



# The REVIEW of RELIGIONS

**VOL LXXX**

**NO. 5**

**MAY 1985**

## **IN THIS ISSUE**

- WAS MUHAMMAD A PROPHET OR A KING?
- REVIEW OF SOME CHRISTIAN DENOMINATIONS
- MUHAMMAD—THE HOLDER OF THE SEAL
- THE ISLAMIC METHOD OF SLAUGHTER

## **AND REGULAR FEATURES**

- COMMENTARY ON A VERSE OF THE HOLY QURAN
- FROM THE WRITINGS OF HAZRAT AHMAD
- EDITORIAL—  
WHEN WAS JESUS BORN?
- CURRENT TOPICS—  
DEHUMANIZING ISLAM
- BOOK REVIEW

لَا إِلَهَ إِلَّا اللَّهُ مُحَمَّدٌ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ

*There is no deity but Allah, Muhammad is His Messenger*

## THE AHMADIYYA MOVEMENT

The Ahmadiyya Movement was founded in 1889 by Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, the expected world Reformer and the Promised Messiah. The Movement is an embodiment of true and real Islam. It seeks to unite mankind with its Creator and to establish peace throughout the world. The present Supreme Head of the Movement is Hazrat Mirza Tahir Ahmad. The International Center for the Ahmadiyya Movement is at Rabwah, Pakistan. The Ahmadiyya Movement is actively engaged in the propagation of Islam.



### Editorial Board:

Dr. Khalil Ahmad Nasir  
Dr. Qazi M. Barkatullah  
Dr. M. Hussain Sajid  
Mr. Abid Haneef  
Syed Hasanat Ahmad  
Mr. Bashir A. Orchard

### Manager:

Dr. Basharat Munir Mirza

Please address all inquiries to the business office:

2141 Leroy Place, N.W.,  
Washington, DC 20008  
Ph: (202) 232-3737

---

The Review of Religions (ISSN 0743-5622) is published monthly for \$15.00 per year by the Ahmadiyya Movement in Islam, Inc., 2141 Leroy Pl., N.W., Washington DC 20008, at the Fazl-i-Umar Press, Pomeroy Road, Athens, Ohio 45701. Second-class postage paid at Athens Ohio 45701.  
Postmaster—Please send form 3579 to P. O. Box 338, Athens, OH 45701

---

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

*In the name of Allah, Most Gracious, Ever Merciful*

## THE REVIEW OF RELIGIONS

A monthly magazine devoted to the dissemination of the teachings of Islam and the discussion of general Islamic problems. It is published by the Ahmadiyya Movement in Islam, Inc., 2141 Leroy Place, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20008. The International Headquarters of the Ahmadiyya Movement in Islam are located at Rabwah, Pakistan.

The Review of Religions is an organ of the Ahmadiyya Movement in Islam which represents the pure and true Islam. It is open to all for discussing problems connected with the religious and spiritual growth of man, but it does not accept responsibility for views expressed by contributors.

All correspondence and enquiries pertaining to the Review of Religions should please be directed to:

The Editors,  
Review of Religions,  
2141 Leroy Place N.W.  
Washington DC 20008  
Ph: (202) 232-3737

### Subscription Rates:

For USA & Canada:

Annual \$15.00

Single copy \$1.50

For UK & Europe:

Annual £10.00

For Pakistan:

Annual Rs.50.00

**VOL: LXXX**

**NO. 5**

**MAY 1985**

### CONTENTS

Commentary on a Verse of the Holy Quran.....	1
From the Writings of the Promised Messiah.....	2
When was Jesus Born? Editorial.....	3
Was Muhammad a Prophet or a King? Sh. Mubarak Ahmad.....	5
Review of Some Christian Denominations B. A. Orchard.....	22
Muhammad—the Holder of the Seal Saleem Nasir Malik.....	27
The Islamic Method of Slaughter A. R. Dard.....	31
Current Topics— Dehumanizing Islam Dr. Syed Barakat Ahmad.....	35
Book Review Shakoora Nooriah.....	41

## WHAT IS ISLAM?

*Islam means peace, surrender.* The significance of the name Islam is the attainment of a life of perfect peace and eternal happiness through complete surrender to the Will of God.

Absolute and uncompromising belief in One God is the central doctrine of Islam. *There is none worthy of worship but the One and Only God (Allah) Who possesses all excellences and Muhammad is His Messenger.* This is the most important doctrine of Islam.

Islam helps us to establish a permanent relationship with God to realize Him during our earthly life as our Helper and Guide in all our affairs.

Islam requires belief in all the prophets and spiritual guides including Abraham, Moses, Jesus, Krishna, Buddha, Confucius and Zoroaster. Islam represents the completion of the mission of *all* the prophets from the dawn of history. It teaches that *all the prophets of God came with one and the same mission.* Thus Islam establishes peace and unity between all religions.

The Holy Quran—the Muslim Scripture—was revealed to the Master Prophet Muhammad 1400 years ago and has been preserved intact without the slightest change. A large number of Muslims know the whole Book by heart. It is an inexhaustible treasure of spiritual truths capable of satisfying the needs of all people in all countries and all stations of life.

The establishment of true democracy and universal brotherhood without any discrimination of caste, creed, color or country is the unique and unrivalled distinction of Islam. Islam has fulfilled and realized the splendid principles of democracy in the actual life and action of human society.

According to Islam, life after death is a continuation of life on earth. Heaven and Hell begin right in this life. Heaven is eternal and everlasting, while hell is temporary. Hell is a hospital for the treatment of the human soul. As a soul is cured, it goes to Heaven. Heaven is the attainment of a life of everlasting progress and complete joy and happiness through union with God and by the development of the fine spiritual qualities and the unlimited capacities which have been implanted in human beings.

A few of the distinctive features of Islam are:

1. Liberation of women by establishing the equality of both sexes, safeguarding their rights and liberties and raising their status.
2. Absolute veto on all intoxicants.
3. Equitable solution of all economic problems.
4. Furnishing mankind with the noblest practical ethics.
5. Promotion of science and education.

Some of the obligatory duties laid down by Islam are:

1. Five daily Prayers.
2. Fasting in the month of Ramadhan.
3. Paying *Zakat* for the relief of poverty.
4. Pilgrimage to Mecca, once in one's lifetime, if circumstances allow.



*In the name of Allah, Most Gracious, Ever Merciful  
We praise Him and invoke His blessings on His Noble Prophet*

## COMMENTARY

### ON A VERSE OF THE HOLY QUR'AN

لَقَدْ مَنَّ اللَّهُ عَلَى الْمُؤْمِنِينَ إِذْ بَعَثَ فِيهِمْ رَسُولًا مِّنْ  
أَنْفُسِهِمْ يَتْلُوا عَلَيْهِمْ آيَاتِهِ وَيُزَكِّيهِمْ وَيُعَلِّمُهُمُ الْكِتَابَ  
وَالْحِكْمَةَ وَإِنْ كَانُوا مِن قَبْلُ لَفِي ضَلَالٍ مُّبِينٍ

*Laqad Mannallahho Alal Mo'mineena Is Ba'asa Feehim  
Rasoolan Min Anfosehim Yatloo Alaihim Aayaatehee Wa  
Yozakkeehim Wa Yo'allehumul Kitaaba Wal Hikmata,  
Wa In Kaanoo Min Qablo La Fee Zalaalin Mobeen.*

*"Verily, Allah has conferred a favor on the believers by raising among them a Messenger from among themselves who recites to them His Signs, and purifies them and teaches them the Book and Wisdom; and, before that, they were surely in manifest error." (3:165)*

The expression, *by raising among them a Messenger from among themselves*, is intended to awaken in the hearts of Muslims a desire to follow the example of the Holy Prophet who was like them and one of them. The Prophet was not only a man like them but was actually one of them. If he could rise to such spiritual heights, why could not they?

All Messengers of God are raised from among human beings and they possess the same faculties and are actuated by the same desires and aspirations as other human beings, and therefore they can serve as true models for their fellow-beings. But a so-called "son of God" does not possess the same desires and the same faculties as we have, and cannot therefore be a model for us. Our model should be from our own kind. He who is not of our kind, being a divine being, free from human passions and human weaknesses, cannot be held out to us as a model for imitation.

The verse also points to the fulfilment of the prayer of Abraham





*Editorial:*

## WHEN WAS JESUS BORN? SOME CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES

That Jesus is the central figure and the very soul of Christian theology is manifestly clear. Without some kind of belief in his Christhood, whichever way may it be defined by various denominations and scholarly theologians, the very foundations of Christianity are totally altered. Throughout the last two thousand years, hundreds of millions of Christians have been sustained in their beliefs through their deep faith in the life of Jesus. The miraculous character attributed to his birth, the stories of the miracles he performed, his encounters with the Romans, Israelites and other gentiles, and finally, his crucifixion provide the basic ingredients which have continued to nourish this leading religion of the Western world not only today but through the centuries past.

Yet, it is rather strange, indeed ironic, that most important events of his life have always remained veiled in mystery. Was he born of a *virgin* mother? When was he born? Why is hardly anything known about his life from early infancy to the time when he proclaimed his ministry? How long did his ministry last? Who were really responsible for his being led to the cross—hostile Jewish leaders or the Roman rulers? Did he really die during the few hours that he was on the cross or was he only unconscious when he was taken off the cross with unusual haste? If there was a resurrection, who were the eye witnesses, if any? What is the significance of the blood stains of the shroud in which he was temporarily wrapped and which is now preserved in the Cathedral of Turin, Italy? Did he leave Palestine for the eastern regions to accomplish his proclaimed mission of having come for the lost tribes of Israel? These and several other issues about the life of Jesus of Nazareth have continued to challenge the curiosity of the Christian as well as the non-Christian scholars.

To illustrate, let us briefly comment on just one issue of his birth. Since as early as the second century A.D., the Christian world has been celebrating his birth on the 25th of December. The Christian calendar leads us to assume that he was born on this date, 1985 years ago. On the other hand, Christian scholars have never come to a consensus either on the exact year or the exact date of his birth. Mr.





## WAS MUHAMMAD A PROPHET OR A KING? THE REAL STATUS OF THE PROPHET

By

Sheikh Mubarak Ahmad, Missionary Incharge, USA

The Holy Messenger of God (Peace and blessings of God be on him) had the real status of a Prophet and not that of a king or a ruler upon this earth. He was the 'Seal of the Prophets,' i.e., the best and the most perfect of the prophets; the embellishment and ornament of the prophets, instead of being a monarch or an emperor. Almighty God in His Holy Book, the Quran, described his status in this way:

*"And Muhammad is not the father to any men among you but he is a Messenger of God and the Seal of the Prophets"* (33:41)

Although his status was that of a Prophet of God and Seal of the Prophets yet there is no reason to doubt that from another aspect he could also aptly be regarded as a King. Looking back at his life in Medina, it becomes very clear that he was in fact not only a king, but was also truly an emperor. His position in fact, was so unique and multi-dimensional that even the question and the debate whether he was a Prophet or a king appears unnecessary.

Apparently the topic chosen for this discussion reflects as if Prophethood and kingship are two totally separate positions, of which one was applicable to the Holy Prophet (pbuh) and the other was not. If we set aside the facts, this doubt grows even stronger. Looking at his life in Medina, the above mentioned calculation does not apply; this means that the title has some other connotations, and that according to his real status, he was a Prophet of God and kingship and kingdom were not his main aim. But as said in the holy Quran:

*"And in the Messenger of God, you have a perfect model"*

Because he was a perfect example for all walks of life, it was necessary that he be given kingship also, to enable him to demonstrate the supremacy of character and perfection of behavior which should be associated with kingship. This of course, was subsidiary to what he strived hard to achieve, the perfection of religious laws and human character and values, during the tenure of his

ministry. But while exercising the responsibilities of a king, he certainly remained innocent of the ill-effects of character which sometimes accumulate in a person who is granted a kingship; and the opponents of Islam, placing and presenting him in the line of worldly kings, have done great injustice to his noble person.

In what follows I have tried to prove that the Holy Prophet (pbuh), from the study of his life and sayings, from his acts and excellent character, was not only a Prophet but was also free from all undesirable elements and blemishes associated with many worldly kings. On one side he was an ideal to follow in his deeds, sayings, character and excellence of behavior; on the other, he demonstrated such a perfect example of political acumen and supreme leadership that anyone could seek valuable guidance from him in this field also.

The Orientalists and other Western scholars often misinterpret the life and work of the Holy Prophet Muhammad (pbuh). Their errors must be pointed out and refuted by facts. The renowned British historian, the eminent Arnold Toynbee, is clearly misguided in his writings about the character of the Holy Prophet. He is only an example of Euro-centric authors who, throughout the centuries have attempted to smear the innocent name of the Prophet of God who was named by Almighty Allah as *Khataman Nabiyyeen*, the "Seal of the Prophets", the best and most perfect of all the Prophets of God, peace be upon them.

Toynbee's unfounded thesis alleges that the lifework of the Holy Prophet (pbuh) was accomplished in two stages:

"Beginning around 609 A.D., in the first stage, Muhammad was concerned exclusively with his religious mission; in the second stage, the religious mission was overlaid, and almost overwhelmed, by the political enterprise."

Toynbee further states:

"Muhammad left Mecca as a hunted fugitive. After seven years absence (622-629), he returned to Mecca, not as an amnestied exile, but as lord and master, not only of Mecca itself but of half of Arabia. It will be seen that the first state in Muhammad's career is comparable to the career of Solon and the second stage with the career of Caesar."

Were Solon and Caesar appointed by God? Is the comparison apt? Fortunately, there are a few Western scholars who deal fairly with their investigations of Islam and the Holy Prophet (pbuh). It is a sad story that a famous historian, known for his liberal views, was

misled. Now when the facts were scrutinized and closely examined by other historians, they rejected Toynbee's assertions outright.

It may also be mentioned that Toynbee has most probably borrowed heavily from David Margoliouth's *Muhammadanism* because he too mentioned that Muhammad (pbuh) may have changed. However, Margoliouth, although he tried his level best to establish that the Prophet (pbuh) had changed, had to admit that he never neglected his roles of preacher and teacher. A most biased enemy of Islam, Margoliouth contradicts the allegations of Toynbee and calls the Prophet (pbuh) Head of State as well as refers to his operations as a Prophet. He says:

"His duties as a ruler of a constantly increasing realm and commander of a constantly increasing army were accommodated to and combined with his operations as a Prophet ... the main doctrines of Islam, the unity of Allah, and the future life, are no less repeatedly emphasised than before."

In *Muhammad and Muhammadanism*, R. Bosworth Smith admits the sincerity of the Holy Prophet's belief up to the time of Hijrah (i.e., migration to Medina) and says that any change in his character and aims must be considered in the context of the general conditions of his life. Contrary to Toynbee's assumption, Smith here states firmly that Muhammad (pbuh) "preserved to the end of his career that modesty and simplicity of life which is the crowning beauty of his character; .... the Prophet became more than a prophet; he became a temporal ruler, aided by the Holy Quran and temporal means".

The writer goes on to note how surprisingly little the Prophet changed, under very different circumstances, intimating that it is a misconception to attribute any moral decline to him:

"If one reads the account of Muhammad's entry into Mecca along with the account of Marius Sulla as he entered Rome, one would be in a position to recognize the magnanimity and moderation of the Prophet of Arabia. There were no proscription lists, no plunder, no wanton revenge."

Smith boldly asserts that "Muhammad never wavered in his belief in his mission nor, what is more extraordinary, in his belief as to its precise nature and well defined limits. He was a Prophet charged with a mission from God; nothing less."

Another example of enlightened scholarship and objectivity is to be found in Thomas Arnold's *The Preaching of Islam*. He decries

the frequent assertion of some European writers that the Holy Prophet (pbuh) adopted an entirely new character from the time of the Hijrah. Arnold presses his case by saying that it is "false to suppose that Muhammad in Madina laid aside his role of preacher and a missionary of Islam, or that when he had a large army at his command, he ceased to invite unbelievers to accept the new faith".

In what follows, I have tried to discuss the life and character of the Holy Prophet (pbuh) by emphatically proclaiming that he never changed his mission from the time he was commissioned by Almighty Allah.

The Holy Prophet's life sketch, sayings, actions and loftiness of character prove positively that he was not only the greatest of all prophets but even in his secular role he was unique. The whole of his life is recorded in the minutest detail and is like an open book. Had he lived like an ordinary ruler, history would certainly have pointed out his acts of omission and commission and would never have spared him for any shortfalls in moral imperatives.

Kings ordinarily are very fond of outward exhibitions of pomp and show and, in fact, this is one of their primary means of expressing this exalted status. But the Holy Prophet (pbuh) was absolutely free from all such trappings. We do not find this grandeur in his life. In Hadith—which is a compilation of his sayings—it has been stated about him that someone sent a silk dress to him as a present. He put it on and offered his prayers. Afterwards he took it off and remarked: *"For simple people these dresses are unsuitable."* (Bokhari)

The Holy Prophet (pbuh) personified humbleness. This is obvious from the incident that once Hazrat Omar, thinking that, now and then, ambassadors and representatives from other places came to visit the Holy Prophet, he should wear impressive clothes on these occasions and also on religious gatherings like the Friday gatherings and the festivals of *Eid*. Once Hazrat Omar was walking with the Holy Prophet (pbuh) in a shopping area where he saw some silk cloth; taking this opportunity he suggested to the Holy Prophet (pbuh) that he should buy that cloth and wear it. But the Prophet (pbuh) replied: *"Only he wears this who does not want any share from the life hereafter."* (Bokhari)

Until the end of his life the Holy Prophet (pbuh) used to wear thick and coarse cotton dresses.

Once he was lying down on a coarse mattress. When he got up the impression on his back was so plain that his Companions said to him: "Shall we provide something made of soft material instead?" The Holy Prophet (pbuh) replied, "I have no connection with this world; my relation with this world is only of a transitory kind like that of a rider who stops by a shady tree while travelling. He rests for a short while in the shade and then takes off." (Jamia Tirmidhi).

Once during the period when the Holy Prophet (pbuh) was living separately, away from his family, Hazrat Omar went to see him. He was amazed at the sight of the place bereft of all comforts; the Holy Prophet (pbuh) was sitting in a small room with a loose cloth wound round his body; there was a bare cot and at the head of the cot was a pillow stuffed with date leaves. In one corner there was some barley and in another corner was a piece of animal skin to store water. Looking at this simplicity of the place where the king of kings was living, Hazrat Omar was overwhelmed and tears rolled down his face. The Holy Prophet inquired, "Omar, why are you crying?" Hazrat Omar replied, "Why should I not cry? I can see the marks of weaves of the cot on your body. On one side I look at your humble belongings and on the other, I imagine the luxury of the kings of Egypt and Persia. They are enjoying such an easy life and you are living in such hardship. To this the Holy Prophet (pbuh) replied, "O, Omar, would you not like that they take this world and I get the Hereafter?" (*Muslim*). In short, what else could be simpler than when the Holy Prophet (pbuh) was sitting amongst his Companions and wanted to go to his house, he just got up and walked to his house barefooted. It has been mentioned in Abu Daud:

"The Holy Prophet (pbuh) used to sit on the floor and we used to sit around him. He used to get up and if he intended to return, he used to take off his shoes."

I have briefly described from the thousands of examples of the life of the Holy Prophet (pbuh), his simplicity, unostentatiousness and humility. When this is compared with the pomp and show of worldly kings, we are left with a feeling of utter amazement. In ordinary dealings and conversations, worldly kings have a peculiar style of ceremony and grandeur; but the Holy Prophet (pbuh), while talking to and dealing with thousands of people, never even let them feel that they were conversing with a superior person and kept such a low profile that he appeared as just an ordinary person. It has been reported that, in Medina, he owed some money to a Jew who came

to him and demanded it in a haughty and insolent manner; addressing the Prophet (pbuh) he said: "You people from Banu Hashim, whenever you take anything you are reluctant to pay back." Hazrat Omar who was present at the occasion was very upset with the nasty attitude of the Jew; but the Prophet (pbuh) said, "O, Omar, you should advise both of us, to the person who lends that he should demand in a nice way, and to the indebted that he should repay promptly."

Similarly, once a Beduin came and demanded a debt from the Holy Prophet (pbuh) in a harsh manner. The Companions of the Holy Prophet (pbuh) were around him at that time. They were very annoyed at that and said to the Beduin; "Do you know to whom you are talking?" On which the Beduin reiterated that he was demanding his right. On this, the Holy Prophet (pbuh) said: "It is the right of a lender to demand the return of his debt."

Once the Holy Prophet (pbuh) was with his Companions in a jungle where they were getting ready to cook. He distributed the work-load and himself participated in making food. (*Seerat Khairul Bashar*). In spite of being the benefactor for the whole world, he worked like an ordinary person. In household chores, his participation was a routine. His wife Hazrat Ayesha used to say that the Holy Prophet (pbuh) worked in the house like an ordinary person and never gave the impression of being a superior person than the rest. Once he came out of his house and the Companions who were waiting outside, stood up as a mark of respect; upon which he said: "Do not stand up like the people of the Ajam, (i.e., as is customary among Non-Arabs) on seeing me." (*Abu Daud*)

It has been narrated that once a person came to see the Holy Prophet (pbuh) and was so impressed by his personality that he started trembling from nervousness; at this the Prophet (pbuh) said: "Do not be afraid; I am the son of a Quraishi woman who used to eat simple dry meat." (*Tirmidhi*). Have ever worldly kings bowed low in such humility? If the Holy Prophet (pbuh) had been a king in the ordinary sense, he would have shown the usual arrogance, pride and pompousness of the kings.

Kings ordinarily find it hard to keep their covenants and easily break them if they find it convenient. About Henry the Third it has been mentioned that "He promised to keep the Great Covenant several times but always went against it." (*History of England* by Garette, p. 30). The Kaiser, disregarding treaties, pushed his forces

from Belgium to Paris without the slightest hesitation. On the contrary, looking at the Holy Prophet (pbuh), the picture is basically different. Abu Rafi' was a slave and a disbeliever; he was sent to Medina as an ambassador by Meccans. Reaching Medina, he was so impressed by the truth of Islam and by the personality of the Holy Prophet (pbuh) that he wanted to accept Islam and remain at Medina. But the Holy Prophet (pbuh) said to him, "It is a treaty among us and Meccans that we cannot hold you; so you should go back to Mecca and if you still feel the same way, only then can you return and embrace Islam." (*Abu Daud*).

About the Treaty of Hudaibia it has been written that while the terms of truce were being written, Abu Jandal managed to come to the Holy Prophet (pbuh) while still in chains, from Mecca, and requested help from the Holy Prophet. The companions of the Holy Prophet (pbuh) were immensely moved when they saw him in that pitiable condition; but the Holy Prophet (pbuh) respecting the prior covenant with the Meccans, said, "If a new Muslim convert at Mecca will make his way to Medina, he will be returned to Mecca." He addressed Abu Jandal saying, "O, Abu Jandal, we cannot break our covenant. God Almighty will open some new doors for you." (*Bukhari*).

At the battle of Badr, the odds were against the Muslims; the enemy was heavily armed and outnumbered the believers. On the other hand, the Muslims were fewer in number; they did not have enough equipment, were practically starving, being short of food and other supplies. But they had trust in Allah. In this precarious condition, two Muslims from Mecca approached the Holy Prophet (pbuh). They told him that they had a pact with the Meccans stipulating that they could go to Medina but were not permitted to take part in any fighting against Meccans. They now sought permission of the Holy Prophet (pbuh) to take part in the battle of Badr along with the other Muslims. The Holy Prophet (pbuh) answered, "you will honor the pact in any case. You should not take part in the fighting. We only need the help of God." (*Muslim*).

Can anybody describe a person with a character like that of the Holy Prophet (pbuh), as a king in the ordinary sense? There have been thousands of kings in this world. Can anyone present a single example akin to this?

A philosopher had a saying: "Revenge is a natural instinct and is universal to all mankind; the tortured one avenges not only the



tortured but all human beings." The worldly kings operate exactly according to the above saying. Thousands of examples can be cited where kings took revenge for their personal grievances. But the Holy Prophet (pbuh) never took revenge for personal rancours. Hazrat Ayesha, the wife of the Holy Prophet narrates: "The Holy Prophet (pbuh) never took revenge for a personal grudge; the only time he would react was for the sake of God and His Commandments." (Bukhari).

It happened in the early days of Prophethood, when the Holy Prophet (pbuh) went to Taif for propagation of Islam. The people of Taif treated him badly; so much so that they threw rocks at him, thereby hurting his feet so badly that they became soaked with blood. But inspite of the Divine indication of the destruction of the people of Taif, the Holy Prophet (pbuh) uttered a prayer: "God, grant them understanding because they do not know what they are doing, and bring them into the embrace of Islam." Some of the very same people came as a delegation in 9th Hijra, to Medina. The Holy Prophet (pbuh) treated them very hospitably and took the best care of them and even arranged their stay in the Holy Mosque. (Abu Daud).

The above mentioned examples of forgiveness and leniency shown to his deadliest opponents by the Holy Prophet (pbuh) are unique and are not to be found anywhere else in recorded history. There was a time when he was weak and helpless and could not punish his enemies. But a time soon came when he became powerful and his enemies were lying prostrate before him and completely at his mercy; but with the exception of a few murderers, all others were pardoned.

The worldly kings are usually greedy; to add to their piles of riches is their fondest aim. In the case of the Holy Prophet (pbuh), it was quite the opposite. Valuables and riches came to him in abundance, but he never let a night pass without distributing everything among his followers. Hazrat Abu Bakr said that once he was passing by the mountain of Ohad in company with the Holy Prophet (pbuh). On this occasion, he said, "If the mountain of Ohad turns into gold for me, I will not let three nights pass with even a dinar with myself." (Bukhari).

Once a rich man from Fidak sent four camel loads of grain. The Holy Prophet (pbuh) asked Hazrat Bilal to sell the grain and to distribute the cash received from the sale. At the end of the day, Hazrat Bilal returned and said that he could not find many people,

therefore, all the money could not be distributed. The Holy Prophet (pbuh) did not go home that night; he spent the whole night in the mosque until the following day when Hazrat Bilal came with the news that he had distributed the entire amount. Only then did the Holy Prophet (pbuh) go home. (*Abu Daud*).

In this connection there is another example. Once he received a huge amount of valuables from Bahrain. He had never received so much booty before. He had it all piled up in the courtyard of the Mosque and then started distributing it. Whoever came, he gave him according to his share. He gave Hazrat Abbas, who had grown poor after the Battle of Badr, so much that he could hardly carry it. When all of it was gone, he brushed his hands clean and went away. (*Bukhari*).

In contrast to what the Holy Prophet (pbuh) did, worldly kings are so greedy that some of them are jealous even of their own people if some of them are a little better off. About Henry the Seventh, it is written that once he went to see the Earl of Oxford. After meeting him, when the king was going to return, the guards of the Earl, in splendid uniforms, were lined up as a mark of respect for the king. The king thanked the Earl for his hospitality and also charged him a huge sum to pay him immediately. (*History of England* by Garette).

In this connection, Garette further records that in the last days of his rule, Henry the Seventh grew even more greedy, and for this reason lost his popularity. He always used to think of ways to squeeze money out of his people.

Look at the noble actions and examples of the Holy Prophet (pbuh) and see the contrast with the doings of the worldly kings. Is there any comparison at all? Not to speak of any accumulation of wealth, he does not let anything stay with him, but is in great hurry to distribute whatever he gets. Is there any such example in the life of any king?

In dealing with near relatives, his attitude was quite different from worldly monarchs who, to gain benefit for their near ones, get all sorts of loopholes in regulations and even make changes in laws when needed. They strive hard that after their death, their family continues to live in luxury. The Holy Prophet (pbuh) had quite a different approach and advice for his relatives. He was so imbued with righteousness and meekness that he advised them all to follow righteous and simple life styles, rather than join in a race for worldly

riches. He directed their attention towards the Quranic verse:

*"The most honored among you is one who is the most righteous."*

His daughter, Hazrat Fatima (God be pleased with her), was very dear to him and whenever she came to see him he used to stand up and offer her his seat. As his dear daughter, she used to complain to him about hard household work, grinding flour herself and bringing water for household use and so she requested for a helper. His response was: "Unless we can make some arrangements for *Ashabe Suffah* (i.e., those living entirely on charity), we cannot do anything for you." (*Abu Daud*).

In another narrative it has been mentioned that addressing his daughter, the Holy Prophet (pbuh) said: "On you the orphans of Badr (the children of those who laid down their lives in the battle of Badr) have preference." (*Abu Daud*). In short, what he gave his dear daughter was the advice to recite *Subhan Allah* (God is exalted), thirty three times before going to sleep at night. He added, "All else that you are asking me is not even remotely related to the benefits which would accrue to you by reciting praises of Allah. This will be far better for you than helpers." (*Abu Daud*). Can anyone present even a single example from the worldly kings who could do that?

Most kings and sometimes even their near ones are regarded as above the law of the land in most cases. But the Holy Prophet (pbuh) never considered himself above the law. Once he hit one of his Companions accidentally and quickly offered him to hit him back or accept compensation. At the time of the battle of Badr, his uncle Abbas was among the prisoners of war. After paying ransom adequately, some of the prisoners were being released. Some of the Companions of the Holy Prophet (pbuh) thought that his uncle could perhaps be shown some leniency. The Holy Prophet (pbuh) came to know of it and said: "I swear to God! I would not allow him the benefit of one dirham (i.e., slightest preference) in treatment over others."

Once a woman from the tribe of Mukhzoom was caught stealing. Osama Bin Zaid, who was very close and dear to the Holy Prophet (pbuh), was sent to him to gain favor on her behalf, to lessen the punishment for the woman; upon which he said, "Are you trying to get a favor against the decree of God?" Then he said:

"Nations have perished before because if a wealthy person committed a crime they used to excuse him and if an ordinary person

did the same, they used to punish him. I swear to God that if my daughter Fatima would have committed theft, I would have ordered her hand severed.” (*Bukhari*)

Worldly kings are usually very fond of praise and flattery and when someone showers on them exaggerated praises they love that gesture. Elizabeth I of England and Henry VIII were particularly known for this trait. But our Prophet (pbh) was quite different from the worldly rulers. There was of course, no question of tolerating false or exaggerated praises, even that which was his due was also discouraged by him. Once Abdullah Bin Sakhir came to see him and addressed him with the words “Our Master”. But the Holy Prophet (pbh) forbade him from uttering such platitudes. He was called by different names, such as Muhammad, Abul Qasim and so forth; but was never called by the title “emperor”, “king” or the like. Likewise, he never built any castles or thrones and he never kept bodyguards, which are so common for all worldly kings. Reverend Gulam Masih writes about him:

“His names and labels reflect his character and personality: Muhammad, Shahid, Nazir, Bashir, and Rasool Allah, and are well-known. Out of these names we do not find any chiefs, such as “Chief of Quarish”, “Chief of Arabs”, “Conqueror of Arabs” or “king of Arabs”. This really amazes us. No doubt the history of Islam has mentioned in his life sketch his contributions, his battles and victories, his bravery and boldness, but has never mentioned any throne, castle, crowns or special robes or dresses. In all his life, he only got one building constructed, and that was Masjid-i-Nabwi, which was a place of worship. Shall we not be amazed at the knowledge of these facts?”

He goes on to say:

“It is hard to believe, me being a Christian and following the common belief of Christians, that I will exaggerate the qualities of the Holy Prophet and would try to project an elevated impression of the Holy Prophet which would be out of the knowledge of educated people. Nevertheless, from a Christian who is unbiased, the pious personality of the Prophet can be expressed if he is really an impartial Christian who has studied the Islamic literature in depth.”

Would that these people, who consider the Holy Prophet (pbh) as a worldly king, study the Islamic literature in depth and get to know the truth.

Kings in general fight battles, usually for selfish reasons; and instead of maintaining peace and harmony in the world, create calamity

and chaos. But the Holy Prophet (pbh) fought battles for the sake of establishing peace and maintaining freedom of conscience. The critics have said that if the Holy Prophet (pbh) was not a king, why did he fight battles? But if we look carefully, it is very obvious that the circumstances in which he took up arms were quite unavoidable and that all the wars were forced upon him and were merely defensive in nature. None of his battles were for worldly gain, as has been clearly mentioned in the Holy Quran, and even by some of his opponents.

Historians write that the first verse which permitted taking up arms was revealed to the Holy Prophet (pbh) on 15th August 623, one year after his arrival in Medina. The verse runs as under:

*"It is allowed to Muslims to take up arms against those who make war against them because these (Muslims) are transgressed upon and definitely Allah has all the power to help them. They were unjustly expelled from their homes, the only reason being that they said that Allah is their Lord and Guardian. And if Allah did not allow defensive wars, then the places of worship of Jews, Christians, and Muslims where God is oft remembered, would be destroyed by each other's transgressions and Allah surely supports His helpers and He is indeed Powerful, Mighty and Prevailing."*  
(Holy Quran, 22:40-41)

The purpose of Islamic wars has been very well defined in the verses above mentioned. In the book *Sirat Khatam-un-Nabiyeen*, (Life of the Holy Prophet), Hazrat Mirza Bashir Ahmad has written an elaboration of the verses mentioned above, which is one of the best illustrations in this regard. Part of his Commentary is presented below:

"If we look carefully, we deduce four points from the verses. First, that the wars were initiated by the non-believers, as is obvious from the words 'against whom war is made'. Second, that the non-believers used to beat Muslims with utmost cruelty and this cruelty was the cause of religious battles, as is clear from the words 'because they have been wronged.' Third, that the purpose of non-believers was to destroy Islam with sword, as is reflected from the word 'pulled-out'. Fourth, that the declaration of war by the Muslims was in self-defense, is clear from 'if Allah did not repel some men by means of others'. In short, the main reason for this verse is to indicate that the reason for defensive war by Muslims was to protect themselves and to guard against the transgressions of the non-believers, who wanted to destroy Muslims by the might of the sword."

In a nutshell, this single verse is enough to rebut all of the objections which are often raised by critics regarding the wars waged by the Muslims, which were purely defensive.

Christian writers often present the incident of the Banu-Qureza as an example of transgression by the Holy Prophet (pbh). There is no doubt that the incident happened; but the circumstances under which it occurred are such as would clarify and justify the steps taken by the Holy Prophet (pbh) in this regard. This is not the occasion to go into details of the incident, but the following account by a Christian writer may clarify some of the doubts. He writes:

“The Great Invasion (Battle of Ahzab) which Mohammad declared had been miraculously frustrated, was due to, or believed to be due, to the propaganda of members of Banu-Nazir, whom the Prophet (pbh) had punished with banishment only. Should he banish the Qureza, he would thereby be setting free a fresh set of propagandists. On the other hand, those who had taken part openly with the invaders of Medina could not very well be permitted to remain there. To banish them was unsafe; to permit them to remain was yet more dangerous. Hence, they must die.” (Margolis)

In fact, these people were traitors and never kept their promises. Even then, the Holy Prophet (pbh) did not make any decision himself, but the Qurezas themselves picked Saad Bin Maaz as an arbitrator, and there was no direct involvement of the Holy Prophet (pbh) in the decision.

This is particularly noticeable that the purpose of battles fought by the Holy Prophet (pbh) was never to acquire or conquer territory or to kill or to exterminate people. If it had been so, he would never have issued an order to keep peace in the area, and to avoid damage to property and crops or damage to anything of public utility; nor would he have issued orders not to harm women, children and the old and the sick. These are factors which are entirely overlooked by worldly kings. It is said in Hadith that whenever he would send a section of his armed people on assignment, he would advise them:

“O, Muslims! Go in the name of Allah and fight only for the sake of Allah! But beware, do not be dishonest in what you get and do not cheat or break promises or covenant with your enemy. Do not kill children, women, the old, or the clergy; and maintain law and order and treat people nicely, and God likes people who treat other people nicely.”

It has been said of Hazrat Abu Bakr that he used to advise his army not to cut fruit-bearing trees and not to make barren areas that were inhabited by people. In the light of these facts, can it be said that the Holy Prophet (pbh) took up arms to kill, destroy or conquer?

In worldly kingdoms, people want to keep close contact with the

monarchs and are obedient to them only to gain material and political favors. Their hearts are far from what they outwardly show to their rulers. But the Companions of the Holy Prophet (pbh) had real love and devotion for him in their hearts. Their minds and bodies moved in total compliance with his wishes because they obeyed him from the core of their hearts. Such devotion is unsurpassed in history.

Americans, in spite of their efforts, have failed to control abuse of alcohol; on the other hand, with just one word against its use, all the Companions of the Holy Prophet (pbh) suddenly and completely abandoned the use of alcohol. It has been narrated by Anas Bin Malik that when consumption of alcohol was forbidden, the Holy Prophet (pbh) asked one of his Companions to declare it in the streets of Madina. Anas said that at that time "I was serving Abou Talha Ansari and some other Companions with drinks when we heard of this new order. Upon hearing this, Abou Talha said: 'Let us investigate what this new order is so as to obey it as soon as possible.' Then, without even confirming it, he said, 'Let us first break our containers of alcohol.'" (Bukhari.)

Does the personality of a worldly king have such a profound and lasting effect on his people? It was only the Holy Prophet (pbh) who generated such a charisma, charm, devotion and loyalty never before seen in anyone else.

From what I have stated so far, it will be clear that the Holy Prophet (pbh) had none of the ordinary qualities of worldly kings; on the contrary, whatever he did or said was to exhort simplicity, meekness, hospitality, selflessness, equality, peace, and love and service to all human beings. Knowing this, it would be decidedly unfair to describe him as an "ordinary king".

The Holy Prophet's kingdom was, in fact, the Kingdom of the heavens. It is obvious that the Holy Prophet (pbh) was not a king in the ordinary sense of the word. As is customary, worldly kings are called by certain titles, such as emperor, Kaiser, and so forth, which the Holy Prophet (pbh) never assumed. Then the question arises: What shall he be called, bearing in mind that at one time he had control and command of several dominions like an emperor?

For this purpose, we turn to books and literature from which we find that kingship has two forms. One form is called dominance (Taglab) and another is termed leadership (Imamat). The worldly kings belong to the former and the Holy Prophet (pbh) belonged to



the latter. That is why it is written that "kingship and politics have two forms; one is perfect politics, called Imamatus; the second is imperfect politics called taglab. The former teaches character and obedience in a sublime order and the ruler is just and humble and considers his people as brothers and friends; and he, himself, is never swayed by selfish motives. The latter is autocratic, stubborn, and believes in self-aggrandizement.

From what is stated above, it is clear that the kingship under consideration in regard to the Holy Prophet (pbh) was of the order of Imamatus, not taglab. And not only ordinary Imamatus. His leadership, or Imamatus, was of the highest order, the kind such as the like of which had never been seen., We can say that Imamatus and Khilafat are one and the same thing. Imamatus, according to the saying: "The king is the shadow of God" bears a perfect description of the Holy Prophet (pbh). That is why throughout his life, all of his actions were the reflection of Divine attributes. Whereas on one side his Prophethood is glittering with grace and grandeur, on the other side his kingship is studded with the heavenly qualities.

Maulana Shibli, in his well-known book on the Holy Prophet (pbh), aptly describes him thus:

"In spite of the fact that he owned all the wealth of Arabia, in his simple house he never had a cushioned bed, luxurious food, flashy robes or gold and silver in his possession. Looking at the degree of obedience that his words carried, one could be mistaken in considering him as Kaiser, a king, or an emperor; but in reality, he looked more like the simply clad orphan of Mecca, in the form of an angel."

His life in Medina is proof that he was a true vicegerent of God on earth. When his state of helplessness was transformed into that of sovereignty in Medina, even then he shunned every form of pomp and show, arrogance or grandeur, and remained the same simple individual that he was previously. As Noldeke states:

"On the whole, after he became ruler of all Arabia, he maintained the original poverty and simplicity of his establishment; he never stored up money or estates nor did he spend his time eating and drinking and wearing soft clothing. He continued to fast and watch and pray after his earlier fashion; and that was plainly out of a heartfelt need and without any ostentation." (Encyclopedia Britannica)

Washington Irving, a renowned Christian writer, relates:

"His Captains were sent on more distant expeditions than

formerly, but it was always with a view to destroy idols and to bring idolatrous tribes to subjection; so that his temporal power kept pace with the propagation of his faith."

Again, Irving says:

"His military triumphs awakened no pride nor vainglory, as they would have done had they been effected for selfish purposes. In the time of his greatest power, he maintained the same simplicity of manners and appearance as in the days of his adversity. So far from affecting regal state, he was displeased if, on entering a room, any unusual testimonial of respect was shown to him." (Muhammad and His Successors)

Will Durant, in his voluminous book, *The Age of Faith*, writes about the life of the Holy Prophet (pbh) in Medina:

"The furniture (in his rooms) was a mattress and pillows upon the floor. He was often seen mending his clothes or shoes, kindling the fire, sweeping the floor, milking the family goat in his yard or shopping for provisions in the market ... his staple foods were dates and barley bread; milk and honey were occasional luxuries ... he put on none of the pomp of power, rejected any special mark of reverence, accepted the invitation of a slave to dinner and asked no service of a slave that he had time to and strength to do for himself. Despite all the booty and revenue that came to him, he spent little upon his family, less upon himself, much in charity."

Such was Muhammad, the Holy Prophet (pbh) the like of whom the world never knew before nor would it ever witness again till the end of time. It is not our intent, nor is it our purpose to shower unmerited praises on a person to whom we owe allegiance in some form or other. But the language of history is such that no impartial person can ignore it except at his own undoing. The Orphan of Mecca indulged throughout his life in the sort of activity which built its own field of reference. His career was crowned with success at every level. But nothing ever changed his lifestyle. The lonely preacher who roamed the streets of Mecca for thirteen long years, unmoved and undaunted by a most primitive opposition, never changed his frugal habits even when he became the undisputed ruler of the whole of the Arabian peninsula. Despite the affluence at Medina, he spent little upon his family, less upon himself, much in charity.

From the above, it is abundantly clear that Arnold Toynbee, with all his flamboyant knowledge of history, missed the mark completely when he asserted that the Holy Prophet (pbh) and preacher of Mecca, on attaining power at Medina, was overlaid and overwhelmed

by political enterprise. This assertion is not borne out by history. The Holy Prophet (pbh), in his dying hour, when there could be no longer a worldly motive for deceit, still breathed the same religious devotion and the same belief in his apostolic mission. The last words that trembled on his lips were a muttered trust that he would soon be entering into blissful companionship with the One Whom he had loved throughout his life—Allah the Merciful, the Benevolent.

Michael H. Hart, in his famous book “The 100”, ranked the most influential persons in history. He designated neither Jesus nor Marx but Muhammad as the most influential man in history. This, he said, was because:

“Muhammad was the only man in history who was supremely successful on both the religious and secular level. The influence of Muhammad through the medium of the Koran had been enormous. It is probable that the relative influence of Muhammad on Islam has been larger than the combined influence of Jesus and St. Paul on Christianity.”



## MEANING OF REVELATION

Revelation does not mean that an idea should arise in the mind of a person who sets himself to ponder over a thing as, for instance, a poet having thought out half a verse seeks the other half in his mind and his mind suggests the other half. This is not revelation but is the result of reflection, in accordance with the law of nature... Revelation is the living and powerful converse of the Holy and Mighty God with a chosen servant of His, or with one whom He designs to make His elect... Sometimes revelation is vouchsafed to a person by way of trial and is not equipped with full blessings. In such a case, the recipient is put on his trial at this elementary stage so that having tasted somewhat of revelation, he should order his life along the lines of those who are true recipients of revelation, in default of which he would encounter frustration. If he does not adopt the ways of the truly righteous, he is deprived of the fullness of this bounty and is left only with vain boasting.

Millions of the virtuous have been recipients of revelation, but they were not of equal standing in the estimation of God... Revelation is a pure divine grace and is not evidence of exaltation; that being according to the degree of truth, sincerity and faithfulness of the recipient, which is only known to God... There is no doubt that if revelation takes the form that the recipient submits a question and God responds to it, and there is a sequence between question and answer, and the revelation is characterized by divine majesty and light, and comprehends knowledge of the unseen and true understanding, it is truly the word of God. (*The Teachings of Islam*, by the Promised Messiah)

## REVIEW OF SOME CHRISTIAN DENOMINATIONS

By  
Bashir Ahmad Orchard

### ROMAN CATHOLICS

The largest Christian denomination is composed of Roman Catholics. It has been estimated that they comprise one sixth to one fifth of the world's population. The supreme head of the Church is the Pope who resides in Vatican City, Rome.

The Church claims to be the only true representative of the Christian faith. This claim is based partly on the New Testament, traditions, history and other considerations. The Church claims that Jesus appointed Peter as the first head of the Church for which the Biblical authority is:

“And I say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.” (Matthew 16:18-19)

Roman Catholics believe that Peter travelled from Palestine to Rome where he was appointed the first bishop of that city. They also believe that both he and Paul suffered the death of martyrdom. The Bishop of Rome was the head of the Church and it was not until a few centuries later that he assumed the title of Pope. The Pope is elected by seventy senior priests known as cardinals.

There are six fundamental rules which Roman Catholics are expected to observe:

1. Attend the mass service on Sundays and Holy days.
2. Confess their sins to a priest at least once in a year.
3. Receive communion at Easter time. This involves the eating of a small portion of bread and the drinking of a little wine which has been blessed by the priest and believed, thereafter, to have become transmuted into the flesh and blood of Jesus.
4. Observe certain fasting and abstinence days.
5. Give contributions.

## 6. Marriage within a proper circle of relations.

Contrary to the belief of other Christians, Roman Catholics believe that Mary, the mother of Jesus, ascended physically into heaven although there is no scriptural nor historical evidence quoted in support of this pronouncement which was proclaimed officially by Pope Pious 12th in 1950 and known as the Doctrine of the Assumption of Mary. They also believe in the Doctrine of the Immaculate Conception which states that Mary was free from both original and all other kinds of sin.

Roman Catholics accept most of the Apocrypha as inspired scripture. These writings consist of fifteen books which were included in the Old Testament until the time of the Reformation in the 16th century when they were deleted by Protestants on the ground that they do not fall within the category of inspired scriptures. The names of these books are:

1st Esdras.	2nd Esdras.
Prayer of Manesses	Tobit
Judith	Rest of Book of Esther
Wisdom of Solomon	Ecclesiasticus
Baruch the Prophet	Letter of Jeremiah
Song of the three Holy Children	The Story of Susanna
Bel and the Dragon	
1st Book of Maccabee.	2nd Book of Maccabee.

Roman Catholics believe these books to be divinely inspired scriptures except the first three. Martin Luther—the German reformer—was the first to extract them from his translation of the Bible in 1534. On the other hand, their divine authenticity was ratified by the Roman Catholics at the Council of Trent in 1541. The New English Bible and the Jerusalem Bible are two of a number of publications of the Bible which contain the Apocrypha.

The priests are not permitted to marry and take an oath of celibacy.

## MORMONS

Mormons are active in the propagation of their faith. They are members of the Church of Latter Day Saints which was founded in America by Joseph Smith. They are persons of integrity with abstemious habits.

Joseph Smith was born in the State of New York in 1806. At the age of fourteen he claimed to have had a vision in which two celestial beings appeared before him. One of them spoke to him. In 1823 he described another vision in which a holy messenger called Maroni appeared to him and announced to him that God had selected him for a special mission. He was told to go after three years to a particular place where he would find buried a set of golden plates on which he would find written the religious history of the ancient people of America. These plates were purported to have been buried fourteen hundred years earlier by Maroni himself who is said to have been a prophet of his time. The story goes that Joseph Smith collected the plates as commanded and during a period of three years translated the weird script into English which he published under the name of the Book of Mormon.

The Book of Mormon tells the story of a family living in Jerusalem about 600 B.C. Lehi, the father of the family, was warned of the destruction of Jerusalem. He built a ship and sailed westward with his family eventually landing somewhere on the American continent. As the family multiplied, there emerged from it two nations of people—The Nephites and Lamanites. Later on, after the crucifixion, Jesus descended among them for a short while.

It is asserted that the book was compiled by a prophet called Mormon about 400 A.D. It contains the abridged history and teachings of the Nephites and Laminites. Mormon entrusted the book to his son Moroni who buried it prior to a destructive war between the Nephites and Laminites. There it remained unknown and unseen until Joseph Smith excavated it after being informed of its whereabouts by Maroni in the vision he claims to have witnessed. Joseph Smith goes on to say that after he had completed the translation, he returned the golden plates to Maroni thereby leaving them unavailable for examination. Some of his followers testified that they had seen them during the period they were with Joseph Smith. The Book of Mormon was first printed in 1830.

Mormons believe that both the Bible and the Book of Mormon are the Word of God. The latter, they say, reveals a clearer understanding of the Bible. They consider as corrupt the present day teachings of Christianity.

The Mormons suffered considerable persecution during the first two decades of their growth. In 1843 Joseph Smith was assassinated

in prison by an unruly mob which burst inside. He was succeeded by Brigham Young. Severe opposition compelled them to migrate westwards. After a long and hazardous journey they settled in the state of Utah where in 1847 they established their centre in Salt Lake City.

At one time the Church of the Latter Day Saints sanctioned polygamy but later abandoned it under Government pressure. It is no longer permitted. Four commodities which are forbidden to Mormons are alcohol, tobacco, tea and coffee. They are active in the mission field and their missionaries are usually young men who devote two years of their life to the propagation of their faith. They work in pairs and stay together usually in lodgings. Should one be unable to participate in the daily outdoor work on account of sickness or any other reason then the other will not carry on alone. They move around only in pairs. They receive no salaries or allowances and are usually financed by their parents.

### **JEHOVA WITNESSES**

Jehova Witnesses are members of the Watch Tower and Bible Tract Society. They are well known for their diligent preaching activities. Like the Mormons they visit homes from door to door and usually work in pairs although this is not binding. Their plan of campaign in Great Britain demands that every house be visited at least twice annually. All members are called upon to devote considerable time in the propagation of their faith. Those known as regular members pledge a hundred hours voluntary service a month while others known as special workers dedicate one hundred and fifty hours.

The Watch Tower and Bible Tract Society originated in America. The first leader and organizer was Charles Taze Russell. He wrote and compiled six large volumes under the title 'Studies in the Scriptures' in which he has presented his interpretation of the Bible which is accepted by Jehova Witnesses. The Society was incorporated in 1884 with Charles Russell as its president. He died in 1914 and was succeeded by Joseph Franklin Rutherford—better known as Judge Rutherford. There was a schism at that time and the smaller splinter group re-named itself the Dawn Bible Students' Association.

Judge Rutherford was a dynamic leader charged with considerable personal magnetism. He re-organised the administration and the activities of the Society. It was not until 1931 that its members became





## MUHAMMAD—THE HOLDER OF THE SEAL

BY

Saleem Nasir Malik

God appointed the Holy Prophet Muhammad the Holder of the Seal. This degree of excellence was barred to all other Prophets since the beginning of time. One who meticulously follows his footsteps, can be awarded the attributes of Prophethood. But the Holy Prophet is gifted with much more than this. A spiritual and intimate linkage with him can elevate an "Ummati" to the exalted status of a Prophet.

It was thus that thousands of the followers of the Holy Prophet were converted by his grace into saints of a high order. But there was 'One' among the Ummah who was wrapped in the silver linings of a Prophet. He was none other than the Mahdi and the Promised Messiah whom the Holy Prophet had himself described as a Prophet, on four occasions (Sahih Muslim).

The perfect man to whom the Holy Quran was revealed, was not limited in his vision nor was there any deficiency in his sympathy in the sharing of sorrows. Both from the point of view of time and space, his soul was charged with perfect sympathy for human beings. He was, therefore, bestowed a full share of the manifestations of nature and he was made Khatamal-Anbia, meaning not that no one would henceforth receive any spiritual grace from him, but that he possessed the Seal of Prophethood and that without the attestation of that Seal, no grace could reach anyone and that for his people, the door of converse with the Divine would never be closed. Beside him, there was no Prophet who possessed the Seal. It is only through this Seal that a Prophethood can now be bestowed for which it is a condition that the recipient must be a follower of the Holy Prophet.

His (the Holy Prophet's) high courage and sympathy did not wish to leave his people in a condition of inferior status and bar to them the door of revelation, which is the root of all spiritual and temporal understanding. Yet in order to preserve the sign of the closing of all (previous) prophethoods, he desired that the grace of revelation should be reserved for the ranks of his followers only. It was in this sense that the Holy Prophet had been appointed as Kahlamal-Anbia.

It is, therefore, established till the day of judgement that a person who does not show true obedience to him (the Holy Prophet) and who does not devote his full being to obeying him, cannot become the recipient of perfect revelation (Wahi-i-Nabuwwat). Direct Prophethood has been ended with the Holy Prophet. But Prophethood which means the receipt of (perfect) revelation through the grace of Muhammad will continue till the Day of Resurrection. This is so that the door of perfection of mankind should never be closed and this sign should never disappear from the world' (Haqiqatul-Wahi).

God does not create another God like Himself because His attribute of Unity and of being Peerless, is eternal and it prevents Him from doing so. But He does create a sample of His Peerless Being by investing in one of his creation a reflection of His attributes. This process started with the beginning of the world and would continue till the ultimate cloud of dust, the final frozen wasteland emerges and puts an end to all that is animate in the universe. The lineage of Prophethood can, therefore, never lapse nor can its true profile ever change. This has been the Divine intent so far and this is His purpose for which mankind was created. The institution of Prophethood is eternal and its denial is delusive sophistry.

We are not dealing here with the birth pangs of a new idea nor with some aberration from the thoughtful thinking of the renowned muslim theologians of the past. This 'Ummat' has never suffered from a paucity of religious scholars and there are few instances where the idea of the finality of Prophethood has synchronized unconditionally with the meaning of Khataman-Nabiyyin in any of the Ahadees or commentaries of the Holy Quran during the last 1400 years. This is not the end of the line. The Quran and the Traditions are replete with prophecies about the appearance of Mahdi and the Promised Messiah in the Latter Days. The Messiah, in accordance with the Quranic *Nuss* is a Prophet, not only in his second advent but till eternity. The truth of the matter is that there is a consensus in the 'Ummah' about the appearance of a Prophet after the Holy Prophet, notwithstanding the loud but empty protestations of the present-day brand of ulema.

The core of the controversy however, rests with the identification of the coming Jesus. Our opponents allege that Jesus of Nazareth who appeared among the Jews 2000 years ago, is still physically alive somewhere in the heavens and is destined to be the Promised Messiah for the Muslims and the rest of mankind. The Ahmadiyya

view is that Jesus son of Mary died a natural death in his own time. The Quran and the traditions clearly state that a man from among the 'Ummah' would appear in the Latter Days in the power and spirit of Jesus and would be designated 'ISA' and the Promised Messiah. The Holy Prophet distinguished beyond a shadow of doubt Jesus of Nazareth from Ahmad, the Promised Messiah for the Muslims by clearly describing the distinctive features of both the Prophets in 'Sahih Bukhari.' It proves, if nothing else, that Jesus son of Mary and the Promised Messiah of this 'Ummat' are two entirely different persons; one was already dead and the other had yet to appear. It does nothing for Jesus of Nazareth and less than nothing for the Mullahs who await the resurrection of the dead in this world and not the Hereafter.

As already pointed out, the freeze on Prophethood applies to such claimants only as are outside the pale of Islam and the Quran. An 'Ummati' Nabi cannot bring a new shariah nor could he operate outside the zone of the eternal Prophethood of the Holy Prophet. This is the true meaning of Khatmi-Nabuwwat as explained in the Quran and the 'Ahadees'. There are thousands of instances of this type of Prophethood in the Mosaic Dispensation. The only difference is that after the appearance of the Holy Prophet, all spiritual denominations are restricted to the Muslim Community till the Day of Judgment.

It is thus clear that it is not the Ahmadis who violate the prestige of the Holder of the Seal. In fact we are dealing with a determination of the Maulvis to destroy the basis on which Islamic values have been built. The appearance of Jesus of Nazareth among the Muslims would demolish for all times the supremacy of Islam on all other religions. Not only this; it would also shatter the Seal of Prophethood of Muhammad, the Leader and Chief of all mankind. There are no doors that could not be unlocked; except the door of Khatmi-Nabuwwat which could never be unlocked by an outsider. True theology has never been the metier of half-baked Mullahs. If you sow the wind, you can only reap the whirlwind. Our Maulvis exalted the status of Christ so much that they never felt contended till he sat on the right hand of God in the Heavens. On the other hand, the Holy Prophet lay buried on earth. A true Muslim would shudder even to think of the consequences of a situation such as this.

The wrath of God fell on this people for this insult to the holiest and noblest of all mankind—the Holy Prophet. Physical might and



*From Our Archives:*

## THE ISLAMIC METHOD OF SLAUGHTER

By  
A.R. Dard

The head of the felled animal or bird having been extended, the slaughterer takes hold of a portion of the skin of the neck between the thumb and forefinger. Then saying: *Bismillah Allaho Akbar*—in the name of Allah, Allah is Great—he slaughters the animal usually with a sharp and smooth knife. The large blood vessels of the neck, the carotid arteries' and jugular veins which supply the brain with blood containing oxygen, are completely divided; and the cut severs all structures on the central side of the vertebral column. The central muscles being severed, the dorsal muscles at once pull back the head, leaving an unrestricted vent for the blood. Immediately, blood spurts from the severed carotid arteries in a jet. The blood contained in the body is rapidly pumped out by the heart, which continues to beat for a few minutes.

The cut is continuous and uninterrupted and the knife is not pressed down vertically but it is drawn across the neck horizontally. The cut is not a stab. It is neither low down nor high up, but in the centre of the neck.

This is a description of the ordinary Muslim process of slaughtering animals for food. But it should be remembered that there is no blind rigidity in Islam because such rigidity really tends to defeat its own purpose. A universal and practical religion must have a measure of elasticity in its regulations to make it really serviceable in meeting the varying requirements of man. For instance, if a knife is not available, Islam allows in an emergency, the use of anything sharp-edged which would bleed the animal, but it allows no cruelty. In the same way no rigid method of 'casting' the animal is prescribed by Islam. If necessary the 'casting' may be dispensed with altogether. All that is required is that the method should be humane, convenient and effective. It should involve unnecessary hardship, suffering and pain neither to animal nor to man. Camels for example may be bled standing with their legs tied. Game is also permissible in Islam. A bird or an animal killed with a gun or an arrow is lawful, but not the one which is strangled, knocked down, gored or beaten to death with

a stick or blows.

It should also be remembered that the essential condition of making flesh lawful is that the bird or beast should be shot, slaughtered or killed by bleeding in the name of God. The formula, *Bismillah, Allaho Akbar*—In the name of Allah, Allah is Great—must be recited at the time of killing. Otherwise the flesh would be unclean and unlawful. The space at my disposal does not allow me to discuss here the necessity, significance and importance of this Islamic injunction. All that I would like to remark here in passing is that it has a moral and spiritual value. Man cannot live by flesh alone.

Whatever be the method of ordinary slaughter, animals have to be driven to market and pushed, pulled, poked, and tail-twisted by drovers in order to make them go first into the pens outside and then into the slaughter house itself. By no means can they escape some measure of rough handling. Some animals must be 'cast' or thrown' so that their throats may be in a position such as to render the cut effective. From the nature of the case the slaughter of large animals for food purposes must always be a repulsive sight to the ordinary person whose emotions, being powerfully stimulated, lead him to draw conclusions as to the animal's sensations which are contrary to physiological facts.

In a sense all killing is cruel, and if we are to avoid cruelty to animals we should logically abstain from the use of flesh as food and be vegetarians. But Divine Law permits the consumption of the flesh of certain animals; they are created for the service of man, even for his consumption. Hence all that can be reasonably said is that animals should be killed with a minimum of suffering and with due regard to the sentiments and principles of humanity. So the Islamic method forbids the inflicting of unnecessary pain.

The only pain felt by an animal killed in the Islamic way of slaughtering is that of the cut in the skin. This is slight. Children often cut their skin without being aware of it. And herbivorous mammals are said to be less sensitive than human beings.

When the cut is made the bleeding is extremely rapid. Cutting of the carotid arteries, by depriving the brain of its blood supply, produces practically instantaneous loss of consciousness. A continuous supply of fresh blood at a high pressure is essential to maintain consciousness. Sir Wm. M. Bayliss, Professor of General Physiology in University College, London, says: "It is really indeed the oxygen



carried by the fresh blood that is the necessary agent for the continuance of the activity of the brain.”

Sir Leonard Hill throws further light on this subject. He says: “Many suppose that the movements of the head, legs and tail which quickly follow the cutting of the throat and the efforts at raising of the head and body from the recumbent position which may occur in the case of an unfastened beast, likewise the presence of the corneal reflex, and the deep, noisy respiration, are signs of consciousness. It is asserted that this consciousness is brought about by a compensatory supply of blood by way of the vertebral arteries.

“In veterinary circles the assertion of a persistent or returning consciousness and capacity of feeling pain is based on the fact that the unfastened beast may make efforts to get up and escape. The opinion, however, of all leading physiologists, including that of our worldwide authority on the nervous system, Sir Charles Sherrington, is that these movements are merely signs of reflex action carried out by the lower nerve centers. They are seen in pigeons, rabbits, cats and dogs after removal of the great brain. Human experience of anaesthesia shows that the sensory areas of the great brain are far more sensitive than the lower centres; so, too, in the case of an interference with the supply of blood and oxygen by the brain. A monkey shuts its eyes and goes to sleep when the oxygen supply is greatly diminished in the air which it breaths, continues to sit and balance its movements; but it is at first difficult and then impossible to wake it up and make it open its eyes. Later, with still less oxygen supply, the motor centres fail and the animal falls over and convulsive movements occur. Convulsive escape movements are made when the oxygen is greatly and rapidly diminished, but the animal is by then unconscious.”

The Director, Department of Applied Physiology, National Institute of Medical Research, writes in the *Lancet*, 1923, II, 1382, that when the throat is cut the centres in the lower parts of the nervous system *viz.*, the spinal bulb and cord, continues to act for a time. Deep, gasping respirations occur, and convulsive movements which press the blood out of the muscles and organs of the belly... The whole of these actions result in almost complete drainage of blood and tissue-lymph out of the body.” Openshaw says that by no other method can all the blood be removed from the body. Blood is forbidden in Islam.

The ordinary Islamic method of slaughtering animals for food is



*Current Topics:***DEHUMANIZING ISLAM**

by

Dr. Syed Barakat Ahmad

On October 16, 1983 an Israeli patrol in Lebanon attacked 50,000 Shiites of Nabatieyeh commemorating Ashura—the martyrdom of Hussain (October 680). Two Shiite mourners were killed and 15 wounded. On October 6, this year the Sunnis of Pakistan did better. They attacked an Ashura procession in Karachi. Five people were killed, 300 were wounded and two Shiite mosques were burnt. The Shiite persecution continues and the Sunni ulema are now demanding restrictions on this minority (15 percent). Burning and destroying mosques is, unfortunately, not a new thing in Muslim history. In 1801, on the day of Eid festival, the followers of the Najdi reformer, Abdul-Wahab (1703-1787), sacked the Shiite mosque of Kerbala where Hussain is buried. It was stripped of the rich hangings, the gold and silver plates, the girdles of precious stones and the priceless carpets which were accumulated for centuries.

The tradition goes back to Yazid bin Muawiah who in 683, hardly fifty years after the Prophet's death, sent an army which included the Christians of Syria to capture Mecca and Medina. After sacking Medina, Yazid's army proceeded to Mecca which was besieged. Catapults were directed against the inviolable sanctuary of the Holy Mosque and the Kaba was burnt to the ground. The Black Stone (*Hajri Aswad*) was split in three pieces. That tradition endures. In 1924 the Ikhwan army and its commander, Luwai, classed the Mecans with other unbelievers as kafirs, smashed the decorations of the Grand Mosque and demolished some of the tombs and shrines sacred to the whole Muslim world. The Grand Mosque in Mecca was again occupied and desecrated by Muslim extremists in November 1979.

**ENDURING TRADITION**

Now, in Pakistan no day passes when an Ahmadi mosque is not desecrated or destroyed. Some mosques have been locked, some others have been disfigured. The Muslim profession of faith, "*There is no God, but Allah and Muhammad is His messenger*" has been

forcibly removed from those mosques where prayers are still held.

In Doshipura (Varanasi) a Shiite community had to be protected by an elaborate Supreme court order. Anticipating Sunni-Shiite clashes on the Ashura day, the Supreme Court restrained the Sunni community from causing any hindrance or disturbance to the performance of religious rituals and rites by the Shiites on the eight plots in dispute during the period of the Muharram mourning. The court further ordered that the graves of the Sunnis on the plots should be cordoned off by barbed wire fencing on all sides, except that of Hakim Badruddin where the Sunnis would be allowed to recite Fatiha and lay chadar on specified dates only.

Culturally and educationally better off than the Sunnis and with a greater consciousness of their religion, Shiites as a minority have not always been well treated by the Sunnis. Though Shiites contribution to Muslim thought, education and political consciousness has been prominent in any age, they have been usually the victims of Sunni prejudice. But as a majority community under Ayatollah Khomeini, Iranian Shiites have not shown that tolerance which they themselves expect in the Sunni world. The suffering and tribulations of the Shiite people in Iran deserve world sympathy and their religious fervor warms the hearts of the Muslim *ummah*. But the use of that fervor by Iranian leaders has not been that glorious. Iran is now linked with world-wide terrorism, from suicide bombings in Beirut to street violence in Jakarta.

Last month, Malaysia's Deputy Foreign Minister, Abdul Kadir Sheikh Fadzir, said that religious extremists had established contacts with militant groups in Iran. "The activities of these groups are regarded by Malaysians as interference by the Iranian Government", the Minister added.

## SUNNI VIOLENCE

Although Ayatollah Khomeini's Iran has attracted greater attention, Sunni Muslims have not been far behind. In 1981 President Anwar al-Sadat was assassinated by Muslim extremists (The Muslim Brotherhood) while in February 1982 the Alawi President of Syria, Hafez al-Assad, pounded the Sunni town of Hama for almost three weeks with tank and artillery fire, killing an estimated 20,000 people. Whole neighborhoods had been plowed up like cornfields and bulldozed. In fact, Ayatollah Khomeini is far behind President Hafez al-Assad and General Zia-ul-Haq in political repression and

ruthless religious persecution. There is no other country, except Pakistan, where millions of people were deprived of their fundamental right to call themselves Muslims and practice Islam. The enormity of this human rights violation is shocking beyond words. For the time being the resurgence of fanaticism has been diverted towards Ahmadis and to a smaller extent Shiites, but it is bound to consume the very fabric of Pakistani society.

The sponsoring of the death squads by the Libyan leader, Muammar al-Qadafi, and Hujjat-ul-Islam Muhammad Musawi's attempts to use Hajj as a cover for subversion in Saudi Arabia are well known. The purpose is to incite the Saudi Shiite minority concentrated in the eastern oil fields of Saudi Arabia. It is reported that Iranian agents have made contacts with some of the 10,000 Pakistani soldiers who serve as guards for the Saudi regime.

Nine years of civil war, the mutual distrust, fear and greed have driven Christians, Sunnis and Shiites in Lebanon to their most extreme positions. On a larger scale this is the position of the whole West Asia where Syrians are involved in the anti-Saudi plotting, Libyans are trying to overthrow the Egyptian government and Iranians are attempting to destabilize the Gulf. All these plots to subvert the neighboring Muslim regimes are of course overshadowed by the self-destructive Iran-Iraq war. Compare all this with the teaching of the Qur'an: *"Whoso saves a life, it shall be as though he had saved the life of mankind."* (5.32).

## EUPHORIA AND FRUSTRATION

The fifteenth century Hijrah began with a great deal of un-Islamic fervor. But it soon became apparent that religious revival is not a political or academic exercise. Inaugurated by bemedalled heads of state and military dictators, dressed up with scriptural verses and high sounding theological terms, but devoid of spiritual and devotional content, such an exercise can only stimulate euphoria. And euphoria always leads to frustrations. Having enjoyed the festivals of Islam and five-star celebrations, the Muslim world sank deep in frustration. There is a spiritual vacuum, a tormenting feeling that all the oratory of the mulla, the erudite narration of Muslim past by the historian and all the elucidation of the "Islamic" political system by the time-serving political scientist have proved to be ineffective and incapable of solving the social, economic and political problems of Muslim societies. They looked to their non-Muslim neighbors which

were liberated along with them from the European dominance and are doing well as stable democracies with a high degree of industrialization. This has produced a sense of impotence and created frustration. This void has now been filled by extreme religious fundamentalism.

A mulla does not wield a sword, but he knows how to wield words. He understands the importance of language. He also understands the importance not only of language but of simplicity. He is willing and able to simplify his position into short cliches and divert attention from the complexities of the real problem. "*Jihad*" and "*kufr*" are two important items of his armory. When he fails with them he exploits the love and reverence in which Muslims hold their Prophet. Iqbal summed up that love in his *Javidnama* in the following words: "you can deny God, but you cannot deny the Prophet!" The Canadian orientalist, Wilfred Cantwell Smith, put it in another way: "Muslims will allow attacks on Allah: there are atheists and atheistic publications, and rationalistic societies; but to disparage Muhammad will provoke from even the most 'liberal' sections of the community a fanaticism of blazing vehemence." So anyone who is to be condemned is accused of showing disrespect to the Prophet. This charge so infuriates the Muslim masses that the accused is not given even a chance to deny the charge. It is a simple cliché which answers emotional needs of finding a scape-goat. It was this simple cliché which was used by the mulla to divert the public attention from the movement to restore democracy in Pakistan. Ahmadis were accused of showing disrespect to the Prophet and the Pakistani people, who were demonstrating against President Zia, started burning Ahmadiyyah mosques instead. When the Ahmadis appealed to the highest court in the country saying that the charge was false, it was dismissed. It may be recalled that Pakistan's relatively independent judiciary was dismissed when in March 1981, nineteen Supreme Court and provincial High Court judges refused to endorse an order allowing General Zia to amend the Constitution. Today in Pakistan there are no enforceable rights. Infact there is no Muslim country, except probably Malaysia, where there are enforceable rights with an independent judiciary. It is a sad commentary on the followers of a religion which enshrines human rights in its holy book, the Qur'an.

### GOETHE AND ISLAM

The well-known orientalist, Sir William Muir, who lived among



### *Book Review:*

#### *Islam in the World*

by Malise Ruthven

New York, Oxford University Press, 1984, 400 pp., \$8.95 (paperback).

What is the essential message of Islam to late 20th century mankind? Journalist-author Malise Ruthven, in his most recent work, *Islam in the World*, concludes that even more important than the injunctions to the faithful to build the good society by obedience to Quranic Law, "is the message that proclaims the Eternal Transcendent and man's special responsibility as guardian of this planet. It is a message which calls on men and women to show gratitude for the world's bounty, to use it wisely and distribute it equitably. It is a message phrased in the language and imagery of a pastoral people who understood that survival depended upon submission to the natural laws governing their environment, and upon rules of hospitality demanding an even sharing of limited resources. In a world riven by the gap between rich and poor nations, and in constant danger of nuclear catastrophe, this message has an urgent relevance and it is one that we ignore at our peril."

An avowed agnostic, he nevertheless presents a refreshing examination of the impact of Islam in the world. He makes the obvious assertion that political agitation against corrupt or unjust Muslim governments will continue for decades, fired by Quranic prohibitions against social injustice and improbity and by the activist example of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of God be upon him).

Ruthven envisions a time when Islam, like other religions, will become subsumed into an amorphism of international culture: he predicts that high Sufism, whose occult ritualism is more universal than Judaism and less "anthropocentric" than Christianity, could become less rigid in terms of literal interpretation of the Shari'a; thus he infers that the way may be opened for the scientific age to have a much greater interchange with Islam. Wise reading of the Holy Quran, even for a non-Muslim, makes it clear that Almighty God has taught man how to use both spiritual and natural Law for his own benefit (22:19, 64:4, etc.). The number of Muslims now engaged in scientific and technological pursuits indicates clearly that Islam enjoins upon man to use whatever the Creator has placed in the earth for his salutary utility. The purpose of Islamic teaching is



not to undevelop man, but to aid his spiritual and material progress in the right direction. Islam has entered the scientific age light years ahead of the Western awakening.

*Islam in the World* is a well-documented, updated Western look at the religion, and its treatment of the Holy Quran and of the Holy Prophet is respectful. Ruthven assures the reader in his opening statement that while he is neither Muslim nor non-Muslim, nor a specialist in Middle Eastern affairs, he has nevertheless attempted to clearly explain how Islam became a political force in the modern world, something which few people writing in English have been able to do without detracting from the faith.

His method aids the general reader to examine several elements of the subject: Islam as a "potentially" ideal system; Islam in history; regional patterns of Islamic culture; contemporary Islamic political systems evolving from centuries old political activism; and at various points he parallels Judaic and Christian views with Islam. He is apparently successful in some areas, however one may question the efficacy of encapsulating such wide-ranging themes in one small volume. As an introductory survey of the subject, it is generally credible. He respectfully uses Quranic sources and the traditions to show "what Muslims believe about God and about mankind's duties in the world" and "how historically Muslims have sought to put their beliefs into practice by observing divine law and sometimes by attempting to recreate the ideal community of Medina as founded by the Prophet "Muhammad."

His other sources include the *Bible*, Ibn Khaldun, Yusuf Ali, Muhammad Zafrullah Khan, Ali Shariati, Maxime Rodinson, Rumi, Carl Jung, Muhammad Iqbal, *The Encyclopedia of Islam*, Toshihiko Izutsu, W.M. Watt, C. A. Julien, Thomas Carlyle, and many others of note.

After musing over some of the miserable earthiness of the Hajj experience for some pilgrims, he tends to concentrate on the pagan, Judaic, and political aspects of that great ritual, which is unsurprising judging from his background. The Pilgrimage which brings together Muslims from every part of the globe, is fertile ground for germinating political action in terms of universal justice and equality, as witness the failed revolt of one Juhaiman al Utaibi and his fellow extremists in the 1979 occupation of the Grand Mosque. Apparently, the aim was to denounce the Saudi regime; however, even the Ayatollah Khomeini, no friend of the royal family, criticized the

revolt as the work of United States or Israeli agents, which set off a round of anti-American demonstrations in many Muslim countries and in some western cities as well.

Rutven, in dealing with this problem of idealism vs. political reality, refers to the political astuteness of the Holy Prophet in his accommodation of the hostile Quraish after the conquest of Mecca, as being parallel to Ibn Saud's betrayal of the Ikhwan when he declared himself king of Saudi Arabia, pursuing his own worldly dream. Does he intend to suggest that the goals were the same? He cites the Christian solution of that classic problem which "pronounced that since Christ's kingdom was not of this world", secular authority, however vicious or irreligious, must be obeyed; pious Christians could take refuge in "their own private worship," "private morality" and almsgiving. There are millions of witnesses to the deleterious results of this stratagem.

In discussing the spectrum of Muslim interpretation of the Hajj, he identifies the range of opinion from the "ultra-symbolic" to the "ultra-literalistic," interpretations which spur activity escalating from "passive acquiescence" to "militant activism". To the Saudis, the Hajj is a religious festival, while to Iranian revolutionaries and other activists, Hajj must lead to the "creation of a true Islamic order, a world free from injustice and oppression."

On page 39, the author attempts to deal with the nature of this "original Abrahamic" religion, in terms of idolatry. This reviewer strongly recommends that he study the Ahmadiyya commentary of the Holy Quran, for greater comprehension of the facts. The same applies to his reading of the differing presentations of the positions of Isaac and Isma'il in relation to their father Abraham, in both the Bible and Holy Quran.

In the chapter on the Holy Prophet Muhammad, he makes the important assertion that there is no evidence in the Holy Quran nor in the traditions that the Prophet was well-acquainted with Christian beliefs and practices before prophethood was bestowed upon him by Almighty God; and notes that the Holy Prophet was probably "unusually taciturn and self-controlled; an introvert, quite unlike the societal values of excited, exuberant, loquacious, and boastful conduct" in the society around him; and that he did possess those qualities of manliness, bravery in war, persistence in virtue, and patience in adversity. Like C. G. Jung, Ruthven diverges from Maxime Rodison's theory that the Prophet received the revelations from his

own consciousness; this atheistic version cannot be substantiated against the powerful refutation found in the Holy Quran, nor even against the evidence uncovered in the psychological experiments of Jung, whose evidence "inferred the existence of a 'collective unconscious' transcending the boundaries of individual self-hood."

The author sees the Muslim community, the Umma founded by the Holy Prophet, as the antithesis of the *asabiya* or tribal solidarity. The social and ideological values of the "Five Pillars" (and the Holy Prophet's own address at the Farewell Pilgrimage) were intended to destroy tribal barriers and to solidify equality and justice in opposition to false assumptions of class or racial superiority. Today these are still dynamic factors in the expansion of Islam.

In "The Quranic World-view", he praises the beauty of the Arabic language, calling it "the key to Muslim culture, much more so than Hebraic and Christian scriptures, which have undergone various translations and revisions, may be said to to keys to their respective cultures." Ruthven defines the Quranic world-view as "a system of ethics from a divine source which aims to bind human behavior; a legal commitment to human freedom, liberating the human consciousness from limited objectives, expanding the brotherhood of all existing things into a unifying whole reality, termed the divine (Creator). Man must take *al-Ghaib*, the hidden, on trust as being beyond human limitations. Man cannot do as he likes, regardless of moral law. Muslims and non-Muslims alike can find guidelines to these limits if they take the trouble to investigate the teachings of the Holy Quran".

In the chapter entitled "Law and Disorder", he raises the question: 'Was Islam an obstacle to capitalist development?' He avers that some Marxist writers cite factors other than religion as obstacles, *i.e.*, the availability of cheap labor; the Eastern tradition of strong state dependency on public works; and the waves of marauding invaders from Central Asia. He brings into focus the issue of the much vaunted "European rationality" which he attributes to the heritage of Roman legalism, in contrast to the socio-political elements in Islamic society which deterred innovation in technology. He censures the *Shari'a* as the major impediment to economic development in Islam, holding at it stymied the growth of European-style merchant guilds. In his opinion, the dissension over this issue is more than "a debate about the origins of capitalism in or out of the Muslim world; it concerns the fundamental difference in

social and political behavior which still accounts for many divisions and misunderstandings between Westerners and Muslims."

He goes on to point out that sectarian divisions in Islam, when compared to those in Christianity, "stem more from politics than from religious dogma," and includes the *assabiya* as one of the offending causes. In his chapter on "Sects and Solidarity" he has investigated several Muslim sects which contribute to this division: Ibadi, Druze, Khoja, Mahdist (Sudan), Sunni, Nizari Isma'ili, and Shi'ite, among others. He focuses closely on Shi'ism and the Iranian revolution. He has evidently not heard of the Ahmadiyya Muslim community, which oversight is an unfortunate deficiency of this book. Ahmadiyya Islam has been termed the most vibrant missionary movement in existence today, due to the prodigious teachings and writings of the Divinely inspired Founder, Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of Qadian, India and his Khilafat.

In attempting to identify the movers and shakers of the "Spiritual Renewal" in Islam, Ruthven chooses Sufism as one of the leading elements, while he also explores the influence of the Naqshbandiya; Tarika-i-Muhammadiya; Ibn 'Abd al Wahhab; and the Mahdi Muhammad Ahmad of Sudan. He concurs that "the revitalizing force of Islamic spirituality is something that will always find political expression when the occasion demands it, deriving its legitimacy from the example of the Holy Prophet Muhammad." To reiterate, it is a pity that he did not investigate the origins of Ahmadiyya Islam and its present day missionary endeavors around the world, the outstanding example of spiritual renewal in Islam.

In "Challenge From the West", Ruthven mentions the ambivalent attitude of many Middle Easterners toward Europeans; the role of both Western and Muslim women in Muslim society; and the dominating intrusion of European colonialism and its continuing influence today. He delineates the varying responses of Muslims to this brutal intrusion, responses which range from acquiescence, to modern intellectualism, to reformism, to the radical activism as found in the Muslim Brotherhood.

In the conclusion of this useful work, Malise Ruthven states that "the ideal Islamic state was probably never more than a pious fiction because power politics, assassinations, war and plunder" have always been a tragic part of its history. Therefore, "there will always remain this constant creative tension between the reality "of human

frailty and the striving for the “ideal to realize true Islam in a violent and wicked world.” This theme recurs throughout the book. “The failure of the super powers of the West and the East to solve the overwhelming problem of Palestine, in addition to Third World disillusionment with the economic systems of both spheres has taught Muslims in general that neither capitalism nor socialism is the solution for their societies. Islam, correctly understood, stands midway between these two less attractive extremes. Its followers, the servants of Almighty Allah,” are working out their own “social-capitalism” in terms of trying to implement a free market economy; social responsibility, private property; and interest-free banking in an effort to conform to the Shari’a in imaginative new ways;” thus setting the optimistic example for those suffering Third World nations which are “floundering between super-power” enslavement. Even an agnostic writer can disseminate the open secret that Islam is the healing power for a world in turmoil.



## WARNING FROM DIVINE WARNER

“Remember, God has informed me of many earthquakes. Rest assured, therefore, that as earthquakes have shaken America and Europe, so will they shake Asia. Some of them will resemble the Day of Doom. So many people shall die that revulets of blood shall flow. Even the birds and the beasts will not be immune against this death. A havoc shall sweep the surface of the earth which shall be the greatest since the birth of man. Habitations shall be demolished as if no one had ever lived in them. This will be accompanied by many other terrible calamities which the earth and the heavens will send forth, till their extraordinary nature will become evident to every reasonable man. All the literature of science and philosophy shall fail to show their like. Then mankind shall be sore distressed and wonder what is going to happen. Many shall escape and many shall perish. The days are near, in fact, I can see

them close at hand, when the world shall witness a terrible sight; not only earthquakes but also many fearsome calamities shall overtake man, some from the skies and some from the earth. This will happen because mankind have stopped worshipping their true God and have become lost in the affairs of the world with all their heart and their effort and intent. If I had not come, these afflictions would perhaps have been delayed a little. But with my coming the secret purposes of an affronted God which were hidden so far, became manifest. Says God:

*"We never punish unless We send a Messenger."*

*Those who repent shall find security and those who fear before calamity overtakes them shall be shown mercy. Do you think you will be immune from these calamities? Or can you save yourselves through artifice or design? Indeed not. That day all human schemes shall fail. Think not that earthquakes visited America and other continents but that your own country shall remain secure. Indeed, you may experience a greater hardship. O Europe, you are not safe and O Asia, you too, are not immune. And O dwellers of Islands, no false gods shall come to your rescue. I see cities fall and settlements laid waste. The One and the Only God kept silent for long. Heinous deeds were done before His eyes and He said nothing. But now He shall reveal His face in majesty and awe. Let him who has ears hear that the time is not far. I have done my best to bring all under the protection of God, but it was destined that what was written should come to pass. Truly do I say that the turn of this land, too, is approaching fast. The times of Noah shall reappear before your eyes, and your own eyes will be witnesses to the calamity that overtook the cities of Lot. But God is slow in His wrath. Repent that you may be shown mercy! He who does not fear Him is dead, not alive."* [Haqiqatul Wahy, pp. 256-57].



## THE AHMADIYYA MOVEMENT

The Ahmadiyya Movement was founded in 1889 by Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, the expected world Reformer and the Promised Messiah. The Movement is an embodiment of true and real Islam. It seeks to unite mankind with its Creator and to establish peace throughout the world. The present Head of the Movement is Hazrat Mirza Tahir Ahmad. The Ahmadiyya Movement has its Headquarters at Rabwah, Pakistan, and is actively engaged in missionary work at the following centers:

### AHMADIYYA MUSLIM MISSIONS

#### AFRICA:

- BENIN:** P.O. Box 69, Portonova.  
**GAMBIA:** P.O. Box 383 Banjul. Tel. 608  
**GHANA:** P.O. Box 2327, Accra (OSU New Estates). Tel: 76845  
**IVORY COAST:** Ahmadiyya Muslim Mission, 03 BP 416, Adjame-Abidjan 03.  
**KENYA:** P.O. Box 40554, Nairobi (Fort Hall Road). Tel: 264226. Telex: c/o 22278.  
**LIBERIA:** P.O. Box 618, Monrovia (9 Lynch Street).  
**MAURITIUS:** P.O. Box 6 (Rose Hill).  
**NIGERIA:** P.O. Box 418, Lagos (45 Idumagbo Avenue). Tel: 633 757.  
**SIERRA LEONE:** P.O. Box 353, Freetown, Tel: 40699/22617  
**SOUTH AFRICA:** Mr. M.G. Ebrahim, P.O. Box 4195, Cape Town (Darut-Tabligh-Il Islami).  
**TANZANIA:** P. O. Box 376, Dares Salaam (Libya Street). Tel: 21744  
**UGANDA:** P.O. Box 98, Kampala.  
**ZAMBIA:** P.O. Box 32345, Lusaka.

#### AMERICAS:

- CANADA:** Ahmadiyya Muslim Mission, 1306 Wilson Ave., Downsview, Ont. M3M 1H5. Tel: (416) 249-3420  
**GUYANA:** Ahmadiyya Muslim Mission, 198 Oronoque and Almond Streets, P.O. Box 736, Georgetown. Tel: 02-67634  
**SURINAM:** Ahmadiyya Muslim Mission, Ephraimswegenweg, 26 P.O. Box 2106, Paramaribo.  
**TRINIDAD & TOBAGO:** Freeport Mission Road, Upper Carapichaima, Trinidad, W.I.  
**U.S.A.:** 2141 Leroy Pl. N.W., Washington, DC 20008. Tel: (202) 232-3737. Cable: ISLAM.

#### AUSTRALIA:

- Dr. Ijazul Haque, 19 Brom Borough Road, Rose-Ville 2069 N.S.W., Sydney.

#### ASIA:

- BANGLADESH:** 4 Baxi Bazar Road, Dacca-1.  
**BURMA:** 191-28th Street, Rangoon.  
**FIJI:** P.O. Box 3758, Samabula (82 Kings Road), Suva. Tel: 38221  
**INDIA:** Darul Masih, Qadian. Tel: 36.  
**INDONESIA:** Jalan Balikpapan 1, No. 10, Djakarta Pusat 1/13. Tel: 36 5342  
**JAPAN:** Ahmadiyya Center, 643-1 Aza Yamanoda, O-Aza Issha, Idaka-cho, Meito-Ku, Nagoya 465, Tel. 703-1868  
**PAKISTAN:** (Headquarters) Rabwah, Distt. Jhang.  
**PHILIPPINES:** Haji M. Ebbah, Simunal, Bongao, Sulu.  
**SINGAPORE:** 111 Onan Rd., Singapore 15.  
**SRI LANKA:** Colombo M.E.M. Hasan, 24 San Sebastin Street, Ratnum Road, Colombo 12.

#### EUROPE:

- BELGIUM:** Maulvi S. M. Khan, 76 Av. du Pantheon Bte 5 1080, Brussels.  
**DENMARK:** Eriksminde Alle 2, Hvidovre-Copenhagen. Tel: 753502  
**GERMANY:** Die Moschee, Babenhauser, Landstrasse, 25, Frankfurt. Tel: 681485.  
**HOLLAND:** De Moschee, Oostduinlaan, 79, Den Haag. Tel: (010-3170) 245902 Telex: 33574 Inter NLA 30C  
**NORWAY:** Ahmadiyya Muslim Mission, Frognerveine 53, Oslo-2. Tel. 447188  
**SPAIN:** Mission Ahmadiyya del Islam, Mezquita Basharat, Pedro Abad, near Cordoba, Tel. 160750 Ext. 142  
**SWEDEN:** Nasir Moske Islams Ahmadiyya Forsamling, Tolvskillingsgatan 1. S-414 82 Goteborg, Sverige. Tel: 414044  
**SWITZERLAND:** Mahmud Moschee, 323, Forschstrasse 8008, Zurich. Tel: 535570. Telex: 58378 MPTCH Islam 374/XA  
**UNITED KINGDOM:** 16 Gressenhall Road, London SW18 5QL. Tel: 01-870 8517. Telex: 28604 Ref. 1292

## The REVIEW of RELIGIONS

The Review of Religions is the oldest magazine of its kind which began its publication in the English language in the Indo-Pakistan Subcontinent. Its first issue was published in 1902 from Qadian, India, and it has been continuously published since. It is currently being published in the U.S.A.

It bears the distinction that it was initiated under the direction of Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of Qadian, the Promised Messiah, himself.

During the more than eighty-two years, the message of Islam has been conveyed through this magazine to hundreds of readers and many fortunate persons have recognized the truth of Islam and accepted it through studying it.

The articles published in it deal not only with the doctrines and teachings of Islam but also set forth a comparative appreciation of the teachings of other faiths.

One of its outstanding features is the refutation of the criticism of Islamic teachings by orientalists and non-Muslim scholars.

It also presents solutions, in the light of Islamic teachings, of the problems with which the Islamic world is confronted from time to time.

A study of this magazine is indispensable for the appreciation of the doctrines of the Ahmadiyya Movement and the teachings of its Holy Founder.

