

**PART TWO**  
**RESPONSE**  
**TO**  
**SWAMI DAYANANDA SARASWATI**  
**“LIGHT OF TRUTH”**  
***(Satyarth Prakash)***

10. “And he taught Adam the names of all things, and then proposed them to the angels, and said, “Declare unto me the names of these things if ye say truth.” God said, ‘O Adam, tell them their names’ and when he had told them their names, God said, “Did I not tell you that I know the secrets of heaven and earth and know that which ye discover, and that which ye conceal.” (Qur’an 2:31, 33).

“Could God ever deceive His angels in this way in order to impress them with His Greatness?” questions the Swami. “It was an act of sheer imposture on His part. No enlightened man could ever believe such a thing of God, nor would he display such hauteur. Was it by these means that God wanted to display His supernatural powers? Such quackery can only flourish among the savages but not among the civilized.” (LOT, p. 656).

But reading from verse 30 (which the Swami did not quote) would show that when Allāh told the angels that He was going to put a ruler on earth, the angels said “Wilt Thou place in it such as make mischief in it and shed blood?” To which Allah God replied, “Surely, I know what you know not.” God teaching Adam the names of “all things” “does not imply absolute totality. It simply means all that was necessary. The Qur’an uses this word in this sense elsewhere also (6:45; 27:17, 24; 28:58)” explains Malik Ghulam Farid. Muhammad Ali quotes Razi as explaining the word *asmaa*, of the Qur’anic text, in which God taught Adam these names, that: “He taught him the attributes of things and their descriptions and their characteristics, for the attributes of a thing are indicative of its nature.” God taught Adam the nature of these things and asked him to give them names.

The fact that the Qur’an did not say angels were taught the nature of these things does not necessarily mean that angels did not know of them. Evidence of this can be inferred in that God did not actually instruct Iblis to bow down along with angels to Adam. The fact that Iblis was in the presence of the angels made him subjected to this command. Likewise the angels must have been in the presence when Adam was taught the names of these things. The angels having preceded Adam in being created must have been aware of the nature of these things. Muhammad Ali points out, “Man is the greatest killer on this earth but he also turns the gifts of God to the best use. The angels speak of the darker side of the picture of humanity (that man would shed blood), but to God was known the brighter side as well as the darker side of this picture. Hence the words I know what you know not (verse 30)”, explains Muhammad Ali. God calling Adam to, and Adam being able to, name these creatures were proof to the angels of the wisdom of man. It “signifies the vast capability of man and the superiority of his knowledge to that of the angels,” says Muhammad Ali.

11. “And when we said unto the angels, worship Adam, they all worshipped him except Eblis (Satan), who refused, and was puffed up with pride and became of the number of the unbelievers.”—(Qur’an 2:34).

The Swami wrote: “This indicates that the Mohammedan God was not Omniscient i.e., He was not cognizant of the three periods of time—the past, the present, and the future. Had He been Omniscient, He would not have created Satan. Nor was God All-powerful, since when Satan deliberately refused to obey Him he could do nothing against him.”—(LOT, p. 656).

In the nearly two billion years since God revealed the Veda(s) to teach mankind, and with about 75 percent of the world not being of the Vedic religion, from the Swami's own pronouncements it seems that the Hindu God was not Omniscient. He did not know the past, the present, and the future—having failed in his object to have all mankind know the Vedas. Neither does all Hindu adhere to the Vedas, which means, according to the Swami's view, the Vedic God is not All-powerful to have them accept the Veda(s). Whereas Mohammad, who it is said wrote the Qur'an for his own "selfish ends", would seem, according to the Swami's reasoning, to be more Omniscient than the God of the Vedas. For in a period less than two thousand years after his mission Mohammad's followers outnumber those of the Vedic religion. **(Iblis being commanded to bow down to Adam has already been dealt with elsewhere)**. And the Rig Veda (I. XXV. 13. Vol. 1, p. 35) tells us that Varuna has spies: "Varuna....His spies are seated round about." Since the Hindu God need "spies" He, according to the Swami, is not Omniscient. **(These angels/spies are not to be compared with the angels of the Qur'an, who act only according to Allāh's, God's, command. Nor are these angels/spies of the Veda to be compared with the recorders of our deeds, as Islam teaches. These recorders record both good and bad actions, whereas spies report only those actions that are against the State)**.

**12.** Regarding the Qur'an—(2:35-37) allegorical story of Adam and Eve being instructed not to eat of the "tree," the Swami questions, "how did Adam come down to earth?" "Did Adam fly down like a bird or fall down like a stone?" (LOT, p. 657).

In the same vein one may ask the Swami, and his followers (and Hindus in general), considering that the soul has no eyes and limbs, how is the soul "Guided by God" into the womb of the chicken to establish itself "in the womb"? Does God clear away the feathers from the chicken and place the soul at that part for it to enter? **(Whereas the story of Adam is allegorical this journey of the soul, according to the Swami, is literal. Please consult Muhammad Ali's translation of the Qur'an for an explanation of the story of Adam. His translation of the Qur'an can be viewed online: [www.muslim.org](http://www.muslim.org)).**

Adam and Eve being instructed not to eat of the tree, as explained by Muhammad Ali, is one of the allegorical statements of the Qur'an. Whereas man is made of earth, the class of jinns, to which Iblis belong, are made of fire—(Qur'an 15:27); and angels, are said to be made of light—(Muslim 53:10. M. Ali, The Religion of Islam, p. 167). In the Hereafter man will be given new forms—(Qur'an 56:61).

**13.** "Dread the day wherein one soul shall not make satisfaction for another soul, neither shall any intercession be accepted from them, nor shall any compensation be received, neither shall they be helped." (Qur'an 2:48). (LOT, pp. 657-658).

People in paradise do not need help. Allah does help those in Hell—eventually, as noted elsewhere; all the inmates will be removed. Hell is not forever. It is obvious the wicked does not "dread the present." There are many that die without being punished for their crimes. There are perhaps many that do not care about punishment, so long as they receive pleasure from their crimes. And in the present the wealthy and the powerful can escape judgment. But in the Hereafter, in the Court of Allāh, God, there is no diplomatic immunity, no legal technicality, no hung-jury/no mistrial; no bribery; no one to "pressure" or bring "coercion and duress" on; and no godfather to shield behind his coat—in fact, the godfather would be hustling for a skirt for himself to hide behind—you did the crime, or was involved in it, you toast the time. And considering that one Divine day is equal to a thousand human years, even if the maximum time spent in Hell is twelve months, in Divine terms that would be 365,000 human years. You're well crisped! As to the intercession by the Prophet Mohammad. Those who reject faith will have no avenue to make up for their rejection. Intercession is only for those who endeavor to Godliness but faltered along the way.

14. “We gave Moses the book and the miracles. We said unto them, be ye changed into scouted apes. And we made them an example unto those who were contemporary with them and unto those who came after them, and a warning to the pious.” (Qur’an 2:65).

The Swami comments: “Both Qoran and the Bible assert that Moses was endowed with miraculous powers, but it is absolutely incredible, inasmuch as no man can work miracles now-a-days, and what cannot be done in our day, could never have been done in the past.

....Now why does not God endow anyone with miraculous powers when both He and His devotees exist in our day.\*.....

Now either what God said regarding their (transgressors’) being changed into scouted apes in order to make an example for others never came to pass or He must have resorted to trickery.” –(LOT, p. 658). \*(According to Hindus, God does show miracles now-a-days: the idols of two of their Gods, Shiva and Ganesh, were said to have drunk milk.–Toronto Star, Friday, September 22, 1995, p. A2).

Since God can create the Universe, and raise creatures from the dirt and have them reproduce themselves from within their own bodies, and produce various fruits and varieties, and flowers of different hues and instill in them fragrances, He can certainly part the Red Sea, and send hail and locusts to plague Pharaoh.

Which is more difficult, to part the Red Sea and send hail or to create the Universe?

The reason why God no longer performs miracles (as we expect miracles to be) is simple: God performs miracles through His prophets. There are no prophets now, and no need for miracles, as His favor to mankind was completed 1400 years ago and has perfected man’s religion–(Qur’an 5:3).

God’s last and greatest miracle was given through the Prophet Mohammad; this miracle is still living with us today, and will live with us to the Day of Judgment, for all mankind to marvel over–the Qur’an.

These Jewish violators of their Sabbath were not turned into actual apes. Only that they were made “morally like apes.” The Book of Ezekiel (22:8-15), as Muhammad Ali detailed, gives an account of this moral degeneration of the Jews. In Qur’an 2:61, Allāh, God, says of the Jews: “...And abasement and humiliation were stamped upon them, and they incurred Allah’s wrath. That was so because they disbelieved in the messages of Allah and would kill the prophets unjustly. That was so because they disobeyed and exceeded the limits.” To which Muhammad Ali comments:

“The verse speaks of the ultimate condition to which the Israelites were reduced when they persisted in setting at naught the Divine commandments and indulged in immoral and depraved practices. A comparison with 3:111 will show the truth of this remark, for that verse, which is almost identical with the one under discussion, clearly refers to the later history of Israel–(3:111 states: “Abasement will be their lot wherever they are found, except under a covenant with Allah and a covenant with men, and they shall incur the wrath of Allah, and humiliation will be made to cling to them. This is because they disbelieved in the messages of Allah and killed the prophets unjustly. This is because they disobeyed and exceeded the limits”)-The truth of this prophecy regarding the fate of the Jewish nation is amply borne out by Jewish history. The Jews are the wealthiest of nations but their lot is miserable in almost every country of the world, notwithstanding their great influence in politics it remains so to this day. Moses had promised the same fate for them: “The Lord shall scatter thee among all people, from one end of the earth even unto the other....And among those nations thou shalt find no ease, neither shall the sole of thy foot have rest; but the Lord shall give thee a trembling heart, and failing of eyes and sorrow of mind” (Deut. 28: 64, 65).”

“Jesus also holds the Jews guilty for “all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias” (Matt. 23:25), and condemns them for their hypocritical assertion that “if we had been in the days of our fathers, we would not have

been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets”(yet they tried to kill Jesus) (Matt. 23:30). There is an allusion here to the Jewish plans against the life of the Prophet also. The word qatl signifies sometimes an attempt to kill or the doing of things which may lead to murder whether murder actually takes place or not (RM). Whether any prophets were actually killed or not is a different question, but they undoubtedly tried to kill prophets, and made several attempts to kill the Holy Prophet Muhammad too.”—(M. Ali, Qur’anic comm. 101, 102).

15. “So God raised the dead to life, and showed you his signs, that peradventure ye may understand”—(Qur’an 2:73).

“If God raised the dead to life (in the past), why does He not do so now? Will they all remain lying in their graves till the day of judgment? Is your God on tour in these days (that He cannot find time to administer justice)? Are these (raising the dead etc.) the only proofs (of the existence) of God? Are not the earth, the sun, and the moon, etc. His signs? Is the wonderful design so manifestly seen existing in the world of no significance?”—(LOT, p. 658).

All things in creation are Signs of God—(Qur’an 10:6; 30:20-25; 41:37; 42:29). Only the moral and spiritual dead are raised: the physical dead are not returned to life—(Qur’an 23:99-100; 39:42). (Day of Judgment is dealt with elsewhere).

16. “They shall never continue to be the companions of paradise”—(The word “never” should be “ever”)—(Qur’an 2:82). The Swami states: “As the soul is finite, its deeds—good or bad—cannot be infinite. It cannot, therefore be sent to an everlasting hell or heaven.”—(LOT, p. 659). As already noted, Hell is not everlasting. The reward of Paradise is for long as Allah deems. Allah Who created the soul can give it life for as long as He pleases. In His infinite mercy to have us refrain from evil Allah offers a reward for goodness in excess of the good act. The wicked is not punished beyond his evil. There is no injustice in Allah giving this excess in reward. Nor is there injustice in Allāh forgiving sinners. In the human sphere, parents also reward and forgive children, even when such children have been in violation of others. Even victims sometimes forgive their assailants, and may even take compensation in lieu of exacting punishment.

17. Qur’an 2:84-85, recounts Allah God making covenant with the Jews. To which the Swami inquires, “Is the making of covenants the work of man, possessed of finite powers, or of God? God being Omniscient cannot behave like an ordinary man.” (LOT, p. 659).

Why did God reveal the Vedas? Are not His injunctions that man must worship Him only; that those who want a higher form of living must do good deeds and those who do evil would receive a lower form of life, a covenant? God making a covenant with man signifies His “giving commandments” to man.

19. “Moreover, to Moses gave we “The Book” and we, raised up apostles after him; ....” (Qur’an 2:87). (LOT, p. 660).

Muslims are required to believe in the Revelations given to all prophets. However, as has been shown in past pages, Books previous to the Qur’an are not of “pristine purity”—human hand-print has contaminated them. Allāh, God, has told us what not to believe in those books—such as Trinity, polytheism, divinity of humans, inherited sin, vicarious atonement, favored nation, karma and reincarnation. Thus, Muslims do not have to believe in all “the defects” found in these revelations.

20. “Although they had prayed for victory over those who prayed not—yet when that Quran came to them, of which they had knowledge, they did not recognise it. The curse of God is on the infidels.” (Qur’an 2:89).

“You call men professing other religions infidels, while they do the same to you, and their God curses you in the same way. Now will you please tell us which of the two should be considered right and which wrong? On reflection it is clear that there are errors in all creeds,” wrote the Swami. (LOT, p. 660). (The swami has used this verse out of context and, seemingly, without knowledge as to the background against which it was revealed).

Verses 88-91 deals with the Jews believing that they had “no need of any further knowledge,” as Muhammad Ali explains. That when the Qur’an came, verifying their own Book, and previously they used to pray for victory over the disbelievers, (as per the prophecy of Deut 18:15,18; 28:1-2 which speak of a prophet who would make them “victorious” over their enemies)– yet they disbelieved in the Qur’an, even though they recognized it to be fulfillment of the prophecy of Moses. And for this rejection they were cursed by God. They “could accept only a revelation granted to an Israelite,” explains Muhammad Ali. Here are the verses:

“And they (Jews) say:  
Our hearts are repositories.  
Nay, Allah has cursed them on account  
of their unbelief; so little it is that they believe.  
And when there came to them a Book  
from Allah verifying that which they have,  
and aforetime they used to pray for  
victory against those who disbelieved  
–but when there came to them that  
which they recognized, they disbelieved in it;  
so Allah’s curse is on the disbelievers.  
Evil is that for which they sell their souls–that  
they should deny that which Allah has revealed,  
out of envy that Allah should send down His  
grace on whomsoever of His servants  
He pleases; so they incur wrath upon wrath.  
And there is an abasing chastisement for  
the disbelievers”  
(Qur’an 2:88-90)

If there are “errors in all creeds,” as the Swami says, the Vedas, which is the basis of Hinduism, must be in error. Clearly, a book whose teaching(s) is in “error” cannot be the religion for “enlightened” mankind. Islam, the religion chosen by Allāh, God, and perfected by Him, cannot be in error.

21. “Whoso is an enemy to God or his angels or to Gabriel, or to Michael, shall have God for his enemy, for verily God is an enemy to infidels.”–(Qur’an 2:98). To which the Swami states: “Is he who is an enemy to others also an enemy to God? This can never be true, since God is an enemy to none.”–(LOT, p. 661). **(An Ambassador is a representative of a President/country. He who is against the Ambassador is also against the President/ country).**

Muhammad Ali quotes Razi that “The Jews considered Gabriel as their enemy because they thought that he was charged to convey the gift of prophecy to the Israelites, and he conveyed it to another people, i.e. Ishmaelites.” And in explaining the enmity of man to Allah God and vice versa Muhammad Ali quotes Abu Hayan that “In reality there can be no enmity between Allah and man; as to man’s enmity to Allah, it signifies opposition to His commandments, and as to Allah’s enmity to man, it signifies the recompense for his opposition.”

As the Swami says “God is an enemy to none.” Yet the Rig Veda says, (emphasis added):

“The Mighty One...  
devoted Friend of priests”  
(III. III. 8. Vol. 1, p. 340).  
(The opposite of friends are enemies)  
“Bounteous are these, Angirases,  
Virupas: the Asura’s Heroes  
and the Sons of Heaven.”



(R.T.H.G. notes that “‘The Asura,’ explained by Sayana as the expeller of the foes of the Gods from heaven, is said to be Rudra, and his sons are the Maruts”.) (III. LIII. 7. Vol. 1, pp. 397, 399).

“O Agni....  
Destroy the cursing Raksasas.....”

(IV. IV. 15. Vol. 1, p. 426)

“O Gods....destroy not us as  
ye destroy Your enemies....”

“All Indra’s enemies were slain  
and passed away  
like froth and foam.”

(VIII. LVI. 9. Vol. 2, p. 225;

X. CLV. 4. Vol. 2, p. 644, resp.)

The Hindu God not only has enemies, He also has spies: “Varuna, wearing golden mail.... His spies are seated round about.”—(I. XXV. 13. Vol. 1, p. 35).

22. “And say forgiveness; and we will pardon your sins, give an increase to the doers of good.”—(Qur’an 2:58). (LOT, p. 661).

If He that promises forgiveness of sins “cannot be God, nor can a book that inculcates such a doctrine be the Word of God”, then the Veda(s) is not the “Word of God” and the God that reveals it “cannot be God;” for the Veda itself teaches the forgiveness of sins. The Rig Veda says,(Emphasis added):

(This hymn is noted to be “addressed to Vayu, Indra, Mitra,  
Varuna, the Visve Devas, Pusan, the Waters, Agni”)

“Whatever sin is found in me,  
whatever evil I have wrought.  
If I have lied or falsely sworn,  
Waters, remove it far from me.”

(I. XXIII. 22. Vol. 1, p. 31).

(To “Asvins”)

“Make long our days of life,  
and wipe out all our sins”

(I. XXXIV. 11. Vol. 1, p. 51)

(To “Heaven and Earth”)

“What sin we have at any time  
committed against the Gods...

Thereof may this our hymn be expiation.

Protect us, Heaven and Earth,  
from fearful danger”

(I. CLXXXV. 8. Vol. 1, p. 264).

(Verse 4 of the above Hymn speaks of “Parents of Gods”; the note to this verse says, “as with the Greeks, Heaven and Earth are regarded as the father and mother of the Gods.”

“Aditi, Mitra, Varuna, forgive us however we have  
erred and sinned against you”

(II. XXVII. 14. Vol. 1, p. 311).

“Most Youthful God, whatever sin, through folly,  
we here, as human beings, have committed,  
In sight of Aditi make thou us sinless: remit,  
entirely, Agni, our offences.”

“Even in the presence of great sin,  
O Agni, free us from prison of

the Gods or mortals.”  
(IV. XII. 4-5. Vol. 1, p. 435)  
“Forgive whatever sin we have committed:  
may Aryaman and Aditi remove it.”  
(VII. XCIII. 7. Vol. 2, p. 97).

The above, which is among many such statements, clearly shows that the God of Hindus also teaches the forgiveness of sins. Only the God that is not merciful would not forgive His servants. Though forgiveness has its parameters.

It would be pointless for God to instruct man to pray for forgiveness if there was no forgiveness to be had.

In fact, the Swami himself quotes the Veda as teaching mercy and forgiveness: “Mayest Thou O God....be merciful unto us. ....O Lord, be merciful and...”–(LOT, p. 1). And part of the Swami’s explanation to this verse says: “Mayest Thou free us from all pain and grief”–(LOT, p. 2).

How can God “free” Hindus from all “pain and grief” when they are subjected to the strictures of karma, “according to the nature of their deeds”?–(LOT, p. 660). And when “no sin can be remitted till one has suffered for it,” as the Swami states–(LOT, p. 473). If God frees or “pardons the sinners,” He would, in the words of the Swami, “renders Himself unjust”–(LOT, p. 661).

The Swami even prayed for mercy against others: “May God through His mercy rid us, Aryas, of this dreadful disease” (of religious “feud”)–(LOT, p. 321). It would seem to be a contradiction for the God of the Veda(s) to teach mercy and not remit any sin “till one has suffered for it.”

However, for the Hindu God to forgive sins would be a contradiction of karma, because karma “operates impartially and unerringly, awarding us exactly what we deserve”, as The Higher Taste says–(p.38).

Allah God forgives all sins, after repentance is made. Sins that are willfully repeated are not forgiven. Sins are forgiven when one repents and abstain from sins. Mercy and forgiveness are synonymous. In order to forgive one must be merciful. The result of mercy is forgiveness.

23. “And when Moses asked drink for his people, we said, “strike the rock with thy rod;” and from it their (? there) gushed twelve fountains.” (Qur’an 2:60).

“Now can anyone (except the Mohammedan God) utter such impossibilities? It is absolutely impossible to believe that twelve springs could gush forth on striking a rock with a rod, unless it had been hollowed out in the centre and filled with water and twelve holes bored therein,” wrote the Swami. (LOT, p.661). (Krishna yet a child lifted mount Govardhana with a finger, and Mahadeo fitted an elephant’s head onto his son’s–Ganesh–body).

God raised all manner of creations from dirt, manifest water in the coconut whose volume increases with its size, have man produce seminal fluid when he matures, have the spider issue silk from its body; and He sends souls into trees, as Hindus believe, why can’t He then have rocks produce water?)

Yusuf Ali notes “The gushing of twelve springs from a rock evidently refers to a local tradition well known to Jews and Arabs in Mustafa’s time. Near Horeb close to Mount Sinai, where the Law was given to Moses, is a huge mass of red granite, twelve feet high and about fifty feet in circumference, where European travellers (e.g.Breydenbach in the 15<sup>th</sup> Century after Christ) saw abundant springs of water twelve in number (see Sale’s notes on this passage). It existed in Mustafa’s time and may still exist to the present day, for anything we know to the contrary. The Jewish tradition would be based on Exod. xvii. 6: “Thou shalt smite the rock, and there shall come water out of it that the people may drink.”

27. Sole Maker of the Heavens and the Earth! And when He decree a thing, He only saith to it, “Be” it is”–(Qur’an 2:117).

The Swami questions: "Now who heard God when He said "Be"?... Where from did this world come into existence when it is written in the Qoran that nothing but God existed before Creation? No effect can be produced without a cause. How could He have then created this vast universe without a (material) cause." (LOT, p. 662).

It is not to be taken that Allāh, God, spoke actual words. "Be," and "it is" simply means that when Allāh decides on a matter nothing or no one can prevent its materialization. This materialization does not mean that it is instantaneous, without involving any process. Everything in creation exists on laws (of Allāh, God).

That Allāh can create from nothing. Allāh, God, has ninety-nine names plus the crowning name "Allāh" giving Him one hundred names. One of these ninety-names of Allah is Al-Badi' which means 'He Who creates out of nothing.'

Regarding the Creation of the heaven and the earth Allah God reveals:

"Then He (Allah) directed Himself  
to the heaven And it was a vapor,  
so He said to it and to the  
Earth: Come both, willingly or unwillingly.  
They both said: We come willingly"  
(Qur'an 41:11)

(we 'come willingly' or we 'submit to your command'—Islam).

That the universe was formed from gaseous matter, as the Qur'an says, Maurice Bucaille, (already noted) wrote: "At the earliest time it can provide us with, modern science has every reason to maintain that the Universe was formed of a gaseous mass principally composed of hydrogen and a certain amount of helium that was slowly rotating."

Allāh, God, tells us that He created everything—(Qur'an 6:102). Allāh may have created the soul in similar manner as He created the heavens and the earth. Because the heavens and the earth are visible and the soul is not is no argument they could not be from the same medium. We have fragrance, an unseen, emanating from flowers, a visible object; and also invisible forces, magnetism and electricity, issuing from metals. Electricity is even stored (in capacitors and batteries) when the generating source is turned off. Just as much the soul could have been created and held separately from its base medium.

Allāh, God, says, "He it is Who created you from a single soul, and of the same did He make his mate" and "He it is Who has brought you into being from a single soul"—(Qur'an 7:189; 6:99). From this, it seems that Allāh created one soul and imparted it into the two beings, Adam and Eve, who passed it on, through procreation, to their offspring. These offspring passes it on to the next generation. Much like a fruit having one seed which grows into a tree, producing many fruits, with each fruit carrying its own seed for reproducing.

Allāh reveals:

"And certainly We create man from  
an extract of clay, Then We make him a  
small life-germ in a firm resting place,  
Then We make the life-germ a clot,  
then We make the clot a lump of flesh,  
then We make (in) the lump  
of flesh bones, then We clothe the bones  
with flesh, then We cause it to  
grow into another creation.  
So blessed be Allah, the best of creators."  
(Qur'an 23:12-14)

(As the fragrance, though a different medium, grows out of the seed, likewise the soul,  
though a different medium, grows out of the cell).



It is interesting to note that the Swami quotes the Bhagavad Gita 2:16 which says, “Nothing can ever become something, nor can something ever become nothing.”—(LOT, p. 261).

But in his book *The Way To True Worship*, (p. 1), Anoop Chandola says, (as already noted): “The first recorded book of the Hindus is the Rig Veda. In it, “being” or sat is said to have its beginning in non-being or asat. More than a thousand years later, the Bhagavad Gita challenged this view, holding that there is no “non-being” state of being.”

So here we have the Bhagavad Gita having “challenged this view” of creation taught by the Veda. The Swami himself says, (in the matter of Krishna being God or not) that the Gita being “opposed to the Veda, it cannot be held to be an authority.”—(LOT, p. 219). Yet here the Gita is said to be “opposed” to the Veda. So which is correct, the Gita or the Veda? In fact, the believers in the Gita may also argue that the Veda being “opposed” to the Gita, it “cannot be held to be an authority”.

Since the Gita being “opposed” to the Veda “cannot be held to be an authority,” the Vedic teaching is to be taken to be correct. This would mean that the God of the Veda could have created matter and soul out of nothing which is in agreement with the Qur’anic statement that Allāh, God, created everything; and that the soul and matter are not, respectively, “eternal,” “self-existing, self-creating, self-dissolving.” (How could the Swami claim that the soul and matter is “beginningless” \* when, according to the Veda God did create the soul and matter – “being...have its beginning in non-being”?) \*(LOT, p. 221).

Regarding the belief that God can do whatever He likes, the Swami questions: “Can He create another God? Can He die? Can He become ill, ignorant or destitute of knowledge?”—(LOT, p. 662). “Can God kill Himself?” Or “Can He make other Gods like Himself, become ignorant, commit sins such as theft, adultery and the like? Or Can He be unhappy?” (LOT, p. 209). (If one should reply in the affirmative to the Swami, how can it be proved or disproved?)

Whereas a person can commit act(s) injurious to himself and to others, it is almost certain a wise person would not injure himself, and a just person would not harm others, and a good person would not indulge in sins. Allāh, God, being wise, just and good, He would only exercise His power wisely and justly.

As Allah God is Rabb—the Creator, Nourisher to perfection, and Sustainer of all—there is no need for another God, or for Him to create another like Himself. While Muslims believe that Allāh, God, is All-powerful, Allāh, God, will not do anything. This is made clear from His statement:

“It is not vouchsafed to a mortal that  
Allah should speak to him except  
by revelation (as an inspiration) or  
from behind a veil (as in a dream or vision),  
or by sending a messenger  
(as the Angel Gabriel)”  
(Qur’an 42:51).

Allāh, God, speaking from behind a veil does not mean that He wears a “purdah.”

28. “When we decreed that the Kaba is sacred, you should go to Abraham’s place for prayers.” (Qur’an 2:125).

The Swami argues, “Had not God appointed sacred place before He sanctified Kaba? If he had where was the necessity of consecrating Kaba? But if He had not, it is indeed a pity that those who were born before that period had to go without a holy place. Perhaps it had not struck God to consecrate a place like Kaba before that”—(LOT, p. 663). (Since God revealed the Vedas to only four people in India— “Agni, Vayu, A’ditya and Angira”—as the Swami wrote, those people in Africa, Europe, North America, South America and elsewhere did not have the Vedas. It “is indeed a pity” that those people “had to go without a holy” Book).

Allāh, God, instructed Moses to remove his shoes because he was “in the sacred valley of Tuwa”–(Qur’an 20:12). Allāh, God, gave all peoples acts of worship. Any place where the worship of God is practiced is a consecrated place. To pray at the place where Abraham offered his prayers is one such act of worship for Muslims.

Allah gave man instructions according to his time and situation. As such there was no deficiency in the worship of those who passed away before the consecrating of the Ka’ba. The Ka’ba is made a station for all mankind in keeping with Allah God’s purpose. Now, through the Prophet Mohammad, He has completed His favor to man and perfected religion for us: for all mankind to follow one religion–Islam; one Revelation–Qur’an; and one universal station of worship–the Ka’ba.

In fact the Ka’ba was consecrated way back in the time of Abraham as the verse shows–(Qur’an 2:125; also vs. 127). And Allāh says: “And who forsakes the religion of Abraham but he who makes a fool of himself”–(Qur’an 2:130). And the religion of Abraham–and the everlasting covenant between Abraham and God–is one of circumcision. And Hindus do not practice circumcision.

29. “And who but he that hath debased his soul to folly will dislike the faith of Abraham, when we have chosen him in this world, and in the world to come he shall be of the Just.”–(Qur’an 2:130).

The Swami questions “Now can it ever be true that he who does not like the faith of Abraham is a fool? Why did God choose Abraham alone (as the founder of the true faith)?”(LOT, p. 663).

What is the religion of Abraham? The religion of Abraham is Islam–Submission to the Will of Allāh, God. Isn’t this what the Swami (and all Hindus, as well as other religionist’s) profess to be doing–following the commands of God? Whoever does not follow the commands of God, is he not a fool? So where then is the problem in Allāh, God, declaring: “And who forsakes the religion of Abraham but he who makes himself into a fool”?

However, that which are passing under the name of God has no basis in Divine Scripture–the doctrines of reincarnation and karma are “very obscure” and “new and strange ones.” (See HINDUISM).

Scriptures prior to the Qur’an are not of “pristine purity.” Abdul Haque Vidyarthi points out: “The Masorah and Septuagint versions of the old Testament, the different authorized editions of the Sadducees and Pharisees, the apocryphal literature believed as part of inspired scriptures by some sects and rejected by others, the different versions of apocryphal Gospels, prove the credibility of the fact that no religious scripture was kept intact or properly maintained or committed to memory in the lifetime of the prophet to whom it was revealed.”

And, in the passage of time:

“the Vedas grew from one into four, and then from four to as many as 1131, there is a verse in Maha Bhashya which explains that there are one hundred and one shoots of Yajurveda, one thousand of Samaveda, twenty-one kinds of Rigveda and nine of Atharvaveda.”(Two quotes, Muhammad in World Scriptures, Vol. 1, p. 315).

Abdul Haque also notes that, “Buddha left no book or scripture after him”, and continued that, “Nevertheless Buddhists believe that the disciples of Buddha committed to memory all that he said, and before his teachings were written down they were honestly narrated.”(pp. 291-292). Regarding the Zoroastrian scriptures, Abdul Haque wrote that, “the Parsis abandoned their religious laws and that “Covenant of Fire”, which was then reduced to mere worship of Fire, was totally forsaken by them (Epistles of Sasan I and Sasan V in Dasatir). Their religious scriptures having been thrown in the background were either destroyed by the sacking of Parsis by the Greeks or were tampered with so that today they are regarded only as the ruins of a religion.

“As the Parsis are a ruin of a people so are their sacred books the ruins of a religion.” (Sacred Books of the East, Vol. IV, Introduction page, 11-12).”

Abdul Haque also noted: “Many base and indecent things regarding women were introduced by Mazda in the Zoroastrian faith. But Anushirvan the Just, being influenced by the teachings of Islam, removed these abuses.” (pp. 128, 132).

And Anoop Chandola wrote about the Vedas: “The Indo-European people who began to enter the Indian subcontinent,” their “language, rich in oral literature, was called Sanskrit,” and that “the Aryan priests collected the oral verse in a book known as the Rig Veda. Each of the ten volumes, probably completed over several hundred years,” and that “Three more Vedas were added: Yajur Veda, Sama Veda, and Atharva Veda. The Vedas are called shrutis; that is, they were heard as heard by others through oral transmission.” (The Way To True Worship, pp. 7, 9,).

Regarding the Old Testament, Maurice Bucaille wrote that it “is a collection of works” which “were written in several languages over a period of more than nine hundred years, based on oral traditions” and that “men manipulated the texts to please themselves, according to the circumstances they were in and the necessities they had to meet.”

About the Gospels Mr. Bucaille noted that “the foremost authority was the oral tradition as a vehicle for Jesus’ words and the teachings of the apostles.” That “It was not until circa 170 A.D. that the four Gospels acquired the status of canonic literature.” And that “the authors of the Gospels were not eye-witnesses of the data they recorded.” (The Bible, The Qur’an and Science, pp. 7, 9, 77, 249).

Regarding the manner in which the Qur’an was transmitted to us, upon its revelation to Mohammad, “Believers learned it by heart. It was also written down during Muhammad’s life,” says Mr. Bucaille. And that “Since then, we know that the text has been scrupulously preserved. It does not give rise to any problems of authenticity.” (Ibid; p. 250,251).

Allāh, God, declares that the protection of the Qur’an from human interference is with Him: “Surely on Us rests the collecting of it and the reciting of it”–(Qur’an 75:17). The Qur’an, which was both memorized and written down at the time of its revelation, is the Criterion that Allāh, God, has given to us to distinguish between Truth and Falsehood in religions –(Qur’an 2:185; 25:1; 98:1-3). The followers of other religions have nothing to lose by embracing Islam; and everything to gain as revealed by Allāh, God, in His Qur’an.

After the Qur’an there is no other scripture that can give more information regarding the moral, social, spiritual and intellectual development of man; and of knowledge of nature, heaven and hell, the soul and life and death; the Resurrection; the Day of Judgment and the Unity of God. Thus, Islam—obedient to the law of Allah God—is the true religion with Allāh, God—(Qur’an 3:18).

**30.** “We have seen thee turning towards every part of Heaven; but we will have thee turn to Kibla which shall please thee. Turn then thy face towards the sacred Mosque, and wherever ye be, turn your face, towards that part”–(Qur’an 2:144).

“Now is this trivial idolatry? We should think, it is the crudest form of idolatry,” the Swami wrote. And that Hindu worshippers of idols “do not regard the image as God. They profess to worship God behind the image,” he states. (LOT, p. 663).

Muslims do not concentrate on the Ka’ba, nor worship God behind the Ka’ba. To compare the Muslims facing the Ka’ba, having no semblance to any living being whatever, to the statues of Hindu worship is absurd. Unlike the Ka’ba each Hindu statue is of a different feature and form. Unlike the Ka’ba, statues are offered food and flowers, and fed milk.

To entertain that Mohammad who, from a minority of one, fought tooth and nail and endured all kinds of sufferings to stamp out idolatry in all its forms, would upon his triumph institute idolatry, is a reasoning unbecoming any thinking individual.

Islam is the Universal religion. Allāh, God, now unites man in one religion. Facing the Ka'ba is symbolic of this oneness of the Muslim brotherhood—One God, Allah; one Book, the Qur'an; one Qibla/station of worship, the Ka'ba. This oneness among Muslims is demonstrated at least five times daily.

The Swami also quotes part of Qur'an 2:115 "Whichever way ye turn, there is the face of God" (which is taken out of context) and says, "If this be true, why the Mohammedans turn their face towards Qibla (i.e. the sacred Mosque at Mecca)? .....If God has a face, it can only be in one direction and not in all directions at one and the same time." (LOT, p. 662).

Face (of God) here means "purpose" (of God). Verse 2:115, read in full with verse 114, shows that the "idolatrous Quraish had turned the Muslims out of the Sacred Mosque at Makkah and the Jews and the Christians were now helping them to annihilate the small Muslim community in Madinah, which practically meant the laying waste of the Sacred Mosque itself." Whereas 2:114 "predicts disgrace" for these persecutors of Muslims, verse 115 "predicts the Muslim conquests by which the enemy was to be disgraced." The Muslims "who had been deprived of all they possessed and made utterly destitute, were promised ample gifts. The words whither you turn, thither is Allah's purpose, points clearly to the Divine promise that all obstacles in the path of the Muslims will be removed and victory will follow their footsteps.

The word wajh occurring here (in verse 115 above, quoted by the Swami) denotes countenance or face, as well as course, purpose, or object which one is pursuing, or adirection in which one is going or looking—(Taj al-Arus [Dictionary], by Imam Muhibb al-Din Abu-l-Faid Murtada; Arabic English Lexicon by Edward William Lane). According to Raghīb it signifies attention or course."—(Muhammad Ali, Qur'anic comm. 159, 160).

**32.** "God is severe in chastising. Follow not the steps of Satan, He only enjoineeth upon you evil and wickedness and that ye should aver of God that which ye know not." (Qur'an 2: 167-169).

If Allāh, God, "has created Satan just to try man, it cannot be right, because only one who is possessed of finite knowledge would do such a thing; while One who is Omniscient is already aware of the good or evil deeds of the soul," the Swami wrote. (LOT, pp. 664 -665).

Since the Hindu God is Omniscient and is "aware of the good or evil deeds of the soul," why does He have man take countless births and deaths and into various kingdoms of creatures? He should just take the souls and put them permanently into bodies of creatures according to His knowledge of their "good or evil deeds." There would be no need then for the Hindu God to hold judgment (of reincarnation).

Also, God is said to have revealed the Veda(s) to be taught to the world. But in the nearly two billion years since the revelation of the Veda(s) very few people know it or its language, compared to those who know the Bible and the Qur'an. Could it then be said that the Hindu God is not Omniscient because others follow the Bible/Qur'an? And that Mohammad who is said to have written the Qur'an for his own "selfish ends", and whose followers know the Qur'an from memory, and has more followers than Hinduism, is Omniscient above the Hindu God?

And as the Hindu God need "spies" He is not Omniscient.

**33.** The Swami quotes Qur'an 2:173, which forbids as food animals that "dies of itself, and blood, and the flesh of swine," etc.

He wrote, "Swine's flesh is forbidden (but not human flesh), shall we then conclude that it is right to eat human flesh?" and "May be, it is permissible to the Mohammedans to eat other animals, creeping insects and ants, etc;" (LOT, pp. 665, 675).

It is puzzling that the Swami should come to such a conclusion, when he himself quotes the Qur'an 8:69 as saying: "Eat therefore of what ye have acquired, that which is lawful and good"—(LOT, p. 681). And when Allah God says: "eat the lawful and **good things** from what is in the

earth”–(Qur’an 2:168); “eat of the **good things** that We have provided you with, and give thanks to Allah if He it is Whom you serve”–(Qur’an 2:172). Clearly, Muslims cannot eat of the earth things that are not “good” and “lawful.”

Allāh, God, tells us that backbiting is like eating the flesh of one’s dead brother–(Qur’an 49:12). Clearly, since backbiting is like cannibalism, how much more loathsome is the eating of dead “human flesh.”

Incidentally, since the God of the Vedas did not seem to make any distinction between what is good to eat and what is forbidden, as the God of the Qur’an has, then according to the Swami Hindus can eat anything.

**34.** On the nights during the fasting month, Muslims are allowed to have intimate relations with their wives–(Qur’an 2:187). The Swami remarks, “Now what kind of fast is it to eat during the night and abstain from food during the day? It is contrary to the laws of nature to take one’s food during the night and abstain from it during the day.” (LOT, p. 666). **(What about the millions who work night shifts: sleeping during the day and eat and work at nights”?)**

Eating at dawn and at sunset can hardly be considered as night. A person can eat at any hour of the night, so long as he/she does not over-eat. As the Prophet Mohammad has taught, the worse vessel that the son of Adam can fill is his stomach: one third space is for food, one third for drink, and one third for air, he says.

The benefits of the Muslim fast are fourfold–physiological, physical, moral and spiritual:

(a) The physiological benefits of fasting are many, such as regenerate the organs, eliminate toxins and purify the blood, improve health.

(b) The physical benefit of fasting: it makes us experience the hunger of the starving; it conditions us to endure long periods without food, drink, and to control carnal passions.

(c) The moral benefit of fasting: it makes us more aware of God as one is more likely to be conscious of God when suffering or in distress. Also, one who voluntarily gives up those things which are lawful will not (or should not) indulge in those things that are unlawful, for instance, eating pork, gambling, intoxicants, illicit relations.

(d) The spiritual benefit of fasting: because of one’s constant remembrance of Allāh, it brings (or should bring) him/her closer to Allāh, God.

A wife is referred to as tilth because she is a producer of fruit (a child).

**39.** “Who is he that will lend to God a goodly loan? He will double it to him again and again”–(Qur’an 2:245). “Now why should God take a loan? Does He, who has created the whole universe, stand in need of taking a loan from men?” asks the Swami. And, “It seems that the Mohammedan God must have been reduced to poverty, otherwise why would He have asked for a loan and tempted them by saying that He would free them from their sins and send them to heaven. It appears that Moham-mad gained his selfish ends by defrauding others in the name of God.”–(LOT, pp. 667-668, 676). **(And what “selfish ends” are they? Mohammad lived a life of chastity, put his life at the forefront of battles, cobbled his shoes, mend his clothes, had no wealth, a bed of palm leaves, prayed half the night, and when he died his shield was in the possession of a “Jewish pawnbroker”).**

Lending a “loan” to God is only a figurative expression meaning to strive/spend in the way of God, and in return will receive a generous reward in the life to come. Perhaps every devotee of every religion must have offered to God a beautiful loan. Even the Swami must have offered God this loan with the expectation of being reincarnated into a higher kingdom of beings.

**41.** “Whatever exists on the earth or in the sky is for Him; His chair has, as it were, occupied all earth and space”–(Qur’an 2:255).

God “must be localised indeed when He has got a chair, but such a Being can never be God as he is All-pervading,” states the Swami. (LOT, p. 668).

While everything has been created for man’s use, everything in creation belongs to Allāh, God. The Arabic word kursi (of the verse under discussion) means knowledge, chair or throne, as



Muhammad Ali explains. The significance of it in this verse (which is only a partial quote) is: “His (Allah God’s) knowledge extends over the heavens and the earth, and the preservation of them both tires Him not”–(Q. 2:255).

In His Qur’an 7:54 Allah tells us, “He is established on the Throne of Power.” The Arabic word here is Arsh. And Muhammad Ali notes: “‘Arsh literally means a thing constructed for shade (LL), or anything roofed (R). According to the latter authority the court or sitting place of the king is called ‘arsh on account of its eminence. And he adds: It is used to indicate might or power and authority and dominion. LL accepts the interpretation of R, who says that “the ‘arsh of God is one of the things which mankind know not in reality but only by name, and it is not as the imaginations of the vulgar hold it to be”. In fact, both the words ‘arsh and kursi have been misunderstood as meaning resting-places for Allah.” The “true significance of ‘arsh is power or control of the creation.” (Qur’anic comm. 895).

Allah God being “established on the Throne of Power” means He is in power or in control of the creation. (Muhammad Ali’s translation of the Qur’an—which is a King Solomon’s mine of knowledge—with text, commentary and notes can be viewed inline: [www.muslim.org](http://www.muslim.org)).

42. In His Qur’an 2:258 Allāh, God, recounts the incident between Abraham and the king, in which Abraham challenged the king (Nimrod): “Surely Allah causes the sun to rise from the East, so do thou make it rise from the West. Thus he (Nimrod) who disbelieved was confounded. And Allah guides not the unjust people.”

“O what an ignorance!” says the Swami, “The sun does not rise in the East and set in the West, nor does it rise in the West and set in the East. It moves on its own axis. Now it is positively certain that the author of the Qoran knew neither Astronomy nor Geography.”–(LOT, p. 668)

If we institute the Swami’s premise that the sun does not rise in the East etc; there would be no East and West and North and South. Mankind would be in total loss for direction.

From a visual and geographical perspective the sun does rise and set. The Swami himself says that “when it is sunrise in India, it is sunset in America and vice versa;” and that “the earth moves from west to east, whilst the moon from east to west.” The Swami also quotes the Vaisheshika Shastra II, ii, 14, as saying: “That direction in which the sun is first seen to rise is called East, where it sets, is West.”–(LOT, pp. 270, 418, 61, resp.). And the Rig Veda says:

“East, west, and north, let the

King slay the foeman...”

(III. LIII. 11. Vol. 1, p. 397).

However, as noted, it was not Allāh, God, who said the sun rises in the East, but only that Allāh was recounting what Abraham said to the king. In any event this designation of “east” and “west” etc. is only a standard of uniformity for the benefit of man

Allāh, God, not guiding the unjust people only means that He does not guide such people until or unless they themselves seek guidance. Allah has shown man the paths of evil and goodness. The choice is his to make. Allāh, God, does not change the condition of a people unless they change it–(Qur’an 13:11), that is to say, when they make the effort to change to goodness Allāh, God, helps them.

43. “He (Allāh, God) said (to Abraham), “Take thou four birds and draw them towards thee, and cut them in pieces; then place a part of them on every mountain; then call them and they shall come swiftly to thee”–(Qur’an 2:260).

“Now is not the Mohammadan God more like a juggler showing his tricks? Does His Godhead rest on such things? The wise will keep aloof from such a God, it is the ignorant alone who will be caught in His trap. (The Mohammadan) God will thus, instead of enhancing His reputation, bring disgrace on Himself”, wrote the Swami–(LOT, p. 669).

The beginning of the verse under discussion shows that Abraham was inquiring from Allāh, God, to “Show me how Thou givest life to the dead,” whereby Allāh instructs him to take the four birds etc.



The Qur'anic text does not say to "cut" the bird in pieces, but "tame" them. Yusuf Ali translates the verse as: "Take four birds; tame them to turn to thee; put a portion of them on every hill, and call to them: They will come to thee (Flying) with speed. Then know that God is Exalted in Power, Wise."

Muhammad Ali and Malik Ghulam Farid have translated similarly.

Yusuf Ali explains that "we are shown the power of wisdom and love: if man can tame birds so that they know him and fly to him, how much more will God's creatures obey His call at the Resurrection?"

And regarding the statement "a portion of them" (from the instruction) "put a portion of them (the birds) on every hill," Yusuf Ali comments:

"The received Commentators understand this to mean that the birds were to be cut up and pieces of them were to be put on the hills. The cutting up or killing is not mentioned, but they say that is implied by an ellipsis, as the question is how God gives life to the dead. Of the modern Muslim Commentators, M.P. is non-committal, but H.G.S. and M.M.A. understand that the birds were not killed, but that a "portion" here means a unit, single birds were placed on hills, and they flew to the one who tamed them. This last view commends itself to me, as the cutting up of the birds to pieces is nowhere mentioned, unless we understand the word for "taming" in an unusual and almost impossible sense." (Comm. 306, 308).

Muhammad Ali has taken this verse under discussion to be a figurative expression. For his in-depth explanation see his translation of the Qur'an, viewed online at: [www.muslim.org](http://www.muslim.org).

Significantly, it is not stated if Abraham did as Allāh instructed.

48. Allāh, God, tells Muslims not to take disbelievers for friends rather than believers"–(Qur'an 3:27). (LOT, p. 670). This verse was revealed at a time when the Muslims were in a state of war with the disbelievers. As such they were "forbidden to look to their enemies to guard their interests or for help of any kind," explains Muhammad Ali. The reason is obvious. Possible treachery. No sane person(s) would, under such a situation, take the word of those against him. In general, Muslims are counseled not to let non-Muslims into their affairs–be it personal or nation-al. This does not prevent Muslims from having good relations with non-Muslims; Allah God says in Qur'an 60:8-9:

"Allah forbids you not respecting those  
who fight you not for religion,  
nor drive you forth from your homes,  
that you show them kindness and  
deal with them justly.

Surely Allah loves the doers of justice."

"Allah forbids you only respecting those  
who fight you for religion, and drive  
you forth from your homes and  
help (others) in your expulsion,  
that you make friends of them;  
and whoever makes friends of them,  
these are the wrongdoers."

It is doubtful that non-Muslims would let Muslims in on their private national or personal affairs. Why then should Muslims let non-Muslims in on their affairs?

49. "O Mary! Verily hath God chosen thee and purified thee and chosen thee above the women of the world!"–(Qur'an 3:41).

To which the Swami says: "Now how can we believe that God and His angels came down to talk with men in ancient times when they do not do so now-a-days? If it be argued that then the people were virtuous, it cannot be true. The fact of the matter is that at that time the majority of the people were uncivilized and ignorant, hence it was that such religions as the Christian

and the Mohammadan, which are so opposed to the dictates of knowledge,\* took root and flourished. But now the people are enlightened, these hollow faiths cannot flourish; on the other hand, they are on the decline.” (LOT, p. 671) \*(Islam “opposed to the dictates of knowledge”??? Wonder which Qur’an the Swami has been reading. Could not have been the one revealed by Allāh, God. Islam enjoins the acquiring of knowledge. Instead of being in decline Islam has surpassed Hinduism in number of devotees, and Islam is only 1400 years old contrasted with Hinduism which is claimed to be two billion years old).

If in the beginning, when man was at his crudest, God can find four men who were “purest in heart,” as the Swami says, to reveal to them the Vedas, then surely just before the beginning of our era, when man was so much more civilized, God could have found, at least, one woman, Mary, who was “virtuous.”

Angels coming to Mary was not a literal happening. Only a vision: “angels are not seen by the physical eye,” as Muhammad Ali notes—(Qur’anic comm. 1536).

Christianity and Islam whose doctrines—Resurrection and Judgment—are clearly expressed teachings could not be “hollow faiths,” compared to Hinduism’s belief—karma and reincarnation – which are not clearly expressed doctrines. If at all.

Allāh, God, from Whom comes only good and Who gives guidance, could not be said to lead astray, or deceive, or be a “trickster.”

In the Qur’an 19:16-22 Allāh, God, recounts the angels announcing the birth of Jesus to Mary, and her subsequent conception. To which the Swami comments:

“Mary while she was a Virgin, gave birth to a son, although she did not like to co-habit with any man, yet contrary to her wishes she was conceived by the angel at the Lord’s command. Now how wrong it was of God to have done so! There are many other objectionable things recorded in the Qur’an which we do not think advisable to mention here.” (LOT, p. 692). (It is a pity the Swami chose not to mention these “objectionable things”).

Mary was not “conceived by the angel.” It is a rather strange conclusion of the Swami that Mary was conceived “contrary to her wishes”. All Mary said was: “How can I have a son when no man has touched me, nor have I been unchaste,” (meaning I am a virgin, and I am not inclined to acts that would lead to carnal relation—Qur’an 19:20). It is doubtful that a devout woman having found such closeness to her Creator as to be chosen among all women of the world by Him, would refuse such a high honor to bear a child in His Divine plan.

The question may have been entertained as to how could Allāh, God, have made Mary conceive without a mate? Surely if Allah God can raise animals and plants from dirt, He could have had Mary conceive without a mate by raising a male reproductive cell within her body. As the Swami says (about God): “He caused the soul to enter the body and He Himself entered the soul thereafter”, and that “God, being Infinite and All-pervading, it can never be predicated of him that He can go in or come out. Coming and going can be possible only if it be believed that there are places where He is not. Then was not God already present in the womb...?” (LOT, pp. 227, 220).

As God was “already present in the womb,” as the Swami states, it was even easier for Him to have Mary conceive without a mate. Again, since “He (God) is able to make the visible universe out of invisible causes,” as the Swami wrote, He is just as much “able to make” Jesus out of “invisible causes”—(LOT, p. 208).

Also, the Swami quotes: “And remember her who preserved her virginity, and into whom we breathed our spirit.”—(Qur’an 21:91).

(Yusuf Ali, Muhammad Ali, and Malik Ghulam Farid translate the Arabic word farj to mean “chastity” instead of “virginity”).

“It is impossible that such obscene statements should have been recorded in Divine revelation or even in a book written by a decent man. When even human beings do not relish such writings, how can God do so? It is such statements as bring the Quran into disrepute. If its

teachings had been good, it would have commanded admiration like the Veda,” the Swami wrote. (LOT, p. 693).

But there is no shame in dispensing knowledge. Wise parents would instruct their children on morality. They would not wait till their sons and daughters become unwed parents before instructing them in matters of sex. Islam is the total way of life for man –moral, social, intellectual, spiritual. It gives guidance in all aspects of our life. There is shame only in the abuse of knowledge.

However, whereas the Swami has criticized this statement of the Qur’an 21:91 “And remember her who preserved her virginity and into whom we breathed our spirit,” as being “obscene,” he quotes the Rig Veda, which is claimed to have been revealed by God for all mankind, and Manu as saying, respectively:

“Let girls, who are **virgins,**  
**resembling cows**  
**that have never been milked before....”**

(Rig Veda, III, 55, 16) (LOT, p. 95)

“Certainly if the wife do not love  
and please her husband, being unhappy  
**he will not be sexually excited....”**

(Manu III, 61) (LOT, p. 109). (Emphasis added 2x).

And the Rig Veda says:

(“Indrani speaks with pride of her voluptuous charms  
which incited Vrsakapi to his amorous assault”)

“No Dame hath ampler charms than I,  
or greater wealth of love’s delights.

None with more ardour offers all her beauty  
to her lord’s embrace.

Supreme is Indra over all.

Mother whose love is quickly won,

I say what verily will be.

My breast, O Mother, and my head

and both my hips seem quivering.

Supreme is Indra over all.”

(“Indra speaks”)

“Dame with the lovely hands and arms,  
with broad hair-plaits add Ample hips,

Why, O thou Hero’s wife,  
art thou angry with our Vrsakapi?

Supreme is Indra over all.”

(X. LXXXVI. 6-9, notes 6, 8, Vol. 2, pp. 547, 548, 549).

Virginity is the natural state in which we are born. Thus, the Qur’anic virginity could hardly be “obscene;” even without comparing it to these inelegant expressions and eroticism of Manu and the Rig Veda.

Regarding the Swami’s assertion that Islam is “opposed to the dictates of knowledge,” it is said that Muslims believe that the earth is supported “on the horns of a bull.”(LOT, p. 268).

Considering that Allah reveals that planets float in orbits–(Qur’an 21:33; 36:40), I wonder from which Muslims the Swami received this view. Perhaps from the Hindu reverts to Islam, who brought beliefs of Hinduism into Islam.

As stated, Islam enjoins the seeking of knowledge (Qur’an 20:114). And the Prophet Mohammad exhorted Muslims to ‘seek knowledge from the cradle to the grave;’ to go to China if need be–(Baihaqi) Mishkat Misabih, Vol. 1, p. 361, #111 W); and that ‘the superiority of the

learned scholar over the pious worshipper is like the superiority of the (full) moon over the stars’—(Abu Dawud Vol. 3, p.1034, # 3634).

**51.** “Is it not enough for you that your Lord aideth you with three thousand angels sent down from on high?”—(Qur’an 3:123).

The Swami argues: “If God really aided the Mohammedans with three thousand angels in the past, why does He not help them now that their rule (in India and other countries) has greatly declined and is till declining? The real object of this verse is to tempt the ignorant and thereby ensnare them into the Mohammedan religion.” (LOT, p. 671).

Yet, regarding the victory of Mahmud of Ghazni over the Hindus, the Swami chastised the Hindus as to: “Why did they not worship the Almighty God whereby they would have put the barbarians, to rout and gained a victory over them? Had they worshipped heroes and brave men in place of all those idols, what a protection they would have afforded them.” (LOT, p. 391).

So if the Hindus worshipped God and “heroes and brave men” they would have gotten His help, but the Muslims cannot receive help from Allah God? Wonder if the Hindu God really aid Hindus, or if the Swami only lectured this “to tempt the ignorant and thereby ensnare them into the” Hindu/Vedic religion? (LOT, p. 671).

**52.** “And help us against the unbelieving people. But God is your real Lord, and He is the best of helpers. And if ye shall be slain or die on the path of God.”—(Qur’an 3:146, 147, 157).

“Now reader mark the error of the Mohammadans!” says the Swami, “They pray for the destruction of those who differ from them in religious opinions. Is God such a simpleton that he will grant their prayer? If God is the best helper of the Mohammadans only, why should they fail in their undertakings?” (LOT, pp. 671-672).

But this line of 3:146 is taken out of context. When this verse 3:146 is viewed in its context (from verse 145) it shows that this was the prayer for help against the disbelieving people of prophets before the Prophet Mohammad.

Since Allah says that all religions are for Him—(Qur’an 8:39), such prayers for help are against those disbeliever who persecute Muslims. There is no person who can honestly say that he does not wish for the destruction of his persecutors and occupiers. In fact the Rig Veda—(VII. XXXIII. 25. Vol. 2, p. 37) says:

“Drive thou away our enemies,  
O Maghavan:  
make riches easy to be won.  
Be thou our good Protector  
in the strife for spoil:  
Cherisher of our friends be thou.”

This call by the Hindus is, evidently, “for the destruction of those who differ from them in religious opinions.” The Swami himself prayed: “May the Omniscient Ruler of all sow the seed of true religion in all hearts, whereby all false religions and false doctrines may soon perish!”—**(Ameen!)** (LOT, p. 327).

Clearly, this prayer of the Swami to “perish” “all false religions and false doctrines” is a prayer for help against those who disbelieve in the Swami’s religion.

And for the Puranics writings, which the Swami states are “falsehood,” the Swami lamented, (LOT, pp. 406-407): “Oh! Why did not the writers of Bhagvat and other Puranas die in their mothers’ wombs or as soon as they were born?”

Isn’t this a prayer for “the destruction of those who differ from them (the Swami) in religious opinions”?

It is acceptable for a Vedic/Hindu to pray for the destruction of their enemies and unacceptable for a Muslim to pray for the destruction of his enemies?

How could they die in their “mothers’ wombs” when they must have had good karma in order to return as humans? And in writing “falsehood” were they not fulfilling karma—others having duped them in a past life for them to now dupe others with “falsehood”?

It would seem to be a sin to pray for another to die in his mother’s womb or as soon as they were born, when God has returned this soul as a human being, according to his karma.

Regardless of the time period, Allāh, God, always helps His believers, be he a Hindu, Jew, Christian, Muslim or other. Belief in God is not mere lip service. Belief in Allāh, God, is of both faith and good deeds. One cannot expect the help of Allāh, God, through mere belief in Him. If all believers in Allah God—Hindu, Jew, Christian, Muslim and others—were living the Com-mandments of Allāh, God, there would be no transgression against the other.

However, Muslims are not to pray for the destruction of his opponents—(Qur’an 3:127), only for their defeat—(Qur’an 2:2:86; 3:146). And only when Muslims are not the aggressors; Allah God does not aid the wrong-doers.

57. “When they come forth from Thy presence, a party of them broods by night over other than thy words; but God writeth down what they brood over.”—(Qur’an 4: 81).

Allah God writing down our deeds only means that our actions are recorded by our own limbs, hence our limbs being called to give evidence against us, in the Hereafter.

That Allāh, God, “lead astray.” Muhammad Ali has also pointed out the error in the belief that Allah God “leads astray.”

“A great misconception regarding the teachings of the Qur’an is that it ascribes to God the attribute of leading astray. Nothing could be farther from the truth. While al-Hadi or the One Who guides, is one of the ninety-nine names of Allah, as accepted by all Muslims, al-Mudzill, or the One Who leads astray, has never been recognized as such. If leading astray were an attribute of God, as guiding certainly is, the name al-Mudzill should have been included in the list of His names, as al-Hadi is. But the Qur’an, which repeatedly says that God’s are all the excellent names, could not ascribe to Him what it has plainly ascribed to the Devil, viz., the leading astray of men.

.....It is impossible that God, Who is so solicitous for the guidance of man, should Himself lead him astray. Guiding and leading astray are two contradictions which could not be gathered together in one being.”

“The mistaken idea that God leads people astray arises out of a misconception of the meaning of the word idzlal when it is ascribed to God.” (The Religion of Islam, pp. 323, 324, 325).

58. “If they do not withhold their hands, seize them, and slay them, wherever you find them. A believer killeth not a believer but by mischance, and whoso killeth a believer by mischance shall be bound to free a believer from slavery; and the blood money shall be made to the family of the slain believer unless they convert it into alms. But if the slain believer be of a hostile people, let him confer freedom on a slave who is a believer. But whoever shall kill a believer of a set purpose, his recompense shall be hell, for ever shall he abide in it, God shall be wrathful with him.”—(Qur’an 4:91-93). (LOT, p. 673)

These verses are used out of context. Only those disbelievers who were at war with the Muslims were to be seized and killed. Verse 90 says clearly: “So if they withdraw from you and fight you not and offer you peace, then Allah allows you no way against them.”

Regarding the verse on murder and blood-money, the Swami has omitted a part of verse 92, which says that if the slain person is from a tribe “between whom and you there is a covenant, the blood money should be paid to his people along with the freeing of a believing slave.”

The tribe(s) that had a covenant with the Muslims was non-Muslim. Since Muslims were required to pay blood-money as well as free a believing slave for killing one of these non-Muslims, there is no “prejudice” as the Swami contends. It was a practice of the hostile tribes to have members pretend a belief in Islam and request Muslims to join them to become their teachers in religion. When this was accomplished they would kill the Muslims.



However there still remains the injunction that if the slain person is a believer of a hostile tribe, to only free a believing slave, but no payment is to be made. Is this “prejudice? Absolutely not! Paying money to a people who is at war with you only fortifies their strength against you. And Allāh, God, is All-knowing, Wise.

When there is no state of war, “retaliation is prescribed for you in the matter of the slain: the free for the free, and the slave for the slave, and the female for the female. But if remission is made to one by his (aggrieved) brother, prosecution (for blood-wit) should be according to usage, and payment to him in a good manner”–(Qur’an 2:178).

60. Allah God says in His Qur’an 4:136, “And whoever disbelieve in Allah and His angels and His Books and His messengers and the Last Day, he indeed strays far away.”

The Swami states: “Can you ever now assert that God is one without a second? Is it not self-contradictory to call God Incomparable and yet at the same time believe that there are others who share Divine privileges with Him?”(LOT, p. 674).

Does a person believing in an Indian Ambassador makes that Ambassador the Indian Prime Minister, or gives that Ambassador equal status with the Prime Minister? These angels and prophets are servants of Allāh, God, believing in them to be from God does not give them “Divine” status or partnership with God.

According to Hinduism God, matter, and soul are eternal. How then can the Hindu God be claimed to be Incomparable? How could the Hindu God be Incomparable when there are many who are worshipped along with Him? It is, in the words of the Swami, “self-contradictory” to call the Hindu “God Incomparable and yet at the same time believe that there are others who share Divine privileges with Him.”

66. “Obey God and obey the apostle”–(Qur’an 5:92).

The Swami opines: “This goes to show that God is not “One without a second,” hence it is absurd for the Mohammedans to believe that it is otherwise.”(LOT, p. 676). (People of a country “obey” the Leader as well as “obey” the ministers and police and priests etc. This does not mean that the Leader has a “second” in his Leadership?

Muslims are also required to believe in all prophets of Allāh, God–(Qur’an 3:178). We are also required to obey those in authority among us–(Qur’an 4:59). Prophets are the Ambassadors of Allāh, God. They are our link to Allah. We obey Allah by following His Revelation. And as the Prophet explains the Qur’an, we obey him by following his instructions, e.g. Allah enjoins on us prayer and charity, but it is the Prophet who teaches us how to pray and what amount to give in charity and on what goods charity are required.

Mohammad is not God or deputy-God.

In chapter 3 of the Qur’an, verse 178 ends with the statement: “Believe therefore, in God and in His apostles.”–(Please note the plural apostles). To which the Swami states, “If it be argued that this verse only teaches that people should have faith in Mohammad as a Prophet, we should like to know where is the necessity of Mohammad (being regarded as a Prophet). If God cannot accomplish His desired object without making him His Prophet, He is certainly powerless.”(LOT, p. 672).

Yet the Swami says: “In the beginning, God revealed the four Vedas, Rig, Yaju, Sama and Atharva, to Agni, Vayu, A’ditya and Angira, respectively.” (LOT, p. 236).

So in order for God to “accomplish” having the Vedas reach the Hindus, God **needed** these four men. In order for Hindus to accept the Vedas as being from God, Hindus **must believe** in these four men as being chosen by God. And as God **needed** these men and as Hindus **needed** to believe in these men, then, according to the Swami’s logic, the Hindu God “is certainly powerless”, since He needed others to help Him “accomplish His desired object.” Since the Hindu God needs “spies” and “artist,” as the Rig Veda says, He “is certainly powerless”:

“Varuna, wearing golden mail...



His spies are seated round about.”

(I. XXV. 13. Vol. 1, p. 35).

“He slew the Dragon lying on the mountain: his  
heavenly bolt of thunder Tvastar fashioned”

(“Tvastar is the artist of the Gods”—Griffith).

(I. XXXII. 2. Vol. 1, p. 46).

Because Mohammad’s name is linked with Allah’s in the declaration “There is no god but Allah, Mohammad is the Messenger of Allāh,” does not mean that Mohammad is a partner with Allāh, God, nor is he “sharing homage” with Allah God. Through this association, Muslims are constantly reminded that Mohammad is not God, he is not son of God, and he is not partner with God; he is only the Messenger of God.

**75.** “And think within thine ownself of God, with lowliness and with fear and without loud spoken words, at even and at morn.” (Qur’an 7:205).

The Swami points out: “At one place the Quran says that God should be spoken to aloud, while at another place it says that He should be addressed “without loud spoken words.” Now which of the two shall we believe to be true and which false? Self-contradictory statements can only be made by one who is demented.” (LOT, p. 679).

There are no contradictions in the Qur’an. As the verse says avoid “loud” spoken words. This only means that one must not recite in a tone that is above normal. This is corroborated by chapter 17:110 which says, “And utter not thy prayer loudly nor be silent in it, and seek a way between these.” Qur’an 7:55 says: “Call on your Lord humbly and in secret.” Muslims can call on Allāh, God, not only in any position—standing, sitting, and reclining—but also in any mode of expression—with voice or in silence. The Prophet Mohammad is the foremost interpreter of the Qur’an. Some prayers (and portions of prayer) he offered audibly and others, without sound.

**76.** “They will question thee about THE SPOILS, say: the spoils are God’s and the apostle’s. Therefore fear God.”—(Qur’an 8:1).

The Swami: “It is very strange that those who plunder others and live by dacoity and teach others to do the same should still profess to be God, prophet and the faithful. These people with one breath plunder others and with the other talk of fearing God, and yet do not feel the least shame in declaring that their religious faith is the best. Can there be a man worse than one who through sheer obstinacy does not embrace the true Vedic religion?” (LOT, p. 679). **(As the Vedic religion also seeks “the spoils” and as its doctrines—karma and reincarnation—are shown to have no clear expression in the Vedas, “Can there be a man worse than one who through sheer obstinacy does not embrace the true” Islamic religion, of which all of its articles of faith have clear expression in the Qur’an, and which has been shown to be superior to all religions?).**

The Prophet and his followers did not “plunder” anyone! War was forced upon them. As has been proven time and again in preceding pages, Muslims are not allowed to be aggressors/transgressors. What would the Swami and his followers suggest be done with the useful things remaining after a war—destroy it? Unless under extenuating circumstances, it is doubtful that any “enlightened” person, be he atheist or religionist, would destroy articles that are useful. Four fifths of the war booty was divided among the soldiers, and the remaining one fifth is declared to be “for Allah and for the Messenger and for the near of kin and the orphans and the needy and the wayfarer”—(Qur’an 8:41). That Allah God is included in this share simply means that a part of this one fifth is to be spent in the spreading of the Message of Allah.

The Hindu king and soldier also have their share of war booty, as the Swami quotes Manu: “Let the king never violate this law that carriages, horses, elephants, tents, umbrellas, grain silver and gold, cattle such as cows, **women**, cases of oil and butter, and various other articles are lawful prize of the soldier or of the officer who takes them in war. The captors should give the sixteenth part of their loot to the king, and so should the latter distribute among the whole

army the sixteenth part of what was taken by them collectively.”(LOT, pp. 175-176. Italics/Emphasis added). And the Rig Veda says,(Emphasis added):

“Help us, O Indra, in the frays, yea, frays,  
where thousand spoils are gained,  
With awful aids, O awful One.  
In mighty battle we invoke Indra,  
Indra in lesser fight,  
The Friend who bends his bolt at fiends.”  
(I. VII. 4-5. Vol. 1, p. 10).

“Save us, our Charioteer, from harm, O Indra,  
soon, very soon, make us win spoil of cattle.”

“Call we on Maghavan, auspicious Indra,  
best Hero in this fight where spoil is gathered.  
The strong who listens, who gives aid in battles,  
who slays the Vrtras, wins and gathers riches.”  
(III. XXXI. 20, 22. Vol. 1, p. 371).

“Indra, for our assistance bring that  
most effectual power of thine,  
Which conquers men for us, and wins  
the spoil, invincible in fight.”  
“For, Mightiest Vrtra-slayer, thee, fierce,  
foremost among many, folk  
Whose grass is trimmed invite to  
battle where the spoil is won.  
Indra, do thou protect our car that mingles  
foremost in the fights,  
That bears its part in every fray,  
invincible and seeking spoil.”

(V. XXXV. 1, 6-7. Vol. 1, pp. 531-532).

“Drive thou away our enemies, O Maghavan:  
make riches easy to be won.  
Be thou our good Protector in the strife for spoil:  
Cherisher of our friends be thou.”  
(VII. XXXII. 25. Vol. 2, p. 37)

“O Soma Pavamana, find wealth for us  
not to be assailed,  
Wealth which the foeman may not win.  
Send riches hither with thy stream in thousands,  
both of steeds and kine,  
Send spoil of war and high renown.”  
(IX. LXIII. 11-12. Vol. 2, p. 335).

The Veda is devoted more to “spoil” of war rather than the Qur’an is. In fact the Hindu Gods also come in for a share of the “spoil” of war:

“May we get booty from our foe in battle,  
presenting to the Gods their share  
for glory”  
(I. LXXIII. 5. Vol. 1, p. 105).