

PART THREE
RESPONSE
TO

SWAMI DAYANANDA SARASWATI
“LIGHT OF TRUTH”
(Satyarth Prakash)

86. “Take alms of their substance, that thou mayest clean and purify them thereby, and pray for them: for thy prayers shall assure their minds. Verily, of the faithful hath God bought their persons and their substance on condition of Paradise for them, in return on the path of God shall they fight, and slay and be slain.” –(Qur’an 9:103, 111).

To which the Swami commented: “This is really fine! Mohammad here figures out as the very prototype of a *Popish* priest who *cleanse* or grants absolution only to those who grease his palm. This Moslim God is a wonderful trader, Who thinks He drives a roaring trade by taking the lives of the poor and helpless through the Mohammedans! By condemning the orphans to destruction and awarding paradise to the oppressors, the Mohammedan God becomes chargeable with cruelty and injustice and this is a blot on His Godhead. He has rightly come to be looked down upon with contempt by the wise and the noble-minded.” (LOT, p. 683).

Mohammad, the King of Arabia, wore coarse garments, had a bed made of palm leaves, mended his clothes and cobbled his own shoes, had a wooden staff for scepter, and when he died his shield was in the pawn shop—quite a lot of “grease (in) his palm”? Mohammad cannot “*cleanse* or grant absolution;” only Allāh, God, can.

The verse says that Mohammad is only to “pray” for them. If Mohammad was empowered to grant “absolution” there would be no necessity for him to “pray for them.” Taking alms (charity/zakaat) from the “substance” of the wealthy is for the benefit of the poor and the orphans, as well as to purify the giver—in that by giving freely of his possession he/she would be inclined to avoid the evil of robbing others, whether in business, trade, or any other dealing. Muslims fighting in the way of Allah is a fight only against those who transgressed the limits set by Allah, as has been pointed out in this book. It is rather poor cerebration to surmise that Allāh, God, sanctions “taking the lives of the poor and helpless” and “condemning the orphans to destruction and awarding paradise to the oppressors,” when He tells Muslims not to be aggressive and to fight oppression—(Qur’an 2:190, 191, 193; 8:39), that oppressors would be punished severely—(Qur’an 42:42); to set right the affairs of the orphans—(Qur’an 2:220; 2:282; 4:2-3, 6, 10; 127; 6:153; 17:34); to take care of the poor—(Qur’an 9:60; 69:34; 89:18; 90:11-16; 107:1-3); and to fight on behalf of the weak—(Qur’an 4:75).

91. “And it was said, “O Earth! ‘Swallow up thy water” and “Cease, O Heaven.” And the water abated. O my people! this is the she-camel of God and a sign unto you; let her go at large, and feed on God’s Earth.”—(Qur’an 11:44, 64).

“What childish talk is this?” says the Swami. “Can the earth or the heavens ever hear? And if God possesses a she-camel, He must also possess a he-camel. ...Does God ever ride the she-camel. If such is the Muslim God, His house must be distinguished for all the pomp and splendour to be found in the house of a mundane potentate,” says the Swami. (LOT, p. 685)

It was not Allah God, but the prophet Salih, who says “This is the she-camel of God and a sign unto you” etc. Yes, every creation in the heavens and earth belongs to Allah—from the gnat to the gigantic orb; she-camel, he-camel, you and me, Swami and all.

Allāh, God, speaking to the earth and heavens does not mean that words were uttered; they are only to illustrate His power.

In the matter of the she-camel, Yusuf Ali narrates briefly the background to this camel being made a “sign” to the people. He explains: “that (1) she was a Sign or Symbol, which the prophet Salih used for a warning to the haughty oppressors of the poor; (2) there was scarcity of water, and the arrogant or privileged classes tried to prevent the access of the poor or their cattle to the springs, while Salih intervened on their behalf (Qur’an 26:155, 54:28); (3) like water, pasture was considered a free gift of nature, in this spacious earth of God—(7:73), but the

arrogant ones tried to monopolise the pasture also; (4) this particular she-camel was made a test case—(54:27) to see if the arrogant ones would come to reason; (5) the arrogant ones, instead of yielding to the reasonable rights of the people, ham-strung the poor she-camel and slew her, probably secretly —(91:14, 54:29).” (Qur’anic comm. 1044).

92. “Therein shall they abide while the heavens and the earth shall last. And as for the blessed ones—their place the Garden! Therein shall they abide while the heavens and the earth endure.” —(Qur’an 11:107-108).

The Swami argues, “If, after the Day of Judgment, all people must repair either to heaven or hell, why should the earth or the sky then continue to exist? (*The Swami seems to believe that our creation will be the first and last*). And if heaven and hell or (are?) to endure as long as the earth and the sky endure, then it follows that the assertion “that they shall abide in heaven or hell for ever” is baseless. It is the ignorant that talk in this vain, and not the wise, or God.”(LOT, p. 685).

As noted elsewhere, Hell is not for ever. As for the gift of Paradise, it shall be “so long as the heavens and the earth endure, except as thy Lord please—a gift never to be cut off;” “Nor will they be ejected therefrom.”(Qur’an 11:108; 15:48).

As noted, our heaven and earth is not everlasting. This does not mean that there will not be other heavenly bodies. Scientists today are witnessing the destruction of heavenly bodies (such as supernova). Yet these destructions do not impact on others. The destruction of our heaven and earth would not affect Hell and Heaven.

93. “When Joseph said to his father, “O my father! verily I beheld eleven stars and the sun and the moon.”—(Qur’an 12:4).

The Swami says, “This verse contains a dialogue between a father and his son, which shows that the Qoran is not from God but is the production of some man who has embodied in it the biographies of human beings.”(LOT, p. 685).

But Allah God is here recounting the story of Joseph. In this is a lesson for us.

94. “It is God who hath reared the heavens without pillars thou canst behold; then mounted His throne and imposed laws on the sun and the moon. And He it is who hath outstretched the earth. He sendeth down the rain from heaven; then flow the torrents in their due measure.”—(Qur’an 13: 2, 3, 17).

The Swami asserts: “The Muslim God is entirely innocent of all knowledge of Physical Science. Were He conversant with Physical Science, He would not have talked of rearing heavens on pillars. If God dwells in a particular locality or in the heavens, He cannot be Almighty or All-encompassing. (*Why not? Leaders of powerful countries does not have to go anyplace to know what is transpiring in distant lands; such powerful leaders, with the aid of satellites can tell who went where, who did what, whosays what and with whom. And if man can have such sophisticated system of detection, consider how much more advanced would be the system of God*). Had the Muslim God known aught of the Science of the clouds, He would have coupled the words, “He made the water go up to the sky,” with the words, “He sendeth down the rain from heaven.” (*And He did, as will be shown*). This shows that the author of the Qoran was ignorant of the science of clouds.” (LOT, p. 686).

Allāh speaking about the heavens being raised without pillars is only calling man’s attention to the marvels of creation.

Regarding rainfall. As noted elsewhere, heat from the sun causes the water of the seas to evaporate. The water vapor rises and condenses and collects into clouds. Allāh says that He “sends forth the winds, so they raise a cloud, then He spreads it forth in the sky as He pleases, and He breaks it, so that you see the rain coming forth from inside it”—(Qur’an 30:48; also 35:9).

98. (Iblis not making obeisance to Adam, please see p. 24).

“If God breathed His spirit into Adam, then Adam also became God,” the Swami opines, “If Adam was not God, then why did God let him share the homage due to Him only?” (LOT, p. 687).

According to Hinduism/Vedism, as the Swami wrote, God “caused the soul to enter the body and He Himself entered the soul thereafter.” Does this mean that the soul or the object that the soul enters is God—seeing that God is inside the soul and the object?

God breathing His spirit into Adam does not make Adam “God”. The light of the sun comes into our houses, but the actual sun is not in our houses. And God did not let Adam “share the homage due to Him only.”

Allāh, God, could not be a “beguiler” when He gives man guidance and points out the ways of goodness and evil. Allāh, God, gives man a free choice in his destiny, if he allows Satan to beguile him he does so by his own hands not by Allah’s. While Allah could have destroyed Satan instantly for his disobedience, Allah is Just and Merciful. He gives man respite to change from his evil ways.

99. “And to every people have we sent an apostle. Our word to a thing when we will it is but to say “Be” and it is.”—(Qur’an 16:36, 40).

The Swami wrote: “If God sent apostles to every country, why did He not send one to *Aryavarta* (India)? Hence this assertion of the Qoran does not deserve to be given credence to.” (LOT, p. 687).

It is incredible that in the beginning God created “hundreds and thousands of men”, as the Swami wrote, yet in this very beginning, as God is said to have revealed the Veda, He could only find “four alone” who were “purest in heart” to whom He could reveal the four Vedas. It is incredible that Allāh, God, Who is the Lord of all, would give guidance only to portions of mankind and disregard others.

Allāh, God, tells us that He raised messengers among all nations—which would include “*Aryavarta (India)*”—(Qur’an 10:47; 16:36; 35:24). Though not all of these messengers are mentioned—(Qur’an 4:164; 40:78); they all taught the people in their own language—(Qur’an 14:4), and considering the size of India and its many different languages one can imagine the number of Divine messengers that Allāh, God, has raised up in India. All these messengers taught one common doctrine:

“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)

It is highly probable that all these righteous individuals of Hinduism who are worshipped as Gods were in fact prophets of God. Hanuman “the monkey-god who helped Rama....was a historic person who was afterwards defied (? deified);” (LOT, p. 24, f/n).

And Anoop Chandola explains: “The Vedas included several major gods and goddesses some of whom must have been culture heroes....As the tradition of honoring culture heroes continued, in due course new heroes were added, ***two of them most important: Rama and Krishna.***” (*The Way To True Worship*, p. 9. Italics/emphasis added).

Allāh saying “Be” and it is, has been dealt with elsewhere.

103. On the day of Judgment Allah God “shall call every people with their leader”—(Qur’an 17:71).

To which the Swami comments: “If God will call the Prophet and all his followers on the day of judgment in order to decide the fate of the dead, all of them will have to remain in custody till that period.....He will keep one man in custody for fifty years, while He will decide the case of another at once. Surely this cannot be called justice. (*But some dangerous criminals might consider this delay in justice a joy; especially those on death-row*). “Again, to hold that God summons the prophets as witness is to question His Omniscience. Can such a book ever be the Word of God and can its author ever be an Almighty God?” (LOT, pp. 689-690).

A person who is asleep would have no knowledge of how long he was asleep, if all evidence of time is removed from him. If he was asleep for a week it might seem to him as if he had slept only for an hour. So if one dead is not resurrected for a million years whereas another is resurrected after an hour it would make no difference to either of them (for their trial on the Judgment).

Allāh, God, calling man with his prophet on the Day of Judgment is not a question on His Omniscience. Allah is Just. And that man should be shown to be guilty by sources independent of His Omniscience—not only would man’s limbs bear witness against himself—prophets will verify that they had brought Divine message to man.

Even in this world even though man has been guilty through his own fingerprint and DNA, independent evidence is still sought against him. Even in this life criminals are brought to trial at a future appointed date. It is not the judge, but man's own peers, who bears testimony against him.

106. "As to the youth his parents were believers, and we feared lest he should trouble them by error and infidelity. Until when he reached the setting of the sun, he found it to set in a mire fount; and hardly he found a people. They said, "O *Dhoulkarnain!*" Verily, Gog, and Magog waste their land, shall we then pay thee tribute, so thou build a rampart between us and them. (Qur'an 18: 80, 86, 94).

The Swami states: "How unwise of God! He feared lest the parents of the boy might be led to rebel against His authority. This cannot be compatible with the nature of God. Again mark the ignorance of the author of the Quran! He thinks that the sun sinks into a lake at night, and comes out of it again at day-break. As a matter of fact, the sun is very much larger than the earth. How can he then set in a river or a lake or an ocean? This proves that the author of the Quran was ignorant of Physical Geography and Astronomy. Had he known these Sciences why would he have written such things as are opposed to the dictum of knowledge? The believers in this book are also illiterate; other-wise they would not have believed in a book which is so full of error. Now mark God's injustice? Though He is Himself the Creator of this earth and is its King and Judge, yet He allows Gog and Magog wage constant war with each other. This is also incompatible with the nature of God. Such a book can only be believed in by savages and not by enlightened men." (LOT, p. 691). **(These verses are of two different topics that the Swami has conjoined together. Verse 80 is of an allegorical narration in the life of Moses, whereas verses 86 and 94 are from a historical event in the life of Dhul-qarnain).**

The "we" in the verse "*we feared lest the youth should trouble his parents,*" is not the words of Allah God, fearing "lest the parents of the boy might be led to rebel against His authority. They are the words of the companion of Moses. In this "we" the companion is, seemingly, associating himself with God in his actions, and hoping that the parents would be given a better son, as the verse following conveys: "So we desired that their Lord would give them in exchange (a son) better in purity (of conduct) and closer in affection" – (Qur'an 18:81).

The Swami teaches that revilers of the Vedas are to be "expelled out of the country", that writers of the Puranas should have "die(d) in their mothers' wombs or as soon as they were born", and that "It is the business of the State to punish or even kill all those men and animals that are injurious (to the community) – (LOT pp. 50; 406-407; 323). Why then should an incorrigible son not be killed for leading his parents away from God, Who is the Creator of all and Who is worthy of all honor?

In this narration there are three incidents associated with Moses: the damage to a boat, the slaying of a youth, and repairing a wall, which Muhammad Ali says: "the incidents seem no more than prophetic allegories of Moses' own life-work;" (*and he gave potent reasons and concludes*), "Read in this light, the narration is clearly an Ascension of Moses, foreshadowing the great events which were to befall him." (See Muhammad Ali's translation of the Qur'an online: www.muslim.org).

About Dhul-qarnain: Not even the "savages" of Seventh Century Arabia attributed such an absurd meaning to the verse that the sun literally "sinks into a lake at night". What the verse is conveying is that Dhul-qarnain's travels had taken him to a large body of water in the west. As Muhammad Ali explains: "*Maghrib al-shams* or *the setting-place of the sun*, signifies the westernmost point of his empire, because going towards the west he could not go beyond it", and that the Arabic words '*ain-in hami'at-in* literally means a "*black sea.*" "The place referred to is no other than the Black Sea, as, Armenia being within the Kingdom of Persia, the Black Sea formed the north-western boundary of the empire," explains Muhammad Ali.

(Muhammad Ali has explained in detail Dhul-qarnain and the Gog and Magog, which is too voluminous to enter here. There are differences of opinion as to the identity of Dhul-qarnain. Muhammad Ali identifies Dhul -qarnain with "Darius I Hystaspes (521-485 BC)." Malik Ghulam Farid identifies him with "Cyrus." And Yusuf Ali says, "Popular opinion identifies Zul-qarnain with Alexander the Great."

Muhammad Ali and Malik Ghulam Farid have made extensive commentaries on Dhul-garnain. Yusuf Ali has devoted an impressive five-page Appendix to this topic at the end of chapter 18. In this Appendix he notes: "It is one of the wonders of the Qur'an, that, spoken through an Ummi's (unschooled one's) mouth, it should contain so many incidental details which are absolutely true." And that "Each of the episodes mentioned is historical. But the pomp and glitter of military conquest are not mentioned. On the contrary spiritual motives are revealed and commended." Which "spiritual significance" is the "chief thing to note in the story").

Allāh, God, does not "allow" man to "wage constant war with each other." Allah gives man a term of life and furnishes him with guidance for righteous living. If man wants to squander his brief respite in wars and iniquities till his appointed term it is his own doing. No blame is to be laid at the feet of Allāh, God.

108. "Dost thou not see that we send devils against the infidels to incite them to sin" –(Qur'an 19:83).

What this means is that God gave the devil respite till an appointed term to lead man astray. Whereas He has shown man the two paths of life—that of goodness and evil—man makes his own choice.

110. "And we placed stable mountains on the earth, lest it should move with them." –(Qur'an 21:31. Also 16:15; 31:10).

The Swami states: "If the author of the Qoran had been acquainted with the phenomenon of the revolution of the earth, he would never have taught that the earth was immovable, because mountains were fixed in it. It could be argued that if there were no mountains, it would be shaken. Why does it quake when there is a seismic disturbance?" (LOT, p. 692).

Malik Ghulam Farid notes that: "Geology has established the fact that mountains have, to a great extent, secured the earth against earthquakes....The verse may also signify that the mountains are a great help to the earth in moving steadily on its axis. The Qur'an spoke of the earth as 'moving round' long before it was discovered that it was not stationary and moved on its axis and round the sun." (Comm. 1885) (See Qur'an, 21:33; 36:40). (Allāh recounting the angels announcing the birth of Jesus to Mary and the Swami's comments dealt with in item # 49).

112. "Seest thou not that all creatures both in the heavens and on the earth adore God? The sun, and the moon, and the stars, the mountains and the trees, and the beasts, and many men?" (Qur'an 22:18).

The Swami wrote: "When it is clear that inanimate objects cannot even know God, how can they then worship Him? This book cannot be of Divine origin. It seems to have been written by some ignorant man." (LOT, p. 693).

But the Rig Veda—(I. CLXVI. 4. Vol. 1, p. 244) says of the Maruts:

"Ye who with mighty powers have stirred
the regions up.....All creatures of the earth,
all dwellings are afraid...."

How can "all dwellings" being "inanimate objects cannot even know God, how can they then" be "afraid"?

How can mountains "prostrate themselves", as the note to the above Hymn says: "...it is related of Agastya that the Vindhyan mountains prostrated themselves before him; and yet the same Agastya is believed to be the regent of the star Canopus."—Griffith.

Worship of Allāh, God, means to follow His laws, either voluntarily as in the case of man who is equipped with reason to differentiate between evil and good, or involuntary, as in the case of animals and inanimate objects—animals who follow the instinct inherent in their creation, and inanimate objects, through the laws of conformation such as the moon and sun floating in their respective orbits and hydrogen and oxygen combining, in preset quantities, to form water. (Allāh, God, revealing: "And remember her who preserved her virginity, and into whom we breathed our spirit." And the Swami's comment is dealt with in item # 49).

113. "Then shall ye be waked up on the day of Resurrection." (Qur'an 23: 16).

To this the Swami writes: "Will the dead dwell in the tombs or in some other place till doom's Day? If they dwell in the tombs, even the virtuous souls will suffer pain on account of their

bodily tenements being foulsmelling and decomposed. This mode of meting out justice is as bad as doing injustice. Moreover, the Mohammedan God and His followers are guilty of the sin of spreading disease.” (LOT, p. 694).

But even today man is exhuming mass graves without spreading disease or becoming infected. However, as Allah God says that He will resurrect the dead. The dead can only be resurrected if it is whole and is functional. Thus, there would be no decay and disease at this Resurrection; which is unlike an exhumation. In the Hereafter man will be given new forms—(Qur’an 56:61).

Some advanced countries have high-tech crematoria. Conventional methods of cremation pollute the atmosphere—thus contributing to the greenhouse effect: producing tons of ashes and carbon dioxide (*and deplete the forest*). This is more pronounced during times of disasters, such as earthquakes (as in Gujarat), flooding, etc; when large numbers of corpses have to be disposed by burning.

Also, cremation ashes being airborne may end up in the respiratory systems of both humans and animals; as well as in their supply of drinking water. And with about 20,000 deaths a day in India.

One great advantage of burying is that the body can be exhumed in the future, for forensic evidence. This has proven beneficial.

114. Allāh, God, tells us that on the Day of Judgment our limbs also will give evidence as to our earthly actions; and that He is the light of the heavens and the earth.—(Qur’an 24:24, 35).

To which the Swami states: “The hands and feet being in-animate cannot give evidence. The second statement being opposed to Laws of Nature is false. Is God fire or electricity? The illustration given in the Qoran cannot apply to God. Such illustrations can only apply to embodied objects.”(LOT, p. 694).

But even here on earth our hands and feet and (bodily fluids) are giving evidence as to our actions—fingerprints and footprints, eye-scanning, DNA. How much more advanced is Allah God’s method of extracting evidence.

Allah God is the light. As Muhammad Ali explains: “*Nur (light) is that which manifests hidden things*, and Allah is called here the *light of the heavens and the earth*, because He has manifested them and brought them into existence.”

115. “And God hath created every animal of water. Some go on upon the belly.”—(Qur’an 24:45).

“What kind of philosophy is this that the creatures in the composition of whose body all elements have entered are said to have been generated from water alone. This is a foolish statement” the Swami says. (LOT, p. 694).

But Allah God did not say that every animal was created from water “alone.” It is a fact that the basis of all living things is water.

119. “O Moses! verily I am God, Mighty, the Wise: cast down thy rod. And when he saw it, that it moved, as though it had been a serpent, he retreated and fled. And God said O Moses, fear not, for my messengers are not disturbed with fear in my sight.” (Qur’an 27: 9-10).

“Now mark! God calls Himself Mighty, even a good man would not indulge in self-commendation, why should God do so? He became the Lord of the savages by tempting them with a sort of jugglery”, wrote the Swami. (LOT, p. 696).

Yet in the Rig Veda God says that He is the “Holiest of all” and is the “most Powerful Supreme Being”—(LOT, p. 1). So it is acceptable for the God of the Veda(s) to “indulge in self-commendation” but not for the God of the Qur’an.

If God can create this universe, raise animals and plants from dirt, if He can take up residence “in the womb” and “entered the soul,” as the Swami wrote—(LOT, p. 220, 227), and as the soul is reincarnated also as plants, surely God can transform a piece of stick into flesh, or He could inhabit the stick as He inhabits the “womb” and the “soul” (in the plant) and make it into a serpent.

121. “And Moses struck him with his fist and slew him: And he said, O Lord, verily I have injured my own soul, wherefore forgive me. So God forgave him; for He is ready to forgive, and Merciful.”—(Qur’an 28:15-16).

“Now mark again!” the Swami says, “Are not God and Moses the Prophet of the Mohammedans and the Christians, both unjust because the latter killed people and God forgave him his sins.” (LOT, p. 697).

But reading this verse in its entirety shows that Moses went to the aid of one of his people who was in a fight with their common enemy. Moses unintentionally killed the enemy. Allāh, God, is always open to sincere repentance. This is a demonstration of His mercy to man.

122. “We hereafter sent Noah unto his people, and he tarried among them one thousand years, save fifty years.” (Qur’an 29:14).

The Swami wrote: “If formerly people lived for 1,000 years, why do they not attain that age now? This statement is also wrong.” (LOT, p. 697) **(Noah living/dwelling 950 years among his people could have meant the time his teaching lasted till the coming of the next major prophet of Allāh, God: Abraham).**

If a *Brahmachari* of the “highest kind” “enjoys the full span of life which is 400 years,” as the Swami writes, why is it incredible that Noah, a prophet of God, could live 950 years?—(LOT, p. 42).

If trees, such as the redwood, live thousands of years, man, who is instilled with the spirit of the Eternal, could have lived a thousand years. However, much as the significance is not how you worship, but who you worship; it is not how long you live but how beneficial you live. According to the Qur’an only Noah’s people were drowned. There was no world deluge.

Incidentally, how many *Brahmacharis* of the “highest kind” have lived to the age of “400 years”? Surely in the near two billion years since the Veda(s) is said to have been revealed there must be quite a few such *Brahmacharis*.

124. “These are the signs of the wise book. He hath created the heavens without visible pillars to sustain them, and hath thrown on the earth mountains firmly rooted, lest it should move with you. Dost thou not see that the God causeth the night to succeed the day, and causeth the day to succeed the night? Dost thou not see that the ships run in the sea, through the favor of God, that He may show you of His signs?”—(Qur’an 31:2, 10, 29, 31).

The Swami wrote: “How funny! That a book like this should be regarded full of wisdom even though it teaches things opposed to science, such as the creation of the heavens without visible pillars to sustain them **(the centrifugal and magnetic forces are the invisible pillars that sustain them)** and the fixing of the mountains in the earth with a view to keep them immovable **(the mountains ensuring balance due to movements and thus rendering the earth “immovable” is not to be confused with the earth moving in orbit)**. Even persons who are a little bit educated cannot write such nonsense or believe in such balderdash. Again, how wise is the statement that the day is entangled with the night and night with the day! Every body knows that day and night co-exist. The Quran cannot be a book of true knowledge, for this statement is absolutely foolish. **(But for Allāh causing the earth to rotate on its axis part of the earth would be in perpetual light and part in perpetual darkness)**. It is not opposed to true knowledge to say that the ships run into the sea through the favour of God when in reality they are propelled by machinery and by sailors? **(But who has given man knowledge to build and sail ships?)**. Would not the sign of God (a ship) sink if it was made of iron or stone? **(But ships are made of iron also!)**. Verily this book cannot have been written by God or by a learned man.” (LOT, p. 699). What these verses are saying is that it is due to Allāh, God’s, power and mercy that man receives these favors.

125. “He governeth all things from heaven even to the earth, hereafter they shall return unto Him, on the day whose length shall be a thousand years, of those which ye compute. This is He who knoweth the future and the present; the Mighty, the Merciful.” **(Muhammad Ali has shown this verse to be a prophecy about the rise and decline of Islam/Muslims)**. And then formed him into proper shape, and breathed of His Spirit into him; Say, The angel of death, who is set over you, shall cause you to die...If we had pleased, we had certainly given to every soul its direction: but the word which hath proceeded from me must necessarily be fulfilled, when I said, verily I will fill hell with both genii and men”—(Qur’an 32: 5, 6, 9, 11, 13).

The Swami: "Now it is quite clear that the God of the Mohammedans is limited by space like man, for if He were Omnipresent, it could not be said of Him that He is stationed at a particular place for the purpose of carrying on administrative work and that he descends and ascends. He cannot but be regarded as limited by space if He sends down angels and Himself remains hung up in the sky, while His emissaries are sent about on errands. How could God know it, if His angels were bribed into perverting the facts of a case or sparing the life of a doomed person. He could find out only if He were Omniscient and Omnipresent, but that He is not. If He had been so, where was the need of sending angels and testing people in any way? **(Why did God reveal the Vedas to four men only, why did He not reveal into the hearts of every Hindu or human being?)**. Again, He cannot be said to be Omnipotent, because it takes a thousand years to arrange for the return of His emissaries **(as stated Muhammad Ali has shown this verse to be a prophecy in which after a thousand years of success Islam/ Muslims will suffer a decline)**. If there is an angel of death, what is there that will bring about his death? **(Allāh, God, who created him can bring about his death)**. One angel cannot ask many people to repair to hell simultaneously, and if God looks at the fun after filling hell with innocent people who have been doomed to torture, He is unrighteous, unjust and merciless. A book teaching such things cannot be the work of God or of a learned man, while a being devoid of justice and mercy cannot be Divine." (LOT, p. 699). Angels cannot 'pervert': they do only as they are commanded by Allāh, God—(Qur'an 66:6). Since, as the Veda says, that the Hindu God needs "spies," this means, according to the Swami's reasoning, the Hindu God is not Omniscient—Him being in need of others. Neither could the Hindu God know if His "spies"/angels "were bribed into perverting the facts." God testing people only means that He brings to light their inner selves. Much like in the human sphere where the examiner tests the student to show to him, and to manifest to society, his (the student's) ability. The examiner has no need to know the ability of the student. His knowledge is above that of the examined.

If the Hindu God can daily, on a worldwide basis, put souls into the wombs and eggs, of billions of humans, animals, reptiles, birds, insects, and trees, and each to its correct destination, surely the Muslim God can give the angel of death the power to have "many people to repair to hell simultaneously."

Allāh filling hell with men and jinn. What makes the Swami believe that these men and jinn are "innocent?" And if by going to hell they are "doomed to torture" then it is by their own heads and hearts and hands. However, hell is not a "torture" chamber. Hell is a purifier much like the "torture" of rehabilitation that an addict goes through to emerge a new/cleansed person. (See HELL).

In reincarnating the corrupt soul as pigs and cockroaches and worms, has the God of the Veda "doomed to torture" these souls?

As *karma* gives to all acts an "equal and opposite" reaction and "operates impartially and unerringly, awarding us exactly what we deserve," it is the God of *karma* Who is "devoid" of mercy: there is no room in Him for forgiveness.

127. Qur'an 33:37 relates the story of Zaid divorcing his wife Zainab, and Zainab's subsequent marriage to the Prophet Mohammad.

To which the Swami comments: "It is also clear that Moham-mad was lascivious, for if he had not been so, he would not have taken his daughter-in-law as wife." (LOT, p. 701). **(It is a rather weird reasoning that a "lascivious" person would marry mostly women who are old, and with many children, when there are camps of vestal nubile at his command).**

Zainab was **not** the daughter-in-law of Mohammad. Zaid was only the adopted son of the Prophet. That Mohammad was not the father of any man does not mean that he was not the father of "no body". The prophet had children. All it means is that he was not of filial relationship with any of the men *(for them to call him "father" and that they should be addressed by him as "son")*. But that he was the Messenger of Allah to them. (For a full treatment on Zaid and Zainab see ZAINAB SCANDAL)

The Swami also wrote: "How cruel that the prophet was at liberty to divorce a wife whenever he chose to do so, while his wife was deprived of the right of obtaining a divorce even if he was guilty of misconduct." (LOT, p. 701).

But not only was the Prophet never guilty of “misconduct”, and not only did the Prophet never divorced any of his wives, his wives also had the right to divorce him. This is made clear in the verse: “O Prophet, say to thy wives: If you desire this world’s life and its adornment, come, I will give you a provision and allow you to depart a goodly departing.”—(Qur’an 33:28). Islam does not require that its women be ‘immured within the four walls of the house like prisoners.’ (See WOMEN)

128. “Neither is it fit for you to give any uneasiness to the Apostle of God nor to marry his wives, after him, for ever: for this would be a grave offence in the sight of God.And they who shall injure the true believers of either sex, without their deserving it, shall surely bear the fruit of calumny and a manifest injustice. And being accused, wherever they are found they shall be taken, and killed with a general slaughter, *O Lord give them the double of our punishment, and curse them with a heavy curse*” —(Qur’an 33:53, 57, 61, 68).

The Swami comments: “Would not the Mohammadans feel aggrieved if some body ordained that they should be pinioned and killed, as, the Qoran has done in the case of non-Muslims. The Prophet was very hard-hearted, for he prayed to God that non-Muslims should receive double the punishment awarded to Mohammedans.”(LOT, p. 702).

There is nowhere in the Qur’an that Allāh, God, has “ordained” that non-Muslims be “pinioned and killed.” Muslims are allowed to fight only a defensive fight, and when they are not the aggressors. It cannot be said that Muslims are allowed to “injure” non-Muslims and their wives, be it physically or verbally. Allāh, God, says that Muslims enjoin good and forbid evil—(3:109); say only what is best—(29:46); the noblest are the best in deeds—(49:13); to speak justly 6:152).

The reason why Muslims were not allowed to marry the wives of the Prophet after his death—(Qur’an 33:53), is because these wives of the Prophet were regarded as the Mothers’ of the Muslim brotherhood.

That Mohammad “prayed to God that non-Muslims should receive double the punishment awarded to Mohammedans.” As I have underlined above, it is not Mohammad who uttered these words. As the preceding verse (*verse 67, which the Swami did not quote*) shows, they are the words of those who were lead astray, asking God to give their leaders double punishment for leading them astray. Here are the two verses:

“And they say: Our Lord,
we only obeyed our leaders and our great men,
so they led us astray from the path.
Our Lord, *give them a double chastisement
and curse them with a great curse.*”
(Qur’an 33:67-68)

If Muslims praying for the non-Muslims to receive double the punishment awarded to Muslims is “very hard-hearted,” how would the Swami’s praying for death to the writers of the *Bhagvat* and other *Puranas* be described: “Oh! Why did not the writers of *Bhagvat* and other *Puranas* die in their mothers’ wombs or as soon as they were born? Had the people (of India) been saved from the hands of these *popes*, they would have been spared the pain and suffering that they are afflicted with?”—(LOT, pp. 406-407).

How can the Swami wish that they had die in their “mothers’ wombs” or “as soon as they were born” when in order for them to be reborn as humans they would have had to have good karma in a past life? It would seem unGodly to wish for the death of others whom God has reincarnated as humans. Are not the “pain and suffering” afflicting the people (of India) a result of their bad karma?

Regarding the punishment for crimes, as Hinduism teaches, the Swami quotes Manu to let a “victorious sovereign reduce all dacoits, robbers and the like to submission by *conciliating* them, by *giving them presents* or by *turning them against each other*. If he fails to restrain them by those means let him do so *by inflicting heavy punishment on them*.”(LOT, p. 177).

It would seem an injustice to inflict “*heavy punishment*” which would be in excess for the crime.

According to Hindu/Vedic teaching, a lying witness “should have his tongue cut-off” –(LOT, p. 194). According to Manu, for evidence given through certain reasons—such as “covetousness,” “love,” “fear,” “hunger”— “Punishment may be inflicted, through property, the penis, the back, the tongue, hands, feet, eyes; ears, the nose, and the whole body.” And for “the *first* offence let the offender be punished by *gentle admonition*, for the *second* by *harsh reproof*, for the *third* by a *fine*, and for the *fourth* by *corporal chastisement*, such as flogging and caning, or by imprisonment or death penalty.”(LOT, pp. 196, 197).

Thus a first time murderer could receive a ‘slap on the wrist’ only.

The Swami also quotes Manu as saying: “With whatever limb a man commits an offence, even that limb shall the king remove or destroy in order to set an example to others...” –(LOT, p. 197).

So the person who commits a crime with his legs, such as kicking, is dismembered; one who injures another with his head is decapitated; and the rapist is castrated. How is the woman guilty of seduction punished?

Manu also says, as the Swami quotes, “punishment inflicted on a king should be a thousand times heavier than that on an ordinary man”, and that “even the lowest official such as a constable, should be punished not less than eight times as heavily as an ordinary man would be.”(LOT, pp. 197, 198).

But it is an injustice to punish one individual more severely because of his status or wealth. The Swami himself declares that “the infliction of just punishment in exact accordance with the amount of crime is called *justice*.” (LOT, p. 207).

Allāh, God, tells us that the punishment must not exceed the degree of the crime:

“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.”
(Qur’an 16:126)

Hinduism teaches also, as the Swami quotes “Manu VII, 371, 372, 406, 419, 420” as saying: “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. 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).

(According to Hinduism: “A woman who has been unchaste should worship Siva in his calm aspect, Siva who is Kama. Then she should summon a Brahmin and give herself to him, thinking, ‘This is Kama who has come for the sake of sexual pleasure.’ And whatever the Brahmin wishes, the sensuous woman should do. For thirteen months she should honour in this way any Brahmin who comes to the house for the sake of sexual pleasures, and there is no immorality in this for noble ladies or prostitutes.”

“The Brahmin guest represents Śiva/Kāma, who purifies the woman whom he seduces, for extreme sexual licence may remove sexual stigma, just as extreme *tapas* (austerity) does.” (Cited in Wendy Doniger O’Flaherty, *Śiva The Erotic Ascetic*, p. 256).

Manu also says, as the Swami quotes: “Let women be witnesses for women, the *twice-born* for the *twice-born*: *Shudras* for *Shudras*, and outcasts for outcasts.”(LOT, p. 193).

So if a crime has been committed against these and there is none of their *Class* present, no one can give witness on their behalf. If these commit a crime and there is none of their *Class* present, no evidence against them will be accepted.

132. “A cup shall be carried round unto them, filled from a unruffled fountain, for the delight of those who drink; And near them shall lie the virgins of paradise.....” –(Qur’an 43:71. *The Swami has conjoined several verses on the rewards of Paradise from chapter 43 –verses 44, 45, 48, 57, 131, 132, 133, 134, which I have been unable to reconcile. Except for verse 44 which equates to Muhammad Ali’s verse 71, the others may be a misquote of the chapter*).

The Swami: “Well! The Mohammedans cry that it is a sin to drink wine on this earth but in their paradise streams of wine flow. It is good that Mohammedans have rendered some service to the cause of temperance here, but they have been more than compensated for this abstinence in paradise. So many women have been allotted to each man there, he would find

it difficult to fix his affections on one. (*Does this mean that a man with one woman doesn't have difficulty fixing his affections on this one wife? There shouldn't be any adulterer then. You would think that a man with "many women" allotted to him would be too occupied to fix his attention on other women*). The place must be afflicted with maladies. If the dwellers have got bodies, they must die and if they have got no bodies, they cannot gratify their lust. What then is the use of a paradise?" (LOT, p. 704)

Will the wine in heaven be the same as that on earth? It is not within reason that Allah God Who has kept man away from drunkenness on earth would allow such a habit on the spiritual plain. We have 'alcohol free' beer, 'alcohol free' wine, 'alcohol free' champagne. What 'alcohol free' will man come up with next? If man can have 'alcohol free' wine on earth, consider how much purer the "wine" in Paradise would be.

The Swami also questions: "Where did these women (of Paradise) come from? Are they dwellers of paradise or have they been imported? If they have been imported, they will surely go back and if they permanently dwell there, what were they doing before the day of resurrection?" (LOT, p. 705).

These women are perhaps doing the same thing(s) the *yogis* and the *sanyasis* who have escaped the cycle of deaths and rebirths are doing on the heavenly planets and in Krsnaloka, till the "Grand Dissolution (of the universe)".

And, speaking of the *horse sacrifice*, the Rig Veda says:

"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."
(I. CLXII. 21. Vol. 1, p. 229)

And this verse is explained as: "*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."—Griffith.

If horses can live in "heaven" forever, and if they can be sent to live in heaven, surely women can be in paradise forever.

It is interesting to note how the Swami has perceived carnality in these youths and women serving in Paradise. Wonder if the Swami, and the Hindus who share his vision, also sees carnality in the handsome youths and alluring women servers at fancy restaurants in the human sphere of life? Are these servers here to offer carnal gratification to the diners?

If the Muslim Paradise is also about sensuality, isn't sexual relationship, even on earth, within the circle of Divine prescription blissful? Where then is the harm if there should be intimate contact between husband and wife in Paradise? And if the dwellers of Paradise would have multiple spouses where is the harm, considering that Hinduism allows polygamous and polyandrous relations? The famous five Pandava brothers had a common wife, Draupadi.

However, as pointed out, not only will we be given new forms in the Hereafter, the Qur'anic descriptions of Paradise are figurative. As Allāh, God, tells in Qur'an 32:17, "And no soul knows what delights of the eyes is kept hidden for them, as a reward for their (good) deeds." And as the Prophet Mohammad explained:

Allah 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. 4, # 467; Vol. 6, #:302-303;
Vol. 9 # 589).

The Swami states, "Perpetual happiness cannot reign where women are to be found." (LOT, p. 705) (*Perhaps women can say the same of men*).

But, (*while there are, no doubt, wayward women as well as men*), Allāh, God, says that men and women were created from the same essence—(Qur'an 4:1); that they are garments to the other—(2:187); that He created her to be his mate, that he might find peace and comfort in her, and He has put between them love and compassion—(7:189; 30:21); that He has established

marriages between men and women—(Qur'an 25:54; 16:72; 24:32); that women are to be honored—(4:1); and that women and men are protectors of one another—(9:71).

In Islam, Women are not objects of revulsion. And what is the Hindu heaven like? (*Details further on*).

137. “His, the keys of the Heavens and of the Earth! He giveth with open hand or sparingly, to whom He will. He createth what He will, and He giveth daughters to whom He will, and sons to whom He will. Or He giveth them children of both sexes, and He maketh whom He will childless. It is not for man that God should speak with him, but by vision, or from behind a veil, or He sendeth a messenger to reveal what He will.” (Qur'an 42:12; 49-51).

The Swami states: “God must be possessed of an inexhaustible stock of keys considering that he must unlock each and all places. Again it argues childishness on His part to bless with plenty and super-abundance whomsoever He pleases regardless of his merits, or to take away the same from any without weighing his demerits.Mark the extraordinary cleverness of the author of the Qoran! It is expressly designed to captivate and entrap the females also. If the Mohammadan God can create whatever He pleases, can He then create another God? If He cannot, are we to understand that His Omnipotence here has come to a dead halt? And if it is God that grants offspring unto men, who is it that grants the same unto fowls, fishes, pigs, etc., that have a more numerous progeny? And why cannot He grant offspring (to mortals) unless men and women cohabit? Why does He condemn some women to a life of sterility and thereby afflict them? (*This could also be asked of the Vedic God*).Should you argue that God is All-knowing and All-pervading (as He really is), this assertion about Him talking from behind a curtain and obtaining news as if it were by post would be utterly meaningless. If He stands in need of such agencies, He could not be God. He must be rather some shrewd piece of humanity. Hence the Qoran can never be of Divine origin.” (LOT, pp. 708-709).

Allāh, God, does not “take away” from any: He only withholds (from giving more). A king can give to whomsoever he likes, regardless of their needs, without him being guilty of any partiality, seeing that the treasure is his to do with as he pleases. Allāh, God, having the “the keys of the heavens and of the Earth,” means that Allah has knowledge and control of all things.

Allāh, God, creating what He pleases—(Qur'an 42:49-50) is self explanatory: (as the verses say) He gives daughters or sons to whom He will, or He gives both daughters and sons to some and leaving some barren. Muhammad Ali explained: “The birth of a daughter was looked upon by the Arabs as a calamity (see Qur'an 16:58, 59), this being due to the low position which women (is) held in society. The wonderful change brought about by Islam in the status of women is clearly fore-shadowed in this early revelation, where the daughter has precedence over the son.” It is a mystery that the Qur'an “is expressly designed to captivate and entrap females also.”

If God was to give women children without the need to “cohabit,” there would be no family unit; there would be no need for God to put love and compassion and desire between man woman (*the lacking of which may result in indifference between them*); mothers would have to care for and maintain children on her own (*which may be a severe hardship, especially during her pre and post-natal periods*).

(Whether God can “create another God” has been dealt with above).

Allah God “talking from behind a curtain and obtaining news as if it were by post;” the Hindu God not only has enemies (*as noted in item # 21*), He has His own His spies:

“Varuna,His spies are seated round about.

The God whom enemies threaten not....”.

(I. XXV. 13-14. Vol. 1, p. 35).

Since the Hindu God “stands in need of such agencies (spies), He could not be God, He must be rather some shrewd piece of humanity,” as the Swami says, hence the Veda “can never be of Divine origin.”

138. “And when Jesus came with manifest proofs.” (Qur'an 43:63).

The Swami: “If Jesus too was sent by God, why did He then send down the Qoran whose teaching is opposed to that of Christ? Again, since the Biblical teaching is opposed to that of the Qoran, neither of these is a Divine revelation.” (LOT, p. 709).

(Allah God's reason for sending prophets to all nations has already been dealt with). The Biblical teachings, as revealed to Moses and Jesus, are not opposed to the Qur'anic teaching. Moses did not teach that the Jews were God's chosen people "to the exclusion of other people;" and Jesus did not teach Trinity, Divine sonship (as begetting—fatherhood—requires the joining of sperm and ovum), inherited sin, and vicarious atonement. (*This has already been dealt with*).

In his writing the Swami says that the Bhagavad Gita is "opposed to the *Veda*"—(LOT, p. 219). If the Biblical teaching "being opposed" to that of the Qur'an disqualifies them as being Divine revelation, then by the Swami's own reasoning, the Gita being "opposed" to the *Veda*, "neither of these (*the Veda and Gita*) is a Divine revelation."

140. "A **picture** of the paradise which is promised to the God-fearing! Therein are rivers of water, which corrupt not, rivers of milk whose taste changeth not: and rivers of wine, delicious to those who quaff it."—(Qur'an 47:15).

The Swami comments: "Can (the Mohammedan) paradise, in which rivers of pure water, milk and clarified honey flow, be any better than this mortal world. Rivers of milk, whose taste changeth not, cannot exist, because it turns sour in a short time. The enlightened people do not believe in the Mohammadan faith since it inculcates such incredible and inhuman teachings." (LOT, p. 710).

The Swami, as usual, has given this verse a literal interpretation. Whereas from the very beginning the verse tells us, as I have emphasized, that this is a "picture" (a parable) of Paradise. As stated, the rewards of Paradise are presented in figurative expressions.

However, clearly, if God can churn the ocean and bring nectar out of it and separates it from poison and bring forth a horse and elephant from the nectar as the *Bhagavad-Gita* says—(10:27 and explained by Swami Prabhupada), then, for sure, God can keep the rivers of milk of Paradise from turning "sour."

143. The Swami Quotes Qur'an 66:1, 5: "Why O Prophet dost thou hold that to be forbidden, which God hath made lawful to thee, from a desire to please thy wives, since God is lenient, and merciful. Verily God is His protector. Happily if he put you both away, his Lord in exchange will give him wives better than you, Muslims, believers, devoutly penitent, observant of fasting, both known of men and virgins."

And he comments: "If we reflect a little on the above, we shall see that God is but a servant of Mohammad to manage his affairs—internal as well as external! (***And don't all devotees of God pray to Him to manage their affairs—internal as well as external?***)

Don't Hindus pray to the God of the *Veda* (as noted in item # 76) to manage their affairs—"internal as well as external"—to show them "where thousand spoils are gained," to "win spoil of cattle" to "Drive thou away our enemies," to "make riches easy to be won," to "Send riches hither with thy stream in thousands, both of steeds and kine, Send spoil of war and high renown"?

Aren't Hindus praying to the God of the *Veda* to "free us from all pain and grief, and always guide us to the path of rectitude which leads to true happiness" and to not "destroy our young ones, nor our old ones, foetuses, mothers, and fathers, nor those who are dear to us, nor our relations, nor our bodies": aren't they praying to God for Him to manage their affairs—"internal as well as external"? (LOT, pp. 2, 213).

And didn't the Swami himself prayed to God to manage the affairs of his sect: "May God through his mercy rid us, *Aryas*, of this dreadful disease;" and lamented that if Hindus had worshipped God instead of stones "they would have put the barbarians, to rout and gained a victory over them"?—(LOT, pp. 321, 391).

Why did the Hindu God gave instructions to man if not to "manage his affairs"?

The Swami notes two stories connected with 65:1 about why the Prophet Mohammad had forbidden himself:- his abstinence from honey and; "The second story is that one night Mohammad was to go to a particular wife of his. She was not there—in fact she was gone to her father's house; Mohammad, therefore, *sanctified* a female slave of his! When the wife referred to hear of this, she became angry with the Prophet and made him swear that he would never do such a thing again." Which incident led to the revelation of the verse under discussion (65:1).

And the Swami comments: “Let the wise declare if ever God acts as an arbitrator in the household affairs of any man. **(Didn’t God, Krishna, act as an arbitrator between the Pandavas and the Duryodhanas in the Bhagavad-Gita?)** And as regards Mohammad’s character, sufficient light is thrown on it by the afore-mentioned stories, for how can a man, who is the husband of many wives, be either a pious man or a prophet? **(How many wives did Krishna have; he even dallied with Radha, the wife of another, and he is revered as God. And Hinduism allows not only polygamy and polyandry but also Niyoga—contract marriages—in which a childless widow/widower can have temporary marriages with up to twelve spouses, one after the other, for raising children; and in a marriage where the husband is sterile or the wife suffers from a chronic disease; and also “If a man be not able to control his passions while his wife and she is pregnant, he may contract Niyoga with (a widow) and beget offspring on her.” LOT pp. 133-138, 140. For more on Niyoga see HINDUISM).** Again, is he not partial, and therefore, sinful who, actuated by partiality, disgraces one wife and honours another. **(Mohammad never disgraced any of his wives).** And how can he, who, not being content with many wives, co-habits with his slaves, be moral, God-fearing and pious?” (LOT, pp. 712-713).

This alleged “female slave” that the Swami claims Mohammad “sanctified” was Mary, the Coptic, a maid given to the Prophet by the Leader of Egypt. And how did Mohammad “sanctify” Mary?

Allāh expressly forbids fornication and adultery. **Mary was a wife of the Prophet, not a concubine or a “sanctified” slave.** In Islam any and all carnal relations outside of marriage is forbidden.

The verses of the Qur’an which relates to this alleged “sexual scandal” are 66:1-5:

“O Prophet, why dost thou forbid (thyself) that which Allah has made lawful for thee? Seekest thou to please thy wives?” (1)

“Allah indeed has sanctioned for you the expiation of your oaths” (2)

“And when the Prophet confided an information to one of his wives –but when she informed (others) of it, and Allah informed him of it, he made known part of it and passed over part.” (3)

“If you both (‘Aisha and Hafsa) turn to Allah... and if you back up one another against him, then surely Allah is his Patron” (4)

“Maybe, his Lord, if he divorce you will give him in your place wives better than you, submissive, faithful, obedient, penitent, adorers, fasters, widows, and virgins” (5)

Mary was a wife of Mohammad. It is hardly credible that Mohammad would have intimate relations with Mary out of wedlock—which would be adultery. Islam (as well as the Torah) forbids this and the penalty for this is a hundred lashes, (and Mary, a Christian, would have been subjected to stoning to death). As Muhammad Ali says, “It is a fact that the Prophet never kept a slave”—(Comm. 2517).

If Mary was Mohammad’s “sanctified” wife why then should Hafsa make such a stink if Mohammad was with Mary when Hafsa was not home (*even if it was Hafsa’s turn to be with him*)? How could this relation be of such bitterness to Hafsa for her to tell ‘Aisha, and for Mohammad to be “ostracized” for it? How could ‘Aisha “expose” Mohammad if he was with his “sanctified” wife? Further, Mary, as a wife of the Prophet, is ranked equally with the other wives of the Prophet. Why then should the Prophet’s intimate relations with her be viewed with an evil eye?

66:3 above speaks of “an information” the Prophet had given to one of his wives. Hafsa surprising Mohammad in bed with Mary could not be “an information” the Prophet gave to one of his wives. 66:4 speaks of the wives ‘backing up one another;’ Hafsa surprising Mohammad and Mary could not be something that the wives were ‘backing up one another’ in. How could ‘Aisha back up Hafsa in a matter when she (‘Aisha) was not present at the time of the Prophet and Mary were in bed? ‘Aisha would have been found to be a liar. What is it then that the wives were ‘backing up one another’ in against the Prophet?

The verses quoted above (66:1-5) has nothing to do with Mary the Coptic. Verses one and three are dealing with two separate matters as careful reading of these verses and as the reports of the Tradition show. Verse one recounts the Prophet’s taking oath to keep away from his wives

on account of their demands for material wants, which is in reference to Qur'an 33:28 which says: "O Prophet say to thy wives, if you desire this world's life and its adornments..." This verse clearly is in answer to the demands of the wives of the Prophet for worldly glamour. And "The Holy Prophet," as Malik Ghulam Farid points out "had severely taken to heart his wives' demand for amenities of life, and in order to show his extreme displeasure had sworn to keep away from them for one month"—(comm. 3072).

Regarding the revelation of this verse (66:1) in which the Prophet took an oath to separate from his wives, Bokhari notes a long narration in which 'Umar says that 'Aisha and Hafsa were the ones who backed up one another against the Prophet. And that his wife told him that his daughter, Hafsa, argues with the Prophet till he becomes displeased. Whereupon 'Umar went to Hafsa who admitted, "we argue with him." To which her father advised her "Don't be betrayed by the one who is proud of her beauty because of the love of Allah's Apostle (peace be on him) for her (i.e. 'Aisha)." Soon afterwards the Prophet separated himself temporarily from all his wives. (Bokhari, Vol. 6, # 435).

Verse 3 (of ch. 66) which says, "And when the Prophet confided an information to one of his wives—but when she informed (others) of it, and Allah informed him of it, he made known part of it and passed over part," recounts the intrigue of 'Aisha and Hafsa to tell the Prophet, who used to drink honey at the house of Zainab, his wife, that he smelled of *maghafir*, "a kind of bad-smelling resin." To which the Prophet promised "I shall never take it (honey) again. I have taken an oath as to that, and you should not tell anybody about it"—(Bokhari Vol. 6, # 434). (It is to be noted, whereas this plot to tell the Prophet that he smelled of *maghafir* was hatched by 'Aisha and Hafsa, the Prophet confided **only to** 'Aisha about this "oath" not to take honey anymore, the words "you should not tell **anybody** about it" confirms this. However, it is obvious that 'Aisha passed on this information of the success of their scheme to Hafsa. And this is what is referred to in verse 3 (of ch. 66) which says: "And when the Prophet confided an information to one of his wives—but when she informed [others] of it").

In summary, 66:1 and 66:3 recounts, respectively, the Prophet taking oath to separate himself from his wives on account of their demand for worldly comforts, and the intrigue of 'Aisha and Hafsa in the *maghafir* affair. Being wives of the Prophet these women were to live simple and modest lives so as to serve as a model for the community. Verses 4 and 5 offer them the high road of repentance, or replacement. As Muhammad Ali says:

"The story therefore that Hafsah's discovery of the Prophet having conjugal relations with her (Mary) upset the Prophet to such a degree that he swore not to have anything more to do with her is a pure invention, and the known facts not only nullify the calumny, but brand it as another of those fables invented by Christian writers who seek to vilify Islam"—(Qur'anic comm. 2517).

It is doubtful that a man who was himself publicly sunk in sexual degradation could lead others to sexual purity. It is not presumptuous to say that the three most notable passions of men are power, wealth, and glamorous women; (*and in the case of women, comfort and pleasure*). The wives of the Prophet are here told—(66:4) that if they consider themselves as women of sophistication and above a life of simplicity and strictures, which as wives of the Prophet they are to observe, then Allah will replace them with wives who are devout from both categories of women—matrons and virgins. As the Qur'an is a guidance for Muslims to be modest and moderate, Allah has related this verse to be a red flag to Muslims of all times, who may be tempted to put desire before duty.

(Regarding the Qur'an 33:50-51, where the Prophet is allowed multiple wives, 'Aisha, as already noted, may have remarked to the Prophet that "your Lord hastens in fulfilling your wishes and desires" (which some may want to interpret to mean that 'Aisha was doubtful of the Prophet's truthfulness, when in fact it could merely have been an observation on her part)—(Bokhari Vol. 6, # 311). But 'Aisha also eloquently said about the Prophet that "Whoever tell you that he concealed (some of Allah's orders), is a liar"—(Bokhari Vol. 6, # 378). Notably, Allah 'hastened' to the aid of 'Aisha also, when she was slandered—Qur'an 24:11-20; Bokhari Vol. 6 # 274).

145. “And the heavens shall be rent asunder, for on that day it will be fragile”. “And the angels shall be on its sides, and over them on that day eight shall bear up the throne of thy Lord.” “And he who shall bear his book given to him in his right hand shall say to friends, Take ye it, read ye my book.” But he who shall have his book given to him in his left hand will say, “O, that the book had never been given!”—(Qur’an 69:16, 17, 19, 25).

“Can the heaven ever be divided?” the Swami questions. “If you call the sky above *heaven*, it is against the dictum of science. There is no doubt now as to the God of the Qoran being corporeal, since none who has not a body can sit on a throne and order it to be borne by eight men on their shoulders.To place books (of their deeds) in the right hand of the virtuous and have it read out and then send them to heaven, while to place books (of their deeds) in the left hand of the wicked and send them to hell, and to dispense justice with the help of books are very strange doings for an Omniscient God! Can an All-knowing Being ever act like this? It is mere childish prattle!” states the Swami. (LOT p. 714).

The heavens and earth are not everlasting. People given books in right/left hand does not mean that Allāh, God, is not Omniscient. Allāh, God, is Omniscient. Man is not. Man needs record as evidence of his past (actions).

About eight bearing the throne of Allāh, God: This is an allegorical expression.

Muhammad Ali has noted that the word “*eight* is not followed by any word showing who or what these eight are;” “the one thing that should be borne in mind in interpreting such allegorical words is that the Divine Being Himself is *al-Qayyum*, or the *Self-Subsisting by Whom all things subsist* (2:255). This being taken as the basis, it is clear that other things are not a support for the Divine Being, but all created things, whether angels or any beings above angels, subsist by God.....Now there are four attributes of the Divine Being which are specially connected with the maintenance of the world. The opening chapter of the Holy Qur’an is, as shown in the preliminary note to that chapter, the essence of the whole of the Qur’an, and that chapter speaks of four attributes of the Divine Being in connection with the maintenance of *al-‘alamin*, i.e., *the whole of the creation*. These attributes are mentioned in the names *Rabb*, *Rahman*, *Raheem*, and *Malik*, and a reference to the notes on these four words in the opening chapter will show that these four attributes, *providence*, *beneficence*, *mercy* and *requital*, are really the chief attributes which bring the creation to perfection and from which all other attributes may be inferred. These four are thus the Personal attributes of the Divine Being which precede all, encompass all, make all to attain to their goal of perfection and remain after all. Hence these are the four *hamalat al-‘arsh*, or *the bearers of the Throne of Power*, so far as this world is concerned.

Why are they eight on the day of Resurrection? The other world is a complete, but at the same time a new, manifestation of the spiritual realities of this life. Hence, there is a new manifestation of the four attributes of the Divine Being by which the world subsists, and thus these four attributes become eight on the day of Resurrection. To clear up any misunderstanding I may add that, as Divine attributes are brought into action through the agency of angels, the four or eight attributes that are considered the bearers of the Throne of Power would also be manifested through angels, and in this sense we may look upon the bearers of the *‘Arsh* as being four or eight angels.”—(Qur’anic comm. 2555).

147. “For He it is who formed you by successive steps. See ye not how God has created the seven heavens one over the other. And He has placed therein the moon as a light, and has placed there the sun as a torch.”—(Qur’an 71:14-16).

To which the Swami argues: “If God created the soul, it can never be eternal or immortal. How can it then live for ever in paradise when what is created must perish? How can God place one heaven over another, since it is formless and all-pervading. If you give the name heaven to some thing other than *Akash* (ether), it would serve no useful purpose. If heavens are placed one over the other, the sun and the moon cannot be placed between them. If they are placed in their middle, then only those that are immediately above and below will be in light; all others, beginning from the second heaven will be in darkness. But such is not the case, hence all this is wrong.” (LOT, p. 715).

Whereas the life span of ordinary humans is about seventy years, the perfect *Brahmachari's* life span is "400 years," as the Swami says. Allah God being the Creator and Vanquisher of the soul, He can give it existence for as long as He pleases.

The heavens and earth are not shielded from the other, like rooms in a building where walls may interfere with light reaching the other. The light of the sun is not blocked by one orb to the other. The sun is ninety-three million miles from the earth. The light of the sun, because of open space, is projected onto the moon as well. However: Whereas Allāh, God, says in Qur'an 71:15 that He "created the seven heavens one over the other", in Qur'an 65:12 He tells us that He "created seven heavens, and of the earth the like thereof" (*meaning seven earths as well*). Muhammad Ali has commented:

"The statement made here that there are "seven heavens and of the earth the like thereof" throws light upon what is meant by heavens where the number seven is mentioned. The seven heavens are elsewhere called the *seven ways* (Qur'an 23:17) and the seven earths may therefore be the seven major planets of the solar system, the earth itself being the eighth, their orbits being spoken of as the seven heavens or seven ways. It should, however, be borne in mind that the heavens are often referred to without a limitation of number, and include the whole of the starry creation. Another point worth noting is that the mention of seven heavens does not preclude the existence of more. For the application of the word *seven* and for further discussion, see note # 46"–(Qur'anic comm. 2516). (Part of note # 46 says, al-Raghib "makes the meaning very clear when he says: "Every *sama*, i.e. *heaven*, is a heaven in relation to what is beneath it and an earth in relation to what is above it.""). (Muhammad Ali's translation of the Qur'an with text, commentary and notes, as well as other books, can be viewed online: www.muslim.org).

149. "And the sun and the moon shall be together." (Qur'an 75:8).

The Swami questions: "Can the sun and the moon ever join together? Mark! What senseless talk is this! What purpose is served by joining the sun and the moon, and why should not all the worlds be joined together? Can these impossible statements have ever proceeded from God? Surely they cannot be the inventions of any but the unenlightened." (LOT, p. 716).

This verse is a prophecy about the Doomsday. Bashir-Ud-Din Mahmood states:

"The phenomena of Moon joining the Sun was predicted by the Holy Qur'an in its verses 75(8-9), many centuries earlier than the scientific speculations of to-day," he wrote, "*tidal forces keep the moon drifting away from the Earth. Its orbit is now becoming wider at the rate of about 3 cm a year. Eventually the Earth will not be able to hold the Moon, and then it will fall in the Sun.*"

"Thus science considers the Doomsday of the Earth as an accepted reality, though there are questions about the ways in which it will take place." And, "As scientific knowledge builds up with rapid advancement in various fields, the extent of the wealth of knowledge contained in the Qur'an is dawning upon us." (*Doomsday and Life after Death*, pp. 133, 134, 113; 19).

152. "When the sun shall be folded up. And when the stars shall fall. And when the mountains shall be set in motion. And when the Heaven shall be stripped away."–(Qur'an 81:1-3, 11).

"It is extremely foolish to say that the sun, which is a sphere, will be folded up. Now how will the stars fall, and how will the mountains, which are lifeless, be set in motion? Again, is the sky a beast that it will be stripped away? Only the most ignorant people such as savages can talk like this," states the Swami. (LOT, p. 717).

These are prophetic statements about the Doomsday. The folding up of the sun refers to the sun burning it self out—ending up as a "black dwarf star." *The stars falling/become dust-colored/ shall disperse*: as the sun collapses, the stars "will go out one by one." *The mountains passing away and heaven being stripped*: in its final "phase" of burning itself out, "the sun's central temperature will have risen steadily towards a billion degrees," wrote Paul Davies. Thus under this tremendous heat of "a billion degrees" the heavens will likely appear as liquid metal—molten copper or red hide, as the Qur'an says. As the sun burns itself out, it "will appear to fill half the sky. At that time, the oceans will boil and any life left here will perish," wrote James Trefil. And, as the sun burns itself out it "may have become so distended that the inner planets will have been engulfed, the Earth's atmosphere stripped away and the solid rocks melted or even vaporized," wrote Paul Davies. See the following:

Events of the Doomsday in the Qur'an:

1. **Sun will fold up:** (Qur'an 81:1). As the sun burns itself out it "will swell up, turning into the sort of star that astronomers call a red giant"; and will end up as a "black dwarf star." (Paul Davies, *God and the New Physics*, pp. 200, 201).

2. **Stars will fall, become dust-colored (lose light):** (Qur'an 81:2). As the sun collapses "The stars in the sky will go out one by one." "Almost all the stars we now see would either be so dim as to be invisible or appear as faint points in a sea of blackness." (James Trefil, *The Dark Side of the Universe*, p. 190).

3. **The heaven will look like molten copper; red hide:** (Qur'an 70:6-8; 55:37, respectively). In its final "phase" of burning itself out, "the sun's central temperature will have risen steadily to-wards a billion degrees." (Paul Davies, *God and the New Physics*, p. 201). **Thus under this tremendous heat of "a billion degrees" the heavens will likely appear as liquid metal –molten copper or red hide, as the Qur'an says.**

4. **Ocean will boil:** (Qur'an 81:6; 82:3) As the sun burns itself out, it "will appear to fill half the sky. At that time, the oceans will boil and any life left here will perish," wrote James Trefil in his book *The Dark Side of the Universe*, (p. 190).

And, as the sun burns itself out it "may have become so distended that the inner planets will have been engulfed, the Earth's atmosphere stripped away and the solid rocks melted or even vaporized," wrote Paul Davies. (*God and the New Physics*, p. 200).

5. **Sun and Moon will join together:** (Qur'an 75:8-9). "The phenomena of Moon joining the Sun was predicted by the Holy Qur'an in its verses 75(8-9), many centuries earlier than the scientific speculations of today," wrote Bashir-Ud-Din Mahmood, *"tidal forces keep the moon drifting away from the Earth. Its orbit is now becoming wider at the rate of about 3 cm a year. Eventually the Earth will not be able to hold the Moon, and then it will fall in the Sun."*

"Thus science considers the Doomsday of the Earth as an accepted reality, though there are questions about the ways in which it will take place." And, "As scientific knowledge builds up with rapid advancement in various fields, the extent of the wealth of knowledge contained in the Qur'an is dawning upon us." (*Doomsday and Life after Death*, pp. 133, 134, 113; 19).

159. "Verily, we have caused it to descend on the night of power. And who shall teach thee what the night of power is? Therein descend the angels and the **spirit** by permission of their Lord for every matter."—(Qur'an 97:1-2, 4).

The Swami questions, "If the whole of the Qoran was revealed in one night, how can the assertion that a particular verse was revealed at a particular time be true?We have already said that there is no *up* and *down* in space, but it is said that the angels and the Holy Ghost, at the command of God, come here to manage the affairs of this world....So far the Qoran has talked about God, the angels and the prophet, now we have got the mention of a fourth being, named, the Holy Ghost. One does not know what is meant by the Holy Ghost. The fourth is an addition to the three personages believed in by the Christians, namely, God, the Son and the Holy Ghost." (LOT, p. 719).

Whereas there is no up and down in space. From an earthly perspective, just as there is a rising and setting of the sun, there is up and down as a standard of reference. As God is regarded as the Highest, He is revered as being above us or up. And when a devotee make supplication he either looks skyward (up) or bows his head (down), in acknowledgment to his lowly status in relation to God's.

It is doubtful that one who has read the Qur'an would entertain that the whole of it was revealed in one night. The revelation of the Qur'an began in the month of Ramadan, and continued for about twenty-three years. The "month of Ramadan is particularly spoken of as being the month in which the Holy Qur'an was revealed," explains Muhammad Ali. He also says, "the word "Qur'an" is applicable as well to a portion as to the whole" of the Book. (Qur'anic comm. 227; 2777).

There is no mention of a "Holy Ghost" in the above Qur'anic verse: the mention is "Spirit"—the angels and the *spirit*, as emphasized. This "Spirit" is the Angel Gabriel, who is mentioned separately from angels—(Qur'an 2:98); and who is also referred to as *Holy Spirit*—(16:102); and also as *Faithful Spirit*—(Qur'an 26:193). There is no "Holy Ghost" in Islam.

As noted at the beginning of this topic, the Swami has used verses of the Qur'an out of context, without, seemingly, any knowledge as to background to which verses were revealed, and has given a literal interpretation to these verses whereas verses of the Qur'an are of both literal and allegorical meanings. The above material is sufficient, not only to refute the Swami's claim against the Qur'an, but to dispel the claim that the Vedic religion is the religion for "enlightened" mankind.

The materials in the Qur'an—Prophecies and Scientific ideas—are sufficient evidence to establish the Qur'an as the Word of Allah God; Islam as the only religion from God; and Mohammad as the Messenger of Allāh, God.

~

The Hindu heaven: What is the Hindu heaven like? Can the soul enjoy everlasting happiness? The Swami wrote: "when the powers of the soul, its instruments (such as body and bodily organs), and its means are all *finite*, how could the reward extend over an infinite period? *Secondly*, the soul does not possess infinite capacity, infinite means and infinite activity to enjoy *infinite* bliss, how could it then enjoy *Everlasting happiness*?" (LOT, p. 286). Yet the Swami states: "The soul was never created. It is beginningless like God" and that "God reside within the soul." (LOT, p. 221, 226).

As the soul is "beginningless like God," is "infinite" and as "God reside(s) within the soul," then the soul *does* have the "infinite capacity" to enjoy "*Everlasting happiness*"—it being beginningless and having God within.

But the Hindu souls do not have to go to heaven to meet God; seeing that God is "all-Pervading," is "present in the womb," "reside(s) within the soul" and have "entered the soul" as the Swami wrote.—(LOT, pp. 220, 226, 227).

(According to Hinduism one Divine day is 4, 320, 000,000 years; and the period of the Grand Dissolution of the universe, which is known as the "duration of Emancipation" of the soul, is said to be "3,11,040,000,000,000 years"—(LOT, pp. 141, 285, respectively). Swami Dayananda quotes the Mundak Upanishad, III, 2, 6, as saying that the soul, after enjoying its emancipation "is again born into this world"—(p. 285). And, as noted, the length of the soul's "duration of Emancipation" is "3,11,040, 000,000,000 years."

And what manner of bliss does this emancipated soul enjoy? The Swami wrote:

"The *emancipated* soul roams about in the Infinite All-pervading God as it desires, sees all nature through pure knowledge, meets other *emancipated* souls, *sees* all the laws of nature in operation, goes about in all the worlds visible and invisible, sees all objects that it comes across, the more its knowledge increases the happier it feels. Being altogether pure, the soul acquires perfect knowledge of all hidden things in the state of Emancipation. This extreme bliss alone is called Heaven (*swarga*)."(LOT p.301).

Imagine this soul —this "one ten thousandth part of the upper portion of the hair point in size," as Swami Prabhupada says— 'roaming' the vast galaxies for some 3.11 trillion years, and meeting other souls.

So, this eternal soul, being of the same "*essence*" as God, after spending perhaps one billion years (about quarter the Divine day) dwelling in and feeding on filth, and other lowly conditions —this soul now "roams about" freely in heaven for more than 3.11 trillion years, where it "acquires perfect knowledge of all hidden things" (only to forget it afterwards), and eventually returns to earth to spend another 4. 32 billion years, perhaps some as sub-humans, to again 'roam' in heaven for another 3.11 trillion years, receiving the same knowledge, and forgetting. Repeating this cycle again and again and... *Ad infinitum*. **Is this heaven?**

The Muslim Paradise consists of splendid Gardens with rivers flowing beneath, and of garments of silk, and beautiful luxuriant couches, and goblets of silver and gold, and its servers with big beautiful lustrous eyes and its youths like scattered pearls in fine green silk and thick brocade and bracelets of silver, and its fruits of all kinds, and fountains of abundance, and of drinks flavored with camphor and ginger, and absolute peace of mind—let me dwell for ever in this "infinite misery," as the Swami so starkly portrays it.

If man should live to be a million years it is doubtful that he would tire of a life of affluence and would deem it "infinite misery"; when in fact his rat race in this world is, without doubt, driven by his desire for a life of ease and luxury.

(A survey should be carried out to determine how many individuals would prefer the Hindu heaven –roaming the heavens for 3.11 trillion years, gathering knowledge, and forgetting it– and to return to earth, possibly as sub-humans, for some four billion years; and how many Hindus, affluent and destitute, would prefer a life in the Hindu heaven instead of life in the Muslim paradise, of splendorous Gardens, fine garments and fruits, and magnificent companions).

(As noted above, the Swami quotes the Mundak Upanishad, III, 2, 6, as saying that the soul, after enjoying its emancipation “is again born into this world.” ***But this teaching is not of the Vedas.*** If there was such a teaching in the Vedas it is reasonable that the Swami would have used it for his quote, rather than using the Mundak Upanishad. Also whereas the Mundak says that the soul, after its emancipation “is again born into this world,” it is said that “All other writers teach and all the world believes that the *Emancipation* is that condition from which ***no soul returns to this world*** and becomes subject to births and deaths.” (p. 285). However the Swami disagrees with this view, and gave arguments to support the Mundak Upanishad. But the Swami’s submission is irrelevant. If the Vedas were clear on this issue it is hardly likely that there would be an opposing view). (Italics/emphasis added).

The Swami says (LOT, pp. 408-409): “When the verse which forms the basis of the book is meaningless, why would not the whole book be the same?”

Likewise, as there are no clear expressions in the Veda(s) for the doctrines of *karma* and *reincarnation* and as there is controversy as to the emancipated soul returning to take birth again or not and disagreement between the soul taking births in every kingdom of life or only in its own kingdom, then according to the Swami’s reasoning, the whole Vedic religion is “meaningless.”

The Islamic Articles of Faith are clearly expressed in the Qur’an.

Swami Dayananda Saraswati, “the illustrious founder of the Arya Samaj”, as the Publisher describes him, says: “It does not become wise men to mislead people.”

“We lay this criticism on the teachings of the Qoran before all thinking people. Let them decide for themselves as to what sort of book it is. As for our opinion, we think that this book can neither be the work of God nor that of an enlightened person, nor does it contain knowledge. We have pointed out some of its many faults so that people may not be taken in and thereby waste their lives.”

“If all enlightened men were, like us, to point out, in an impartial spirit, various defects found in different religions, it is not at all impossible that all quarrels should cease, that people should live together in peace all following one religion, and that truth should thus triumph. The wise and the good, it is hoped, will understand the motives which actuated the writer of these lines and profit by what little has been said here about the Qoran. They are requested to correct any mistakes that might have crept into the book through error of judgment.” (LOT, pp. i, vii; 719-720, respectively).

In the preceding, mistakes by the Swami have not only been ‘corrected’, it is also shown that the basis of Hinduism/Vedism–*karma and reincarnation*–are not only “strange” and “very obscure” teachings but that there is a difference in belief that man is reincarnated into various kingdoms or only as one type of creature and that the methods of one freeing himself from this cycle of deaths and rebirths “differ from school to school.”

If *karma* and *reincarnation* were clearly expressed doctrines in the Veda(s), it would be expected that there should be no difference between the various schools of Hinduism, as to the type of creatures one is reincarnated into and as to the method(s) that frees the soul from the cycle of deaths and rebirths. They should be the same.

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).

If suffering is the result of *karma*, no attempt should be made to alleviate the miserable conditions of the sufferers and the poor. If their conditions can be improved, *karma* is meaningless –seeing that it can be subverted. 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.

In Islam man does not have to suffer the body for the “salvation of the soul.” He does not have to “free” himself from this world. This world is not bondage for man. Allāh, God, sent man with a pristine nature into this world with the capability of conquering all other creations.

Whereas Allāh, God, gives man guidance, man makes his own future. The moral map charted by Allāh, God, is no “compulsion” to man, but for man to shape himself to have mutual respect for what is his and what belongs to others; and to bestow good to others as he would have others bestow good unto him.

*

Summary: Hinduism where God is merciless—*askarma* is said to give to every action an equal and opposite reaction, and unerringly award us exactly what we deserve—; where there is division as to whether Krishna, Rama, and Hanuman are Gods or not, whether creatures are reincarnated into various kingdoms or as one type only, and whether God incarnates as humans or not; whose doctrine of *reincarnation* is “very obscure”; which follow books that are “mythological;” where the Gita is “opposed” to the Veda; whose Rig Veda is composed (at least in part) by “bard-priest;” where there is difference as to whether everything is created by God or not—that soul is “eternal” and the universe (matter) is “self-creating, self-dissolving, self-manifesting”—; whether the soul returns to earth or not after its Emancipation; that teaches a mix of Monotheism, monism, deism, dualism, and polytheism; where the God (Vishnu) grows in status—from being a “minor solar deity”—; where worship is made to Vishnu, Krishna, Shiva, and *grama-devatas*; where there are differences in the attainment of Moksa/Emancipation; where man’s destiny as influenced by the planets is either fact or “fraud;” where the ‘*misconducting*’ wife is fed to dogs and the adulterer is burned to death; where woman is of lower birth; and where adherents are ‘caste-sied’ according to birth—the religion of such conflicting doctrines and beliefs, and discrimination could not be the religion for “enlightened” mankind.

The Islamic Articles of Faith—Unity of God, Prayer, Charity, Fasting and Hajj— Resurrection, Judgment, Paradise and Hell are clearly expressed in the Qur’an.

Fourteen hundred years ago, Islam put an end to the God incarnate(s) and the medley of Gods; it impelled man to elevate himself above the irrationality of polytheism and the degradation and futility of idolatry and inspired chronic idolaters to entomb their artifacts of stone. **This** religion—Islam—**is** the only religion for “enlightened” mankind.

**Allah, Lord of the worlds,
glory be to Thee, Allah!**