

Vol. IV.

No. 6.

THE REVIEW OF RELIGIONS

JUNE 1905.

Digitized by Khilafat Library



CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
FURTHER REMARKS UPON PARDAIL AND POLYGAMY,	201
EARTHQUAKE TO COME	227
WOMEN IN CIVILIZED COUNTRIES	237

QADIAN,
DISTRICT GURDASPUR, PUNJAB, INDIA.

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

THE REVIEW OF RELIGIONS.

VOL. IV.)

JUNE 1905.

(No. 6.)

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ
نَحْمَدُهُ وَنُصَلِّي عَلَى رَسُولِهِ الْكَرِيمِ

Further remarks upon *Pardah* and Polygamy.

In view of the attention which the question of marriage in relation to social progress has recently received in the West, it is desirable that some general remarks may be added to the subjects of *pardah* and polygamy which have already been dealt with at length in these pages. "Few features of modern life," observes a writer in the *Fortnightly Review*, "strike the philosophic observer as more strange than the convention which, in a scientific age, forbids any discussion of the department of ethics that is concerned with the institution of marriage." The same writer says further on: "This attitude of acquiescence is ill justified by the facts that lie underneath. There is no need to indulge in the vocabulary of sensationalism. Here, if anywhere, there is required not the hysterical horror of the 'unco-guid,' but common sense. Yet certain features of contemporary life afford melancholy comment on the twentieth century civilization. The existence of what has been called 'the social evil,' with its results, direct and indirect; widespread clandestinity, inside and outside marriage; voluptuousness cheek by jowl with repressed instincts, point inevitably to the conclusion that society has not even begun squarely to face the sex question." The existence of this deplorable state of things has ultimately forced the question of the reconstruction of marriage-laws upon the Western mind, and the conspiracy of silence on this point has at last been broken. Within the last few years, this question has received a prominence, and the great social evil which prevails in the relations of the sexes is not only depicted in true colours by the rank and file of novelists, men and women alike, but the subject has also

come under the serious consideration of famous writers, and attempts are being made to diagnose the disease. There is a general feeling of dissatisfaction with the current marriage laws, and the first attempts to get rid of them are, as usual in such cases, more or less in the wrong direction. Yet there are glimpses of truth here and there which give one the hope that the true solution of the question would not remain long in the dark.

In a recent article in the *Fortnightly Review* a writer on the "Marriage Contract in its Relation to Social Progress," finding the prevalence of fornication too strong to be checked, advances the proposal that this evil should be suffered to prevail and should not be looked upon as an evil. "The fact remains that the evil continues, and that the thunder of a thousand pulpits for centuries has not availed to stop it." This is, no doubt, true, for the thousand voices of the pulpit have never searched the true causes of the prevalence of the evil and never aimed at their removal. Denunciation of the crime is absolutely useless unless the right step is taken to remove the cause of it. As I have said, prejudice colours the judgment of these thinkers, and hence their inability to see the true solution of this vexed question. Yet the writer is not unaware that there is a general feeling that the only remedy of this great social canker of civilization is polygamy. "The objection commonly raised against those who venture to criticise the conventional code is," he remarks, "based on the assumption that the only alternative to present conditions would be a polygamous system, which, it is pointed out, truly enough, has been rejected by all progressive nations. Indeed a reversion of the civilized world to polygamy is as inconceivable as a return to the use of bows and arrows." There is strange confusion in this argument. If polygamy must be rejected because it is rejected by the so-called progressive communities, why then question the reasonableness of their marriage laws? Why should not the laws governing the sex relations of these very progressive communities be considered faultless on the same ground? And yet the writer questions their truth and shows on the basis of facts that these laws are productive of the most serious mischief to society. The fact is that a community which is progressive in one direction may be backward in another. Christendom may have shown great progress in trade or in material advancement, but it is certainly backward in matters of chastity

and sexual morality, and no one has ever seriously disputed the truth of this fact. Is it not then a fatal error to reject an institution governing marriage on the flimsy ground that Christendom has rejected it? This would give the reader an idea of the fallacious reasoning advanced to throw discredit upon polygamy. Vere Collins, the writer of the article in the *Fortnightly Review*, offers, however, another alternative, and one has only to read his words to be convinced that the permission of polygamy is the only remedy for the evil. His proposal is in effect this that there should be no marriage at all, and that society should not care whether a child is born in wedlock or out of wedlock. "What reform does demand is," we are told, "that love should be freed from the swaddling bands of taboos and formulas, and be transferred to its proper place as a private concern between two individuals." That is to say, that there should be no formal union of a man and a woman as in marriage, but that everybody should be at liberty to love whom and how long he or she will. Had the object of the writer only been that separation between two married persons should be made easier of access, the remark would have been quite right. But he wants the society to be freed from the obligations of marriage itself. He says: "A woman, whose error may have been only ignorance or a too trusting affection, finds the doors of respectable society closed upon her. . . . The source of the wrong is to be traced back to the circumstance of woman's dependence on a particular man. It must, therefore, be in the direction of removing this condition that a solution to the difficulty will be found. At the present day it is not unusual to hear concern expressed at the falling birth rate, and apprehension at the spread of physical deterioration. . . . But certainly our ideas of morality seem to be inverted, when it is regarded as respectable for worn-out women to bear large families of diseased children to drunken fathers; while maternity 'in the lusty stealth of nature' drives the mother to the river or the streets. As Mr. Bernard Shaw points out, 'Every woman who can produce a citizen, with efficient reason, sound organs and a good digestion, should clearly be secured a sufficient reward for that national service, to make her ready to undertake and repeat it.' This is an alternative to polygamy. Under this system a woman shall be at liberty to have sexual intercourse with any man she thinks fit, and this act on her part shall not only be permitted by the state, but even rewarded hand-

somely and thus the state would encourage the production of illegitimate children. Here I may put a question to Mr. Dilawar Husain and other detractors of polygamy if they have no objection to adopt this alternative in case polygamy is prohibited as desired by them. Would it be a gain or loss? Even Christendom has seen after so many centuries that it must either sanction polygamy or legalize an evil. I call it an evil because if this course is adopted, it would only widen the sphere of promiscuous intercourse between the two sexes which has already become a source of great trouble in the civilized countries of Europe and America.

In every country in the world in which polygamy is prohibited, prostitution and fornication rage to an enormous extent. Nay, in the civilized countries, it is now seriously contended that "prostitution is a necessary evil." The Romans were probably the first people who adopted in theory a monogamy unmixed with polygamy, but mark the degraded state of their morals.* "There have certainly been many periods in history," says Lecky, "when virtue was more rare than under the Caesars; but there has probably never been a period when vice was more extravagant or uncontrolled. . . . The Romans had three kinds of marriage Usus was effected by a simple declaration of a determination to co-habit. The last form of marriage became general in the empire. Cicero evidently regarded sexual intercourse necessary for the physical health of at least young men. . . . 'If there be one of them,' he says, 'who thinks that young men should be altogether restrained from the love of courtesans, he is indeed very severe.'" Alexander Severus, who of all the Roman emperors was probably the most energetic in legislating against vice, when appointing a provincial governor, besides providing him with horses and servants, if he was married, also procured for him a concubine." (Page 913).

"In Rome, under Augustus, the laws did not punish prostitution, and they also held out rewards to the fathers of large families, and this combination of circumstances actually led ambitious husbands who were physically incompetent of becoming fathers to cause their

* The following facts and quotations are for the most part taken from Dr. Foote's *Home Cyclopaedia*, and the references to pages unless otherwise stated are to this volume.

wives to become public prostitutes, in order that numerous progeny might be obtained." (Page 849).

The state of Greece which was practically the first to prohibit polygamy is thus described by the same author. "When Grecian society reached this stage, and concubinage disappeared, perhaps, their marriage deserved the name of monogamy as much as ours does to-day. Nicholas, speaking of Greece at this period, remarks, 'In Athens, the most refined city of Greece, prostitution was as common as in New York, or London or Paris The Aspasiens, Phrynes, and Laïses of Greece have their counterpart in every modern capital; but we have a conventional standard of morals, which, though everywhere disregarded, imposes upon us the meanness of a continual hypocrisy of a very depraving character.' 'In the time of Pericles,' remarks Dr. S. Pancoast, 'there appeared and flourished at Athens a class of females who gloried in their wild excesses. In the Greek Colonies of Asia, temples were erected to the earthly Venus, and courtesans not merely tolerated, but honored as priestesses, of that condescending divinity. The wealthy and commercial city of Corinth was a nursery of courtesans. In the temple of Venus, as we are told by Strabo, there were no less than one thousand beautiful damsels, who to gain the goddess's favour, prostituted themselves for hire' In Athens the number of brothels was incredible. Solon found it necessary to allow the courtesans and prostitutes to enter the temples and forums for the purpose of public prostitution." (Pages 860, 861).

Such was the condition of the earliest monogamous nation which excluded polygamy from its laws of marriage. The advance of civilization shows no improvement in this respect. "Lady Augustus Hamilton, who wrote in the beginning of the nineteenth century, spoke of public houses in the Netherlands which were licensed by the state for the reception of the girls of the town. 'To these places,' remarked this writer, 'people of character resorted openly without fear or shame; there was as little scandal in being seen in one of them as being seen at a play-house or any other place of amusement. The entertainments at these places were music and dancing; those not engaged in dancing were seated around the room with their paramours. For any one choosing to retire with one of them, there were

small rooms adjoining, furnished with a bed and other conveniences. Their entrance to and exit from these rooms attracted no more attention than if they had stepped out to speak with a friend. It was the opinion that if they did not indulge the people in this particular, they should never be able to keep their wives chaste." (Page 849).

I will now consider the marriage laws of the Japanese who have, within nearly a century, earned a fame which brings them to the front rank of progressive societies. Prior to 1880, "a Japanese could have one legal wife and as many concubines as his means would permit. When a girl's relatives were too poor to support her, she could become the member of a plural household instead of adopting the profession of beggary, but the legal wife adopted all the children." The proposal of the abolition of this system was met with great opposition. A writer in the *New York Daily Sun* observed: "The husband, they say, may seek variety in his sexual relations in other and less open, and, therefore, more pernicious ways; he may lead a double life, squandering his means on a clandestine establishment, perhaps raising an illegitimate family, and thus creating a class hitherto almost unknown in Japan, the class of unfortunate innocent beings who, in the West, suffer cruelty for the transgression of their parents; he may frequent the *Yoshi-wara*, or he may cast eyes of desire on his neighbour's wife or daughter." But this system which permitted an inferior kind of polygamy was abolished in 1880, and now "prostitution in Japan is regularly licensed by the Government, and the houses occupied for the purpose often cover large blocks in the cities." (Pages 925-8).

Regarding England, much need not be said, for a reference to these pages will convince every reasonable man of the sexual immorality prevailing there. Dr. Foote says: "In England, the monogamic system of marriage, as in our own country, is professedly established by law, but public opinion tacitly sustains polygamy for husbands." And again, in speaking of the laws of divorce, he says: "An adultress's husband may obtain a divorce from her, if he can prove that she is guilty of adultery, notwithstanding his own conduct may have been at variance with what he requires of his wife. During the

discussion of a new bill, one of the members of Parliament in substance remarked, that if the law should be made equally binding on the husband, every gentleman in the house might be legally deprived of his wife." (Page 949.) *These are the men who make laws against polygamy!*

"In Spain little fidelity is known among married people. Jealousy never finds place in the Spanish breast, and the 'liberty of married women has no limit except their own discretion,' which, owing to an ardent temperament, interposes but a feeble restraint. . .

. Lord Byron, in describing the customs of the Spaniards in a letter to his mother, from Cadiz, wrote as follows: 'I beg leave to observe that intrigue here is the business of life; when a woman marries, she throws off all restraint, but I believe their conduct is chaste enough before. It is Spanish etiquette for gentlemen to make love to every woman with whom they have the opportunity, and a Spanish lady of rank has said that she would heartily despise the man who, having a proper opportunity, did not strenuously solicit every favour she could grant.' Yet the husbands of Spanish ladies, like those in all other countries, are under still less restraint than their wives." (Pages 952, 953).

The relations of the two sexes in France are thus described by Dr. Foote, who quotes the words of a woman resident in Paris: "The conversation with married women is very much more free than with us Many things that certainly are natural, but which our taste forbids, are spoken of by their real names, and with perfect coolness. This freedom of conversation is carried into the other details of life. Married women may go out with other men if they choose, and are often excessively independent of the husband. In cases where the wife is untrue, it depends on circumstances and the character of the husband, whether he makes a fuss or not. If not chaste in his own habits, he generally takes it easy." (Page 955.)

"As for the unfortunate girls of Paris, with which the streets swarm, they die mostly in misery, of ill-health and poverty; sometimes in the hospital; sometimes nobody knows where There is an institution in Paris, 'Des Enfants Trouves,' designed for the reception and support of illegitimate children. To this place come poor women unable to support their offspring, or rich women

too proud to own their fault. In a little box or can, running on a little railroad, is deposited the infant which enters the institution without the slightest clew to the person who placed it there I think a good motto to put over the gates of this house would be—The rich and the poor meet together for the *devil* is the maker of them all.” (Page 956).

Regarding Portugal we are told that the married women there are “quite as much given to intrigue and matrimonial infidelity as in Spain. (Page 958).

Regarding Italy “it has been remarked that ‘marriage is not a bond but the reverse.’ Before marriage a lady is the prisoner of a convent, or the parental mansion, and is not allowed the society of gentlemen; but after she has become the wife, she may also become the lover of from one to three more besides her husband. Byron, in one of his letters from Venice, said: ‘The general state of the morals here is much the same as in the Doge’s time. A woman is virtuous according to the code, who limits herself to her husband and one lover; those who have two, three, or more, are a little wild; but it is only those who are indiscriminately diffuse, or form a low connection, who are considered as overstepping the modesty of marriage. There is no convincing a woman that she is in the smallest degree deviating from the rule of right, or the fitness of things, in having a lover. The great sin seems to be in concealing it, or in having more than one—that is, unless such extension of the prerogative is understood and approved by the prior claimant.’ (Page 959).

In Austria-Hungary, while the monogamic system is upheld by law, there is a large percentage of illegitimate births. In the city of Vienna in 1853, there were about as many children born out of wedlock as in marriage. More recent statistics look considerably better. In the entire empire in 1885, only about fourteen per cent. of all births were illegitimate.” (Page 961).

In Sweden and Norway, the monogamic system is the law, and practical polygamy the violation. In the country first-named, a species of practical omnigamy, or free-love, prevails to a remarkable extent, though not under the sanction of law. Bayard Taylor, in a letter from Stockholm, remarked as follows:

'After speaking of the manners of Stockholm, I must not close this letter without saying a few words about its morals. It has been called the most licentious city in Europe, and I have no doubt with the most perfect justice. Vienna may surpass it in the amount of conjugal infidelity, but certainly not in general incontinence. Very nearly half the registered births are illegitimate, to say nothing of illegitimate children born in wedlock. Of the servant-girls, shop-girls, and seamstresses in the city, it is very safe to say that scarcely one out of a hundred is chaste, while, as rakish young Swedes have coolly informed me a large proportion of girls of respectable parentage, belonging to the middle class, are not much better. The men, of course, are much worse than the women; even in Paris one sees fewer physical signs of excessive debauchery. Here the number of broken-down young men, and blear-eyed, hoary sinners, is astonishing. I have never been in any place where licentiousness was so open and so avowed, and yet where the slang of a sham morality was so prevalent At the restaurants, young blades order their dinners of the female-waiters with arms around their waists, while the old men place their hands unblushingly upon their bosoms. One does not wonder when he is told of young men who have passed safely through the ordeals of Berlin and Paris, and have come at last to Stockholm to be ruined." (Pages 961, 962).

From these quotations, it is sufficiently clear that strict monogamy has not been productive of good results in a single country in the old world. Evil is prevalent everywhere. Here is testimony from the words of a Western writer that the poison has found its way into every society which prohibits polygamy. Speaking of the marriage laws in the dominion of Canada, Dr. Foote says: "In the Dominion of Canada there is no lack of statutory law of the most stringent character to preserve the sexual morals of the people. Still the net results are not such as to give satisfaction to the advocates of unadulterated monogamy All open violations of the statutes are doubtless visited with the prescribed punishment, but the clandestine practices of those who regard neither statutory law nor conventional morality are about the same as in the United States or other monogamic countries." (*Italics are mine*). (Page 972.)

The United States of America are in no better position in this respect. Speaking of the Mormons, Dr. Foote thus contrasts them with the orthodox: "Nevertheless they have been compelled by the National Government to outwardly relinquish their favourite marriage system. What they may do in their private lives under the influence of the religious views they entertain, may be easily imagined when it is no secret that in every Gentile city of the United States, where polygamy is under the ban of the church and the statues of the land, where, indeed, it is considered highly immoral for any person to indulge in the sexual relation outside of monogamic marriage, there are more plural wives, practically speaking, than there are in Utah. If the 'Gentile' will cater to outward public opinion, law and conscience, while leading a dual life, what can be reasonably expected of a people whose religion and morals justify such social relations. In the one case the innocent fruits of illicit amours falling victims of abortionists or "Baby Farmers or growing up in the slums of a big city to fill our work-houses and prisons, and in the other, the offspring reared under the fostering care of affectionate mothers who have not lost self-respect nor the social recognition of their neighbours. All this must look quite unaccountable to an outside barbarian." (Page 873).

"Occasionally cases occur of mutual exchange, transient or permanent. There once lived in a New England city a couple of husbands, in respectable position, who traded wives by consent of all parties concerned in the transaction I recently read of a couple of husbands in Illinois who traded wives, one of them receiving 'boot.' Transient exchanges are not uncommon among some of the married people of large cities; but permanent ones, unless effected by elopement, when the bargain is all on one side, are certainly rare occurrences. 'Lycurgus, the great legislator of Lacedaemonians,' it is said by a historian, 'thought that freely imparting wives to each other was the best way of preventing jealousy, ridiculing those who thought the violation of their bed an insupportable injury.' Those who exchange are probably disciples of his theory." (Page 975).

"American wives, with occasional exceptions, are faithful to their husbands, and many husbands, particularly in the rural districts, are

faithful in return. But the fact that thousands of public prostitutes and mistresses are supported in all large cities and many in villages and rural neighbourhoods leads to the irresistible conclusion that, while monogamy is the law in state and society, polygamy is the custom of not a small proportion of the male population. It is a proverbial remark in New York, that the abandoned females of this city are maintained chiefly by the patronage of married men visiting the metropolis. Singular disclosures in fashionable life, growing out of a recent notorious affair, go to show that it is not impossible for wives to imitate their husbands' vices." (Page 976.)

"By a private letter from a correspondent living in Washington, D.C., I am informed that 'a Cuban girl of fifteen may become a prostitute by paying the administration fee' (whatever that may mean) but that 'she cannot marry at seventeen without the consent of her parents or guardians.' This correspondent also writes me that the prevalence of syphilis in Cuba is quite remarkable; that 'our Government had a health examination made by the American officers there which developed the astounding fact that eighty per cent. of all women were tainted with it'." (Page 986).

Of Porto Rico, Sherman "asserted that the number of children born to these people out of wedlock exceeded the number vouchsafed by Divine providence to parents who had been married to each other." (Page 982).

After describing the state of the different Christian countries which observe a purely monogamic system in their marriage-laws, the Home Cyclopaedia goes on to say: "Is sexual morality, even among nations nominally the most Christian, a prevalent virtue? If so, where is the moral oasis? It is not in our great cities; they are as destitute of it as were the cities of Rome and Athens in the 'Augustan age.'

..... It is not in our villages, where there is always enough scandal based on fact for the villagers to keep up an incessant talking at their tea-tables and sewing-circles; nor does it present itself conspicuously in rural district. In addition to these come the pitiful appeals of young women, living in small as well as large neighbourhoods, for something to save their name from the disgrace which awaits them." (Page 1024).

"But someone must undertake the unpopular work of exhibiting the defects of the marriage-system and of awakening the invention and ingenuity of the age to the discovery of new rules and customs for the regulation of intercourse between the sexes; for we are now rapidly drifting into the vicious manners and practices of the Grecians in the day of Pericles, without adopting their virtue, frankness, and honesty. Paris, London, and New York are worse in their sexual morality to-day than were the people of ancient Athens, for the reason that while the practices of their citizens are no better, their professions *are*, and the souls of husbands and wives are weighed down with deceit and hypocrisy." (Page 992).

Before describing the causes and remedies of these evils, it is necessary to take some more facts into consideration. The ratio of the male to female population is a question of importance in the reconstruction of the marriage-laws of Christendom. Something has already been said on this subject in the article on the "Necessity of Polygamy." Here I would quote from the Home Cyclopaedia to throw further light on this point. "At present, the tendency, all over the world, except in newly settled regions, where adventurous men naturally predominate, is to an excess of females at adult age. 'At the recent annual meeting of the Society for the Employment of Women, in London,' remarked the New York Tribune in one of its issues in July, 1899, 'Sir Owen Roberts, who presided, said that in England there are two million women in excess of the male population, while in the Colonies the surplus of males is about the same. The tendency of all dense population,' remarked a newspaper writer thirty years ago in urging the necessity of making women self-supporting, 'is to make the female sex preponderate, and we must find something to do with the surplus women. If we look at foreign countries, we see that *under the age of fifteen* the males exceed the females; but that beyond fifteen the females preponderate, and so on until ninety. In sixteen foreign nations this holds good. In England, the ratio of females to males is as three to two; while in France, where the people are longer-lived than any other European nation, it is even greater. In Massachusetts the women are nearly 20,000 (in 1890, over 60,000) in excess, while in Connecticut they are, 6,114 (in 1890, 7,182), and the same ratio runs through New

Hampshire and Rhode Island. In Vermont and Maine, the men are in surplus; while the state of New York shows 5,234 (in 1890, 44,067) more women than men, to be accounted for by the crowded condition of New York City, which alone shows nearly 20,000 in excess.' (This statement it will be observed was made before the birth of greater New York. The excess is probably now much greater.) . . . It is shown that the tendency of the female sex is to out-number the other. As we grow in civilization, we must, therefore, expect this to take place. . . . I may add that in the states of Maryland, New Jersey, North Carolina, South Carolina and Virginia, the women out-number the men at this time." (Page 1017).

I have quoted these facts at some length from Western sources so that I may not be blamed for prejudice in entraining a low opinion of Western morality in sexual matters. The next step towards the solution of the question which I have set before myself in this article is to point out the defects in the Western marriage laws and marriage institutions, in other words, to diagnose the disease from the symptoms given above. This collection of facts gives rise, in my opinion, to the following conclusions. Firstly, that in all civilized societies married persons not only take too much liberty with others than their mates, but that there is actually a deplorable laxity of morals within the circle of marriage as well as outside it. Secondly, that in such societies married life often becomes too bitter on account of the attachment of either party to strangers. Thirdly, that to the extent to which a restraint is put upon the free mixing of the two sexes, there is marked improvement in chastity. Fourthly, that in all communities which have excluded polygamy from their matrimonial codes, chastity, without as well as within the marriage circle, is more or less a rare thing. Fifthly, that in all societies which do not sanction polygamy, prostitution is sanctioned of necessity. Sixthly, that there is more infidelity to the marriage-bed on the part of men. Seventhly, that women who give themselves over to prostitution are generally such as cannot find honorable conjugal relations and as have not the means to lead an honorable life. Eighthly, that in all the civilized countries which have prohibited polygamy, the number of women far exceeds that of men.

It would be convenient to consider the first three headings in one

place. The facts upon which the three assertions are made have been quoted at length in the previous pages. That there is much trouble in married life in the civilized countries is admitted on all hands, but the remedy of this defect is not sought in the right direction. George Meredith, the famous novelist, for instance, some time ago, advocated the temporary marriage system, the marriage tie coming to dissolution of itself after some time. Why was this extreme proposal made? Because after some time the parties to the marriage get tired of each other and seek to establish new relations. Only yesterday I read a story in the *Civil and Military Gazette* illustrative of the matrimonial relations in many English homes. After several years after her marriage the lady gets tired of her clumsy but rich husband, because she likes more another whom she loves. Similar feeling regarding the bitterness and tiresomeness of married life is found expressed in numerous novels of the day. The heart of the husband goes away after an actress or a mistress, and life becomes a misery to both parties. They feel as it were the pangs of hell in this life. The result is that the institution of marriage is becoming more and more unpopular every day, and there are numerous men and women in civilized countries who like to pass their lives and actually pass them without contracting marriage relations. The evil consequences of this love for celibacy can be seen even by a superficial observer. To mention only one, the extension of this measure would either bring about a termination of the human race or produce a beastly race which is the offspring of promiscuous intercourse. To propose terminable marriage systems so that after some time each of the parties should be at liberty to seek new relations, or to advocate "free love," i.e., that there should be no union of man and woman in marriage at all, is not to afford a solution of the difficulty, but to enhance the trouble which already exists. Our duty is to seek first, with a cool and unprejudiced mind, the causes of these troubles in family life. It is not true to say that on account of the monotony of family life the two parties get tired of each other and want a variety in their relations. If there were no external circumstance to detach the affections of one or both of the parties, the seed of love sown in the marriage contract should grow gradually into a powerful tree. Unless there is some storm which takes it out from its roots or unless the

water of affection which afforded it nutrition at first changes its course, there is nothing that can harm it. It would be found that though there are many causes which upset family arrangements, yet the most powerful, the one which brings the greatest embitterment in married life, is that which alienates the affections of the husband or the wife and turns them into another direction, and this is due, in civilized life, to the too free mixing of the two sexes. The more liberty the sexes take with each other, the more disastrous are the consequences. I have quoted above the words of an American lady who lived long enough in Paris to form an opinion about the manners and customs of the French people. This lady tells us that married women in France take more liberty with others than their husbands than their sisters do in England or America, and that accordingly they look upon themselves as independent of their husbands going away anywhere they like with any one they choose. The consequence is that much more adultery prevails in France than either in England or America. Similarly, in Spain and Italy, there is much infidelity among married persons, but unmarried girls are usually chaste, the reason being that until they get married they are usually excluded from the company of males in these countries and this freedom is allowed them only after marriage. From this it is clear that infidelity to marriage-bed arises directly from the free mixing of the two sexes, and that so long as a check is not put upon the evil, the troubles of family life cannot be lessened. I do not mean to say that the seclusion of women would utterly extirpate the evil, and that if such a step is taken, there would be no ripple in the surface of family life, for such a perfect state is not vouchsafed to human society in this world. But to the extent to which reform can be carried out in consonance with the conditions of human life, I think the seclusion of women is a safe remedy for many of the evils with which European and American society is affected. This is a measure which takes away from both parties to the marriage contract many of the occasions which are likely to prove injurious to their married state.

The subject of the seclusion of women, or the *pardah* system as it is generally called, has been dealt with at full length and in all its phases, its necessity, the extent to which it is required and the

invalidity of the objections against it, in previous issues of this magazine. Its introduction into Western society is sure to remedy many of the defects in the marriage institutions of that people. At the root of all family troubles which are making marriage an unpopular institution in the West lies the fact that married men and women have every occasion to form relations of love with others and to seek pleasure and enjoyment away from home. When young women with all their attractions which civilization has enhanced are allowed to freely mix or talk or go out with young men who may be under the influence of sensual passions, the consequence that must follow is too evident to be mentioned. That it actually does follow such a state of things is apparent from the condition of society in the West, a true picture of which has been drawn above. I think the need of the *pardah* has become greater in this age, because with the advance of civilization simplicity is giving place to attractive adornments, beauty is growing more and more refined, and ease and luxury are assisting in the growth of sensual pleasures. All these features of modern society are so many causes in giving prominence to the sensual desires in man. Much is said in favor of education but will any detractor of the *pardah* tell me what education has done for the Swedes at Stockholm, or for the Austrians at Vienna, or for the French at Paris, or for the English at London, or for the Americans at New York? These are the great centres of civilization, and, I regret to add, the great centres of adultery and prostitution. I say we should not fight with nature. Reform should be directed in the line in which in consistency with human nature it can do any good. Nature has ordained that the beauty of the female sex should generate certain desires in the heart of the male and it is the gratification of these desires which is sought through conjugal relations. You cannot change the nature of man, nor can you make young men and women so pure that no evil idea should find access to their hearts when they are allowed to take every liberty with one another. We should first do everything that lies in our power to make the occasions of evil the fewer. The experiences of family life tell us that the smooth road which love chalks out at first in the hearts of young people is only illusory. In the actual course of life there would always be small hitches and small grievances against each other. The expected pleasure is some

times not found at home. Under these and similar circumstances allow the husband and the wife to seek that very pleasure elsewhere, I mean the pleasure which one sex has in the company of the opposite sex, and the result generally is that the gulf of separation between them is widened, trivial or even imaginary matrimonial ills are given an importance, and one or both of the parties deviate from the right course. It is a fact that there can be no contentment in home life if there is an occasion for the parties to seek pleasure and enjoyment away from home. I know that the chief argument of the detractors of the *pardah* system is that under this system they miss the pleasure which flows from the company of the two sexes, but I have shown in the previous articles that such pleasure can only be obtained at the cost of the true happiness of home life, the happiness of others as well as of ourselves. At any rate it is easy to see that the seclusion of women would considerably lessen the chances of seeking pleasure away from home and therefore also the occasions of evil. I wish to know if the civilized society has any valid objection to the application of this remedy for the diseases which prevail in it. The only other alternative is of course that there should be a kind of omnigamy or free love and that sexual connections without the marriage-tie should not be looked upon as disgraceful. Sooner or later civilization will have to choose one of these two alternatives, and though the tendency is at present in favour of the latter, I have every hope that with a slight improvement in the moral ideas of Christendom this tendency would soon be crushed, for the moral ideas of man, if not diseased, revolt at it.

Not only would the *pardah* system be a guard against any disturbance of the happiness of home life, but it would also be a protector of the chastity of virgins. I would not have said this had I not read of thousands of instances in which pure virgins were brought to shame because they trusted too much in the affections of their lovers. There are many scoundrels in the world who press their love until an innocent girl has surrendered herself and then desert her either to die in a hospital or to adopt the damned profession of a prostitute. I call her innocent because if she had not been placed under such trying circumstances, there were ninety-nine chances out of hundred that she should have preserved her chastity. It is

easy to charge woman with frailty, but why place her in the power of the devil first. The method of wooing prevalent in the Western countries is productive of serious mischief as is apparent from the vast number of illegitimate children born in every civilized country. This method reached its climax in Wales and certain parts of Germany where it was the custom, as it was also in England a century ago, in the words of Dr. Foote, that "the lover generally came under the shadow of the night, and was taken without much reserve to the bed of his sweetheart." Strange enough that the number of illegitimate children under this system was not greater than under the current system of courtship. Moral diseases must be treated like physical diseases and they should not be allowed to vitiate human society until education has produced the imaginary strength of character which is a proof against every trial. No education can uproot the instinct of human nature which inspires love for the opposite sex. The sexual passions must, like the appetites, do their work in all those who have reached the age of puberty, and if, when these passions are in a state of utmost excitement, as they must be when a young man and a young woman are allowed to take every liberty with each other, young people indulge in the realization of the supreme sexual pleasure, they are not to be so much blamed as the institutions which place them under such trying circumstances. For, sexual association if too free and between persons who may have no other object than deriving sexual pleasure from such association is sure to lead to sexual gratification in many cases, and to avoid this it is necessary to prohibit a free mixing of the two sexes. This would preserve chastity, save many a woman from disgrace, many from death and disaster, and lessen the high rate of illegitimacy in the West which is at present appalling.

Pardah then is to a certain extent a remedy for the evils which vitiate Western society. But the *pardah* alone is not a remedy for all the evils, and accordingly, I will now enquire further into the nature of these evils and their probable causes. That chastity is on the decrease, among males as well as females, married as well as unmarried, that such a black evil as prostitution has to be sanctioned, that among the married persons the number of males who are not faithful to the marriage bed is far greater than the number of fe-

males, that the females that go wrong are mostly those who are unmarried and unable to find honourable marriage relations, and that the number of females exceeds that of the males, are the facts which have now to be considered. I may say at the very outset that polygamy is a remedy for all these evils and that for the following reasons. The number of females far exceeds that of the males and thence proceeds the whole evil because the strict monogamic law makes no provision for the excess number of females. Had the case been the reverse of what it is, strict monogamy would no doubt have not required to be supplemented by any other law, because a slight excess in the number of males is easily exhausted in military or adventurous professions abroad, professions not suited for women from their very nature. But the statistics of all civilized countries show a preponderance in the number of females in all monogamic countries, while their excess in countries which sanction polygamy is evident from that very fact. It is an error to suppose that in the latter countries the women are all monopolized by the rich polygamists and that other men have, therefore, to go without wives altogether. Monogamic relations are necessarily preferred by women and generally when a woman can find a good unmarried husband, she would not choose one who has already a wife. In short, the testimony is conclusive which shows that the number of females in the world exceeds that of the males and the same testimony shows that there is a tendency to further increase of the female sex with the advance of civilization. This is a conclusion at which Christian writers have arrived, and to whatever cause it may be due, it must convince the monogamic Christians of their error in the rejection of polygamy.

Now the question arises, what must be done with the excess number of females? This question has puzzled many Christian thinkers, and the only solution they can afford of it is that employment should be found for the surplus number of women. But while employment would support them and satisfy their appetites, it would not satisfy their passions, their desire for the male sex. Is there any one who thinks that it would? Let him answer. I do not mind if it is Mr. Dilawar Husain or any other hater of polygamy, Eastern or Western, for I want only the answer to the question. And if employment would not satisfy their passions, as every sane person

must admit, are we entitled to suppose that Almighty God has so arranged matters that the excess number of females should not be created with the desire for the other sex, that the sexual passions should in fact form no part of their feminine nature? Has nature kept any distinction between women that should be married and women that need not be married? The world has failed to discover such a distinction hitherto. The only alternative left then is, if polygamy is not to be sanctioned, that such women should be forced to subdue the passions which nature has made a part of their nature. I think in such a case there is no need even to provide employment for them, for if they can subdue their passions, they must also have the power to subdue their appetites, *i.e.*, hunger and thirst and hence they do not stand in need of satisfying their appetites or their passions, the one being as much a part of their nature as the other. The passions of an individual for the opposite sex are an integral part of his nature and it is an error to suppose that so long as we live on this terrestrial globe, we can do without them. Even if you meet here or there a woman who in technical language is called an 'old maid,' she may not actually correspond to the description contained in these words or she may only be an exception like the impotent man; and if neither, the suppression of passions must no doubt tell upon her health. For be it remarked that sexual starvation has, like real starvation, its effect upon physical health. Even a Christian preacher, Henry Ward Beecher, admitted this in one of his sermons. "The soul," said the preacher, "is a symmetrical whole. There is nothing superfluous in man; if he were to be made again, he doubtless would be made as he is. Man's faculties are well constructed. The fault is not in the faculties themselves, but in the use of them. Every part is needed. In religion are included, not the moral feelings alone, but also the imagination; and not the moral feelings and the imagination alone, but also the reason; and not the moral feelings, and the imagination and the reason alone, but the affections; and not all these combined alone, but all the organic passions and physical appetites; subordinated, controlled, applied to moral and proper ends; but, nevertheless, the passions and appetites. For a man without his appetites and passions would be like a man pulled up by the roots. As long as a man lives on the physical globe, and is dependent upon a physical structure to think,

feel, and act in, so long he must have appetites and passions." After giving this quotation from the sermon, Dr. Foote adds: "There can be no doubt that it was originally designed that these organs should be preserved or they never would have been assigned a place in the human organization; as well talk of abbreviating the arms or amputating the limbs of a man in obedience to a supposed divin law, as to propose to dwarf the development or paralyse the action of these faculties! All of them may be exercised without harming your neighbour; it is a perverse use of them that leads to disorder, disease and unhappiness." (Pages 822, 823). Again Dr. Oliver Wendill Holmes is quoted: "There comes a time when the souls of human beings—women, perhaps, more even than men—begin to faint for the atmosphere of affections they were made to breathe. Then it is that society places its transparent bell-glass over the young woman who is to be the subject of one of its fatal experiments. The element by which only the heart lives is sucked out of her crystalline prison."

Apart from these considerations whose value can only be appreciated by a philosophic mind and not by one which is blinded by bigotry and prejudice, it is evident that as a matter of fact the increase in the number of women who cannot find husbands has produced the worst consequences. Adultery and prostitution are steadily increasing and the number of illegitimate children threatens the order of society. Yet it is not the fault of the women, but that of the institutions which make no provision for them to get husbands. A woman was prosecuted for the fifth time for having illegitimate children in one of the states in America under old regulations when bearing a bastard was an offence, more than a century ago. She defended herself in the most heroic manner, arguing thus her own case: "You are pleased to allow, I don't want sense, but I must be stupified to the last degree, not to prefer the honourable state of wedlock to the condition I have lived in. I always was, and still am, willing to enter into it; and doubt not my behaving well in it, having all the industry, fertility and skill in economy pertaining to a good wife's character. I defy any person to say I ever refused an offer of that sort. On the contrary I readily consented to the only proposal of marriage that ever was made to me, which was when I was a virgin; but too easily confiding

in the person's sincerity that made it, I unhappily lost my own honour, by trusting to his; for he got me with child, and then forsook me. That very person you all know; he is now become a magistrate of this country; and I had hopes that he would have appeared this day on the bench and endeavoured to moderate the court in my favour." This one case affords sufficient reason for the introduction of both *pardah* and polygamy into the Western society. While the former of these guards the chastity of women against the passions of lustful men, the second never denies to woman the honourable position of being a beloved wife and an affectionate mother. In short, the excess of females over the males throughout the civilized world argues conclusively in favour of polygamy. There is no remedy besides polygamy, and if polygamy is still rejected, the civilized society shall plunge deeper and deeper into immorality. Had this excess been limited to a few states, intermarriages could have solved the difficulty, but as matters stand, the civilized nations are brought face to face with polygamy, the only other alternative being widespread adultery and prostitution. Let us see which of these two Mr. Dilawar Husain endorses. Here, moreover, I humbly enquire of the *Arya Patrika* what remedy has the founder of the Arya Samaj pointed out for the surplus number of females. Is it *Niyog* or something else? But probably no woman can have recourse to *Niyog* until she becomes subject, whether actually or nominally, to the authority of a husband. It may appear strange that a woman who owns or has owned a husband, should have carnal knowledge of another than her husband while a woman who has never owned a husband should not be permitted to take the same course, but even the scientific West presents so many strange features that one need not be astonished at the principles held nearer home. There among the civilized societies of the West they hate polygamy to such an extent that they prefer any and every evil to it. Their laws punish polygamy, but sanction prostitution! And yet we are told that the people owning these institutions are enlightend and civilized people, while those who sanction polygamy and condemn prostitution and adultery are barbarians. For my own part, I would side with these barbarians, and I think every man governed by reason would do the same.

There is one more circumstance to which I wish to draw the reader's attention. It appears from the facts quoted above that men

are generally more unfaithful to their marriage vows than women; Now Christendom is generally guided by emotion and not by reason. There was a time when it looked upon woman as the devil incarnate, but that opinion is now changed. She has now become the angel while her former position is taken by her "lord and master." She was once supposed to possess the fiendish qualities while the man was quite blameless even though he may have acted the devil in tempting her. The state of things is now reversed: woman is looked upon as being endowed with superhuman virtue while the man is the devil in carnate. The truth is that neither man nor woman is endowed either with sub-human wickedness or with superhuman virtue. Let one set of laws and institutions govern them and they are both angels, and let another set of laws and institutions be their guiding rules, and they are worse than devils. The greater unfaithfulness of men to the marriage bed is not due to any extraordinary degree of wickedness in their nature, but to the fact that the institutions which govern them go against their nature and do not undertake to satisfy their needs. In the first place, the fire of their passions is always kept kindled because of the too free mixing of the two sexes. But this is a reason which equally affects both the sexes. The additional injustice which is done to men by the marriage institutions of the West is that they are compelled to stick to monogamy even when they really stand in need of polygamy. I have shown in the article on the "Necessity of Polygamy" that there are certain disabilities attending women in particular which incapacitate them for conjugal relations for long periods. Under such circumstances a husband endowed with strong sexual passions may stand in need of a second wife and though nature may have made a provision for him by producing more females than males, society in its blind love for old institutions would not suffer him to take such a course. But the force of society and its institutions cannot make a man go against his nature. He must satisfy his natural needs, and if he is prohibited to do this in a straightforward and open manner, he must resort to clandestine ways. This is the reason that there is greater unfaithfulness on the part of married men than married women. Nature would never be stopped in its course. Nature is inexorable in its laws and accordingly it is the institutions which must be adapted to nature. If they are not, the result is disastrous, as may be seen in

of the people against polygamy, if called in question, is satisfied to defend itself in misrepresentation and denunciation, which amounts to nothing when you arrive at the 'hard pan' beneath the dregs."

Prohibition of polygamy, it should be borne in mind, has arisen, originally out of a laxity of sexual morals, and it was then engrafted upon the Christian society because of their distorted views of marriage. Prohibition of polygamy was first introduced into the world by the Greeks and the Romans, among whom vices of the basest sort prevailed to such an extent that they ultimately brought about their ruin. In the Roman Empire was born Christianity, an offshoot of Judaism which recognised the legality of polygamy. This institution had in fact the endorsement of the great prophets of Israel, Abraham, Moses and others. Christ did not say a single word against it. Even the apostles did not, though monogamy was clearly required of bishops, deacons and elders of the church, but it was not required of laymen. Accordingly polygamy continued to be practised in the Christian Church for a long time, and even Martin Luther and the synod of six reformers held, says Nicholas, "that the Gospels nowhere in express terms commanded monogamy, and that polygamy had been practised by the highest dignitaries of the church." Thus polygamy had a religious sanction even in Christianity. But though polygamy was held to be legal and practised in the Christian church, another set of circumstances had arisen which made marriage itself an institution more or less hated. Jesus, it was the popular belief, did not marry, and Paul, who worked most vehemently to separate Christianity from Judaism, was an "old bachelor." The effect of the celibacy of these two leaders was that marriage was decried and celibacy extolled. I would quote from the Home Cyclopaedia again: "St. Jerome, who flourished in the fourth century, and to whom the Christian world is mainly indebted for the early translations and revisions of the Old and New Testaments, and other Christian works, said: 'Let us put the hand to the axe, and cut by its roots the sterile tree of marriage. God had well permitted marriage at the commencement of the world, but Jesus Christ and Mary have consecrated virginity.' 'It was,' says Gide, 'the accepted opinion of the Fathers of the Church of the fourth century that marriage was the consequence of the original sin, and that, without

the first transgression, God would have provided otherwise for the perpetuation of human kind. From the writings of the Fathers, this doctrine soon passed into a law. The Church forbade marriage to its clergymen, and, not being able to control the simple faithful, they applied themselves to restraining them. It was unfortunate for the early Christians that old St. Paul, through some love-disappointment in youth, probably, was an old bachelor, and always threw his influence in favour of celibacy. He was like the fox who lost his tail, and would have preferred that all other foxes should get along without this caudal extremity. He wrote to the Corinthians : ' It is good for a man not to touch a woman. ' The influence of these distorted views of marriage on the morals of the clergy is too well-known to be described. " St. Bernard, the most conspicuous ecclesiastic of the day, uttered a vigorous protest against the endeavour to enforce a purity at war with the instincts of human nature. According to Lecky, ' an Italian bishop of the tenth century epigrammatically described the morals of his time when he declared that if he were to enforce the canons against unchaste people administering ecclesiastical rites, no one would be left in the church except the boys, and if he were to observe the canons against the bastards, these also must be excluded ! ' " (pages 888-92). But the hatred of the church against the institution of marriage, still finds expression among the Shakers, who believe " all sexual association, even for the purpose of procreation, sinful, and marriage a sort of compromise with the devil. " These distorted views of marriage should, naturally have produced a strong hatred against polygamy, and this is the reason that though polygamy was allowed and practised by the church, it has ultimately begun to be looked upon as forbidden by religion. In giving this prohibition a religious colouring, Christianity stands almost alone. Yet among the earliest Christians, loose practices also prevailed : " The early Christians, as is well-known, were divided into nearly as many sects perhaps as now. Among these the Adamites, as they were called, a sect of the second century, who held that the merits of Christ restored them to a condition of Adamic innocence, appeared naked in their assemblies, and rejected marriage; they practised promiscuous intercourse, and held it as one of the surest means of salvation. This sect was twice revived, once in the twelfth century at Antwerp, and again in the fifteenth, among the Hussites,

in Germany and Bohemia. The Gnostics and Manicheans, sects from the second to the sixth century, held the same tenets of promiscuous intercourse and rejection of marriage." (page 920).

Earthquake to Come.

Under this heading the *Pioneer* publishes, in its issue of 30th April, the following letter, signed Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, Qadian.

"Sir—I hope you will kindly give place to the following in your columns and lay myself and the public under an obligation by doing so.

"In 1882 I first received information from on high of a disaster in the mountain-range and published in my work entitled the Barahin-i-Ahmaddiyya the revelation so received which ran as follows :—
 'ولما تجلى ربه للجبل جعله دكا' and when the Lord manifested Himself to the mountain, He crushed it down.' Thus it was foretold more than twenty years ago that at some future moment a severe crushing in the mountains would be brought about, referring to the terrible earthquake of 4th April. After this I published in 1901 an Urdu poem entitled the 'Amen' in which appeared the following lines :—

'An hour lies in wait for you
 'Which will bring before your eyes the scene of the day of judgment.
 'Of this the Lord has informed me.'

"In these lines to a plain reference is contained too the severe shock of earthquake which brought before the minds the terrible shaking of the judgment day. After this in December 1903, a Divine revelation which was published at the time spoke still more plainly of the earthquake, the words of this revelation being زلزله کا دھکا, lit, a shock of earthquake. More recently still it was revealed to me in May 1904 that a heavy disaster would overtake the country which would level buildings with the ground. The revelation in which this was foretold was published in a newspaper, *Alhakam*, on the 31st May 1904, and ran thus غيب الديار محطها ومقامها i.e. 'No trace shall be left of the abodes, both permanent and temporary.' This revelation also plainly foretold of the severe shock of earthquake by which the abodes of men were to be laid waste. Similar revelations, foretelling of this

heavy disaster, were received by me immediately before the shock and published in newspapers as well as notices issued by me.

"In accordance with these revelations from Almighty God, a severe shock of earthquake was felt on the 4th April whose effect on the mountain-range was crushing and which levelled to the ground numerous abodes bringing about an enormous ruin and loss of life. So terrific was the shock that there was hardly a man who on witnessing it did not cry out that it was like the shaking of the day of judgment. But after this shock, Almighty God has informed me of a still more severe shock, a reference to which is also contained in the Barahin-i-Ahmadiyya in the same words that have been quoted above. The earthquake of which I have now been informed would be extraordinarily severe. In the Divine revelation the words in Arabic are زلزلة الساعة, that is to say a terrible shaking like the shaking of the hour of judgment. I have also been informed that this earthquake would bring about a terrible ruin of houses and severe shocks would be felt in the mountains. The severity of the coming shock is apprehended to be so great that the first shock would be nothing in comparison with it. This information I have received more than once and my sympathy for my fellow-beings has obliged me to give publicity to this fact. I have caused about 50,000 notices to be published and distributed in the country. But I wish that our kind Government for which I have the deepest sympathy may also be informed of it. As I am fully certain of the appearance of this disaster I consider it a sin to keep silence. Perchance my voice may be of some service in saving human life in general and the lives of British officers in particular if the Government makes any arrangement to keep away from the dangerous mountainous area for some time, say up to the commencement of the next year, the headquarters being changed temporarily. It is my earnest desire that some such step may be taken so that valuable lives might not be placed in danger."

The comment which has appeared on this letter in the press calls for some explanation. It has been argued in the first place that the prophecy, which, it is claimed, was fulfilled by the shock of earthquake felt in this country on the 4th April, was a vague one and that accordingly no value should be attached to the prophecy concerning

a fresh shock. Such words from the pen of one who has read this letter, are indeed astonishing. Not to mention the earlier revelations contained in books one of which was published quite a quarter of a century ago, the revelations published last year are sufficient to rebut the charge of vagueness. What would be the nature of the predicted calamity and what its effect are two things as plainly stated in revelations published only a year before as they could possibly be in any set of words. At the end of December 1903, the following Divine revelation was published by the Promised Messiah in *Alhikam*, a weekly newspaper issued from Qadian: زلزله کا دھکا, which literally means, "a shock of earthquake." Five months later another revelation was published. It was in Arabic and ran as follows: عفت الدنيا ر محلاتها ومقامها i.e., "In a vast tract of the country permanent and temporary abodes shall be levelled with the ground." No more appropriate words can describe the devastation wrought by the shock of earthquake which was felt on the 4th April. Now vagueness can only be attributed to these words if they are capable of bearing any other significance besides the one which has been given above. The words in the latter revelation are no doubt in the past tense but prophecies of the future are often expressed in the past tense even in the Holy Quran. This form of expression is meant to indicate that not the slightest doubt can be entertained as to the occurrence of the event prophesied and hence it is spoken of as if it had already occurred. At any rate it cannot be denied that in the words عفت الدنيا ر محلاتها ومقامها a certain calamity is predicted which overtaking this country would blot out the traces of buildings. Even if the words زلزله کا دھکا had not been spoken, it would have been easy to understand the nature of the calamity which should level buildings with the ground. To foretell such a disaster in the Punjab, which has no previous experience of such terrible earthquakes, could not be based on surmise.

It should, moreover, be borne in mind that instead of the first prophecy detract from the value of the second on account of alleged vagueness, the second prophecy relating to the earthquake to come enhances the value of the first. For, admitting for the sake of argument, even against the plain revelation foretelling 'a shock of earthquake' and afterwards its devastating effect, that there is any

vagueness in the prophecy relating to the earthquake of 4th April, it can be easily seen that the prophecy relating to the earthquake to come is as distinct and clear as it can be. And if this comes to fulfilment, there must be an end of all discussion as to the nature of the earlier prophecies. The wonder is that in these matters men are solicitous as to the particulars not revealed, but never ponder over that which is revealed. They are prone to ask why was not the exact hour stated, or why were not the limits of the area affected by the seismic disturbance defined, but they never question themselves if that which was revealed was within the power of a mortal. Take the prophecy relating to the earthquake of 4th April, for instance. There was a revelation which foretold a severe shock of earthquake; there was another which described its devastating effect, *viz.*, that buildings would be levelled with the ground in this country; there was a third which described the condition of the people at that time, *viz.*, that they would think that the hour of judgment had come; there was a fourth which showed that the greatest disaster would be wrought in the mountains; and there was a fifth which exactly five weeks before the catastrophe revealed the strange scene of death and devastation. All these prophecies were published either in newspapers or books, references to which were given in the last issue. Here then we do not depend upon oral testimony, but have written testimony of the strongest character. But now that the thing has happened, all these wonderful prophecies are ignored because it was not stated that on the 4th of April in 1905 a severe shock of earthquake would be felt at 6-15 A.M., which would level the buildings with the ground in such and such cities situated in the Kangra district, that its crushing effect would also be felt in such and such other cities of the Punjab, and that the number of persons killed or buildings destroyed would be so much. What is the particular which was not foretold with the exception only of the names and figures?

There are numerous other instances in which future events were foretold long before in a manner which baffles human knowledge. Those who pass by indifferently or hold the signs of God to mockery cannot benefit by them, but a reflecting mind can easily see how the deep secrets of the future are revealed by Almighty God. As one living in the company of the Promised Messiah, I bear testimony that

hardly a day passes when a fresh sign from God is not manifested. These wonderful signs are a proof conclusive that their source is the Omniscient Being who has the clearest knowledge of the deepest secrets of the future and the Omnipotent Being who holds in His powerful hand all the powers of nature and directs them in accordance with His supreme will. These signs are not seen only by those who live around the Promised Messiah, but the manifestation of numerous signs has also been witnessed by the whole world. I will cite here two further instances. Lately there was a defamation case pending against the Promised Messiah in the court of a magistrate at Gurdaspur, and a counter defamation suit had been instituted by one of his disciples against the complainant in the former case. On the 29th June 1903, at a time when the court had not yet done anything in the way of proceeding with these cases, the Promised Messiah published a prophecy with regard to "the End of the Cases" which was also published in English in this Magazine in its issue for July 1903. In this prophecy he declared in plain words that while he was praying to God to reveal to him the end of the case instituted by Karam Din of Bhin against him or that instituted by one of his followers against the said Karm Din, he received a Divine revelation whose interpretation in English was given at the time as follows: "Of the two parties to these cases, Almighty God will be with those, and will grant assistance and victory to them, who are righteous, do not tell lies, are not unjust These are the people to whom the decisions of these cases will be favourable." I have stated above that this prophecy was declared at a time when the cases had not been taken up by the Court for hearing, although the complaints had been lodged. Could it be within the power of a mortal to say at that stage that the cases would be decided in his favour and against his opponent? Nor were these words spoken by an ordinary man to whom it might not matter much whether what he had spoken proved to be true or false afterwards. It was the word of a religious leader and it was uttered with the full consciousness that its truth or falsehood was a criterion of his own truth or falsehood. Moreover, the prophecy was held out to the world as a sign which was to determine whether he was one of the righteous servants of God and His messenger or only a liar. The words which were spoken were distinct and clear as to the result of the cases: he was to be acquitted of the

charge while his opponent was to be convicted. The circulation of the prophecy was very wide. The Magistrate before whom the cases pended was a Hindu belonging to the Arya Samaj sect which bears particular ill-will to the Promised Messiah on account of his prophecy relating to the murder of one of its leading Pandits, Lekh Ram by name, and, therefore, religious feelings, if they could ever influence the Magistrate's motives, could not have allowed him to act otherwise than hostilely to the Promised Messiah. It was in spite of a clear knowledge of all these circumstances that he announced what God had revealed to him because he knew that it was the Word of God and that despite all obstacles it would be brought to fulfilment. The issues at that time were all hid in obscurity, for the cases had not yet practically commenced. Under these circumstances the prophecy was published, and fully eighteen months passed away before it saw the light of fulfilment, so tortuous was the course these cases had taken. The Lower Court could not see its way to a dismissal of the complaint against the Promised Messiah. Whether or not the Hindu Magistrate was influenced by motives of strong religious prejudice or a desire to show that the prophecy turned out to be false is no business of mine to discuss. Suffice it to say that the Appellate Court came to the conclusion that the Promised Messiah was quite blameless and that the Lower Court had merely wasted its time in lengthening a case which should have been thrown out at an early stage. In the cross case, his opponent was found guilty. But this was not the only prophecy published as to the end of this case. There were many others to the same effect, one of them having been published nearly three years before the decision. This prophecy which was published in the newspaper *Alhakam* in November 1901, foretold that a criminal case would be instituted against the Promised Messiah, the words referring to the decision being: "He will be acquitted by the Appellate Court," thus foretelling three years before the judgment and fifteen months before even the institution of the case that the judgment of the Lower Court would be against him, for otherwise the case could not go to the Appellate Court. To the same effect there was another prophecy published after the prophecy of the 29th June (about the end of August 1903) which ran as follows (see *Alhakam*):—

سا کر مک بعد تو ھینک "I will exalt thee after thy disgrace," the disgrace referring to the judgment of the Lower Court which adjudged

him guilty, upon which the hostile newspapers made much noise saying that he had met with disgrace, and the exaltation which had to come afterwards referring to the judgment of the Appellate Court which found the Promised Messiah to be quite blameless and true in the statement which he had made concerning the complainant. The publication of these revelations months, and even years, before the circumstances arose which brought them to fulfilment is the clearest evidence that there is an all-knowing and all-powerful God, and that the revelations which had been announced and thus wonderfully fulfilled could only be His mighty word. To foretell such deep secrets of the future with such clearness and distinctness is not within the power of any human being. What matters it in the face of these revelations if it was not foretold that the criminal case would be a defamation case, that it would be instituted by a person named Karam Din and that it would be decided unfavorably by a magistrate bearing such and such a name and favourably by another known as Mr. so and so. All that we have to see is if a man who could not have any inclination to be involved in a case could tell a year before that a criminal case would be instituted against him in which the finding of the Lower Court would be against him and that of the Appellate Court in his favour, or if he could say while he knew that his fate was apparently in the hands of other men whose religious feelings ran counter to his own, that the case would be ultimately decided in his favour and that his opponent would be found guilty. If this is not within the power of any mortal, and everybody knows that it is not, then it is undoubtedly a sign from God displaying His wonderful knowledge and mighty power and showing the truth of him who is made the recipient of these revelations. If there is any one who can show an instance of this and produce strong written testimony of a similar nature, then indeed the critics would be justified in requiring a revelation of further details.

The other instance to which I wish to draw the reader's attention is the prophecy with regard to the prevalence of the plague. Prophecies concerning the plague were contained in the *Barahin-i-Ahmadiyya*, published about fifteen years before its appearance in India. But when these prophecies were pointed out, the same objection of vagueness was brought against them. Upon this the Promised

Messiah published another revelation in 1897, in Urdu as well as in English, in which was foretold great prevalence of the plague in India and especially a very severe outbreak of the epidemic in the Punjab which was to be the scene of its greatest ravages. This prophecy was published in 1897. The circumstances under which it was published must be borne in mind. At that time the plague raged in Bombay city and Bombay presidency and had also made its appearance in one district of the Punjab in which a few villages were affected with the disease. On its outbreak the Punjab Government took the strongest measures to check the disease. Strong rules of quarantine were enforced, and as soon as it made its appearance in a village, the whole village was evacuated, temporary huts being raised for the inhabitants. The people within the affected area were under strict watch and were not allowed to remove to healthy villages. The plague inoculation system was also in force and had actually shown some good effect. The Government in fact combated the disease with all its resources, and the disease actually slackened its pace during the next year as is evident from the figures and the number of new villages affected. Under these circumstances when everybody hoped that the plague would soon disappear from the Punjab, there was one who declared that Almighty God had told him that a great havoc would be wrought by the plague in the Punjab and that he had seen that plague trees were being planted throughout the Punjab. He said that the people should repent and walk in ways of righteousness so that Almighty God should avert the evil. He was laughed at for making both these statements, for not only was it considered highly improbable that the plague should prevail in the Punjab in spite of the very strong and efficient measures to check it, but it was also looked upon as absurd that the plague should have anything to do with the sins of men. But the ultimate truth of the former statement has established the truth of the latter. The havoc which the plague has since wrought in the Punjab is unparalleled in the whole of India. Of the total number of deaths from plague in the whole of India, nearly half and sometimes even more than half are in the Punjab. From one district it has travelled to another until now we have scarcely a village through the length and breadth of this afflicted province which has not been affected with the plague. And what is still more wonderful, every year there is a

new revelation foretelling a greater havoc from the plague, and exactly in accordance with this there is a greater loss of lives every succeeding year. How could a man without any knowledge from the Knower of all secrets foretell these circumstances over which not men, but only the Divine laws of nature, have any control? The word which foretold the special prevalence of the plague in every village in the Punjab could not but be the word of One who could direct nature and its laws to act according to His supreme will. No one whose mind is not blinded by prejudice would fail to see that all these wonderful things were brought about by Almighty God in this materialistic age that people may know that His is the power before which mortal power is mere weakness and His the knowledge before which human knowledge is simple ignorance. The signs of the prophets were denied in this age as fables and exaggerations, and, therefore, Almighty God wrought these great things that His power may be again known to the world, and that it might believe that the God of Abraham, Moses, Jesus, Muhammad and other prophets, peace be on them, is also the God of this generation. Had He not thus shown His existence to the world, the whole world would have turned to atheism, for a God who can neither manifest His mighty power at any time nor open His mouth to favour His chosen servants with His sweet word cannot claim reverence from men, for a weak and dumb God is no God at all.

The prophecies relating to the earthquake afford a parallel to the prophecies relating to the plague. The first prophecies relating to the earthquake, the earliest of which is contained also in the *Barahin-i-Ahmadīyya*, are declared to be vague, and therefore, to refute the charge of vagueness Almighty God has foretold another and severer affliction. It is laughed at now as the prophecy relating to the plague was laughed at some years before. No doubt the time when this must take place is not stated in the prophecy, but does this detract from the value of the prophecy in any way? Is not what has been foretold far beyond the knowledge of man? And is not this prophecy made in spite of what the geologists and astrologers say to the contrary? Let us now wait for the result.

I wish to remove a misconception before finishing this article. It has been asserted in some quarters that the prophecy relating to the earthquake to come has been published only to cause apprehension

If such had been the object of its publication, why should the prophet have been the first of all to suffer all the inconvenience which he is suffering. His conduct in such a case should have been at variance with his words. But this is not so. Moreover, what he wants is that people should transform their lives and shunning every evil walk in the ways of virtue. Thus he said in one of his manifestoes: "Bear in mind that if any one owns a false doctrine or an erroneous religious belief, but refrains from evils and transgressions, such as injustice, oppression, perjury, murder, theft, adultery, &c., and leads his life in humility and meekness, he will be dealt with mercifully by God if he does not associate with the evil-doers, and he will have to answer for his errors in the next world. Remember well that people upon whom Almighty God brought down His punishment in this world were not destroyed because of their religious differences with the prophets of God, but on account of their daring transgressions and evil deeds." I do not think any sensible person would think it undesirable that people should be exhorted to ways of virtue. Even worldly governments punish all the offenders they can lay their hands on, and it is astonishing if a threat of Divine punishment to the workers of iniquity should be taken ill. As the condition of being saved from this, the prophet does not require faith in him as being essential, but exhorts people only to walk in virtue and shun evil. There is another circumstance, however, which shows the impossibility of there being any apprehension at all on account of this prophecy. It is a prophecy based on Divine revelation and hence it can be accepted only by those who believe in the truth of the mission of the Promised Messiah. The vast majority of the public, however, does not belong to this category. No one except the comparatively very small community of the Ahmadis believes that the words asserted by the Promised Messiah to be the Word of God are really so. On the other hand, they are taken by the people as a lie and fabrication. Persons belonging to this class cannot, therefore, have any apprehension on account of a prophecy which they believe to be a lie. Had the prophet declared his prophecy to be based on astrological considerations or geological knowledge, it could have caused apprehension. But as he declares the prophecy to be based upon a Divine revelation, the public which does not consider him true in this claim cannot have any fear on account of his utterance.

Women in Civilized Countries.

The following sketch of the New York women by Mr. Moffet in the *Success* which is quoted in the *Review of Reviews* for May would, it is hoped, be read with interest. Mr. Moffet had written in an article on "the Shameful Misuse of Wealth," that New York women spent up to Rs. 18,000 on a sable coat. The truth of this statement was questioned, and in his recent article not only has Mr. Moffet re-verified the facts, but has even come to the conclusion that he greatly understated the actual extravagances of American women. At a leading New York furrier's, "a short coat of rather light skins, moderate quality," was priced at Rs. 30,000. On inquiring what a good coat would cost, Mr. Moffet received an estimate of Rs. 30 per square inch. Thus calculated, the price of a 30 inches long sable coat would be Rs. 99,000 and that of "a coat reaching to the ankles," Rs. 1,32,000. Among the rich women the lowest annual expenditure on dress only is estimated at Rs. 15,800. Upon these considerations, Mr. Moffet comes to the conclusion that six thousand New York women spend a total of over Rs. 120,000,000 a year on dress, and adds: "And that leaves Chicago, Boston, Philadelphia, and the rest of the country out of consideration. There are certainly ten thousand rich women in America who could save for the poor at least £6,000,000 (Rs. 90,900,000) a year by simply reducing their annual dress allowances to £600 (Rs. 9,000). And after all a woman *could manage* to dress on £600 a year!"

The *Review of Reviews* adds on the authority of the same writer: "Against this, the average amount spent on clothes by an ordinary tenement family of six or seven persons is not quite £ 10 (Rs. 150) a year."

All this extravagance in dress is, we are further told, not meant by the women so much to please their husbands "as to please themselves and for general admiration. If it were simply to attract men, as a method of husband-hunting, why should the most lavish dressing be done by married women?" In support of this, Mr. Moffet states his own experience: "I stopped once at a quiet New York hotel, and in the dining room happened to sit near a married couple who nearly always sat alone. And I noticed that every evening the lady wore a new gown. After about a week, I began to watch for the re-appearance of gowns

I had already seen, but she still appeared in new ones, each more elaborate, one would say, than the others. This actually continued for about six weeks when I left the hotel. I am sure I saw that lady in at least thirty gowns—costly gowns, imported gowns, velvet gowns, embroidered gowns, lace gowns, and all for hum-drum dinners with a common-place husband.” In fact vulgar ostentation has reached its meridian” in most civilized countries, and this is all due to the fact that women do not keep in the sphere which nature has appointed for them.

~~the most advanced of all women~~ American women, the most advanced of all women, are looked upon even in England as a moral pestilence. Giving expression to this feeling, Lucas Mallet writes in the *Fortnightly Review* for May about women “whose aspirations are exclusively worldly, who ape the clothes and pastimes of their betters on insufficient incomes, regard marriage as the gateway to cheap intrigue, and waste their times at ladies’ clubs with much the same detrimental consequences to family and household as is the case with women of the people who waste theirs in the public house. They are given over to that most deadly of all delusions—the worship of appearances—with the result that nothing is really genuine about them from their enthusiasms to the material of their underskirts. They are infected by a greed of notoriety, of publicity, of gadding. They must catch the eye and be talked of. But all this is expensive, especially in the case of persons of no intrinsic importance. Some body has to pay the bill. It is idle to pretend it is always the husband who pays it. These are hard sayings,” and I would add, regrettable facts at the basis of civilized society. “I can only regret that they are not unmerited. In respect of this contingent there is, incontestably, great need of reform; and one could wish President Roosevelt’s utterances might not only be read, but be very thoroughly digested by them.” The President’s advice to women hankering after greatness in society is “to return to their ancient *role* of the breeder of babes and the maker of beds.” “And in all seriousness, I would submit that for the worship of the false God of Appearances, not to mention other delinquencies of the foolish contingent aforesaid, our American invaders—themselves mostly women—must be held responsible. Is it not they, to begin with, who in their republican simplicity have reduced our many and complex needs to two only—possession of wealth and opportunity of amusement.” It is a happy sign of the times that civilization has begun to own its fault.