

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

(Followers of Islam are Muslims, not Mohammedans. I have tried to retain the Swami’s spelling.

There are various spellings of the Prophet’s name, I prefer ‘Mohammad.’ In the following presentation the designation ‘LOT’ refers to Swami Dayananda Saraswati’s book *Light Of Truth*.

Quotes from the Rig Veda are taken from Ralph T. H. Griffith, *Hymns Of The RgVeda*, Volumes I and II. First Published in 1889, and Published 1987 by Munshiram Manoharlal, New Delhi. Reference to quotes such as, I. VII. 4-5. Vol. 1, p. 10, indicates that the quote is taken from Book I, Hymn VII, verses 4-5, of Volume 1, page 10).

For those readers who wish to compare the Swami’s quotes of the Qur’an with Muhammad Ali’s translation and commentary, Muhammad Ali’s translation of the Qur’an with text, commentary and notes can be viewed online: www.Muslim.org).

*

If the Veda(s) is Divine revelation it should teach the worship of one God. For Allāh, God, reveals to us that He raised up prophets among all people. And that these prophets were given one common message: “And we sent no messenger before thee (Mohammad) but We revealed to him that there is no God but Me, so serve Me” – (Qur’an 21:25)

In his book *Light of Truth* Swami Dayananda has commented on verses of the Qur’an in his attempt to prove the Vedic religion to be the one religion for all “enlightened” mankind. However, Qur’anic verses are quoted out of context, are used without, seemingly, any knowledge as to the background of its revelation, and all verses are interpreted literally without paying any attention to the fact that in the Qur’an “some of its verses are decisive—they are the basis of the Book—and others are allegorical” – (Qur’an 3:6).

Before I take up the Swami’s criticisms of the Qur’an—there are 159 criticisms—there are a few statements of the Swami that warrants commenting on:

Soul: Regarding God and the soul, Swami Dayananda says: “In *essence* they are both conscious entities. *Bynature* both are pure, immortal and virtuous, etc.”; that “the soul acts by virtue of its free will”; and to reincarnate, the soul “Guided by God it enters the body of some living creature with air, water, food, drink or through any one of the openings of the body. Having entered it, it gradually reaches the reproductive element, and thereby establishes itself in the womb, and is thus invested with a body and eventually born. It is clothed with a male or a female body.” (LOT, pp. 222, 223, 300, respectively). (So the souls of the “Gods” Rama and Krishna were in the wombs of their mothers’ waiting to be covered with semen?)

If the soul has to establish itself in the womb, it is reasonable that it must enter through the mating passage. If it enters through the mouth it will go through the digestive system and pass out the excretionary passage. That this “pure, immortal and virtuous” entity of “free will” and of the same “*essence*” as God, would chart its way down the mouth or genital canal of the female human, beast, bird, or insect and sit in the “womb” waiting to be covered/fertilized by the male seed and to take on flesh, could hardly be the cerebration of “enlightened” mankind.

Like the eggs of a chicken are in a cluster, if more than one soul has to be reincarnated as chicken, one chicken may have more than one soul taking up residency in its womb.

The same applies to all other egg-laying creatures—turtles, crocodiles, and frogs; as well as with some animals, such as dogs, cats, pigs, whose litter consists of many. A woman who has multiple births—twin, triplet, and quintuplets—must have two, three, eight souls taking up temporary residency in her womb. And there is the possibility of this soul being aborted instead of being reincarnated.

If the soul enters the womb of living things “through any one of the openings of the body,” as the Swami says, how does the soul enter a plant when it has to be reborn in the vegetable kingdom?

Swami Dayananda states: “He (God) caused the soul to enter the body and He Himself entered the soul thereafter.” (LOT, p. 227).

Since the soul is “conscious,” “immortal” and embodies God, it must be cognizance of the reality of the existence of God; as such there should not be any atheist. But it is a fact that there are millions, if not hundreds of millions, of atheists. And communist countries should have small populations of humans and overflowing with animals, as the atheists, not believing in God, would be reincarnated as sub-humans. **(It is doubtful that this “pure, immortal and virtuous” soul would deny the existence of God [through freedom of choice] to be subjected by God into the bodies of sub-humans and to dwell in sewer conditions, for millions of years till it emancipates itself).**

Since God enters the soul, and the soul is incarnated as dogs, rats, cats, and pigs, according to the teachings of Hinduism, God eats all the things these animals eat, and dwells in the same conditions as these animals dwell. (?)

It is also said that the soul does not remember its past life—(Gita 4:5). How can the soul not remember its past life when God is inside the soul, and God is Omniscient? Whereas the Bible and the Qur’an teach that only one couple (Adam and Eve) was created in the beginning, the Swami says that God created more “than one” man. He quotes the Yajur Veda: “(In the beginning) there were born many men as well as *rishis*, i.e. learned seers of nature. They were progenitors of the human race”. To which he comments, “On the authority of this *Vedic* text it is certain then that in the beginning of Creation hundreds and thousands of men were born. By observing nature with the aid of reason we come to the same conclusion, viz., that men are descended from many fathers and mothers (i.e., not from one father and one mother)”—(LOT, p. 263). **(Meaning the differences in colors and features, etc; show that we came from different couples, as compared to us coming from one couple wherein we all would be of the same complexion and feature etc. But this would seem to say that God made some people white, some brown, black etc; which may cause enmity; and the cynics may charge that God was biased. But God creating one couple, and man undergoing bodily appearances due to his own domicile, God could not be charged with being biased. And many animals would have to be killed for God to provide these thousands of couples with “coats of skins”).**

If God created many couples, and in different regions of the earth, those couples in the Frigid zones—having no clothes, no implements of agriculture, no house, no fire, and prohibited from killing animals for food and skin for clothing—must have frozen and starved. They would only have caves to shelter them, and perhaps frozen fruits/berries/vegetables for food. Those assigned to Torrid regions with desert conditions must have been sun-burned, starved, and parched from thirst. These would only have sand dunes and caves for shelter, and dates, perhaps, and insects for food. However, it may be argued that God would not have subjected this creation to such harsh conditions. This, seemingly, would be true. But if these couples were not in separate regions and were in proximity of each other or dwelt together, there would be the argument that there were these thousands of naked people of different colors and features exposed to one another; which would have seemed like a nudist colony. And

physically, the men and women must be, respectively, the same, if not, one party might be envious of the other who is finely endowed.

The descendants of one couple (Adam and Eve) could have dispersed throughout the earth, as the land mass of the earth are mostly connected or separated at their shortest point by about 1,500 miles—this is not incredible, given the accomplishments of the Aztecs, Incas, Egyptians and Phoenicians. Solomon navigated the seas 2,300 years ago; before him Noah built an Ark. Sailing seems to be as old as recorded history.

That God created thousands of men at the beginning contradicts with the Gita that Manu is “the father of mankind”—(Gita 4:1).

The Swami says: “One billion, nine hundred and sixty millions and some hundred thousand years have passed since the creation of the world and the revelation of the *Vedas*.” (LOT, p. 267).

Since the *Vedas* is as old as the creation of the earth, it stands to reason that humans were also present this nearly two billion years ago, for if there were no people there would be no need for the *Vedas*.

Assuming God created one thousand couples—to take a conservative amount from the Swami’s “hundreds and thousands of men” that “were born”—and that each couple has a life-span of sixty years, and that each couple and each successive couple produces seven children (compared to ten enjoined by Hinduism, explained later), there would be more than six billion people in the world today. **(The scholars of mathematics, using exponential calculation, would be able to give us a fairly accurate number of people that would be on the earth).**

Even if we take one couple as being on the earth for this nearly two billion years, and using the same figures (a life-span of sixty years, and that each couple and each successive couple produces seven children) there would be more than six billion people in the world today.

While the earth may be billions of years old, it is not necessary that God created man soon after the creation of the world. It may have taken millions of years for the earth to cool and become habitable—for the creation of vegetation and other forms of animal life.

***Karma/Reincarnation*:** The claim that the Vedic religion is the only religion for “enlightened” mankind and that karma and reincarnation are truths is a baseless claim. No one seems to know the origin for these doctrines:

“The origin and the development of the belief in the transmigration of souls are very obscure...This doctrine of *samsara* (reincarnation) is attributed to the sage Uddalaka Aruni, who is said to have learned it from a Ksatriya chief. In the same text, the doctrine of *karma* (works)...also occurs for the first time, attributed to Yajnavalkya. Both doctrines appear to have been new and strange ones, circulating among small groups of ascetics who were disinclined to make them public.” (*Ency. Brit*; 15th Ed; Vol. 8, p. 911).

And Anoop Chandola states: “Through contact, the Aryans and non-Aryans began to modify and integrate each other’s pathways. In the context of religion, for example, the Austro-Asiatics may have contributed the belief in each life passing to another life. This belief later, in the form of reincarnation, became a major element in the *Upanishads*.” (*The Way To True Worship*, p. 8).

If reincarnation was Divine bequeath it could not be speculated to have been “contributed” by the “Austro-Asiatics.”

In believing that his suffering is the result of his actions in a past life, man “is thus induced to reconcile himself to social cruelty, exploitation and oppression,” wrote V.M. Tarkunde. (*Radical Humanism*, p. 69).

It is incredible that only Africans and Hindus and Bangladeshis seem to have the worst *karma*, considering that these are the nations/people that suffers the most of famine, flood, and poverty; even though they engage in little or no war or aggression or oppression or exploitation of others; and are probably more religious.

If suffering is the result of bad karma, no attempt should be made to alleviate the miserable conditions of the sufferers and the poor—those who try to improve the lot of the poor and the suffering would be working against karma. If their conditions can be improved, karma is meaningless—seeing that it can be subverted/defeated. If karma can be annulled, man can change the natural law of God. If man can change the natural law of God, man would be greater than God. But man could never be greater than God. Also the need for higher education would be pointless. (Perhaps lower caste Hindus should be schooled to see how many are poor or illiterate because of karma).

Karma and *reincarnation* are cardinal doctrines of the Hindu faith. And, as they delineate between heaven and hell cardinal doctrines are to be clearly expressed: they are not to be left to the function of interpretation.

Jawaharlal Nehru points out in his book *The Discovery Of India*: “The early Vedic Aryanspaid little attention to the soul. In a vague way they believed in some kind of existence after death.” (p. 79).

If these Vedic Aryans were followers of the Vedas they could not have in a “vague way” believed in “some kind” of existence after death if the Vedas expressly taught the doctrines of *karma* and *reincarnation*.

It is incredible that God would give man an “eternal” path to follow without a clearly charted map.

Swami Dayananda states: “If you refuse to believe in the pre-existence of the soul, how do you think it to be consistent with the justice of God to bless some with riches, power, and talent, etc., while afflict others with poverty, suffering, idiocy and the like without their having done anything—good or evil—in their previous lives to deserve them?”—(LOT, pp. 296-297).

If people are given wealth and poverty because of karma then the souls that are given wealth should not become poor; and the souls that are given poverty should not become wealthy; as sometimes happen in society.

The atheists who are born with power, wealth, and talent, it is rather strange that God “bless” with these them when they do not believe in Him. The drug dealers and the pimps, if God “bless” these persons they should not be criminalized. And if the victim(s) of a sadist suffers because of deeds in a past life, the sadist is not to be prosecuted. And the masochist who punishes himself must have punished himself in a past life.

If karma is the law of God, and if people are born wealthy or poor according to this law of God, and since the wealthy can be reduced to penury and the poor can be elevated to affluence, this shows that karma can be compromised. If this natural law of God – karma– can be annulled it would mean that man can change the natural law of God. If man can change the natural law of God man would be greater than God. But man is not greater than God. Therefore, either karma is a myth, or God is. But God is not a myth.

If souls come from previous births, and as there are more births than deaths—the number of people on earth has increased to more than six billion and it is expected to double again sometime in the future—where do these extra souls come from? If God keeps on making souls (on a daily basis?) to accommodate these new bodies, He could not be said to be Omniscient, not knowing how many souls He will be sending to earth. And if He has already made all the souls that He would send to earth, how many

souls did He make? And with cloning in vogue, from where do all these souls (for the clones) come?

The Swami says “When sin predominates over virtue in a man, his soul goes into the bodies of lower animals and the like when virtue predominates over sin in a soul, it is born as a good and learned person. When sin and virtue are equal, the soul is born as an ordinary man” –(LOT, p. 299).

But it is rather strange that these souls whose “virtue predominates over sin” and become “learned” are non-Hindus—considering that Christians (of America) are the intellectual giants in matters of science, technology, and medicine etc; and that Muslims were the rulers of the world in the early part of our era; even the atheists (of the USSR) were way ahead of the Vedic souls. One would expect that God would have reincarnated such virtuous souls into the bodies of Hindus—the believers in His Veda(s).

How is it that God reincarnates those souls that are deserving of human bodies into atheists? If He does so unknowing that they would become atheists, He is not Omniscient.

Hindus are also divided as to whether man is reincarnated into various kingdoms or as one type of creature only:

“*The Vedas* explain that the soul... may inhabit any of 8,400,000 general species of material bodies.... beginning with the primitive microbes and amoebas, continuing on through the aquatic, plant, insect, reptile, bird, and animal species, and culminating in human beings and demigods.” (*The Higher Taste*, pub. International Society for Krishna Consciousness, pp. 38, 39).

But the sage, Uddalaka Aruni, is said to have taught his son: “Whatever these creatures are here, whether a lion, or a wolf, or a boar, or a worm, or a midge, or a gnat, or a mosquito, ***that they become again and again.***” (Meaning that they do not reincarnate into other kinds of animals). (Lin Yutang, *Wisdom of India*, p. 30. Italics/emphasis added).

Hindus are also divided over the method of one freeing himself from this cycle of deaths and rebirths known as *Moksa*: “The methods by which release is sought after and attained differ from school to school” –(*Ency. Brit.* Vol. VI, 15th Edn; p. 972).

If karma and reincarnation were clearly expressed doctrines in the Veda(s), it would be expected that the method of attaining *Moksa* should not “differ from school to school.” It should be the same.

Swami Dayananda notes from the teaching of Hinduism: “Should a wife out of her family pride desert her husband and misconduct herself, let the king condemn her to be devoured by dogs before all men and women” and “Similarly should a husband forsake his wife and misconduct himself with other women, let the king cause that sinner to be burnt alive publicly on a red hot iron-bed.” (LOT, p.199).

And The International Society for Krishna Consciousness states in its book *The Higher Taste* (p. 38) that “the law of *karma*operates impartially and unerringly, awarding us exactly what we deserve.”

Since karma is “awarding us exactly what we deserve” such a wife and husband (as in the above discussion) should not be subjected to human punishments, seeing that their actions were dictated by karma—they, in a past life had done the same things to each other for karma to now have the roles reversed.

Since karma is “awarding us exactly what we deserve,” there is no need for the Vedas. As we would not be able to circumvent karma. (Incidentally, it is more barbaric to slaughter animals for food than to feed women to “dogs”?)

If God gives man sub-human bodies as punishment in judgment, man is keeping Him busy with his cloning, grafting of new plants, and crossbreeding of new animals for Him to assign errant souls into.

The forest fires that ravage North America and elsewhere, the souls that inhabit this multitude of trees, were their terms of karmic reaction expired for them to be razed or did they suffer pre-mature death?

Karma—law of action and equal reaction—is for science. Along with his right to retaliate, man is endowed with reason and to be merciful and forgiving. The God Who gives to all human action an equal and opposite reaction is devoid of mercy: there is no room in Him for forgiveness. If karma/reincarnation were Divine truths, trying to improve the conditions of the unfortunate—which is the “reaction” to their bad karma—would be to work against karma; if such works are successful man would have subverted karma.

Whereas in earlier times India’s “intellectual inquiry and philosophical development” was “comparable” to the Greeks, as V.M. Tarkunde notes:

“By the 8th century A.D., however, the school of thought which came to prevail in the country was the other-worldly Vedant philosophy. It regarded physical existence to be an illusion, the human body to be the prison-house of the soul, and escape from the cycle of births and deaths to be the highest human ideal. Self-denial, abstinence, celibacy, desirelessness and meditation became the highest virtues. The best spirits being thus pre-occupied in other-worldly pursuits, the rest of the society came easily under the domination of ambitious princes and self-seeking priests. The theory of Karma, which says that our sufferings in the present life are the result of the sins committed by us in our previous lives, reconciled the poor to their miserable lot and consolidated the prevailing caste system and the barbaric custom of untouchability.” (*Radical Humanism*, pp. 10-11).

Abdul Haque Vidyarthi has pointed out in his monumental work *Muhammad in World Scriptures*, Vol. 1 (p. 6): “No scripture of any religion was to be found in its original form and pristine purity at the time of the Holy Prophet’s (Mohammad) advent, nor is one found today. Such books, therefore, cannot prove the truth of religion.”

The religion that cannot prove the “pristine purity” of its text and the clear basis for the articles of its faith could not be the religion for “enlightened” mankind.

On page 690 of his book, the Swami quotes the Qur’an which says that for Muslims there will be Paradise “under whose shades shall rivers flow: decked shall they be therein with bracelets of gold, and green robes of silk and rich brocade shall they wear, reclining them therein on thrones. Blissful the reward! and a pleasant couch!”—(Qur’an 18:31).

The Swami has given this verse a literal meaning, ignoring or ignorant of the fact that Allāh, God says “So no soul knows what refreshment of the eyes is hidden for them: a reward for what they did”—(Qur’an 32:17). The Prophet Mohammad is reported to have said: Allāh says, I have prepared for My righteous servants that which no eye has seen and no ear has heard, and which the heart of man cannot conceive—(Bokhari Vol.’s 4:467; 6:302-303; 9:589)

Man can relate to things only in the physical life. To us the ultimate in possessions are gold and precious stones, wealth and carnal pleasure. So Allah relates to us in terms of what we understand. These descriptions of paradise are to let us know that we will receive in paradise the ultimate in bliss. This reward is not a lure for us to do good and to avoid evil, but rather the fruits of our own labor that we have toiled for in this life. To the above noted verse the Swami comments: “Indeed! What a fine place is the paradise described in the Quran! It has gardens, ornaments, clothes, cushions, pillows

for affording pleasure to those who live therein. A wise man will, on reflection, find that the Mohammedan paradise excels in nothing except injustice which lies in the fact that the soul will have infinite enjoyment or infinite suffering for actions which are finite. Besides, infinite happiness will appear to them infinite misery, even as if a person goes on eating sweet things for a long time, they begin to taste like poison to him. Therefore, the belief that the soul is reborn after having received the bliss of salvation till the Grand Dissolution (of the universe) alone constitutes the true doctrine.” (*Meaning that belief in karma and reincarnation is the true belief*).

There is no infinite suffering in Hell, as noted in “HELL.”

If the Muslim Paradise has ornate furnishings for its righteous, what does the Hindu heaven has for those who attain the heavenly planets—those who are freed through *moksha*? (*Dealt with later*).

If the luxuries of paradise will become “infinite misery” what will constant deaths and rebirths become when one is returned as worms to feast on sewage and on decayed corpses—human and animals; as cockroaches to be reviled and smashed; as maggots and as flies to feed on sores and wounds; as cats, dogs, and swine and vultures to live in filth, to feed on filth, to forage in sewer and to scavenge on carcasses? Such living could hardly be blissful for the human soul.

Let the “wise man” and woman reflect which of the two he/she would have—the ignominious rebirth of (the mythical) karma and reincarnation, or Paradise’s “infinite misery” of gardens and delight?

The Bhagavad Gita speaks of hell—(*Bhagavad-Gita As It Is*, 1:43; 16:16, 21. See p. 193). The Rig Veda also speaks of hell:

“They who are full of sin, untrue, unfaithful,
they have engendered this abysmal station.”

(“*This abysmal station*: that is, says Sayana,

narakasthanam or hell. The wicked are the cause of the existence of the place of punishment prepared for them”).

(IV. V. 5, note # 5. Vol. 1, pp. 427, 428)

“The friends have sung in unison, the prudent wish
to sacrifice: Down sink the unintelligent.”

(“*Down sink: narake*, into hell, says Sayana.)”

(IX. LXIV. 21, note # 21, Vol. 2, pp. 338, 339).

If man is punished by being reduced to taking births in lower forms—animals, birds, insects, etc—according to his deeds, there is no need for hell— a “place of punishment.” If there was no hell in Hinduism, it is doubtful that reference would be made to it.

To have *hell* and *karma/reincarnation* seems to be a contradiction.

Caste: The Rig Veda (I. VII. 9. Vol. 1, p. 10) says, “Indra who rules with single sway men, riches, and the fivefold race, Of those who dwell upon the earth.”

There is a difference of opinion as to the identity of the “five-fold race” spoken of in the verse. Whether it is the whole world or the five “Aryan settlements or tribes only” or the four castes. “But there were no such distinctions of caste when the hymn was composed.”—(Griffith).

However, such caste designation could have been revealed/ composed at a later date. As Griffith noted, the above Hymn was “composed.” By who was it composed? If it was human composition, this would seem to negate the claim that the Veda (or at least part of it) is Divine Revelation. According to *Britannica* (noted further on), hymns were composed by “bard-priest”, of which the best of these “poems” were compiled into “an anthology called Rgveda.”

According to the Bhagavad Gita man is born into either of four castes: “Brahmans, ksatriyas, vaisyas and sudras are distinguished by the qualities born of their own natures in accordance with the material modes”–(Bhagavad Gita, As It Is, 18:41-44). Whereas Brahmans and ksatriyas are considered the higher of the two castes, women, vaisyas, and sudras are said to be of the lower castes or “lower births”: Krishna says:

“those who take shelter in Me, though they be
of lower birth–women, vaisyas [merchants]
and sudras [workers]–
can attain the supreme destination.”

(Bhagavad Gita As It Is, 9:32)

The Rig Veda also says that man is born into castes:

“When they divided Purusa how
many portions did they make?
What do they call his mouth, his arms?
What do they call his
thighs and feet?
The Brahman was his mouth,
of both his arms was the
Rajanya made.
His thighs became the Vaisya,
from his feet the Sudra
was produced.”

(X. XC. 11-12. Vol. 2, p. 559):

It is true that a person can increase intellectually or regress regardless of the mental status of his/her parents. If these division of castes were one of merit and not of class, women could not be categorized as being of “lower birth,” as the Gita teaches.

Islam teaches that man is born a Muslim–i.e. in the nature to serve Allāh, God–with the potential to rise to the highest or to degrade himself to the lowest; and judges man only by his belief in Allah God and his deeds.

God/Veda: The difference in Hindu beliefs in the matter of God is markedly pronounced where Krishna is revered in the Bhagavad Gita. However, The Gita, “Being opposed to the *Veda*, it cannot be held to be an authority. ...Krishna could never be God,” states the Swami–(LOT, p. 219).

But the worshippers of Krishna could use the counter argument to the effect that the *Veda* being “opposed” to the Gita, “it cannot be held to be an authority.” Even though the *Veda* is said to be more than 1.9 billion years old, age is no guarantee of knowledge or authenticity.

Again, part of Hinduism teaches that God (Vishnu) incarnates Himself as man and beast. In answer to the question, “Does God incarnate or not?” The Swami states: “No; because it is said in the Yajur Veda, “He is unborn.” He...is never born and never takes on a human form.”” LOT, p. 219).

The religion of such a contrasting view of its Godhead cannot be the religion of “enlightened” mankind.

The Swami wrote: “Had He (God) revealed the *Veda* in the language of some particular country, He would have been partial to that country, because it would have been easier for the people of that country to learn and teach the *Veda* than for the foreigners, therefore, it is that He did it in *Sanskrit* that belongs to no country, and is the mother of all other languages.”(LOT, p. 237). (One would expect that God would want his message to be easy for people to learn and understand; and to teach it to others, since it is for all man, as is claimed. Incidentally, how many Hindus are there who know the

Veda from memory? There are thousands of Muslims who know the Qur'an from memory).

Compare the Vedas being revealed in a language that no one knows to Allāh, God, giving revelations to all people in their own language, so that their messengers “might explain to them clearly” – (Qur'an 14:4).

The Swami notes (and it is worthwhile to point out that the following first two statements are not those of the Veda, but of the Shatpatha Brahman, XI, 4, 2, 3; and Manu 1,–23, respectively): “In the beginning, God revealed the four *Vedas*, *Rig*, *Yajur*, *Sama* and *Atharva*, to *Agni*, *Vayu*, *A'ditya* and *Angira*, respectively.” That “*Brahma* learnt the four *Vedas*” from these four men who “Among all men those four alone were purest in heart.” And that the age of the Vedas, since it was revealed is “One billion, nine hundred and sixty millions and some hundred thousand years.” (LOT, pp. 236; 237; 267, respectively). (If the Rig Veda is of pristine purity it could not have been revealed to Agni, or to Agni only, when it is said that the Rig Veda consists of hymns composed by “bard-priest.” Details further on).

Here we have a God, Brahma, who is said to be the Creator, learning books from men. Also if these men (Gods?) had taught the Veda to men, there should not be difference in beliefs in Hinduism's cardinal doctrine of reincarnation—as to whether beings return as different creatures or as the same type of creature again and again. Neither should there be a difference in beliefs as to whether God incarnates Himself or not. Secondly, here we have a book almost two billion years old, transmitted orally—papyrus came into use only around 3500 BC; and paper was not invented till about 105 AD in China—and in a language that belongs to no one. Is there any wonder it is not in its “pristine purity”?

If God revealed the Veda only to the Hindus (of India), this itself shows that God was “partial” to India/Hindus; for people would have to go to India to learn Sanskrit. (It is yet to be known that Swamis went to Arabia or Palestine or Zimbabwe or Russia or Chile to teach the natives Sanskrit).

The Rig Veda says: “Agni thou madest heaven to thunder for mankind: thou, yet more pious, for pious Pururavas.” – (I. XXXI. 4. Vol. 1, p. 43). The explanation to this verse says that *Pururavas* is the “son of Budha. He is said to have instituted the three sacrificial fires. Agni, to reward him, sent thunder the forerunner of rain.” –Griffith.

If this *Pururavas* is the son of the famous religious personality, Buddha, the Veda could not have been revealed nearly two billion years ago, because Buddha's term was from 563BC–483BC—his son was not in “the beginning”: *Pururavas* could not have been at the beginning, when his father existed around 563BC–483BC. Either this Budha of the Vedic verse is not the famous Buddhist, Buddha, or the Veda is not all Divine Revelation: not of “pristine purity.”

If thunder came only because of *Pururavas*, around 563BC–483BC, this would mean that there was no thunder in “the beginning”: for at least one billion years.

Interestingly, the Swami claims that God revealed the Vedas to four individuals in a language that was not the mother tongue of any. But Anoop Chandola says: “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). If the Rig Veda was revealed by God, and God had stated clearly in the Rig Veda that He revealed the Rig Veda, as well as the other three Vedas, to these four men – *Agni*, *Vayu*, *A'ditya* and *Angira*, respectively—it is doubtful that it could be said that the Rig

Veda was “collected” from the “oral literature” of the “Indo-European people who began to enter the Indian subcontinent.” And that “Three more Vedas were added: *Yajur Veda*, *Sama Veda*, and *Atharva Veda*.”

The Swami quotes the Rig Veda (I, 164, 39) as saying, “they alone enjoy *eternal bliss* who study the *Vedas*, live a righteous life, become perfect *yogis* and realize God.” (LOT, p. 72).

Contrastingly, the Qur’an teaches that Allāh, God, gave guidance to all nations: thus people, men and women, of all nations who follow their respective prophet will achieve “eternal bliss.”

If the Veda(s) is the only Divine Book, there must be a God other than the God of Hinduism/Vedism, because the Qur’an has information which no man could have known.

The Swami says, “God has names in all the three genders;” and that God has “millions” of names—(pp. 14, 17, resp.) (In Islam Allāh, God, is known by one hundred names; and only in masculine gender).

In support of the claim that Hinduism/Vedism teaches only Monotheism, the Swami notes: “The word *Devata* is erroneously translated into god by the orthodox *Pandits* and European scholars.” Generally anything or anyone, including God, who gives enlightenment is said to be *adevata*. (p. 203, footnote).

However, Jawaharlal Nehru says (about the Vedas) “Gradually the conception of God grows: there are the Olympian type of gods, and then monotheism, and later, rather mixed with it, the conception of monism.” And that “There is in the Mahabharata the ***polytheism of the Vedas***, the monism of the Upanishads, and deisms, and dualisms, and monotheism.” (Please note the words: “polytheism of the Vedas” which is italicized and emphasized).

Britannica notes:

“An important aspect of Aryan religious life was the bard-priest who composed hymns in praise of gods, to be sung or chanted at sacrifices. ...By about 1000 BC this body of chanted poetry had apparently grown to unmanageable proportions, and the best of the poems were formed into an anthology called Rgveda, which was then canonized. – (15th Edn; Vol. 17, p. 151).

In contrast to the Swami’s claim, there are several statements of the Rig Veda that speak of Polytheism—Gods and Goddesses:

“The two Invokers I invite, the wise,
divine and sweet of tongue,
To celebrate this our sacrifice.
Ila, Sarasvati, Mahi,
three Goddesses who bring delight”
(I. XIII. 8-9. Vol. 1, p. 17).

(It “seems uncertain” *who these two Invokers are*, “whether Agni and Aditya, or Agni and Varuna, or Varuna and Aditya”—(Note # 8).

(Agni, Aditya and Varuna are names of God, but these “two Invokers” are objects. If Saraswati is the feminine name of God, she could not be a Goddess—names are not objects. “Delight” could not be brought by three Goddesses, when it is claimed that there is only One God).

“Indrani, Varunani, and
Agnayi hither I invite”
(I. XXII. 12. Vol. 1. p. 28).

(The note says: “*Indrani, Varunani and Agnayi*: are respectively the consorts of Indra, Varuna, and Agni”).

(If God is One with “millions” of names only, it would seem that each name, or at least some, has its own consort. Why would God, being Omnipotent, Omniscient, and Omnipresent need a consort?)

“Glory to Gods, the mighty and the lesser,
glory to Gods the younger and the elder!
Let us, if we have power, pay the Gods worship:
no better prayer than this, ye Gods, acknowledge.”
(I. XXVII. 13. Vol. 1, p. 38).

(The note to this verse says: These distinctions of greater and lesser, older and younger Gods, or as we should say, angels, are nowhere further explained. Sunahsepa, it is said, by the advice of Agni, worships the Visvedevas or the Universal Gods. The Visvedevas, as a separate troop or class of Gods, are ten in number, especially worshipped at funeral obsequies, and moreover, according to the laws of Manu, entitled to daily offerings). ”

“Agni whom daily Varuna and Mitra the
Gods bring thrice a day to this our worship.”
(III. IV. 2. Vol. 1, p. 341)

(If Agni Varuna and Mitra are the names only of the One God, Varuna and Mitra cannot bring Agni, when Agni is only a name).

“May Bharati with all her Sisters,
Ila accordant with the Gods,
with mortals Agni,
Sarasvati with all her kindred Rivers,
....Three Goddesses....”
(III. IV. 8; Vol. 1, p. 341).

(The note to this verse says: “*Bharati, Ila, and Sarasvati* are Goddesses presiding over different department of religious worship. See I.13.9”).

(If there is one God, why the need for Goddesses to preside over different department of worship? Again, if Saraswati is only a feminine name of God, how could she be a Goddess—names are not objects).

“So Agni, kindled mid this adoration,
invite thou Mitra, Varuna, and Indra.”
(VII. XCIII. 7. Vol. 2, p. 97)

(If there was One God and these others were names only of God, Agni could not be asked to invite Mitra, Varuna, and Indra—names are not objects).

“O Gods,
And thee too, O great Aditi,
thee also, Goddess, I address,
(VIII. LVI. 9-10. Vol. 2, p. 225).

(Clearly, this prayer is not addressed to One God).

(There are legions of verses that speak of “Gods” and “Immortals.” While some may be taken to be angels, it is not reasonable that people should call humans and angels “Gods,” and when only the One God can give provisions).

If the four personages—*Agni, Vayu, A'ditya* and *Angira*—to whom God is said to have revealed the four Vedas nearly two billion years ago had explained the Vedas clearly to Hindus, it is doubtful that there would have been, among the Hindus, “as many as sixty-three confusing schools of philosophy at the time of Buddha (563-483 B.C.),” in which *karma* and *reincarnation* likely were among the topics of discussion:

“The Sankhya philosophers believed that the world consists of two principles, souls and the material world, the *Prakriti*, or Nature, while the Vedanta philosophers

believed in one all-comprising unity. Out of such debates in the forest grew these books.”

“...the final consummation of Vedic philosophy is to be found in *Bhagavad-Gita*, written perhaps two centuries later, when an ardent devotion to a personal God took the place of these barren speculations. According to Buddhist records, there were as many as sixty-three confusing schools of philosophy at the time of Buddha (563-483 B.C.), which explained Buddha’s revolt at their futile reasonings and ritualism.” (Lin Yutang, *Wisdom of India*, pp. 24, 25).

Jawaharlal Nehru wrote in his *The Discovery of India*:

“The early Vedic Aryanspaid little attention to the soul. In a vague way they believed in some kind of existence after death. Gradually the conception of God grows: there are the Olympian type of gods, and then monotheism, and later, rather mixed with it, the conception of monism.”

That “foreign elements” brought their customs into India. And:

“Many of these customs were unlike those of the Aryans, and so a curious mixture of opposing ideas and customs is observable....Gradually the absorption of the earlier indigenous elements as well as of newcomers was taking place, and ***the Vedic religion was being modified accordingly. It was beginning to take that all-inclusive form which led to modern Hinduism.***” (pp. 79, 106-107, resp. Italics/ emphasis, added).

The Vedic religion cannot be the religion for “enlightened” mankind when Hindus are worshipping “*gramadevatas*,” Shiva, Vishnu or Kali.

The Vedic religion cannot be the religion for “enlightened” mankind when the Hindu God, Vishnu, was “a minor solar deity in the Rgveda, who later became one of the most important and popular divinities of Hinduism”, as noted by *Britannica*. It is doubtful that “enlightened” mankind would accept that God increases in stature or status.

Whether the Vedas is two years old or two billion years old is of no consequence. It is not the antiquity of the Vedas that is of importance, but its source and doctrines.

The above entry is enough to show that the claim that Hinduism/Vedism is the religion for “enlightened” mankind is a myth.

Unlike Hinduism which cannot show the clear basis of its Articles of Faith—*karma and reincarnation and pure Monotheism*—Islam can show the clear basis of its Articles of Faith—Monotheism, Prayer, Charity, Fasting, and Hajj—and even clear expressions for the Resurrection and Day of Judgment and Paradise and Hell.

Let us examine the Swami’s criticism of the Qur’an. The Qur’anic translation noted ***are entries by the Swami***, which “translation was rendered into *Bhasha* and transcribed in Devanagari character”—(LOT, p. 649). As the numbering system of the *Bhasha*’s translation differs with Muhammad Ali’s, for ease of identification for those who may wish to check these quotes, I have replaced the verse *numbers* of this *Bhasha*’s translation to that of Muhammad Ali’s translation. I would suggest that readers consult Muhammad Ali’s translation, as there are discrepancies in certain words of the *Bhasha* translation. Muhammad Ali’s translation of the Qur’an can be viewed online: www.muslim.org

The Swami’s material is cumbersome; as such not all of his comments are repeated; the responses given should be clear enough to give an indication of the Swami’s comments. For example, in item # 5, the Swami quotes Qur’an chapter 2:1-6

“There is no doubt in this book;
it is a direction to the pious
who believed in the mysteries of *faith*,
who observe the appointed times of prayer,

and distribute *alms* out of what we
 have bestowed on them;
 and who believed in that revelation,
 which hath been sent down unto thee,
 and that which hath been sent down
 unto the prophets before thee,
 and have firm assurance in the life to come:
 these are directed by their Lord and
 they shall prosper.
 As for the unbelievers it will be equal to
 them whether thou admonish them,
 or do not admonish them;
 they will not believe—God hath sealed
 up their hearts and their hearing;
 a dimness covereth their sight and they
 shall suffer a grievous punishment”

To which the Swami comments: “Is it not arrogance on the part of God to praise His own book? The revelation of the Qoran is of no use, since the pious are already treading the right path without extrinsic aid, while the wicked are not directed by it. Does God provide (the Mohammedans) with the necessary cash to defray all their expenses out of His own treasury without any exertion on their part or paying heed to their merits and demerits? If He does, why does He not do the same for all, and why do the Mohammedans then work at all? If it is permissible to have faith also in the Bible, why do not the Mohammedans believe in that book in the same way as they do in the Qoran? But if they do, where is then the necessity for the Qoran to be revealed? If it be argued that the Qoran is more comprehensive than the Bible, it might be asked if God had forgotten to write anything in the latter book. If He had not, it was useless for Him to reveal the Qoran. Besides we find that the Bible and the Qoran differ so little, in other words, they are at one with each other in most things, it is, therefore, reasonable to ask why the revelation was not sent down (once for all) in one (complete) book such as the *Veda*?

Should one believe in the last day alone? Are the Christians and the Mohammedans alone directed by the Lord? Are there no sinners among them? Should even the unrighteous among the Mohammedans and the Christians prosper, but not even the righteous among others? Does it not show want of justice and equity in God? Is it not an *ex parte* decree to call those, who do not profess to believe in the Islam, *Infidels*? If God hath sealed their hearts and their hearing and this leads them to commit sin, they are not to blame. The fault lies at the door of God Himself. This being the case, why should some suffer while others enjoy happiness?

Thus the human soul cannot be held responsible for its sinful or virtuous deeds since it cannot be said to be a free agent.” (LOT, pp. 653-654).

Allah praising His own Book: Allāh, God did not “praise His own book.” Since man’s knowledge in physical things is limited, and in unknown things is negative, Allāh, being the Omniscient is assuring man that whatever He has revealed in His Qur’an is the truth “There is no doubt” in it! Those who accept His Words and practices His commands of prayer, charity, etc, are on the path of righteousness and success, and believe in the rewards of the next life.

Those who are dedicated to disbelief, would not respond to the doctrines of the Qur’an, and thus cannot benefit from the preaching of the Prophet.

Allah providing cash: As explained, Allah God created the heavens and the earth and all for the use of man. These fruits can only be reaped through the acquisition of

knowledge and striving. The religionist(s) who sit in his shrine will not have, but the atheist who tends the field and the flocks will have. Muslims who are fortunate are required to share their fortune with the poor and the needy.

The Infidel: As noted, Islam accepts that all Divinely inspired religions have righteous people. Followers of their respective prophets will receive bliss; whereas the wicked will suffer. Islam is not only belief in the Hereafter. Islam is of both belief and practice. Since a disbeliever is a person who does not share the belief of another person; anyone outside a person's circle of belief can be called a disbeliever, e.g. to a Christian the Muslims and Hindus etc, are the disbelievers; to the Hindus the Muslims and Christians etc, are the disbelievers.

In fact Hinduism also refers to others as "infidel." The Swami quotes *Manu* as saying, "He is an infidel who is a reviler and disbeliever of the *Veda*."—(LOT, p. 78).

Allāh sealing the hearts and hearings. Since Allāh has created all men sinless, and instructed us to be upright in religion, and, equally important, that there is no altering his creation and has given man a free choice, He cannot be said to have created some men with sealed hearts and ears and eyes.

This sealing of the faculties, as noted in the verse, are expressly, the faculties of those who are heedless of the call of the Prophet. They are the ones who are the cause of their faculties being sealed. Much as a covetous person increases in enviousness at the increasing wealth of his neighbor, the stubbornness of the sinners increases at the continuing preaching of the Prophet, and the increasing success of Islam.

Elsewhere it is said, "...they have hearts wherewith they understand not, and they have eyes wherewith they see not, and they have ears wherewith they hear not. They are as cattle; nay they are more astray. They are the heedless ones"—(Qur'an 7:179). (They are more astray than cattle because they have the capacity to reason and do not utilize it).

A parent having grown tired of trying to reform a wayward child leaves the child to wander in his own way. The child has sealed his ears to his parent's words. He has set up a barrier between himself and parent. The cause of the sinner's faculties being sealed is due to their continued rejection of the Prophet. The more they are called to Allah, the more obstinate they become. The more Islam triumphs the greater their hatred becomes. They have sealed themselves out from Divine light.

Why do we need the Qur'an?: Allah God gave instructions to all nations, to suit their needs at the time, much like parents instructing growing children until that child reaches maturity. It is not uncommon for the Qur'an and the Bible, as well as other Divine revelations, to have similar teachings, since they are from the same one God. But as noted, revelations previous to the Qur'an, suffers from want of "pristine purity." The Qur'an, through which God's guidance to man is completed, much like that child reaching maturity, highlights the false doctrines –such as polytheism, independent existence of the soul and matter, karma and reincarnation, divinity of humans, inherited sin, vicarious atonement– and gives guidance to all mankind until the Day of Judgment, in matters of moral, social, intellectual, and spiritual development. (Creation of the soul is dealt with later).

1. "In the name of God, the Compassionate, the Merciful."

This is the formula at the beginning of the chapters (except the ninth) of the Qur'an. The Swami, after speculating as to the true meaning of this verse, states: "If (the Mohammedan) God be merciful, why has He sanctioned that men should inflict great suffering on other creatures by killing them for their food," and "He should have also advised men to begin only good deeds in His name and not evil ones. Thus the passage (under discussion) is quite ambiguous;" "The Mohammedan God can never be called Merciful, because He shows no mercy towards those animals (whose slaughter He

sanctions”).—(LOT, p. 651). (The Veda also sanctions the killing of animals. As well as the Ramayana. Rama and Laksmana are said to have killed many animals. Goats are sacrificed on a daily basis to the goddess, Kali. Are/were these animals not inflicted with great suffering? Or is killing of animals allowed only in Hinduism?)

As noted above, Swami Dayananda notes from the teaching of Hinduism that a wife who “out of her family pride desert her husband and misconduct herself, let the king condemn her to be devoured by dogs before all men and women.”(LOT, p.199).

So it is not allowed to kill cows for food but it is allowed to feed women to “dogs.”

When Muslims slaughter we offer the prayer “In the name of Allah! Allah is great!” – we do not pray “In the name of Allah, the Beneficent, the Merciful” at the time of slaughtering. Muslims who offer such a prayer at the time of slaughter is in error.

Allāh, God, tells us that we Muslims “are best nation raised up for men: you enjoin good and forbid evil and you believe in Allah”–(Qur’an 3:109). In order to retain this lofty status we must practice what we preach. We are to do good so as to enjoin good, and are to avoid evil so as to forbid evil. Allāh also tells us that all things from Him are good.

In the prayer, “In the name of Allah the Beneficent, the Merciful” Muslims are reminding ourselves that Allah is our Benefactor and that He is always open to mercy. And since Allah is good and all things from Him are good, and He has instructed us to do good and to avoid evil, the Muslim who utters this prayer with such consciousness would not commit an evil act. He is instantly reminded that He is committing an act in the name of Allāh, God. This act must not be an evil one. In effect this prayer: “In the name of Allah the Beneficent, the Merciful” assists us to do good and avoid evil.

Contrary to what is being propagated there is no vegetarianism in Hinduism; Hinduism sanctions the killing and eating of animals.

Sheldon I. Pollock in *The Ramayana of Valmiki, Vol. II*, notes that Rama and his brother, Laksmana

“killed four large animals—a boar, an antelope, a gazelle, and a great black buck. They were famished and took meat hurriedly.” “Proceeding two miles further, the brothers Rama and Laksmana killed many animals such as are pure to consume and ate them in a grove by the Yamuna.”(pp. 183, 190).

About Rama eating meat, C. Rajagopalachari wrote in his *Ramayana*: “Some good men are troubled by this. But meat was not prohibited for Kshatriyas. Indeed, *it has always been the rule in India* to permit any food legitimately obtained and consecrated as a sacrifice. Raama was a Kshatriya and he lived in the forest in the Kshatriya way, though abstemiously.” (p. 90. *Italics added*). (Rama may not have killed and eaten animals, seeing that the Ramayana is “mythology,” as Rajagopalachari says. It does, however, establish that killing and eating of animals is permissible in Hinduism; if it was not, the sage(s) who wrote the Ramayana would not have attributed such acts to Rama).

Jawaharlal Nehru wrote, “The eating of beef, previously countenanced, is later absolutely prohibited. In the Mahabharata there are references to beef or veal being offered to honoured guests.” (*The Discovery of India*, p.108). (This prohibition may have been instituted by Buddha).

The *Gita* (3:14): “Rains are produced by performance of yajna [sacrifice]...”

“Lord Buddha is the incarnation of Krsna...Although there are certain restrictive rules and regulations regarding animal sacrifice for particular purposes in the *Vedas*, people of demonic tendency still took to animal sacrifice without reference to the Vedic principles. Lord Buddha appeared to stop this nonsense and to establish the Vedic principles of nonviolence.”—(Swami Prabhupada, *Bhagavad-Gita As It Is* (4:7)).(Seems

that Buddha only put an end to sacrifices that were “without reference to the Vedic principles.” It is unlikely that Buddha would criticize or prohibit any ordinance of God.)

Swami Prabhupada, commenting on the *Bhagavad Gita As It Is* 18:3, states:

“Although animal killing in a sacrifice is recommended in the Vedic literature, the animal is not considered to be killed. The sacrifice is to give a new life to the animal. Sometimes the animal is given a new animal life after being killed in the sacrifice, and sometimes the animal is promoted immediately to the human form of life.”

(In which event the Muslims annual sacrifice of Eid-ul-Adha might be doing a tremendous good to millions of souls trapped in animal forms by freeing them “immediately to the human form of life.”

In some parts of India “The *gramadevatas* (village deities) continue to be propitiated with animal sacrifices as a way of warding off and removing epidemics, crop failures, and other natural disasters.”—(*Ency. Brit.* 15th edn; art. *gramadevata*, Vol. IV, p. 667). And goats are “sacrificed” to the goddess Kali “daily.” And “to avert cattle epidemics a bull is sacrificed to Rudra” (who is Shiva in another form) (Hamlyn, *Man and his Gods*, p. 180).

And whereas Swami Dayananda states, “Horse-sacrifice and cow-sacrifice not being enjoined by the *Vedas*....”—(LOT. p. 141), the Rig Veda mentions *horse sacrifice—Ashwamedh yajna*:

“We will, with Indra and all Gods to aid us,
bring these existing worlds into subjection.
Our sacrifice, our bodies, and our offspring,
let Indra form together with Adityas.
With the Adityas, with the band of Maruts,
may Indra be Protector of our bodies.”

(X. CLVII. 1-3. Vol. 2, p. 645)

According to the note, the above three verses “were recited at the Asvamedha or Horse Sacrifice.”

The Rig Veda, I. CLXII. 1-22. Vol. 1, pp. 227-230 speaks of Horse Sacrifice. (Notes in brackets under applicable verses are the comments of Griffith):

2. “What time they bear before the Courser, covered with trappings and with wealth, the grasped oblation,

The dappled goat goeth straightforward, bleating, to the place dear to Indra and to Pusan.

(*Grasped oblation*: the offering that is to be made for the horse, and which had been taken from the remains of the burnt-offering made the night before.

The dappled goat: this goat is to be tied to the horse at the sacrificial post. *Pusan* here is said by Sayana to stand for Agni).

3. Dear to all Gods, this goat, the share of Pusan, is first led forward with the vigorous Courser,

While Tvastar sends him forward with the Charger, acceptable for sacrifice, to glory.

4. When thrice the men lead round the Steed, in order, who goeth to the Gods as meet oblation,

The goat precedeth him, the share of Pusan, and to the Gods the sacrifice announceth. (*Who goeth to the Gods*: the object of the sacrifice is to send the horse to the Gods that he may obtain wealth and other blessings for his sacrificers).

9. What part of the Steed’s flesh the fly hath eaten, or is left sticking to the post or hatchet,

Or to the slayer’s hands and nails adhereth,—among the Gods, too, may all this be with thee.

10. Food undigested steaming from his belly, and any odour of raw flesh remaining,
This let the immolators set in order and dress the sacrifice with perfect cooking.

12. They who observing that the Horse is ready call out and say, the smell is good;
remove it;

And, craving meat, await the distribution,—may their approving help promote our labour.

13. The trial-fork of the flesh-cooking cauldron, the vessels out of which the broth is sprinkled,

The warming pots, the covers of the dishes, hooks, carving-boards,—all these attend the Charger.

18. The four-and-thirty ribs of the swift Charger, kin to the Gods, the slayer's hatchet pierces.

Cut ye with skill, so that the parts be flawless, and piece by piece declaring them dissect them.

19. Of Tvastar's Charger there is one dissector,—this is the custom— two there are who guide him.

Such of his limbs as I divide in order, all these, amid the balls, in fire I offer.

20. Let not thy dear soul burn thee as thou comest, let not the hatchet linger in thy body.

Let not a greedy clumsy immolator, missing the joints, mangle thy limbs unduly.

21. No, here thou diest not, thou art not injured: by easy paths unto the Gods thou goest.

Both bays, both spotted mares are now thy fellows, and to the ass's pole is yoked the Charger.

(*Both Bays*: thou art now associated in heaven with the two bay horses of Indra, the two spotted mares of the Maruts, and the ass that draws the chariot of the Asvins).

22. May this Steed bring us all-sustaining riches, wealth in good kine, good horses, manly offspring.

Freedom from sin may Aditi vouchsafe us: the Steed with our oblations gain us lordship!" ~

(Notably, verse 21 above says that in this sacrifice, the horse is "not injured." And as recalled, the Swami says: "If (the Mohammedan) God be merciful, why has He sanctioned that men should inflict great suffering on other creatures by killing them for food," and "The Mohammedan God can never be called Merciful, because He shows no mercy towards those animals (whose slaughter He sanctions)". So when Hindus kill animals they are "not injured," but when Muslims kill animals they are?

If the Muslim God "can never be called Merciful" because He allows the killing of animals for food, what is the Hindu God to be called for allowing the killing of animals (horses) so Hindus can receive "all-sustaining riches, wealth in good kine, good horses, manly off-spring;" and even "Freedom from sin" and the gaining of "lordship"?)

Regarding this horse sacrifice. The *Ramayana* by C. Rajagopalachari, records Rama as saying to Guha: "I must not touch dishes daintily cooked and served. We have to live only on fruits, roots and permissible kinds of meat such as we offer in the sacrificial fire."—(p. 88).

What is this "permissible kinds of meat" that Rama spoke of that is offered in the "sacrificial fire"? Is it the meat of the sacrificial horse?

Regarding cow-sacrifice, the Rig Veda—(X. LXXVI. 13-14. Vol. 2, p. 548) says:

"Wealthy Vrsakapayi....
Indra will eat thy bulls, thy
dear oblation that effecteth much.
Supreme is Indra over all.

Fifteen in number, then, for
me a score of bullocks they prepare,
and I devour the fat thereof:
they fill my belly full with food. ...”

(The note to verse 14 says: “Indra speaks. *Fifteen*:sacrificers; probably Vrsakapi and his wife, and their sons and daughters-in-law. Sayana explains differently: –‘The worshippers dress for me fifteen (and) twenty bulls.’–Wilson.”).

One explanation of the verse could not be–‘The worshippers dress for me fifteen (and) twenty bulls’ if there were no bull/cow sacrifice in Hinduism/Vedism.

Again, the Rig Veda–(X. CLV. 5. Vol. 2, p. 644) says:

“These men have led about the cow,
have duly carried Agni round,
And raised their glory to the Gods.
Who will attack them
with success?”

And the note says about *These men* mentioned in the verse:“According to Sayana, the Visvedevas are meant, who have brought back the stolen cattle. But the reference is probably to the sacrifice which the priests are performing.”

Whichever view is correct, it is obvious that cow-sacrifice is/was a practice of Hinduism. If it was not it could not have been opined, in this verse where cows are mentioned, that sacrifice of the priests may be meant.

As already noted, Jawaharlal Nehru states: “The eating of beef, previously countenanced, is later absolutely prohibited. In the Mahabharata there are references to beef or veal being offered to honoured guests.”

Further. The Rig Veda says about the Maruts, (who Mr. Griffith notes that according to Wilson), are “deified mortals” (Vol. 1. p. 104 note # 3). And the Rig Veda says of these Maruts:

“Held in your manly arms.....
Deer-skins are on their shoulders....”
(I. CLXVI. 10. Vol. 1, p. 245)

It is strange that these “deified mortals” of Hinduism/Vedism would be adorned with deer-skins if the killing of animals were forbidden by God.

Again:

“Her tooth a deer, dressed
in an eagle’s feather,
bound with cow-hide, launched forth,
She flieth onward,”

(VI. LXXV. 11. Vol. 1, p. 693).

(This verse is describing an arrow, the point being “made of a piece of a deer’s horn attached to the shaft with leather strings.” –Griffith).

Unless this deer was killed, it would be cruel to cut off its horn. How did they acquire this “cow-hide” to strap the “deer’s horn” onto the arrow, if the cow was not killed? Surely, it would be an abomination to skin the cow alive. If it is illegal to kill cows, it must be, through a point of reason, also illegal to make use of its dead parts. To use its dead parts would be condoning others killing it.

(Swami Dayananda wrote: “It is true that in eating and drinking out of the hands of flesh-eaters and wine-drinkers, such as the Mahomedans and the Christians, there is some danger of even the *Aryas*—followers of the *Veda*— contracting these evil habits, *e.g.*, eating flesh and drinking intoxicants.”(LOT, p. 320).

There may be few, if any, vegetarian products produced by Muslims on the International market. But since Christians are both “flesh-eaters and wine-drinkers,”

perhaps a survey can be conducted to determine how many vegetarians/Hindus began “eating flesh and drink-ing intoxicants” after eating and drinking the milk and pop and juices, yogurt, cheese, peanut butter, butter, various crackers and bread, and other products produced by Christians).

2. “Praise be to God, the Lord of all creatures, the Compassionate, the Merciful” (Qur’an 1:1-2.) (LOT, p. 652).

The verse that says to “Put Infidels to swords,” is used here out of context. (This subject has been dealt with elsewhere).

That the Qur’an says to kill the Unbelievers, is a statement applicable only during the time of battle. Even then Muslims are urged to take prisoners and to set them free – (Qur’an 47:4); and more importantly, to make peace with the enemies when they desire peace: “And if they incline to peace, incline thou also to it” – (Qur’an 8:61).

Allāh, God, commands also that fighting is allowed against those who fight against you and on behalf of the weak – (Qur’an 2:190; 4:75; 22:39); until there is no persecution, and religion is only for Allah – (Qur’an 2:193; 8:39); to free the captives – (Qur’an 47:4); to teach and protect the idolaters – (Qur’an 9:6); that there is no compulsion in religion – (Qur’an 2:256; 109:1-6); and that “The truth is from your Lord, so let him who please believe, and let him who please disbelieve” – (Qur’an 18:29); as this verse shows, disbelievers cannot be killed when they are free to “disbelieve.”

That Muslims are to “slay the unbelievers wheresoever ye find them” – this refers only to those who fight against the Muslims – (Qur’an 2:191).

Allāh is Just and Merciful. Surely, the Swami must know that punishment is a benefit to people. As he himself declared: “The infliction of a heavy punishment on one man prevents others from committing similar crimes, and tends to keep them steadfast in righteousness.” – (LOT, p. 200). And that “*Justice* and *mercy* differ only in name. The object served by justice is the same as accomplished by *mercy*. Now the object of inflicting punishment through *justice* is to prevent people from committing crimes and thereby enable them to be freed from pain and misery. What is the object of *mercy* but to rid people of misery?” (LOT, p. 207).

There is none who had more right than Mohammad to inflict this “heavy punishment” onto the idolaters for their persecuting, attempted assassination, exiling, and fighting him to prevent the Message of Allāh, God, from being heard.

Bear in mind, Mohammad did not force the Message, only preach it. Whether one accepts it or rejects it, it is not Mohammad’s concern.

Allāh, God, does show mercy to sinners. He implores us in loving, compassionate terms, as He revealed to the Prophet Mohammad: Say: O My servants who have sinned against their souls, despair not of the mercy of Allah, surely Allah forgives all sins. Verily, He is Most Forgiving, Ever Merciful” – (Qur’an 39: 53. Also 12:87; 15:56).

It is the nature of Allah to be merciful – (Qur’an 6:12, 54). His mercy encompasses all things – (Qur’an 7:56; 40:7). Allah is so Just and Merciful that He enjoins on us in Qur’an 16:126-128:

“And if you take your turn,
then punish with the like
of that with which you were afflicted.
But if you show patience,
it is certainly best for the patient.”
“And be patient and thy patience is not
but by (the help of) Allah, and grieve not
for them, nor be in distress for what they plan.”
“Surely Allah is with those who keep their duty
and those who do good (to others)”

Hinduism also teaches the eradication of enemies. The Swami quotes the Yajur Veda as saying: “O ye learned men!and rid the world of its enemies”–(Yajur Veda, IX, 40.)(LOT, p. 163).

And the Rig Veda says: “O Agni...Destroy the cursing Raksasas...”–(IV. IV. 15. Vol. 1, p. 426).

Interestingly, the Swami quotes Qur’an 2:58 (out of context), where Allāh says: “And say forgiveness; and we will pardon you your sins, give an increase to the doers of good.” And he (the Swami) states “Why should one fear sin when he is given the promise of redemption?...God can never do injustice, but if He pardons the sinners, He renders Himself unjust” (LOT, p. 661).

Yet—regarding “The Aryas are still treading “the wicked path of the despicable low *Duryodhana*, the destroyer of his race and the enemy of his country—the Swami himself prays: “May God through His mercy rid us, *Aryas*, of this dreadful disease.” (LOT, p. 321).

And the Rig Veda says:

“What sin we have at any time committed
against the Gods, our friend, our house’s chieftain,
Thereof may this our hymn be expiation.”

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

Not only does the Hindu God(s) also forgive sins, but Hindus also, just as Muslims, can make offerings for the “expiation” of sins.

But how can the Hindu God(s) have mercy/grant forgiveness when Hindus are subjected to the dictates of karma, which cannot be changed –awarding us exactly what we deserve?

Regarding this forgiveness of sins. After the Grand Dissolution of the universe, do the souls that were reincarnated as sub-humans return as humans in the new Creation, or do they return as what they were before the Grand Dissolution, so as to complete their term as sub-humans?

If they return as humans, their sins would have been forgiven, which would make God “unjust,” according to the Swami. If they are returned as sub-humans to complete their term, they would have to “remain in custody” for billions of years (the period of Emancipation) to pass without getting to serve their time and be free sooner, which would make God to have done a “wrong,” according to the Swami.

3. “The King of the day of judgment. Thee only do we worship and of Thee do we beg assistance. Direct thou us on the right path”–(Qur’an 1:3, 4-5).

The Swami comments: “Does not God always administer justice If He administers justice only on one particular day, He does wrong....Is the right path that of the Mohammedans alone and not of others?...If good is the same in all religions, the Mohammedan religion can have no superiority over others. If the Mohammedans do not believe that other religions are just as good as their own, they are prejudiced.” (LOT, p. 652).

As the Swami and his followers believe that Hinduism/ Vedism is better than other religion(s), by the Swami’s own reasoning he and his followers “are prejudiced” against other religions. If “good is the same in all religions,” Hinduism/ Vedism “can have no superiority over others.”

That Islam is superior to all other religions has already been proven—there are no Divinely revealed doctrines as karma, reincarnation, Trinity, Divine sonship, God Incarnate, chosen people to the exclusion of others, inherited sin, and vicarious atonement; these doctrines are assumed and propagated as Divine truth. Even the Hindu Holy Books are not of pristine purity:

“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”.(A.H. Vidyarthi, *Muhammad in World Scriptures*, Vol. 1, p. 315). (See ISLAM. QUR’AN. HINDUISM. CHRISTIANITY. JUDAISM).

This, however, does not mean that Islam/Muslims “are prejudiced.” As Allāh, God, gave guidance to all people, and as all religions are for Him, Islam/Muslims cannot be “prejudiced” against anyone, Hindu or other.

The followers of other prophets of God were also on the “right path.”

Allāh is not “King” of the Day of the Judgment. He is “Master” of the Day of Judgment; as Muhammad Ali has explained, “a master is more than a king,” “which shows that Allah is not guilty of injustice if He forgives His servants, because He is not a mere king or a mere judge, but more properly a Master.” The adoption of “*King* as the translation of the word *Malik*” is “not correct.”

Considering that every second of every day people are dying world-wide, it makes sense for Allāh, God, to have one day on which to give Judgment.

Allāh has given man respite till an appointed term, when he will be called to account for his actions. That some people, such as the opponents of the Prophet and criminals, are punished through defeat and magistracy does not mean that they should not be subjected to eventual judgment and punishment. This earthly punishment is only to put an end to their aggression. The second punishment is for violating the law of Allāh, God. This latter punishment would be in proportion to their violation of this law of God.

One does not have to believe in Allāh to know that causing harm to others is wrong. All sins are committed against God, whether one believes in Him or not—by transgressing His commands, such as evil plots though the victim may have escaped the plot, hypocrisy, and illicit relations even though of mutual consent—and committed against another—such as murder, theft, bodily injury, aggression. So if a person is punished in this life for the latter sin, he still has to account for the former, i.e. violating the commands of Allāh, God. If he is not punished in this life for sin(s) against another, he has to account for both on the Day of Judgment.

If God reincarnates the soul immediately upon the death of one creature, with all the people and other creatures dying every minute world-wide God must be busy portioning off and directing souls into the wombs of fowls and ducks and geese and other birds, into sheep and goats and pigs and dogs and cats and cows and other animals, into the eggs of fish and turtles and insects and flies etc; and into humans, and into trees.

Such a belief cannot be the religion of “enlightened” mankind.

(A *Brahmachari* is a person who is under the vow of celibacy, which may be for a period of 24, 44, or 48 years, as the Swami explains). The Swami opines that “it is a *Brahmachari* alone, who attains to success in worldly affairs, enjoys perfect sensuous pleasures and spiritual happiness.”—(LOT, p. 42)

Muslims are not only allowed multiple wives but are avid meat-eaters who were ruling the world a mere hundred years after the revelation of the Qur’an. Likewise there are/were many Christians and other non-Hindus, who are not *Brahmacharis*, who “attains to success in worldly affairs, enjoys perfect sensuous pleasures and spiritual happiness.” Perhaps, there are/were many Hindus also who were not *Brahmacharis* that have attained “success in worldly affairs, enjoys perfect sensuous pleasures and spiritual happiness.”

“He that remains a *Brahmachari*, till he is 48 years of age...by virtue of this highest kind of *Brahmacharya* acquires perfect knowledge, perfect physical strength” (etc); and “enjoys the full span of life which is 400 years,” writes the Swami. –(LOT, p. 42). Now, since the revelation of the Vedas nearly two billion years ago how many *Brahmacharis* have lived to be 400 years?

Wouldn't one say that Einstein, who was Jewish, had “perfect knowledge, perfect physical strength”? (Apologies if Einstein was a “*Brahmachari*”).

4. “The path of those to whom Thou hast been gracious, not of those against whom Thou art incensed, nor of those who go astray.” (Qur'an 1: 6-7). (LOT, pp. 652-653). (One does not have to have sins in a previous life to seek forgiveness. We have sins in our present life for which to seek forgiveness).

Those “against whom Thou art incensed” are the Jews who had incurred the wrath of Allah, by breaking their covenant, disbelieving in His messages and killing prophets; and the Christians are the ones who have gone astray by imputing divinity to Jesus; and that Muslims are praying to be kept free from these infractions. As Muhammad Ali has noted that the Prophet Mohammad is reported as saying: “Those upon whom wrath is brought down are the Jews and those who went astray are the Christians” – (Tirmidhi 44:2).

Incidentally, Hindus, as the Rig Veda teaches, are to pray:

“O Gods, who fain would lend your aid,
destroy us not as ye destroy
Your enemies who go astray.
And thee too, O great Aditi, thee also,
Goddess, I address,
Thee very gracious to assist.
Save us in depth and shallow from the foe,
thou Mother of Strong Sons:
Let no one of our seed be harmed.”
(VIII. LVI. 9-11. Vol. 2, p. 225
Italics/emphasis added).

So how is it that Hindus are allowed to pray for the grace of God and Muslims are not allowed to pray for His grace? Isn't the Hindu God “open to the charge of being partial by showing favour to some and disfavour to others inasmuch as it is quite unjust to bestow happiness on men or subject them to pain and suffering without paying any regard to their merits and demerits.”

6. “There is an infirmity in their hearts and God hath increased that infirmity.” – (Qur'an 2:9). The Swami questions: “Well! did God increase their infirmity, while they were innocent? (LOT, p. 654)

When read in its context, this verse shows that the disbelievers believed they were deceiving Allah and Muslims by feigning belief in Allah. Allah is saying that they only deceive themselves. The more Islam became successful the greater their effort against Truth became. Thus, by their own action this “disease” to deceive was increased by themselves, (much as the example of the increasing of the enviousness of the covetous person given above.)

As noted above every person is born sinless and with a choice to act justly or corruptly. Allāh, God, is good, gives guidance, and is Ever-Forgiving!

7. “Who hath spread the earth as a bed for you and the heaven as a covering” – (Qur'an 2:22). “Well!” says the Swami, “Can the heaven be a covering for anything? Now does it not show ignorance (of the author of the Qoran)? It is absurd to believe in the sky being a covering. If the Mohammedans believe some kind of planet to be the heaven, it can only be the work of their own imagination.” – (LOT, pp. 654-655).

But as Muhammad Ali explains: “The heaven is here called a *structure* in reference to the order which prevails in heavenly bodies. But *bina* is also used to signify *the roof* or the *ceiling of a house*, and as such is used figuratively to indicate the vast blue overhead. Attention is thus drawn to the oneness of humanity, as if it were a single family living in one resting-place under one roof.”

Malik Ghulam Farid notes “that just as a building or a roof is a means of protection for those living in or under it, similarly the remoter parts of the universe serve as a protection for our planet (earth); and those who have studied the science of the stars, the clouds and other atmospheric phenomena, know how the other heavenly bodies, running their courses through the boundless expanse rising high above the earth on all sides, make for its safety and stability. It is also hinted here that the perfection of the material world depends upon the coordination between earthly and heavenly forces.”

8. In Qur’an 2:21-22, Allāh has challenged the doubters to produce a chapter like that of the Qur’an. And that the fuel of the fire of Hell would be men and stones. To which the Swami asserts: “Well! Is it impossible to produce a chapter like unto it? Did not Maulvi Faizi in the time of king Akbar compile a Qoran without making use of any dotted letters in it?” (LOT, p. 655)

If compiling a Qur’an “without making use of any dotted letters in it” was the same as producing a chapter like that of the Qur’an, there are probably thousands, if not millions, of Christians of both Arab and non-Arab descent who are eager to belie the Qur’an as the Word of Allāh, God, and would already have produced the Qur’an. And long before Maulvi Faizi.

Regarding men and stones being the fuel of the fire of Hell. Stones here may signify the leaders, who are generally the more hardened against a cause and *men* would be the followers of these leaders.

As mentioned already, Islam teaches that there are righteous people of all religions. Those who disbelieved their prophets –be it Moses, Jesus, Mohammad, or any of the other prophets that Allah God raised up for man—are the ones who will be sent to Hell. The difference between earthly fire and the Hell-fire is that in the Hell-fire the body is not consumed, it is not reduced to ashes. (Hell has various shades of meaning, see HELL).

9. “But bear good tidings unto those who believe and do good works that they shall have gardens watered by rivers; so oft as they eat of the fruit thereof for sustenance, they shall say, this is what we have formerly eaten of; and they shall be supplied with several *sorts of fruit* having a mutual resemblance to one another. There shall they enjoy wives subject to no impurity, and there shall they continue for ever” –(Qur’an 2:24).

The Swami comments: “The Paradise described in the Qoran is in no respect better than this world, because the same sort of things that are obtainable here are to be had there....We would like to know how these poor women pass their days till the day of judgment?....Similarly in the temple of God (paradise) women are valued and loved more than men by God. They live forever in heaven but not men. How can this arrangement last unless God desires it? The Mohammedan God is surely in danger of falling in love with these women!!!” (LOT, pp. 655-656). (How do yogis pass their time in the forest? What makes the Swami, and his followers, believe that these women are there in Paradise before the day of Judgment? Allāh can create what He wills, when He wills, and how He wills)

Surely, an Indian living in another country would recognize his favorite national food when given it, and would remind him of his life in India. So where is the problem if the inhabitants of Paradise are given fruits that delight them in this life? What is the

problem if they are given “wives” of purity? In fact these “fruits” and “wives” may very well be of the allegorical state-ments of the Qur’an. For as already noted *no eye has seen and no ear has heard, nor can the heart of man conceive* what Allah God has prepared for His righteous servants.

We are not the only beings in existence. Allāh, God reveals: “And of His signs is the creation of the heavens and the earth and what He has spread forth in ***both*** of them of living beings. And He is All-powerful to gather them together, when He will” – (Qur’an 42:29).

If the horses that are sacrificed in the Hindu fire can go to heaven and be “associated” forever with the two horses of Indra, women can surely live forever in paradise. If Hindu mortals can be “deified,” Muslims can be made to live forever in paradise.

Whereas time spent in Hell by a sinner will be proportional to his sin – (Qur’an 78:21-26); the rewards of heaven is a gift from Allāh never to end – (Qur’an 11:108; 15:45,48). And whereas punishment is equal to the crime, the reward for doing good is manifold – (Qur’an 6:161. Bokhari, Vol. 1, # 40).