stories current about Jesus among the Jews and the beliefs entertained by the Christians. It is clear from this that he did not possess any knowledge on whose basis he could arrive at a conclusion with regard to a man who at that time was misrepresented in the world. Yet these conclusions are wonderfully sound, so sound indeed that the minutest criticism has ultimately been obliged to take exactly the same view of this much misrepresented personality as the Holy Prophet took. Did he not tell the Christians what they have discovered after two thousand years that Jesus was not a God, but only a man, mortal like ourselves? Did he not warn them of



the erroneousness of the doctrine of atonement and trinity saying : *ولا تقولوا ثلاثة* " Say not, there are three. Forbear : it will be better for you ?" But the word of this sympathetic adviser was not heeded at that time. Again, did he not tell the Jews that in charging the chaste Mary with adultery, they were guilty of a great slander ? Did he not tell them that Jesus was not an impostor ? But they did not believe in his kind and sympathetic words. Who was it that informed him of this great and deep truth which lay hidden under a mass of errors which has been with difficulty only partly removed by the labours of many generations ? Certainly as a mortal he could not have any access to it. It was the Omniscient God who revealed to him the truth, for it was not in his power to know it. Is not this a clear proof that the Holy Prophet was fed from the source of Divine revelation ? Certainly it is, for an unlearned man sitting in a desert and cut off from the outside world, could not discover such a truth by his own efforts. Had his view of Jesus been only his own view, it was more probable that he would have leaned to one side or the other. Great must be the joy of the Muhammadan world that the only true view about Jesus, to which both the Jews and the Christians have ultimately found it necessary to give their assent, is the view entertained by the Holy Prophet, whom they follow as their leader and guide. A wonderful leader he and a most reliable guide whose heavenly-brightened eye discovered the truth from underneath the heavy mass of error.

**A WORD FOR THE JEWS AND THE CHRISTIANS.** A few words more are only to be added.

While both the Jews and the Christians thus clearly see and acknowledge their errors, will they be prepared to confess their obligation to him who first showed this truth to the world ? Unfortunately there remains to this day a great prejudice against Islam, while the correctness of its principles is being gradually admitted. But though the veil of prejudice may interrupt the light of that sun of righteousness for a time, its piercing rays would ultimately shatter the dark cloud of error and clear the mist of prejudice. Then would he be recognised in his true glory. Truth cannot remain suppressed for a long time and must at last overcome every prejudice. There have been many great men in the world and many would still be born, but the greatness of this great man far transcends



the greatness of all. The critic and the scientist must bow their heads to him no less than the philosopher and the moralist.

---

## A Christian Government and the Muhammadans.

### SUFFERINGS OF THE EARLY MUSLIMS

One occurrence recalls to the mind similar events in the past, and thus the association of ideas takes us back for a while to what happened 1300 years since before we speak of the present. To those who still entertain a belief in *Jehad*, or look for a Mahdi who would appear with a sword in his hand and fill the earth with the blood of the unbelievers, the circumstances, under which the Holy Prophet preached the truth, should appear somewhat discordant with their cherished beliefs. For a long time the Holy Prophet and his followers had to yield to the severest persecutions and the most excruciating tortures at the hands of the unbelievers. The poorer converts to Islam were in the words Muir, by no means a willing witness, "seized and imprisoned; or they were exposed on the scorching gravel of the valley to the intense glory of the mid-day sun. The torment was enhanced by intolerable thirst, until the wretched sufferers hardly knew what they said." Of one of them, Bilal, it is related that "in the depth of his anguish, the persecutors could force from him but one expression, Ahad! Ahad! one, one (only God)," as if he saw God in that anguish. But the constancy and strong faith of the believers only enhanced the rage of their persecutors. Under these trying circumstances, the Muslims were at last obliged to leave their homes and properties on account of the oppressions and persecutions of their own kith and kin, and to take shelter in a foreign land. "Yonder," said the Holy Prophet, "lieth a country where *no one is wronged*—a land of justice. Depart thither and remain there until it pleaseth God to open your way before you." What was the land where no one was wronged, not even a convert to Islam whom even his blood-relatives were not willing to spare. It was the country ruled by a Christian ruler Najashi or Negus, the King of Abyssinia. Thus expelled from their



homes this small band of exiles about 15 in number found a refuge under a Christian Government. Najashi treated them with kindness and they were allowed full liberty in the exercise of their religious obligations. A few months later a large emigration of the Muslims took place and about a hundred souls thus escaped the most painful tortures of their own kindred by taking shelter under a Christian Government.

#### MARTYRDOM OF ABDUL LATIF.

History repeats itself. There is another Christian Government and another oppressed band seeking its shelter. It is small in numbers yet like the first emigrants to Abyssinia. In Khost (a province of Afghanistan) lived Akhundzada Maulvi Abdul Latif, honoured and revered not only throughout the whole country of Afghanistan but also in the Kabul Durbar owing to his vast learning and great sanctity of character. He had a following of over 50,000 men. Several years ago, some books written and circulated by the Promised Messiah fell into his hands, and with deep insight he accepted the truth of his claims. After some time he paid a visit to Qadian, the abode of the Promised Messiah, and on his return home invited the chief officers of the state to the views which he held on important religious questions. By far the most important of the new doctrines which he taught was the doctrine which rejected *Jehad* and the coming of *Ghazi Mahdi*, this doctrine being in fact the basis of the claims of the Promised Messiah. To the Amir of Afghanistan this departure from the orthodox faith boded serious trouble and was indicative of something more than a mere religious difference. In Afghanistan the idea of national unity is based more upon a recognition of the doctrine of *Jehad* than upon any other consideration. The repudiation of the doctrine of *Jehad* was accordingly considered by the Amir to be a serious political danger and serious steps were immediately taken against the Akhundzada. He was imprisoned and sentenced to be stoned to death, pardon being promised by the Amir on the condition that he should accept the orthodox doctrine of the advent of a *Ghazi Mahdi* and renounce faith in the claimant who repudiated such a doctrine. But the prisoner preferred to be put to death by being stoned to the renunciation of truth. And when the stones were raining upon him from all quarters, he still confessed with a loud voice his strong



faith, thus repeating the scene of the constancy of the early Muslims who laid down their lives for the sake of truth and did not recant under the severest tortures.

**THE DIFFICULTIES OF  
THOSE WHO SHARED  
HIS VIEWS.**

Thus passed away the man Abdul Latif, but he had sown a seed. Though force may for a while appear to have suppressed the truth, truth is ultimately victorious. On the other hand, the efforts made for the suppression of truth raise a stronger conviction in minds which are prepared to accept it. So it happened in the case of Abdul Latif. He was gone but he left after him men who had heard from him concerning the Promised Messiah. Having witnessed the scene of his death and the constancy he showed, their faith too was strengthened. The more they pondered over these circumstances, the more convinced they became of his truth. But they knew that if living in the territory of the Amir they gave expression to these views, they would meet the fate which their master had met. A few of these seeing the danger to which they were exposed removed later on into the British territory, some coming over to Qadian and settling here and others taking their residence in British dominions adjacent to the Amir's territory where the late Maulvi Abdul Latif held some landed property. Thus has this small band of emigrants who were threatened with painful death by their own people, found peace and a home under a government under which "no one is wronged" in the words of the Master, in a country which is the "land of justice" as compared with that "land of tyranny."

**DENIAL OF  
JEHAD.**

Some time ago a newspaper while commenting upon the murder of Maulvi Abdul Latif, doubted the accuracy of this story on the ground that a religious difference could not be punished with such severity even by a Muhammadan monarch. It is perfectly true that even Hindus, Jews and Christians are not dealt with in this manner by the Amir. But the murder of Maulvi Abdul Latif in the cruel manner stated above is also a fact, and we have hinted above the true reason of this. Had the Amir considered the religious opinions entertained by an Ahmadi Muhammadan as forming only another schism in Islam, he would have never thought of punishing one whom even he revered as a learned and holy man, and



who had his pupils among the high officers of the state. What mattered it to him whether a man had this or that spiritual guide and whether he believed Jesus to be alive on the heavens or dead and lying in some sepulchre. Far greater differences exist among the various Muhammadan sects, and each sect promulgates its own views without any interference on the part of the state. But the particular doctrine whose suppression the Amir sought in this cruel manner, was the repudiation of *Jehad* and the denial of the advent of a Mahdi with the sword. This latter doctrine in fact involves a denial of *Jehad* not only at present, but also for the future. By denying the *Ghazi* Mahdi and accepting one who comes to preach the Word of God in humility, a death-blow is given to the doctrine of *Jehad*, while the mischievous doctrine of slaying unbelievers only on the pretext of their professing an untrue religion remains alive in all its strength so long as a Mahdi is expected, whose first business upon earth would be to murder the infidels. And the idea must further lurk in every mind that if the slaying of the unbelievers would be right at the advent of the Mahdi, why should it not be so now? The idea of *Jehad* is based on the legality of taking away the life of a man simply on the score of religion, and is, therefore, necessarily kept alive in the expectations of a Mahdi who would slay men simply because they would not profess the religion of Islam. The extinction of *Jehad* is, therefore, impossible without the extinction of this false hope. And the denial of the advent of a bloody Mahdi, a denial which separates the Ahmadiyya from the orthodox, deals a death-blow to the doctrine of *Jehad*. This was the reason of the Amir's unusual severity towards Maulvi Abdul Latif and others who professed a belief in the Ahmadiyya movement.

#### NOT AN ISLAMIC DOCTRINE.

It may not be out of place to add a few words as to the absurdity of the doctrine which looks for a reformer who should spread the true faith by means of a general laughter. It is a horrible idea. Almighty God sends His prophets and reformers to invite people to the truth and this can never be done by means of the sword. To say that the Holy Prophet appeared with the sword is a serious error. Even the opponents of Islam have borne testimony to the cruel persecutions of the unbelieving Meccans which continued for years. What was the advice which the Holy Prophet gave to his followers in these trials? Not that they



should buy swords, but that they should bear the persecution with patience. At length when they became unbearable, he advised them to migrate to a more peaceful land. Could such a man sanction the propagation of religion by means of the sword? Why was the sword taken in hand then, would be the question? The sword was taken, we would reply, because self-defence rendered it necessary. The cruelties of the unbelievers had reached their climax. The verse giving permission to the Muhammadans to fight states also the reason:

اَذِنَ لِلَّذِينَ يَقْتُلُونَ بِاَنفُسِهِمْ ظَلَمُوا وَاِنَّ اللّٰهَ عَلٰى نَصْرِهِمْ لَقَدِ يَّرْتَضٰى  
 Permission is given to those who are fought against (to take up arms in defence) because they have suffered outrages; and verily God is well able to succour them—those who have been expelled from their homes wrongfully, only because they say: 'Our Lord is God.' This verse shows clearly that the unbelievers against whom the Musalmans were permitted to fight, had already taken up arms, to say nothing of their previous persecutions, and forbearance at this juncture would have meant the extinction of the Muhammadan community. They were outraged; persecuted and expelled from their homes. All this had been borne with wonderful patience. But when no way was left to them to escape; when the sword was taken up by the unbelievers to cut off the whole community, then were the Muhammadans also allowed to take up the sword in self-defence. And what was the power of the Muslims at that time? Barely 313 men of over twelve years of age. And against them were arrayed all the powerful and warring hordes of Arabia. It was clearly a desperate fight for life, and not a fight to spread the religion, because who could have thought of vanquishing the whole of Arabia and compelling them to accept Islam with these insignificant numbers? These circumstances in the Holy Prophet's life are sufficient to convince every sensible person that the doctrine of a Mahdi who should slay the infidels for not professing Islam is a false doctrine.

#### GHAZISM ON THE FRONTIER.

In the British territories, situated adjacent to Afghanistan, outbreaks of the spirit of *Ghazism* are frequently witnessed. Recently two such lamentable instances have occurred. A sepoy of the South Waziristan Militia attacked Lieutenant-Colonel Harman with a bayonet while that officer



was in the Officer's Mess at Wana and killed him. The fanatic was arrested on the spot by another officer. This sad occurrence took place on the 11th of February last. The death of Captain Brown is also reported to have been caused by a fanatic. These are recent instances, but such cases are of frequent occurrence on the frontier. The Government should make enquiries as to the real cause which keeps this spirit of *Ghazism* or fanaticism alive on the frontier. And while every well-wisher of humanity will regret these lamentable occurrences, the Muhammadans are particularly bound to express their hatred for these abominable deeds which are directly opposed to the teachings and principles of Islam. The conduct of such men is a disgrace to humanity and a disgrace to Islam. We are further bound to say that this shameful spirit of fanaticism can never be utterly dispelled from among the Muhammadan community until a death-blow is struck at the principle which the doctrine of the advent of a *Ghazi Mahdi* involves. The value of the reform introduced in this respect by the Promised Messiah is very often underrated, but the fact is that those who fail to see its real importance place too low a value upon human life. The severity of the laws for the punishment of *Ghazi* offenders has not brought about any abatement in this branch of crime. Such suggestions as the one now made that along with the offender some of his male relatives should also be punished, only show that punishment is not an effectual deterrent.

HOW CAN THE EVIL BE CHECKED ? There is only one remedy and that is that the people should be religiously convinced that the Holy Book which they follow condemns such atrocities as inhuman deeds, and that the popular doctrine of *Jehad* and the doctrine of the advent of *Ghazi Mahdi* are in fact so many errors. So long as the religious views of the people on these two points are not changed, severity of punishment would only give a stimulus to the spirit of *Ghazism*. We wonder why the Government never thinks of this remedy, and why its responsible officers do not care for giving effect to proposals which alone can prove a check against this crime. Such proposals have often been put forward by the founder of the *Ikhwaniyya* movement. If it is true that these murders are due to a religious belief of the people, it must be taken to be equally true that the right remedy will be found in the same quarter. That such a remedy



would prove successful and that people would be willing to renounce their faith in *Jehad* and the *Ghazi* Mahdi if their error is shown to them, is abundantly clear from what has been said above. To this same people belonged Maulvi Abdul Latif who laid down his life for the sake of truth when he was once convinced of the error of the advent of a *Ghazi* Mahdi and slaughter in the name of religion, and to this same people also belong his followers, some of whom have chosen to be exiles rather than remain in a country where they are compelled to confess a faith on the doctrine of *Jehad*. The Government can make enquiries as to the truth of these remarks, and if it finds that such a change has been brought about in the religious belief of some people, there is no reason why there should be disappointment as to the rest. If the Government carries out the proposal made by the Promised Messiah in a memorial submitted to the Government of India on the occasion of the Coronation Durbar and printed in this Magazine in its issue of January 1903, or if it lends a helping hand in the circulation in the Frontier Provinces of the forcible writings of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, Chief of Qadian, against the doctrines of *Jehad* and the advent of a *Ghazi* Mahdi, a remarkable change in the attitude of the frontier people towards their British rulers would soon be witnessed. We say this about the writings of the founder of the Ahmaddiya sect, because these writings have already shown their wonderful effect in those parts of the country. We are also of opinion that no other writing can serve the same purpose, for writings which accept the doctrine of the *Ghazi* Mahdi fully recognise the doctrine of *Jehad*, or the murder of unbelievers only on account of their professing a different religion and the utmost that can be said in favor of them is that they half recognise *Jehad*. It is quite useless, therefore, to circulate such writings which at their best partially admit the doctrine of *Jehad*, amongst a people the flame of whose fanaticism is already ablaze. It is to tell them that they are right in believing in the meritoriousness of the murder of infidels for the great Mahdi must himself resort to that course, but that they should refrain from murdering the Englishmen for certain considerations. It is high time that having regard to the valuable lives of British Officers, the Government should consider the expediency of the measure suggested above. And we are bound to add at the end that it is by no means an inconsiderable gain to the Government that more than two hundred thousands of its Muhammadan subjects entertain the firm belief that the doctrine of the advent of the *Ghazi* Mahdi and consequently that of *Jehad* are not Islamic doctrines.



## Review.

We are in receipt of two pamphlets, "Why Have I Accepted Islam," and "Muhammad, the Prophet of Islam?" by Dr. Nishikanta Chattopadhyaya whose Muslim name is Muhammad Aziz-ud-Din, late Principal, Hyderabad College. In the first of these, the author gives his reasons for accepting Islam as the only true religion. It is not an ordinary case of conversion. The author has a vast learning. He travelled in many countries and for a long time studied the various religions of the world. He was at first a great admirer of the rationalistic school in Europe, but rationalism could not satisfy the deep thirst of his soul. Accordingly he began to study Buddhism and was carried away by its apparently lofty ethical code which he ultimately found to be against human nature and thus grew tired of it. This was while he was in Germany where he delivered two lectures on Buddhism in the German language. From thence he went to Paris and then to St. Petersburg. Studying the French language, he became an admirer of Renan and through his influence began to study the Semitic languages and Semitic religions. For a long time he devoted himself to "the comparative study of all the great religions of the world, to wit: Judaism, Zoroastrianism and Brahmanism on the one hand, and Buddhism, Christianity and Islam on the other." Of all the forms of Christianity, he thought the Church of St. Peter was the best as a religion, but as atonement and eternal damnation stood in his way as serious objections to Christianity in general, the doctrines of Papal infallibility and transubstantiation were additional hinderances in the acceptance of Roman Catholicism. In this undecided state of mind, he returned to India where he gave himself up to the study of Theosophy for sometime, but this also failed to convince him. The study of Zoroastrianism and Islam had been "somewhat neglected," hitherto and so the former had its turn now. Then came Islam which occupying his attention last of all was destined to influence his life permanently. He had long felt the truth of Islam, but external circumstances prevented him from declaring his confession in its truth at an earlier date. On the 28th of August 1904, at last he openly accepted the religion of Islam in a meeting in which this lecture "Why Have I Accepted Islam" was delivered.



The chief reasons stated for accepting Islam are three, viz., that Islam alone is a truly historical, reasonable and practical religion. "The historical ground-work of Islam has struck," even the opponents of Islam. Professor Bosworth Smith is quoted to have said in his lectures on Muhammad and Muhammadanism: "We know indeed some fragments of a fragment of Christ's life; but who can lift the veil of the thirty years that prepared the way for the three? . . . . But in Muhammadanism every thing is different; here instead of the shadowy and the mysterious, we have history. . . . Nobody here is the dupe of himself, or of others; there is the full light of day upon all that light can ever reach at all." The next point considered is the eminent reasonableness of Islam. The Unity of God and the apostleship of Muhammad are the two fundamental doctrines of Islam. "Every sound and normal man . . . must readily give his assent to that simple and sublime truth: the Unity of God." In Islam there is neither the Three-in-one doctrine, nor are there the thirty millions of gods. The doctrine of apostleship also cannot be denied by any reasonable man. "Whenever the fundamental truths on which moral and religious life is leased, are either obscured or forgotten, whenever men become too worldly and avaricious, too immoral and materialistic, there appear, in the history of races and nations, men so highly spiritualized by birth and breeding as to be called prophets and apostles of God, and whose sole mission in life is to remind men of what they have forgotten and to revive what they have lost." Add to these the fact that Islam is so well-suited to the practical life of man. The moral teachings of Buddha and Christ are sometimes thought to be the very perfection, but that is a mistake. They may resemble "the Quixotic perfections in novels and romances," there may be "poetical beauty" in them, but that is not the way in which we working, toiling and social men should judge of the perfection of certain principles. We should look to the needs of humanity and judge of the perfection of principles by their practical utility. It is exactly on this basis, that is, having regard to the needs of humanity, that Islam has sanctioned polygamy. The laws of matrimony promulgated by Islam are "more practical, more consonant to the actual needs of human society and more conducive to its development from a moral and spiritual point of view." Other moral precepts of Islam possess the same excellence.



The other pamphlet, "Muhammad, the Prophet of Islam" gives a brief outline of the life of the Holy Prophet and deals with the wonderful transformation brought about by him. At the end the author answers briefly some of the objections brought forward against the Holy Prophet by prejudiced critics. We heartily commend both these pamphlets to the attention of the Muhammadan public as well as all enquirers after truth. They can be had either at Messrs. Luzac & Co., London, or at Chudderghat, Hyderabad, Deccan, "Why Have I accepted Islam?" for 4 annas, and "Muhammad, the Prophet of Islam," for 8 annas.

## An Exhortation.

Almighty God says in the Holy Quran : قل ما يعْبُؤُا بكم ربِّي لولا "Say what careth my Lord for you if you do not invoke Him" (xxv : 76). Friends! May God have mercy upon you, about nine months ago when being informed by God, I caused the following revelation to be published in *Alhakam* and *Albadr*, two newspapers issued from Qadian : عَفَا إِلَهُ يَارِ مَحَلِّهَا وَمَقَامِهَا which means that this country is about to be laid waste with Divine punishment, neither permanent abodes affording a security nor temporary ones ; in other words, that the plague would prevail generally and rage violently (*vide Alhakam* No. 18, Vol. viii, column 3, dated 31st May, 1904, and *Albadr* Nos. 20 and 21, dated 24th May and 1st June 1904, page 15). Now I see that time has drawn nigh. Just now, i.e., at 4 a.m. on the 27th February, I have seen in a vision that there is a great noise caused by painful deaths, at the same time the following words of Divine revelation were on my lips : "Death on all sides." Then I awoke and at that very time when a part of the night still remained, I began to write this notice. Arise and be ready for a time of great distress has come for this generation. There is no other bark, but that of piety which can take you to the shore. In times of trouble the faithful one inclines to God, for besides Him there is no other security. Atone now for your sins by making yourselves truly humble and give a sacrifice of your own selves by annihilating yourselves in truth. Yourselves take up your burdens by exerting to your best in



the path of righteousness, for gracious and merciful is your Lord. His wrath is stopped against those who shed tears, but such only as shed tears beforehand and not when they see the dying and the dead, for He can avert punishment from those who entertain fear of Him. The ignorant man says, why is the prophecy of punishment averted, but had it not been a Divine law that God should have removed the distresses which He intended to bring upon people or averted prophecies of punishment which He revealed to His chosen servants, upon a people turning to charity, repentance and humility, the world would have long since been utterly destroyed. Do good then that you may deserve the mercy of God. Walk fast towards God with all your strength; and if you cannot do it, take yourselves to the gate of His will though you do it limping and halting like a sick person; and even if this is not in your power, let charitable deeds bear you to that place like a corpse. These are days of great distress and the wrath of God is kindled upon heaven. This is not the time when you can be saved by mere words of mouth and boasting of the tongue. Let such a transformation be wrought within you, and let your footsteps fall in such a path that your gracious and compassionate Master may be pleased with you. Make your corner of solitude a place for the remembrance of God. Remove the rust of impurities from your hearts and shun rancour, niggardliness and abuse. Before the time should come, which would make you mad, make yourselves like mad men with untiring and restless prayers. How unfortunate are they who make their religion depend upon the cleverness of their tongues, while in their hearts is all darkness and impurity and a hankering after the world. If you wish good to yourselves, be not of such. How unfortunate is he who never casts a glance at his own disobedient spirit and abuses others with hateful prejudice, for he is in the horrible jaws of destruction; make yourselves then fully righteous and fear God and do not get tired of praying, that God may have mercy upon you. Which of you is there who when hungry is satisfied with the name of bread or with but one grain. So you cannot please God unless you walk wholly in His ways. Do not contend with your enemies when they are fanatically excited, for in meeting an ignorant man you will be led into ignorance. Therefore, if your enemies give you vexation or do you mischief or speak of me contemptuously and in abusive words, you should forbear and keep silence, so that your God



who knows on heaven the secrets of your hearts and their hearts, may reward you for your forbearance. Know it for certain that these are days of such great affliction for the world as it has never seen since its creation. All this has been brought about so that the word may be fulfilled which had been uttered by the prophets in the beginning. Almighty God informed me of these violent onslaughts twenty-five years before this time, and this Divine information was recorded and published in the *Barahin-i-Ahmadiyya* at that very time. Again while this country was yet almost free from the plague, He informed me of its great prevalence and this was also announced by me at the time. And again He has informed me of the serious and devastating outburst of the plague which must take place in the near future. He has done it to warn the people. Do not, therefore, follow the clever men whose hearts are full of impurities and uncleanness, who invite others to God, but are themselves farther away from Him. Almighty God now wishes to show it clearly who leads a pure life in God, and who leads the accursed life of estrangement from Him. Be so engaged in humble and touching prayers that you may be quite dead to all besides, so that God may save you from that other death. These are days of heavy tribulation for the world, but the world does not care when these afflictions are actually brought upon its head. I have done my duty and delivered the message, for I have informed you of the heavy afflictions which are in store for you. And peace be on those who follow true guidance.

To avoid misunderstanding I may add here that I do not mean by these exhortations to advocate the opinion that people should not leave their houses at the time of the prevalence of the plague. On the other hand, having regard to sanitary laws, it would be better that the village or *Mahalla* in which the plague makes its appearance should be immediately left and temporary huts should be raised in open fields outside the town or village. But it is not proper to fly to other villages or towns for this would be a wrong to those whose villages or towns are free from the pestilence. Such a course would in fact lead to the spread of plague and involve places which are free. He who takes pity on himself, should take pity also on his fellow-beings.

MIRZA GHULAM AHMAD.