

اللَّهُ نُورُ السَّمَوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضِ  
"GOD IS THE LIGHT OF THE HEAVENS  
AND THE EARTH"  
(The Holy Quran)

Phone: 3737

**Light**  
Lahore  
(WEST PAKISTAN)

GRAMS TABLIGH  
ORGAN OF  
THE LAHORE AHMADIYYA  
MOVEMENT

THE OLDEST MUSLIM ENGLISH WEEKLY OF INDO-PAK SUB-CONTINENT

Vol. XL No. 44  
Life-membership Rs. 50/-

November 24, 1961 C.E.—LAHORE—Jamadi-ul-Sani, 15, 1381 A.H.

Annual Subscription :  
Rs. 5/- or Sh. 10/- or \$2.00  
Single copy Paisa 13.

## ISLAM AND CHRISTIANITY

BY RUAK SNABRAH

### The Aim of Religion

The aim and object of religion is to know the true and living God who created the world, to attain that stage of perfection in God's love at which the love of others beside Him is completely consumed, to have full sympathy with God's creatures and to lead a life of true and perfect purity. The chief criterion of a true religion is that it should point out the means to a true knowledge concerning God, so that through knowledge men may be kept back from sins, and realizing the Divine beauty and love, they may so love God as to deem even a momentary estrangement from Him, through disobedience and sin, more painful than the severest agonies of this world. No one can be saved from sin and attain salvation except by a true and perfect knowledge of God.

### The Knowledge of God

Now knowledge of God is of two kinds and can be attained in two ways; (1) *Inferential knowledge* i.e., the knowledge of the existence and nature of the Creator from the study of His creation (i.e. the universe, including human beings). This knowledge is not perfect or free from doubts, for it is the result of man's own efforts and depends on man's observation and reasoning, which are by no means perfect instruments; (2) *Direct knowledge* or Revelation of God to man. This knowledge leaves no doubt with regard to the existence and nature of God, for when this knowledge comes to man he hears clearly the voice of God declaring within him, "I AM". This voice was heard by all the prophets and sages. It can be heard, says the Holy Quran, by every man. Even today God listens to the prayers of men and reveals Himself to those who

seek Him. Thus God says in the Holy Quran :

"Pray to Me and I will accept your prayer."  
"And if My servants question thee as to the proof of My existence as to how they should know that God exists, say to them that I am very near : I answer him who calls upon Me, and I hear his voice when he invokes Me, and I speak to him. They should, therefore, make themselves fit to receive My Word and have perfect faith in Me so that they may find My way."

"Those who try hard and exert themselves to their utmost to find Me, I surely guide them into My path."

The Quran further points out how we may find God. It says :

"Whoever wishes that he should see, in this world, God, the Lord of the worlds, should do the deeds of virtue which are free from every sort of corruption and in worshipping his creator he should not be guilty of any kind of polytheism."

According to Christianity, however, this direct knowledge of God, by which alone man can become Godfearing and Godly, and free himself from sin, is not possible for man. Christians are all one in the belief that after the time of Christ the fountains of Divine revelation and inspiration are closed to all. The blessing of Divine revelation has, according to them, been left behind and now remains closed to the day of judgment.

### Conceptions of God : Christian and Islamic

The result is that, deprived of Divine inspiration and guidance, Christians have gone wrong in their knowledge of God and means of salvation. They believe in a Godhead which is divided among three Divine Persons, God the Father, God the Son and God the Holy Ghost, whereas no prophet (not even those who are accepted as such by Christians, e.g., Abraham, Moses, Job, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Jonah, Zachariah) ever

talked of Trinity. Jesus himself believed in the unity of God and not in Trinity :

"The Lord our God is one Lord." (Mark 12,29)

Moreover, Christianity believes in the God of wrath who condemned all human beings to be born sinful for the transgression of one man, Adam, and who demanded the blood of an innocent man, Jesus to forgive the sins of men—and, ironically enough, this is declared by Christians to be a proof of the love of God!

The Holy Quran gives us true knowledge about God, which is confirmed by the experiences of sages and saints in all ages. It says :

"In the name of God, the All-loving, the Most Merciful.

Say : He, God, is one.

God is He on whom all depend.

He begets not, nor is He begotten ;

And none is like Him."

Regarding God's forgiveness of the sincerely repentant, the Holy Quran says :

"Say : O my people who have acted extravagantly against your own souls, do not despair of God's mercy ; surely God forgives sins altogether, surely He is the All-forgiving, the All-compassionate."

This shows that God does not need the blood of any one to forgive those who sincerely turn to Him and ask His forgiveness. Even His punishment of the reprobate sinner, when He does punish, is only to remove the effect of sin from him. Ultimately He will forgive all and admit them into heaven.

### The Plan of Salvation

The Christian plan of salvation is opposed to the established principles of the world ; it is contrary to human reason and to Divine justice and mercy. It is said that Jesus Christ bore the sins of the world and chose to die on the cross, that by his death others may be delivered, and

(Continued on page 5)

(All rights reserved including the method of transliteration)

## ENGLISH

## TRANSLATION OF THE HOLY QUR'-AN

By DR. KHADIM RAHMANI NURI OF ASSAM

Chapter IV AN-NI-SAA' (continued)

56. Surely, as to those who reject Our signs, We shall cause them to enter Fire. Every time their skins are thoroughly burned, We shall change them with other (fresh) skins, that they may (continually) taste the agony. Surely Allah is ever Mighty (in power to treat you in the Fire), Wise.
56. *in-nal la-zee-na ka-fa roo bi-aa-yaa-ti-naa saw-fa nus-lee-him naa-raa, kul-la-maa na-qi-jat ju-loo-du-hum bad-dal-naa-hum ju-loo-dan ghay-ra-haa li-ya-zoo-qul a'-zaab, in-nal laa-ha kaa-na a'-zee-zan ha-kee-maa.*
57. And as to those who believe and do good deeds, We shall soon (as a contrast with the Fire, 5 : 56) cause them to enter Gardens wherein flow rivers to abide therein for ever. For them there shall be, therein, pure companions (2 : 25) and We shall cause them to enter a dense (and ever deepening) shade (i. e. to enter in entire happiness, 13 : 35 ; Matt. 21 : 43, 44).
57. *wal la-zee-na aa-ma-noo waa 'a-mi-luṣṣaa-li-haa-ti sa-nud-khi-lu-hum jan-naa-tin taj-ree min tah-ti-hal an-haa-ru khaa-li-dee-na fee-haa a-badaa, la-hum fee-haa az-waa-jum mu-tah-ha-ratun wa nud-khi-lu-hum zil-lan qa-lee-laa.*
58. Surely, Allāh commands you to make over the trusts to those worthy of them and that when you (the entrusted judges) judge amongst men, you judge with equity (and justice). Surely, Allāh admonishes you with what is excellent. Indeed, Allāh is ever Hearing, Seeing (of your actions).
58. *in-nal laa-ha ya'-mu-ru-kum an tu-ad-dul a-maa-naa-ti i-laa ah-li-haa, wa i-zaa ha-kamtum bay-nan naa-si an tah-ku-moo bil a'dl, in-nal laa-ha ni-i'm-maa ya-a'-ṣu-kum bih, in-nal laa-ha kaa-na sa-mee-a'n ba-see-raa.*
- ان الذين كفروا بايتنا  
سوف نصليهم نارا ط كاهما  
نضجت جلودهم بدلناهم  
جلودا غيرها ليذوقوا  
العذاب ان الله كان عزيزا  
حكيمًا ﴿٥٦﴾
- والذين آمنوا وعملوا  
الصالحات سنمدخلهم جنت  
تجري من تحتها الأنهار  
خلد ين فيها أبداء لهم  
فيها أزواج مطهرة و  
سندخلهم ظللا ظلالا ﴿٥٧﴾
- ان الله يامركم ان تؤدوا  
الامانت الى اهليهاج  
واذا حكمتكم بين الناس  
ان تحكموا بالعدل ان  
الله نعيم يعظكم به ان  
الله كان سميعا بصيرا ﴿٥٨﴾

# The LIGHT

Friday

November 24, 1961.

## AFRICA SPEAKS—III

THAT the holy Imām of this age, Hadzrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, set aside and abrogated the Quranic doctrine of Jihad, is another arrant nonsense spoken against him. He was, on the other hand, a strong upholder of the great truth that not a jot nor a tittle could be obliterated or abrogated from the Holy Quran which was a Perfect Book, insusceptible of any change. He raised his voice against the wrong theory of abrogation according to which it was alleged that some verses of the Holy Quran had been abrogated by others, and uttered the grim warning that "whoever adds to or detracts even a jot from the Holy Quran, is of the devils who are wicked." Hadzrat Mirza Sahib wrote a pamphlet entitled *The Jihad*, a perusal of which will show clearly that it was not the doctrine of Jihad which he had rejected, but it was the orthodox interpretation of it which had given rise to grave misconceptions against Islam in the Western World that he set his face against and denounced. We reproduce a few lines from this pamphlet:

It should be remembered that the doctrine of Jihad as understood by the Muslim Ulama of our day who call themselves Maulvis, is not true. . . . These people are so persistent in their belief, which is entirely wrong and against the Quran and Hadith, that the man who does not believe in it and is against it, is called a Dajjal. (Page 5)

The false conception of Jihad that war should be waged for the enforcement of Islam upon the non-Muslims, was evidently against the basic principle laid down in the Holy Quran that *there is no compulsion in religion* (2:256). The baneful belief in an aggressive war against the non-Muslims did immense harm to the cause of the spread of Islam amongst them. Just turn over *Religion of Islam* by a Western critic, Mr. Klein, and read:

Jihad . . . The fighting against unbelievers with the object of either winning them over to Islam or sub-

duing and exterminating them in case they refuse to become Muslims.

Hadzrat Mirza Sahib removed this misconception, enunciating two important principles:

- (1) That *Jihad* means *exerting oneself to the extent of one's ability and power, whether it is by word or deed, and that the word is used in this broad sense in the Holy Quran.*
- (2) That, when it is used in the narrower sense of *fighting*, it means fighting only in self defence.

We quote another passage from his pamphlet (p.6):

Their contention that, since Jihad was permitted in the early days of Islam, there is no reason why it should be prohibited now, is entirely misconceived. It may be refuted in two ways: *Firstly*, that this inference is drawn from wrong premises, and our Holy Prophet never used the sword against any people, except those who first took up the sword against the Muslims. . . . *Secondly*, that even if we suppose for the sake of argument that there was such a Jihad in Islam as these Maulvis think, even so that order does not stand now, for it is written that, when the promised Messiah appears, there will be an end of Jihad with the sword and of religious wars.

The reference, evidently, is to the well-known *hadith*, recorded in Bukhari, which makes, in the following words, a mention of the Messiah's mission:

*fayaksir al salib wa yaqal al-khinzeer wa yadz al-harab,*

i.e. he will smash the Religion of the Cross, slay the swine (indecent and defilement) and put down religious wars, "chain the dogs of religious war."

Addressing the Muslims of the world, Hadzrat Mirza Sahib wrote in an Arabic letter:

There is not the least doubt that the conditions laid down for Jihad (in the Holy Quran) are not to be met with at the present time and in this country; so it is illegal for the Muslims to fight for the propagation of religion and to kill anyone who rejects the Sacred Law, for God has made clear the illegality of Jihad when there is peace and security (*Tohfa Golarwiya*, Supplement, p. 30).

Jihad with the sword is permissible only in self-defence, as expressly stated in the Holy Quran. *And fight in the way of God against those who fight against you, and be not aggressive, for God does not love the aggressors* (2:191).

Praise of the British Rule is another pet charge which Messieurs Deedat and Najaar

have laid at the door of Hadzrat Mirza Sahib, in the words of Mr. Deedat:

This movement, a fifth columnist, a tool of the British Government who were against the struggle for self-rule by the Muslims in the Indo-Pak sub-continent, is a direct challenge to the inner unity of Muslims, and they cannot be tolerated for long.

And Mr. Najaar would have the world believe:

But the most striking feature in this book is his praise of the British Government which he hailed as the best form of government one could find. . . . Mirza Ghulam Ahmad was actually instrumental in helping the British to gain the upperhand in India. He prevented the oppressed from rebelling against the Government.

The mission of Hadzrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, the Promised Messiah and Mehdi, it should be clearly understood, was *fayaksir al-salib*, to launch a peaceful, spiritual warfare against the Religion of the British Rulers, and not against their Government established by law, for the reason that the Religion of the Cross only had made an aggressive attack upon Islam, whereas their Government had given full freedom of religion and conscience, establishing peace and security in the land where, before the advent of the British Rule, there was Sikh lawlessness and anarchy to such a great extent that Islam and its culture had been pushed to the brink of extinction; and when the British Government replaced the Sikh misrule and oppression, the Muslims heaved a sigh of relief, and considered it a blessing. It was not Hadzrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad alone who spoke fair words in praise of the British Rule, but all writers and religious leaders of the time considered it their duty to give similar expression to their feelings of loyalty and thankfulness. Sir Syed Ahmad and Dr. Muhammad Iqbal; it may be a news for Messieurs Deedat and Najaar, wrote in the same strain. A few quotations from the writings of religious leaders will further illustrate our point:

(1) Wrote Maulvi Muhammad Jabbar, the famous religious leader of the Wahabi school of thought:

Before all I thank the Government under which we can publicly and with the beat of drum teach the religious doctrines of our pure faith without any interference whatsoever, and we can pay back our opponents, whether they are Christians or others,

in their own coin. Such religious liberty we cannot have even under the Sultan of Turkey.

(2) Wrote *Maulvi Muhammad Hussain of Batala*, the well-known leader of *Ahl-i-Hadith*, who was the bitterest opponent of Hadzrat Mirza Sahib: Considering the Divine Law and the present condition of the Muslims, we have said that this is not the time of the sword.

(3) Stated *Nawab Siddiq Hasan Khan*, a scholar of great fame and learning: A perusal of the historical books shows that the peace, security and liberty which all people have received under this rule, have never been obtained under any other rule. Whoever goes against it (i.e. loyalty and faithfulness to the British Rule), not only is a mischief-maker in the eyes of the rulers but he shall also be farthest from what Islam requires and from the way of the faithful, and he shall be regarded as a violator of the covenant, unfaithful to his religion and a perpetrator of the great sin, and what his condition will be on the day of Judgment, will become evident there.

The Religion of the British Rulers of India, it is perhaps not unknown to Messieurs Deedat and Najaar, was church Christianity. They paid Divine honour to Jesus the Christ, and worshipped him as their god; they reposed full faith in the doctrine of salvation through his blood, and his ascension to heaven with this physical body; and they also believed that Jesus would pay another visit to this earth. Hadzrat Mirza Sahib, living in the land of the British Rule, preached and proclaimed at the top of his voice that Jesus who was nothing more than a prophet, died a natural death upon this earth, and lay buried in his grave at Srinagar (Kashmir), and that the theory of his ascension to heaven with the earthly body was a mere myth. Hadzrat Mirza Sahib said to the Rulers of British Government that he was the Promised Messiah which was for to come; and that he had been raised in the power and spirit of Jesus, and bore close resemblance to him; and that the prime purpose of his mission was to annihilate the Religion of the Cross, and pull their god-Jesus down from his Divine pedestal.

The Anti-Christ, called *Dajjal* in the technique of Islam, had been held in horror and hate ever since the time of the prophets, for the great mischief and corruption that he would create on this earth. The *Dajjal* was

considered to be more deadly and delusive than the Devil himself; and the prophets, including the Prophet of Islam, had strongly warned their followers against the wickedness and iniquity which the *Dajjal* would devise to corrupt the world. Hadzrat Mirza Sahib declared with the beat of drum that from the religion's point of view, the British and other nations of Christian Europe, was the *Dajjal* spoken of in the Scriptures. Yet Messieurs Deedat and Najaar have the conscience to say unto the world that Hadzrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad was a "Quisling", and his followers, the "fifth columnists" of the British Rulers of India.

The severe mental work which Hadzrat Mirza Sahib did, night and day, strenuously for many years, at last told upon his health, and he fell a victim to what the doctors call *Neurasthania*. Its attack generally occurred when he had worked hard for some days at a stretch in the compilation of a book or preparing an important discourse. Dr. Basharat Ahmad of the blessed memory who attended upon Hadzrat Mirza Sahib in his illness, states on p. 1208 of his monumental work, *Mujaddid-e-Azam*, that the attack of the disease sometimes affected the upper part of his body causing dizziness and depression of the heart, and sometimes it produced its effect on the lower part of the body causing frequent discharge of urine and loosening of the bowels. In 1908, when he had been working hard continuously for four months, compiling a big book, *Chashma-e-Ma'rafat*, the attack overtook him on May 25. He was at Lahore at that time. This attack turned out to be fatal, and the Promised Messiah expired on May 26, 1908 C.E. corresponding to Rabi-us-Sani 24, 1326. The dead body was carried to Qadian to be laid to eternal rest. His age was somewhere between seventy and eighty years. This is the true story of the death of Hadzrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. But our conscientious critic Mr. Deedat would kiss the book and state: *The curse of Allah befell Mirza Ghulam Ahmad in the shape of his death by cholera.*

"The curse of Allah be on the liars."

In this connection we have yet another charge to deal with and discuss. Mr. Najaar writes on page 6 of his charge-sheet: *He (i.e. Hadzrat Mirza Sahib) also prophesied that he would live to the ripe age of 80. Unfortunately, he died at the age of 76. It should be remembered that there was no record to tell the exact date of his birth, and whenever he made a mention of his age in his writings, it was only approximatively. The date of his birth, as could be gathered from different reports, was probably 13th February, 1835, corresponding to 14th Shawwal, 1250; and the date of his demise was 26th May, 1908, corresponding to 24th Rabi-us-Sani 1326; so that according to the former computation, his age was about 74 years, and according to the latter, 76 years. The Revelation which Hadzrat Mirza Sahib had received with regard to the years of his age, said:*

ثمانين حولاً او قريباً من ذلك - او تزيد عليه شيئاً -

i.e. 'Thy age will be 80 years, or near about it, or a few years over it.' And what he understood from this Communication, he wrote on page 97 of his book, *Barahin-i-Ahmadiyya*, vol v, stating: *It appears from the words of this Revelation that the age will be between 74 and 86 years.*

Before concluding this article it may be stated for the information of Messieurs Deedat and Najaar that the press of this sub-continent, appreciating the most valuable services which Hadzrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad had rendered to the cause of Islam, and thereby to the wider cause of humanity, lamented his sad demise in woeful terms. We quote a few lines from *The Vakil of Amritsar* which was one of the leading papers of the country, edited by Maulvi Abdullah who commanded a wide reputation and respect for his knowledge and learning. He was not an Ahmadi. He devoted a whole leading article to announce the death of Hadzrat Mirza Sahib. He wrote:

He, Hadzrat Mirza Sahib, was, no doubt, a great man whose pen had the power of magic and whose speech, the charm of enchantment.

# ISLAM AND CHRISTIANITY

(Continued from page 1)

that Almighty God killed His own innocent son to forgive the sinners. It is difficult to understand how the unjustifiable death of one man can automatically purify the hearts of others from the impurity of sin, and how by the murder of one guiltless man others can be absolved of the sins and crimes which they have committed. This course is directly opposed to justice and mercy, for to punish the innocent in place of the offender, even if the former be willing, is against justice; while to demand the price of blood for the sins of men, and cause the son to be murdered cruelly for no fault of his, is contrary to Divine mercy. The whole affair is a meaningless transaction. It has been observed earlier that the true cause of the prevalence of sin is the absence of true Divine knowledge. If, therefore, the cause is not removed the effect cannot be annulled, for cause must bring about its effect.

The Holy Quran says that man can attain salvation by acquiring the true knowledge and love of God,—by striving to purify himself of all ungodly or sinful thoughts and desires and by doing his duty in the world. Instead of deceiving himself by imagining that the sacrifice of another man has purified him of sin, he must be ever ready to sacrifice himself—his ungodly passions and desires, and even his life, if need be—in the way of God. Thus will he become purified of sin and attain salvation.

**The Miracles of Jesus do not prove his Divinity**

As already stated, Christians believe that the doors of Divine revelation are for ever closed and miracles ended with Jesus and apostles. What is left then to judge the truth of the Christian religion except the authority of reason, but the deifying of a man (Jesus) has already set reason at naught.

If the old stories of miracles, as narrated in the Gospels, are adduced in support of Christianity, various objections may be put forth against this evidence by one who does not admit the truth of the Christian religion. In the first place, it is impossible to ascertain what amount of truth is contained in these narratives. For there seems to be no doubt that the evangelists were writing from hearsay and were great exaggerators. For instance, in one of the Gospels it is written that if all the things which Jesus did had been written in books, the world could not have contained those books. This is a most extravagant statement. How could the world prove insufficient for the record of deeds done by one man within the limited period of 3½ years of his ministry in a very small province? Secondly, the miracles stated to have been performed by Jesus were in no way superior to the miracles of other prophets. It is often claimed by Christians that the distinctive miracle of Jesus was the raising of a dead man to life. But while making this claim it is forgotten that, according to the Bible, the same miracle was performed by the prophets Elijah and Elisha long before Jesus. (Please see the Holy Bible, I Kings, XVII : 17-24, II Kings, IV : 32-36). If,

therefore, the performance of certain miracles can make a man God, many of the prophets shall be entitled to Divinity.

**Was Jesus the Son of God ?**

The alleged Divinity of Jesus is sometimes supported on the ground that Jesus called himself the Son of God or that he is so called in some books. This is an idea which deserves no serious consideration. In the Bible many are designated as the Son of God. In Exodus IV : 22, Israel has been called the first-born son of God. In Psalm II : 7, David is reported to have said : "The Lord hath said unto me, 'Thou art my son : this day have I begotten thee.'" Solomon was also given this title. Jesus, in fact, went to the extent of calling all good and kind hearted men, "Son of God." (Please see, The Holy Bible, Matthew's Gospel, 5 : 9, 5 : 44, 45, etc.). They all, therefore, belong to the same category and one of them cannot become a God to the exclusion of all others.

Even if the title 'son of God' had not been used for any one besides Jesus, it would have been absurd to interpret it literally and to draw from it an argument for the divinity of Jesus, for such metaphors abound in the Books of God. But when the title on whose basis divinity is claimed for Jesus is freely applied to others in the Bible, it ceases to have the slightest force as an argument for his divinity, and if it has, it at the same time proves the divinity of all those to whom it is applied.

According to the Holy Quran, Jesus was a messenger or prophet of God and one of the select band of men whom God purified with His own hands. The Holy Book of Islam rejects the belief in God's incarnation in a human body. How could Jesus be a God when he even disclaimed his own perfection and used to pray to God and ask His help in everything ?

(Please see the Holy Bible, Mark X : 18 XIV : 38-36)

**The teachings of the Quran and Gospels compared**

As to the teachings contained in the Gospels, I am of opinion that they are imperfect. A perfect code of ethics is that which is calculated to develop all the moral faculties of man and does not lay stress upon one side of human nature only. Such perfect teaching is contained only in the Holy Quran, for in every matter it adopts the middle path, which is the path of truth and wisdom. For instance, the Gospel says : "whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also." But the Holy Quran does not teach us unconditional forgiveness on all occasions. It directs us to see the occasion first, whether it requires forbearance or chastisement, forgiveness or punishment. It is evident that sometimes the latter is the proper course for a man to follow, and its observance is necessary for the social life of man. No society can live on the principles taught by the Gospel, nor can any Christian society be pointed out

which has ever acted on the turn-to-him-the-other-cheek-also text. The Quranic teaching is that we should not punish or forgive in obedience to our impulses, but must exercise our judgment and act in a manner calculated to further the welfare of the parties concerned and the society generally. So the Holy Quran says :

"And not alike are the good and the evil. Repel evil with what is best. When lo I be between whom and you was enmity would become as if he was warm friend."

Again the Gospel says that no one should look "on a woman to lust after her," but the Holy Quran tells that a man should not unnecessarily look upon strange woman whether with lust or without lust for this habit will after all make him stumble. On such occasions the Quran requires that a man's looks

(Continued on Page 6)

## Editorial

(Continued from Page 4)

He was an embodiment of intellectual excellences and curiosities. His eye was sedulous and seductive, and his voice raised to life and resurrected. His hands were the two batteries which produced electric power; and the wires of revolution were wrapped round his fingers. For thirty years he was a thundering storm that shook the world of religion, and a tempestuous noise that roused people from the sleep of life . . . . Notwithstanding the difference we had in respect of some of his claims and beliefs, the sad demise of Mirza Sahib has caused the educated and enlightened among the Muslims to feel that a great man of theirs has departed from them, and with him has also passed away the great defensive war which he had waged in vindication of Islam. His distinctive quality that he was a victorious general against the opponents of Islam, obliges us to make this confession openly so that the magnificent and mighty movement which had disrupted and despoiled our enemies for a long time, may be carried on and continued . . . . The literature which Mirza Sahib has produced to repel and repulse the Christian missionaries and the Arya Samajists, has been accepted and appreciated on all hands. We have to show, from the core of our heart, honour and respect to this literature which has accomplished its object so marvellously . . . . It needs no saying that Mirza Sahib had a wonderful capability of establishing the glory and greatness of Islam in contradistinction to other religions of world . . . . As for his moral character, not even the faintest stain can be seen on his garment. He has lived a pure and clean life, the life of virtue and godliness of a true saint.

Blessed are those who recognize and rally round the Imam of this age, Hadzrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, the Promised Messiah and Mehdi, and carry out his mission of propagating Islam among the nations of the world.

# AL-GHAZALI

## A PSYCHOLOGICAL STUDY OF THE MAN

BY J. Y. PARKINSON

(Continued from the previous issue)

He was hampered in his speech, his appetite failed and his digestion became sluggish, his stomach weak. He could neither swallow a morsel of bread nor drink a drop of water. The doctors gave him up, saying his disease was mental, and could only be treated mentally. In his weakness and feebleness the light came and he went out into the realm of the Sufis. As he says in his Confessions :

"Conscious of my weakness and the prostration of my soul, I took refuge in God as a man at the end of himself and without resources."

Henceforth in his writings his tone is that of a partisan, not that of a seeker. This attitude is due principally to pride in his own powers of intellect. A pride that engendered in him a certain contempt for others, especially those who differed from him. A pride no doubt that is found in many other geniuses ; it was strongly marked in Thomas Carlyle.

### Eagerness for certitude

He is said to have met Omar Al-Khayyam and to have detested him. This is little to be wondered at. The eternal "perhaps" of Omar would have no attraction for him : he was not seeking for "a perhaps" ; what he desired was certitude. He was well aware of his own weakness, and in his *Ihya'ul-'ulum* ("Revival of the Religious Sciences") he devotes a chapter to the dangers involved in a love of notoriety and the cure for it. It is doubtful if he ever completely succeeded in curing himself, although his final Sufistic beliefs and practices may have curbed the tendency. Cautious in his criticism, he always admits those truths of mathematics, logic, and physics that cannot intellectually be rejected.

His insight is deep, showing not only that his researches into the literature of his time must have been encyclopaediac, but that his experience of men in the mass must have been wide and his observational faculties keen. A myriad phrases in his writings go to show this. Speaking of the tendency of weak minds, he says :

"They judge the truth according to its professors, instead of judging its professors by the standard of the truth."

### Of the wise man he says :

"Once in possession of the truth he examines the basis of various doctrines which come before him, and when he has found them true he accepts them without troubling himself whether the person who teaches them is sincere or a deceiver."

He taught the people of the East to apply that principle to all thinkers. They neglected to apply it to him. Not but what his writings received criticism, especially after his death. His noblest

critic, Abu Walid Ibn Rushd, wrote a "Destruction of the Destruction" but its effect on Islam was practically nothing—it scarcely made a ripple on the surface. The reasons are obvious. Al-Ghazali's power was over the masses. He wrote for the people in a language the people understood. He brought philosophy and scholastic theology down to their level, and there was sincerity in his every spoken word and every written line. Ibn Rushd, on the other hand, wrote not for the multitude but for the few, and his writings often lacked sincerity. His opinions were definite enough, but it was plainly evident that his writings were sometimes a compromise. He often understated his own stand-point. Some problems he wrote round, instead of dealing with them directly. Not so with Al-Ghazali ; he was enthusiastic for the faith that was in him, for the truth he knew or as he realised it. He was a strong man in earnest, and his enthusiasm and his fire imbued his readers with feeling akin to his own. His very strength and personality carried them with him, so that they thought as he thought, and became filled with his every principle. The environment, of course, had a large say in the matter. Ibn Rushd could not at that period, in Spain and Morocco, afford to carry his arguments to the uttermost. Al-Ghazali could ; that made a difference. The position of two great Muslim thinkers was far apart, yet Al-Ghazali, although not carrying the process so far, was in the broad sense of the term rational, in so far as he substituted "private judgment" for mere "tradition and authority." That was the substantial difference between his early and his later positions. While in his youth he relied on what had been taught to him—namely, on the authority of others—in his later years he relied on his own experience. What his followers failed to see was that the private judgment of others when they differed from him might be equally as valid as his, and that reliance on private judgment gave an opening to any or all other modes of thought. Such a system was of immense advantage for thought, for mental emancipation and progress. Again, while the Western thinker had a bias for a natural explanation of phenomena—namely, a bias to find an explanation by means of the so-called natural law, the Eastern thinker had a distinct bias to seek a supernatural explanation, which may have been due to his early training and to his physical infirmities combined, both factors tending to give him a subjective outlook. The one looked at things "objectively," the other "subjectively."

Al-Ghazali speaking of man says :

"The highest faculty in him is reason, which fits him for the contemplation of God."

(Continued on page 8)

## ISLAM & CHRISTIANITY

(Continued from page 5)

should be cast down, for this is the only way in which a man can remain pure in heart.

The same defect of Gospel teaching is brought to light in its direction regarding divorce. The Gospel says that no one should "put away his wife, save for the cause of fornication." But the Holy Quran permits divorce on other equally urgent occasions, for instance when the husband and wife become the deadly enemies of each other, or when either is guilty of having gone through the preliminaries of fornication, though he or she may not have actually committed fornication, or when there is absolute incompatibility of temperament between the two and family life has become a farce. In all such cases divorce is permitted to both husband and wife, and the truth of the principle is practically admitted by the Christians themselves.

It has been said in the Gospels that you should not drink to excess, but the Holy Quran says that you should not drink wine at all, for if you do, you shall not find the way to God, nor will He speak to you, nor purge your hearts of impurities. It tells us that wine is the innovation of Satan and that therefore we must shun it. Wine clouds the intellect, weakens the moral sense, opens the flood gates of passion and lust and creates quarrels among people.

It has been said in the Gospels that you should love your enemies, but the Holy Quran says that you should have no enemies in obedience to your own desires, and that your sympathy should extend to all. Your enemies are only such as are the enemies of your God, your Prophet and the Word of God. Invite even these to the right path and pray for them. To the individual you should bear no enmity, but hate their evil deeds. Let all your efforts be to reclaim these men and to make them mend their ways. Thus it says :—

"Almighty God commands you to do justice, i.e. to do good for good, and further, to do good even to those who have done no good to you, and last of all to love and sympathise with your fellow-men as you love and sympathise with your own close relatives."

Christianity is an incomplete Islam—interpolated by St. Paul and others after the departure of Jesus Christ, the true prophet of God—and Islam is a completed and perfected Christianity.

N.B. In writing this article I have derived full benefit from the writings of Hadzrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad.

### Suggestions for reading :—

1. Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din : *The Religion of Jesus and Traditional Christianity.*
2. Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din : *Islam and Christianity.*
3. Mrs. Ulfat Samad and Mirza Masum Beg : *Islam and Christianity—A Comparative Study.*
4. Maulana Muhammad Ali : *Muhammad and Christ.*
5. Lord Headley : *The Affinity Between his original Church of Jesus-Christ and Islam.*

## ISLAM IN THE WEST



## SPECIAL POST-MARK FOR WOKING

On October 28th a post-mark with a difference was used in Woking. Instead of the normal town postmark with its wavy lines, a special pictorial postmark was used for some mail posted in Woking. This pictorial postmark depicts the Shah Jehan Mosque in Woking.

The issue of this postmark is in connection with the third annual convention of Surrey Philatelic Societies which take place in Woking on October 28th. All mail posted in a letter box installed in the Convention Hall received this special cancellation.



This is the cancellation mark which flared up the controversy. The Mosque is seen depicted at the centre.

It was the first time that Woking has been accorded the use of a special cancellor. Very few towns are allowed to have one as the Post Office only issues a limited number each year for conventions, exhibitions and similar gatherings."

News abridged from Woking News & Mail, October 20th, 1961.

## ENSUING CONTROVERSY

(Extracts from the Letters' Column of the Woking News & Mail dated 27-10-1961) Philatelists' Choice  
To the Editor

Dear Sir,—What an unfortunate choice to commemorate Surrey Philatelic Society's work on October 28th by stamping letters from Woking with a picture of the Mosque, which represents a faith that is an enemy of Christianity. Surely a picture of our newly consecrated Cathedral of the Holy Spirit would have been more appropriately a testimony of a living faith that has changed for the better so many human lives.—

Yours, etc,  
SURREY CHURCHMAN

Should be Proud  
To the Editor

Dear Sir,—It was the greatest honour and pride that I read in your paper last week that the G.P.O. has granted Woking

## ISSUE OF SPECIAL POST MARK: ENSUING CONTROVERSY: REVEREND FLOWERS' ACTIVITIES OF ISLAMIC PROPAGATION

a special postmark, bearing a copy of the Shah Jehan Mosque. I would remind any person whose opinion it is that a church would be more appropriate, that it was the Mosque that has made our town famous throughout the country.

Also, I can assure you, as a Muslim, that this fame is spread throughout the Islamic World. I should think, therefore, that any native of Woking would be proud to see this reproduction of the Mosque on the letters leaving our town.

—Yours sincerely,

LAWRENCE WORSFOLD

[News extract from Surrey Advertiser dated 18-10-1961]

## More criticism of convention postmark

The postmark to be used for the Surrey Philatelic Convention at Woking on Saturday, which was reproduced in the "Surrey Advertiser," has brought a critical letter to the organisers, the Woking Philatelic Society.

The letter, which is on the lines of editions of the paper and signed "Surrey Churchman," suggests that it was an unfortunate choice to use a picture of the Shah Jehan Mosque, "which represents a faith that is the enemy of Christianity."

It suggests that a picture of Guildford Cathedral would have been more appropriate.

"I see no reason to complain," comments the Rev. Eric Hague, Vicar of Christ Church, Woking.

Mr. J. Lea, one of the convention organisers, stated: "The Woking Society are the hosts, and this is our brain child. Religion did not enter our minds when we made the choice. We received permission from the authorities at the mosque before the Post Office approved the symbol. The protest is an isolated one."

Mr. Lea pointed out that the cathedral, being situated in Guildford, did not enter the committee's consideration.

Mr. Tom Leam, chairman of Woking Council, commented: "The mosque is nationally and internationally famous. I think the choice is a very good one. It is possibly Woking's most widely-known features and is seen by thousands of people travelling by rail.

Although we are proud of the cathedral at Guildford, this postmark should depict something that is essentially Woking."

### "ISLAM NOT ENEMY OF CHRISTIANITY"

#### Imam's Rejoinder

S: Muhammad Tufail, the Imam of the Mosque, Woking, speaking at a meeting of the Theocratic Union in Old Woking on Tuesday said: "It is not correct to think that Islam is an enemy of Christianity" as mentioned in the "Surrey Advertiser" of October 21st. The difference between

Muslims and Christians with regard to the person of Jesus Christ is not about the person of Jesus Christ, who is greatly respected, but about the interpretation of the term 'Ebad,' which means 'servant' or 'slave' and metaphorically 'child.'

"Passages in the Gospels which attribute humanity to Christ are taken literally by Muslims and those which apparently predicate divinity to him are interpreted allegorically. There are so many similarities between Islam and Christianity that we should emphasize the points of contact and try to raise ourselves above the influence of mediaeval propaganda when Muslims and Christians were considered enemies."

Surrey Advertiser dated 28-10-1961.

Reproduced below are the letters of Brother Farooq Flowers, the former Christian missionary addressed to Mr. S. M. Tufail, Imam Woking Mosque, which reflect on his enthusiasm for the preaching and propagation of Islam—Ed.

Dear Brother-in-Islam,

Greetings, and the blessings of Allah be upon you.

I am enclosing a clipping from the Newcastle "Evening Chronicle" dated 26th September 1961 which I had sent in for publication following an attack on me by an orthodox priest. He tried to belittle me, made a scathing attack on my article regarding Western Christianity and, snubbed the Islamic Faith. I have given him the answer as contained in the enclosed article, and have also invited him to come in the open and disprove my statement. As a firm believer in Islam I shall allow no orthodox Priest or their satellite to snub that great truth of Islam. For 13 years I was a soldier of her Majesty's Fores, as also a servant of God and Humanity. The banner of the Islamic Brotherhood must go forward to the glory of God and in honour of our great Prophet Muhammad (peace be on him), Sister and I are looking forward to your proposed visit, and also, coming to London to meet you all. Our love and blessing are ever with you all.

I close with our deepest affection, always remaining in the service of God and Humanity by and through the Islamic Brotherhood.

Yours affectionately,  
Brother Farooq Flowers.

Following are the contents of the Evening Chronicle's clipping:—

#### Vicar Refutes 'Farce' Attack

Christians who feel that the church has been pre-occupied with money in recent years might be advised to wait and see how the increased income was spent before passing judgment, says the Rev. C. W. Stromberg, Vicar of St. John's Church, Wallsend.

Mr. Stromberg comments in his parish magazine on a recent article in the Evening Chronicle by the Rev. R. J. Flowers, of Fenham, alleging that Western Christianity was a farce.

"If, as one hopes, we can really use our increased resources for the glory of God and the building up of His Kingdom through the gospel and works of mercy we shall have proved ourselves worthy stewards of material benefits," writes Mr. Stromberg.

The efforts of social workers and the increasing labours of local authority welfare workers showed that Mr. Flowers'

accusation of narrow-minded hypocrisy was a wild and untrue exaggeration. World Refugee Year gave the lie to the accusations that the Christian churches of the Western world ignored humanity.

Mr. Stromberg later pointed out that his comments were written before Mr. Flowers announced that he had renounced Christianity for the Moslem faith. "This subsequent announcement somewhat lessens the weight of his attack," he said.

[Through the Letters column of the same Paper, Brother Flowers refutes the above contention of Rev. C. W. Stromberg in the following terms:]

As the Rev. C. W. Stromberg, Vicar of St. John's Church, Walsend, is apparently hypnotised by the influence of orthodoxy, and therefore unable to face up to the truth. I would like to suggest, he writes to me, so that we may arrange a public debate on the issue, with the Press present.

I can assure him I shall prove my statement that Western Christianity is a farce and hypocrisy, and that my statement is neither wild nor exaggerated. Also that my public statement that I accept the Moslem faith in no way lessens my statement about Western Christianity.

I am proud to be a Moslem, and accept unreservedly the statement of truth and fact "there is but one God and one God only," and that Muhammad was and is the true accepted messenger of God.

I am neither too proud nor ashamed to state publicly that from this date I accept the name of Farooq Flowers as a true member of the Islamic Brotherhood. —FAROOQ FLOWERS (formerly the Rev. R. J. Flowers), 146, Wingrove Avenue, Fenham.

Dear Brother-in-Islam,

My acceptance of Islam has brought about an all-powerful and inspiring train of events so rapidly into my life that I am, as it were, emerging out of the mist. Letters, invitations, requests to visit various mosques, etc., are pouring in abundantly. When Dr. John was here he wanted Sister Flowers and myself to go to London to a special gathering some time in November. We should be most happy to do so, and it would help me a lot if some definite date can be arranged. The reason is that the Welfare Officer of the Glasgow mosque came through to Newcastle and called on me. He wants me to go to Glasgow sometime in November to meet a group of Muslims there and also the Indian High Commissioner. No date as yet has been fixed, and though I am willing to go anywhere in the service of God as a humble servant of Islam, I seek your help and guidance.

Yours Sincerely,  
Farooq Flowers.

My dear Brother-in-Islam,

It is with sincere heart-felt thanks I acknowledge not only your ever-welcome letter of 7th instant, but also enclosure and prayers said for sister's health. I am

a very firm believer in the indisputable power of prayer and faith in the healing of not only the soul but also the body, and have had much valuable experience of it. Again, on behalf of sister and myself sincere thanks for flowers, the essence of love and beauty.

Now with regard to an invitation from Islamic Society, London, coming for 18th of October, I shall be most happy to accept it, and be in London on that date. Should it be impossible for you or Mr. Khan to come through to Newcastle before I come to London? I shall be very pleased indeed to meet you then. As I have said before, as a humble servant of Allah, and as a member of the great Islamic Brotherhood, my services are available as an Islamic missionary. Regarding the Nigeria proposition, Sister and I fully consent, acknowledging the will and work of Allah as foremost in life. As for the proposed opening of a school, and in social and missionary work, Sister could be of invaluable service should you consider this matter. However, it rests with your directive office authorities. I do believe we can do much to boost the moral and spiritual interest of all people, in the Islamic cause. The great need of such a spiritual awakening is evident throughout the world, and the people like sheep, are wandering astray awaiting a strong unshakeable leader. *Christianity has failed miserably, and is on the point of bankruptcy.* Islam alone has the capacity to quench the thirst of the Souls, to-day.

Yours Sincerely,  
Farooq Flowers.

### AL-GHAZALI

(Continued from page 6)

"If passion and resentment master reason, the ruin of the soul infallibly follows."

"The unintelligible can neither be accepted nor rejected."

Yet he had no hesitation in asserting: "Man had beyond reason and at a higher level a new faculty of vision bestowed upon him, by which he perceives invisible things, the secrets of the future and other concepts as inaccessible to reason as the concepts of reason are inaccessible to mere discrimination and what is perceived by discrimination to senses."

In speaking of inspiration we are assured that:

"To prove the possibility of inspiration is to prove that it belongs to a category of branches of knowledge which cannot be attained by reason."

In dealing with the doubts relative to an individual claiming to be inspired, we are to examine his case on evidence in the light of the facts pertaining to his life, and the truths of his teachings or sayings we are to test by experience. It will be noticed that in spite of his claim that man had beyond reason a higher faculty bestowed on him, the return for proof is always to reason, and in antagonism to his subjective outlook his final test is to experience and is objective. In his summing up he throws overboard his whole case for subjective illumination.

When he destroyed philosophy as then

taught by showing that philosophy could prove nothing, and that there was no certainty in the method of the philosophers, he left only one path whereby he might travel, that of subjective illumination, as understood and accepted by the Sufis. He was assisted into this position by his moral nature, seemingly the strongest part of his character. He had a distinct moral bias. His whole cry was for the Truth. His every faculty was absorbed in the search. The height of assurance was his aim-mentally. Correct thought and correct action was the goal of all his strivings. He wanted to know the right and do it. Sensitive, he must have been of a high-strung nervous temperament. One can imagine him torturing himself over a slight lapse in reasoning or an error in conduct; knowing no rest until he made the matter right. Such men are the salt of the earth.

While the simplicity of his language and demonstration was largely instrumental in drawing people after him, the purity of his life and the ethics he expounded and practised must have been leading factors in the case. A striking personality is one of the greatest forces in moving men. Even at the present day our investigations into the effects of personality on others and of suggestion are only in their infancy, but so far as we have gone we find those aesthetic features of wonderful complexity and vital importance. Although he made lapses of conduct and reasoning equally with all other great men, it shall be well with us if we make no more. I have not been concerned here with either the correctness or incorrectness of his doctrines—philosophical, scientific, or religious—but simply with what they tell us of those traits, both inherited and acquired, which affected his whole outlook on the universe, material and spiritual. We have seen that that outlook was mainly subjective, and he had with it a strong moral bias, and thus his constitution and his environment tended to foster and develop those very feelings which were the determining factors of his character. Not infallible but beautiful, dominant, masterful even in its limitations.

Al-Ghazali stands out an uncommon figure in the ranks of literature and in the firmament of thought. Sincere in every word and act. Devoted to Truth. An intellectual giant filling all the ranges of the knowledge of his day. A grand personality. A purist in morals. Intense with scorn for wrong, and the thirst for combat with error. Neither a pioneer nor a scholar. Not a specialist in any one field, but the possessor of a wide knowledge that touched every aspect of the science, philosophy, history, and literature of his day. His force of character must have been striking, powerful enough to carry the people along with him and to sweep his opponents away. The love of God, the love of Truth, detestation of wrong and error and the elevation of all that was good and noble, to these add the fire of genius and you have the master-mind which led Islam for centuries, one of the greatest of the great Imams—Abi Hamid Al-Ghazali.