

ازالدين عند الله الاسلام

THE
**MUSLIM
SUNRISE**

Edited By

A. R. Khan Bengalee

B. A. Munir, Ph. D.

Volume XXXII

Third Quarter 1964

The Muslim Sunrise

VOLUME XXXIII

Ḥ Ḥ Ḥ Ḥ. 1964

NUMBER 1.

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL	3
A PASSAGE FROM THE HOLY QUR'ĀN.....		4
CITADEL OF HOLINESS		
Bashir Ahmad Orchard		
British Guiana	5
WHY 400,000,000 FOLLOW MUHAMMAD		
Abdul Rahman Khan Bengalee		
Pittsburgh, Pa.	7
CHRISTIAN FAITH		
Major Abdul Hamid		
Dayton, Ohio.	22



The sun sets and again rises. The MUSLIM SUNRISE, having set for a short time has, thank God, appeared again and let us hope it will not set for a long long time.

The purpose of this magazine is to disseminate the light of Islam in the West, to dispell the misunderstandings that prevail here and to acquaint the people of the West with the true teachings of Islam as embodied in the Holy Quran and as expounded by the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement.

Islam brought to this world the message of peace, love, fraternity, tolerance, sympathy and righteousness. Early adherents were the very embodiment of this message and devoted followers upheld it for many centuries. However, as predicted by its Founder, Islam suffered deterioration and setbacks during the last few centuries. Taking advantage of the situation, the opponents of Islam painted a grim picture of this religion by grossly misrepresenting it. But the Holy Prophet of Islam had also prophecied the advent of the Promised Messiah and had predicted that the sun (of Islam) will rise in the West.

The Promised Messiah has come to divulge the true teachings of Islam and to bring about a spiritual re-awakening in the world. Through him the sun of Islam is rising in the West. Let us hope and pray that it will soon envelope the entire world in its effulgence. Amen!

A Passage From The Holy Quran

O ye who believe, shall I point out to you a bargain that will save you from a painful punishment.

That you believe in Allah and His Messenger, and strive in the cause of Allah with your wealth and your persons. That is better for you if you did but know.

He will forgive you your sins, and make you enter the Gardens through which streams flow, and pure and pleasant dwellings in Gardens of Eternity. That is the supreme triumph.

And He will bestow another favor which you like: help from Allah and a near victory. So give glad tidings to the believers.

O ye who believe, be helpers of Allah, as said Jesus son of Mary, to his disciples, 'Who are my helpers in the cause of Allah?' The disciples said, 'We are helpers of Allah.' So a party of the children of Israel believed, while a party disbelieved.

Then we gave power to those who believed against the enemy, and they became victorious. (61:11-15)



Citadel of Holiness

By

BASHIR AHMAD ORCHARD

The general tendency today is to live and make merry. There are few people who select a worthwhile goal in life and pursue it to the end; and more often than not their aims lie only within the domain of material success and happiness.

Islam states in no uncertain terms that the real object of human existence is the development and purification of the soul. Success and progress in this direction gives more joy to the heart than any worldly attainment. These may seem idle words to the majority of mankind, but those who have experienced both pleasures know that they are charged with truth.

Whatever may be the stage of spiritual advancement enjoyed by an earnest Muslim, he is ever anxious to progress further. Having conquered common sins he strives to overcome every form of lesser evils and then all weaknesses which normally may not be regarded as sinful but yet have a direct influence on his personality and spiritual development. He is eager to manifest the light of Islam in every word, thought

and action so that he may become an embodiment of holiness. He knows that his spiritual development depends upon two essentials: complete submission to the Will of God, and the Grace of God.

There is a marked difference between the power of spiritual elevation in Islam and Christianity. Islam teaches that man can throw off the curse of sin and attain to a state of spiritual purity. Many are the sons of Islam whose saintly lives bear testimony to the efficacy of the Holy Quran. On the other hand, the churches teach that man is constantly weighted down under the burden of sin. He enters this world a sinner and leaves it a sinner. Therefore, Jesus Christ bears for them the punishment of their sins and absolves them of their guilt in the Hereafter. Despite the fact that this doctrine is untenable, millions continue to render lip service to it although they themselves remain unconvinced. A christian is told that he cannot shake off the shackles of sin and as Jesus has atoned for his sins in this world, there exists little or no incentive to strive towards perfection. However, the spiritual pinnacles of purity and righteousness which may be scaled and conquered with the aid of the Holy Quran forever encourage a Muslim in the path of self purification. The way may be rough and strewn with pitfalls. but the sublime citadel of holiness which gleams on the heights is accessible to the one who perseveres and implores the help of God in attaining this objective.

All praise is due to Allah, the Lord of the Worlds.

Why 400,000,000 Follow Muhammad

By

ABDUL RAHMAN KHAN BENGALIEE

An article under the above caption, written by Robert Payne, was published in the New York Times Magazine of August 4, 1963. Although the author tried to be fair in his criticism of some of the facts and incidents of the life and character of the founder of Islam, yet he has made some remarks which are objectionable and far from truth. These remarks need to be clarified.

As to the author's remark about the Black Muslims and Elijah Muhammad, I should only say that I do not really know much about his claims and how his followers regard him. If he really claims to be a "messenger of Allah" and his followers also regard him to be what the writer of the article suggests, then he and his followers have, I must say, gone far astray from the true teachings of Islam. According to Islam, there can be no other prophet after the Holy Prophet Muhammad, (peace and blessings of God be on him) except one who explicitly claims to be a faithful follower of the Holy Founder of Islam and implicitly

follows his teachings. Indeed, one such prophet has already appeared in the person of Hazrat Ahmad of Qadian (India), who was raised to the rank of prophethood through being a perfect follower of the Holy Founder of Islam.

Islam does not recognize any distinction of color, caste or race. There cannot be any communities defined by color, such as 'Black Muslims' or 'White Muslims'. According to Islam, all people constitute one humanity, whether they are black, white, red or yellow; Semetics, Aryans or Mongols; Brahmins, Shudras or Kshatris. The Arabs cannot look down upon non-Arabs, the Europeans cannot dislike the Asians, the whites cannot hate the blacks, nor can the blacks hate the whites. All humanity is one brotherhood—children of one common Progenitor, Adam, and creatures of One and only Creator, Allah.

With these preliminary remarks, I will now proceed to comment upon some of the remarks made by the writer about the life, character and teachings of the Founder of Islam. Some of his remarks are true, but there are some statements which are against history and tradition. Moreover, the language employed is sometimes very inappropriate to the dignity of a religious founder who, as the author himself admits, has 400,000,000 followers.

1: To begin with, the author says that the events of his life, except the early beginnings, are well established. He seems to have presumed that whatever he does not know about his life, or has not cared to know, is not well established. Had he taken a little trouble to study his early life, he could have

found out that the date, the day and the hour of his birth, the conditions under which he was born and the circumstances in which he was brought up are all recorded in detail. The testimony of his foster mother and foster brothers are there to tell us of his behavior even when he was a baby. In fact, all his life history, from birth to death, has been recorded with painstaking detail.

2: The author says, "something of the harsh, violent, beautiful landscape of Mecca entered into him." I wonder by what stretch of imagination he could attribute harshness and violence to a person about whose early life his foster relatives testify that he was very mild and he never took part in the rivalries or quarrels of other children, except with a view to put an end to them. He, who in his youth, joined an association the purpose of which was to help the oppressed and the obligation of which he alone discharged most faithfully, even at the risk of his own life. He, who bore cheerfully for thirteen years the brutal and inhuman persecutions of his enemies and when he was victorious over the same persecutors, granted them general amnesty; who forgave the woman who served him poisoned meat and the man who wanted to kill him when he was alone, resting under a tree; who set all his slaves free and laid it down that if anybody abused his slaves, the only expiation was to set the slave free and in fact abolished slavery.

3: The author then suggests that within a few years of the Prophet's death "armies proclaiming his faith stormed out of Arabia", thereby meaning that Islam was spread by sword.

He should have known from history that although the early Muslims had to have recourse to fighting in self defence and won miraculous victories against heavy odds, they never compelled the conquered people to accept their religion. The Muslims fought only for the freedom of faith and conscience, and the same freedom was given to the people under Muslim rule. India remained under Muslim rule for seven hundred years, yet the people of that country remained predominantly non-Muslims. It was under the British rule that there was a rapid progress due to missionary efforts which accounted for as much as 25% of the population. Islam penetrated into China and Indonesia and, as the author admits, is gaining converts in Africa and the United States. Is Islam gaining converts in these continents by the help of armies? Nay, it is the beauty of its teachings and its spiritual force that have been winning the hearts of these people.

4: The writer says, "As a youth, he was like all poverty stricken youths of Mecca, sometimes a hired camelman..." The wording of the statement is disparaging. The writer could have worded it in more dignified terms. Although the Holy Prophet had to work in his youth as a shepherd or trade agent, he was held in great esteem by his people who conferred on him the title of "Al-Amin"(the trustworthy) and "Al-Sadeq" (the truthful). He was chosen, when a lad, to arbitrate a dispute that arose among the leading Meccan tribes regarding the right to replace the black stone in the House of God, which shows in what great esteem he was held by his people in his youth.

5: The statement, "In his early life he took part in skirmishes

between the tribes," has no corroboration in history which tells us quite the contrary. He took no part in the tribal feuds of his country and used to repair to a cave for meditation and prayer for the solution of the ills of his society.

6: "Like all the other Meccans he worshipped the Black Stone" is another remark far from the truth. It is the idol-worship and the polytheistic practices of his nation that grieved him sorely and led him to retreat to the cave to pray to the One True God. History records that he never had recourse to any sort of idol-worship, even in his early life.

7: Then follows a romantic statement to the effect that "attracted by his skill as a camel driver and masculinity, a forty year old lady fell in love with him." How fantastic it is to suppose that a youth's skill as a camel driver and masculinity infatuated a twice widowed old lady. History gives an emphatic lie to this fantasy and tells us that it was the reputation of his extraordinary honesty and integrity that led her to offer her hand to him.

8: The author further says, "To his grief, there were no male heirs of his line." That he had no male heirs is, of course, a historical fact, but the modifying phrase, "to his grief," is the author's own concoction. I wonder how he could penetrate into his heart and find out his grief. How he could attribute grief to one who, according to history and tradition, bore cheerfully and never bewailed the loss of four children. Once, while passing by a graveyard, he saw a woman bewailing at the grave of her son and he admonished her to have patience. Not knowing his identity she retorted, "If your own

child would have died, I could see how you bore it." The Prophet said, "I lost four children and bore the loss patiently." In fact, there is nothing in history or tradition to show that he ever expressed any sorrow or grief for not having a male issue. His only son died at an early age.

9: Mr. Payne says further, "Perhaps being influenced by the wandering hermits called Hanifs, he first began to meditate alone in a cave outside Mecca." How self-contradictory is the idea of learning the lessons of meditation from the hermits who kept wandering. The fact is that he was a lover of solitude and given to serious thinking even in his childhood. It was the social and moral evils of his people that drove him into the cave to think out remedies for them.

10: The Holy Prophet learned about Judaism and Christianity from a Christian named Waraqa, according to the author. It is an attempt to divest the Holy Prophet of the knowledge given to him from the Divine source. The Holy Quran is replete with strong refutation of the doctrine of Trinity, the Crucifixion and God's having a begotten son. If it is true that the Holy Prophet learned these things about Christianity from a Christian, it has to be admitted that the Christians of his time did not believe in Trinity and the Crucifixion theory and the Divine sonship of Jesus are later innovations. If the learned writer is willing to accept this necessary corollary, thereby shaking the very foundation of Christianity, I need not refute his assertion here.

11: He further says that many of the Prophet's visions were "colored by the events of the Old and New Testaments." It

is a sweeping remark. The author ought to have mentioned some of the visions which, to him, were so colored. Even granting that some visions were so colored, it does not detract anything from the truth and dignity of the visions; it only verifies the truth of some of the events of the Testaments. Our Christian friends ignore one fundamental point, that all religions – Christianity, Judaism, Buddhism, Hinduism – are from the same Divine source, according to Islam. Their scriptures were the Word of God, although they suffered a lot of interpolations as time passed on. This necessitated the sending down of a complete and perfect Book containing the basic teachings of all religions. So God sent down the Holy Quran and made arrangements to protect it from interpolations. If, therefore, some of the Prophet's visions were akin to those of the former prophets, it only shows that all prophets were from the same God.

12: The author says, "In despair of making headway, he sent some of his followers to Abyssinia." The writer here betrays ignorance of the function of prophets who act only under Divine guidance. They only carry out the Will of God, undaunted by opposition and defeat. The Holy Prophet sent some of his followers to Abyssinia under Divine Guidance, but he himself kept on with his mission, undaunted by opposition, with a firm faith in an ultimate success. In actual practice, his mission was so successful that we find no parallel in history to the speed with which Islam spread. Would this be any cause to despair?

13: The author says, "In the hope of bringing peace to the

city (Medina), the elders approached Muhammad and offered to make him King." Though there is no disparagement in the statement, yet perversion of historical truth there is. The Medinites never offered kingship to him, and how could they offer it to a helpless, persecuted and excommunicated fellow, belonging to a different tribe and a different city; having no influence, no following? The fact is that a few Medinites who came to Mecca on the occasion of a pilgrimage, heard him and accepted him, and then asked him to go to their city and preach his faith there. It was an invitation to preach Islam and not an offer to be king.

14: "The last ten years were years of war, ambush, of sudden raids," says the author; as if the Prophet had no religious or spiritual functions to do. What a perversion of truth. These were the years during which the Prophet, (peace and blessings of God be on him), devoted himself to the religious training and spiritual up-bringing of his followers. Of course, he had to fight now and then, but in defense and not in aggression. It is indeed a great distortion of facts to depict as a raider, a man who preached, "There is no compulsion in religion," and, "Only for God's sake fight those who fight you, but do not attack them first; God does not love the aggressor;" the person who distributed all he got among the poor and the needy; whose house consisted of only one room without any furniture, all through his life, even when he was a king; the person who left nothing in his house except a few dates, when he died. The writer seems to have written the article, not from the study of history but from the study of the writings of hostile critics who,

blinded by prejudice and unable to see the beauty of Islam and the spiritual force of its founder, attributed all the successes of his mission to violence. But truth triumphs. In spite of their straining every nerve to paint Muhammad and his teachings in the darkest color possible, Islam is progressing, not only in Asia and Africa, but also in Europe and America. In all the countries of the world, the followers of Muhammad are increasing daily and are invoking the blessings of God upon him day and night. It is indeed against reason to expect that a raider would have such a large and ever-increasing following all over the world, ready to sacrifice everything for his sake.

15: The expression, "Shaken by defeat, Muhammad took refuge in the walled city," is expressive of the low estimation of a most resolute person having valor, determination and firmness of faith in his mission. He cheerfully endured the inhuman tortures and persecution of Meccans for a period of thirteen years. He then migrated to Medina but was pursued by his enemy. He hid with only one companion in the cave of Thaur and when the pursuing enemy was within a few yards of him, he comforted his companion, saying, "Fear not, God is with us." He was once resting alone under a tree when an enemy came upon him with a drawn sword and said, "Who will save you now?" "Allah," was his calm and emphatic reply. The enemy was so stunned by this bold answer that the sword fell down from his hand. In the battle of Hunain, the Muslims fell back at one point. One of the soldiers held the reins of his mule and requested him to retire from the field for a while until the Muslim army would rally back. His

reply was, "Let go of the reins, I am a Prophet, not an imposter," and so saying, he advanced alone towards the enemy lines. Are these behaviors characteristic of a shaky personality?

16: Quoting imperfectly the last words of the Holy Prophet, (peace and blessings of God be on him) he says, "But no one knows exactly what he said." This remark clearly shows that the author has not read Islamic history. The last words of the Holy Prophet were too distinct and too well known to admit of any difficulty in their apprehension. These words were, "To my Friend, the Highest of the High, to my Friend the Highest of the High," meaning clearly that he was returning to his God Who had sent him to this world.

17: Referring to the verses of the Holy Quran, the writer says, "Some are composed with extra-ordinary violence," Does he mean to suggest that these verses are of human composition? To us, Muslims, every word of this Holy Book is revealed by God and human brain had nothing to do with it. If the writer wants, we can furnish him convincing proof of its being a revealed book. As for the word 'violence' we cannot make out what he means by it here. It does not convey any sense at all in this place.

18: Referring to the Islamic concept of life in paradise, he says that it will be a life of leisured ease. Islamic scriptures, however, do not support this view. The life in Paradise, according to Islam, will not be a life of inactivity, freedom from engagement or exemption from occupation. The blessed ones will be very active glorifying God constantly and

desiring increasing knowledge and realization.

19: By saying, "Judaism profoundly affected Islam and Muhammad adopted some of the Jewish customs and practices", the author suggests that Islam had no originality, being, to a large extent, a production of Judaism. It has already been said that Islam in essence claims to be the same religion that had been revealed by God through His prophets—Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses, Jesus, Buddha, Krishna, etc.,—attaining perfection at the hands of the Holy Prophet. It is very likely that some of the universal precepts and practices of the previous faiths have found recognition in Islam. Eternal truths are the same for all ages. It is to the credit of Islam that wherever it differs from other religions in matters of history or doctrine, it comes out supreme.

20: Again the writer says, "The Jewish angels are incorporated bodily into the texture of Islam, their flaming wings wheel across the landscape of Muhammad's imagination with irresistible power and terror, blazing with God's fire." This is a remark too frivolous and childish to deserve any serious consideration and comment. This much will suffice to say that Islamic angels are not corporal beings. They have no physique although they can appear to people in physical form, as they did come to Jesus (peace be on him) in the form of a dove.

21: His statement, "The stories of the Old Testament are told as they might have been seen from some mountain deep in Arabia", is also too frivolous, childish and vague to need any comment.

22: The author goes on to make the following unwarranted statement, "And, in the end, Muhammad turned against the Jews who had welcomed him in Medina. He slaughtered them unmercifully." This is a very serious remark made without proof or justification. I wonder how he could be so unscrupulous in making such a serious allegation against a person so noble, kind hearted, beneficent and magnanimous. History testifies to his generous and forgiving character. He forgave the thousands of Meccans who had earlier meted out the most cruel treatment to him and his followers. He forgave the Jewish lady who administered poison into his food. He forgave the man who wanted to kill him while he was resting alone under a tree. How horrible it is to say that he condoned an unmerciful slaughter. It is obvious that the writer did not consult history. Before writing an article on such an important personality, he should at least have read the opinions of some impartial writers on Islam, e.g., 'Apologie de Islamisme' by Laura Vaglieri, an Italian non-Muslim professor.

The fact is that the Jews of Medina violated the covenant they made with the Muslims to defend the town against the invaders. At the time of an invasion by Meccans, they not only refused to help the Muslims but joined the invaders and plotted to attack the Muslims from the rear. However, God granted the Muslims a miraculous victory. At night time the wind extinguished the fire in front of an enemy tent. Taking it as a bad omen, the campers withdrew from the battlefield. Others began to follow suit and, overnight, an army of about 20,000 departed. Thus the battle was over without a fight. The Holy Prophet sent some men to the Jews to ask for an

explanation of their behavior. Rather than showing them any courtesy, they started abusing the Holy Prophet and started to fight; but unable to hold very long, they asked for an emissary to talk about peace. They suggested that they would accept the award of a man named Sa'd bin Mu'ad and would accept any punishment he would propose. The Holy Prophet accepted and Sa'd gave his award according to the Commandment of the Bible, which is as follows:

“When thou comest nigh unto a city to fight against it then proclaim peace unto it. if it will make no peace with thee, but will make war against thee, then thou shalt besiege it: and when the Lord thy God hath delivered it into thine hands, thou shalt smite every male thereof with the edge of the sword: But the women and the little ones, and the cattle, and all that is in the city, even all the spoil thereof, shalt thou take unto thyself; and thou shalt eat the spoil of thine enemies, which the Lord thy God hath given thee.” (Deut. 20: 10 – 18)

Sa'd, who was friendly to the Jews, decided their case according to their own laws. The responsibility does not lie with the Prophet or the Muslims, it lies only on the Jewish law and the choice of Sa'd by the Jews. If the Jews had left it to the Holy Prophet to decide their fate, he would certainly have treated them leniently, just as he had done so often with his enemies.

23: Towards the conclusion, the writer says that the Holy Quran attributes to Jesus the power to raise the dead. In

actual practice the Quran says emphatically that none but God can give life or cause death. The Quran repudiates the Divinity of Jesus in unmistakable terms. Indeed the Holy Quran assigns him the rank of a prophet who quickened the spiritually dead and cured the spiritually diseased.

24: At the end the writer says that Belal was the Prophet's slave, the Prophet had no religious objection to slavery and Belal was not set free until after his death. It is downright falsehood. Belal was never a slave of the Holy Prophet, he was the slave of a non-Muslim who persecuted him most brutally and severely and tried to make him recant after he accepted Islam. But Belal steadfastly persisted in his faith until, at last, he migrated to Medina and became a free man. He was appointed the summoner to prayers.

The Holy Prophet encouraged the emancipation of slaves by words as well as by deeds. On his marriage to Hazrat Khatija, the first thing he did was to set all her slaves free. He laid down that if a person would beat or abuse his slave, the only expiation lay in setting him free. He further said that if a person sets his slave free, God will save every part of his body from the torment of hell.

Islam recognizes no such class of people as slaves by birth. The only persons who may be deprived of their freedom are prisoners of war. They too can earn their freedom by payment of ransom by themselves, their friends or their relatives. If a prisoner offers to do some work with a view to earning some money to pay his ransom, he is to be given such an opportunity.

25: Lastly, the author says, "In time there came subtle alterations in the texture of the religion, for each advance of Islam across the world added new colors, new perspectives." This is not at all true. The fundamental doctrines, precepts and practices and the book are exactly the same today as they were thirteen centuries ago, inspite of the division of Muslims in different sects. The Holy Quran is the only book in the world which has not suffered any interpolations whatsoever, every word of it being the same today as it was when it was revealed. Of course, the doctrines and scriptures of all the other religions, including Christianity, have undergone so many changes that the real teachings can hardly be recognized.

In conclusion, I agree with the writer that the Holy Quran teaches that all humanity is one brotherhood and it is inconceivable that the God of Islam should have any color. To a true Muslim, race hatred is unthinkable.



Christian Faith

By

MAJOR ABDUL HAMID

In his book, "Honest to God," published in March, 1963, Dr. John A. T. Robinson, Bishop of Woolwich, south London, has admirably exposed the hollowness of Christian faith. In this age of reasoning and advancement of technology and science, Christianity is being attacked from all sides. The Bishop of Woolwich, like many other defenders of Faith, does not find any weapon in the arsenal of Christianity to defend it. He, therefore, raises a white flag before the modern secular man and says:

"Moreover, the line to which I am referring, runs right through the middle of myself, although as time goes on, I find there is less and less of me left, as it were, to the right of it. Thus, not infrequently, as I watch or listen to a broadcast discussion between a Christian and a humanist, I catch myself realizing that most of my sympathies are on the humanist's side. This is not in the least because my faith or commitment is in doubt, but because I share

instinctively with him his inability to accept the scheme of thought and mould of religion within which alone that faith is being offered to him. I feel he is right to rebel against it and I am increasingly uncomfortable that 'orthodoxy' should be identified with it.

.....(page 8)

Commenting on the Christian concept of God 'up there' or 'out there', Dr. Robinson says:

"But the signs are that we are reaching the point at which the whole conception of a God 'out there' which has served us so well since the collapse of the three-decker universe, is itself becoming more of a hindrance than of a help."

(page 15)

"But suppose such a Super Being 'out there' is really only a sophisticated version of the Old Man in the sky? Suppose God does not, indeed cannot, mean being persuaded of the existence of some entity, even a supreme entity, which might or might not be there, like life on Mars? Suppose that all such atheism does is to destroy an idol and that we can and we must go on without a God 'out there' at all? Have we seriously faced the possibility that to abandon such an idol, may in the future be the only way of making Christianity meaningful, except to the few remaining equivalents of flat-earthers (just as to have clung earlier to the God 'up there' would have made it impossible in the modern world for any but primitive peoples to believe the Gospel)? Perhaps after all, the Freudians are right that such a God-

the God of traditional popular theology – is a projection, and perhaps we are being called to live without that projection in any form.”(page 17)

Dr. Robinson also wrote an article under the title, “Our image of God must go”. It appeared in the OBSERVER of London, in its issue of March 17, 1963. Commenting on the article and the book of Dr. Robinson, Antony Flew, Professor of Philosophy, University of Keele, writes:

“The Bishop of Woolwich calls his book ‘Honest to God’. It is indeed a very bold and honest work. Yet I cannot help asking whether he really intends every thing he says. The first two-third of his article unequivocally rejects the idea of a God as a supernatural person, such as religion has always posited?” (The Observer, London, March 24, 1963)

We have every sympathy with Dr. Robinson, and for that matter, everyone who shares his views. If he has not been able to reconcile himself with the Christian way of thinking, it does not mean that the very existence of God, Who created the whole of the universe, should be doubted or that His being Supernatural should be questioned. The Christian philosophy of God is doubtless repugnant to human reason. We have yet to see a person who could say with confidence that he understands the doctrine of Trinity which is explained by the Very Rev. Francis J. Ripley in his book ‘The Blessed Trinity’:

- 1: There is one Divine Nature in which there are three Persons, the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost.
- 2: No one of these three persons is either of the others; they are distinct; the Father is not the Son, the Son

- is not the Holy Ghost, the Holy Ghost is not the Father.
- 3: Each person is God; the Father is God, the Son is God, the Holy Ghost is God.
- 4: There are not three Gods but only one God.

Christian theologians agree that the doctrine of Trinity is difficult to understand. In his book, 'The Christian's God', Bishop Stephen Neill writes:

"This is very difficult to understand. Some people complain that faith is made so difficult, and ask whether it would not be better just to say that God is one and leave it at that. Some people think it clever to make fun of the doctrine of Trinity: 'How can you say that one plus one plus one equals one?'.....It may be well to remind ourselves that the Christian teachers of old times who worked out the doctrine were among the greatest thinkers who have ever lived in the world; it is not likely that they would have set out their faith in such a difficult form, unless they had been sure that this was the only way in which it could be set out, if we are to be true to all that we learn of God from the Bible and from the experience of trying to follow Jesus Christ..... (pp 76-77)

I leave it to the readers of this article to find for themselves if from the above lines it appears to them that the writer himself could understand the doctrine of 'three in one and one in three'. The only reason given by him is that the Christian teachers of old times who worked out the doctrine were among great thinkers and could not go wrong. If the writer of the above lines had said that the doctrine of Trinity

was revealed to Jesus Christ and that he taught it to his disciples, it would have meant something. Are we to follow the religion expounded by Christ or the doctrines concocted by the great thinkers? As a matter of fact, Jesus was not even aware of this doctrine. Neither the prophets of the Old Testament nor Jesus Christ preached anything like it. A few quotations from the Old and New Testaments will illustrate it:

“Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord.”

.....(Deuteronomy, 6 : 4)

“Jesus answered him, ‘the first commandment of all is, Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is one God.’”

.....(Mark, 12 : 29)

“One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in us all.”(Ephesians, 4 : 6)

“For there is one God and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.” (I Tim. 2:5)

As against this unambiguous teaching given in the Old and New Testaments, we are told that some Christian thinkers of the old time worked out the doctrine of ‘three in one and one in three’. What made those thinkers work out this doctrine is not known. In the book, ‘The Christian Religion’, by L. Elliot Binns and others, we read:

“Every religion has its own conception of God, and the Christian religion has as its own, the doctrine of the Trinity. But this doctrine was not taught by Jesus in the way that a doctrine of God was taught by the founders of other great religions.” ..(page 295)

In ‘The History of Christianity in the Light of Modern Knowledge’, a collective work by twenty two theologians, we

find:

“The belief in God as a Trinity, or as one substance with three ‘personae’ – the word means ‘masks’ or ‘dramatic roles’ – is directly inherited from Greek speculation. The third person was more usually feminine, the Divine Wisdom, or Providence, or the Mother or the Son: the ‘Spirit’ or ‘Breath of God’ comes from the Hebrew.”

This fantastic belief in God as a Trinity which, according to the Christian theologians themselves, was inherited from Greek speculation, has jeopardized the very conception of God in the Christian school of thought. It is, therefore, not surprising if the defenders of Faith are seen in the forefront today to rebel against it.

The more one reads about the Christian philosophy of God, the more one gets lost. We are told that Jesus Christ was God himself, who came to the earth and lived among men. Let us examine the Scriptures and see what we find in there. It is said that “God is Spirit” (John, 4:24). Jesus Christ was born of a woman. He appeared in flesh. How could he be God then? God is invisible, but Jesus Christ was not invisible. God is immortal, He is not subject to death. According to the Christian belief Jesus died on the cross. How can he be God? God is perfect. Was Jesus Christ perfect? If so, why did he cry, “Eli, Eli, lama sabachtani – that is, My God, My God, why hast thou forsaken me?” God is good. Jesus says, “Why callest thou me good? None is good, save one that is God.” (Luke, 18:19) Again we are taught that God is Powerful, Strong and Almighty. The story of crucifixion

of Jesus shows that he was neither powerful, nor strong, nor almighty. God is spaceless, but Jesus occupied space. God is indivisible but when Jesus was on earth, he always referred to God the Father who was in Heaven. What does this mean? The fact is that Jesus was neither God nor Son of God.

LOVE OF GOD

"God is love. This is the very heart of the Gospel," says Stephen Neill. Christian theologians are very proud of such phrases. Can they logically prove from what they believe that God is love? Stephen Neill says:

"Love means coming to help in time of need; it means saving activity. In the parable of the good Samaritan, when the Samaritan saw the wounded man, he came to his help; a kindly feeling of pity would not have been of any use. What was needed was action to save life. Jesus told that parable not only to show us how we ought to act but also to show us what God is like, and make clear to us that God also acts to save."

When one applies this philosophy of love in the case of Jesus Christ, one fails to understand how God is love? Jesus was put on the cross, he was nailed and wounded. That was the time when he needed the help of God. When God saw his wounds, did He come to help Jesus? A kindly feeling of pity would not have been of any use. What was needed was action to save a life. According to the Christian beliefs, Jesus died on the cross. In view of this, how can one believe that God also acts to save and that God is also love? It may be said

that Jesus Christ did not need the help of God. Then why did he say, 'Abba, Father, all things are possible unto thee, take away this cup from me.' He also says, 'Eli. Eli, lama sabachtani?' that is to say, My God, My God, why hast thou forsaken me?' God the father does not answer the prayers of Jesus and we are told that He is love. God does not come to help Jesus Christ in the hour of need and we are made to believe that He is love. In the light of the explanation given by Stephen Neill, God did not love Jesus Christ, or in other words, He did not love his only begotten Son. How can we understand that God loves other human beings.

ATONEMENT:

Christians believe that Jesus, son of Mary, was the son of God or God Himself Who became man. He died on the cross for the salvation of mankind. We are told that man is a born sinner. Jesus came as a Savior to save men from the punishment of sin. In the pamphlet entitled 'Sin', issued from the Catholic Enquiry Center, London, it is written:

"Finally, consider sin from the point of view of the love of God. In order to conquer sin God became man, suffered and died on the cross. He showed us the consequences of sin on His own person."

"Christ's human nature was a real human nature. He really suffered. He really died. And he bore in some way the sins of the whole world....."

This line of thought is also a borrowed one. Jesus could not have given such a fantastic teaching to his people. Why should God become man? Why should he hang himself in

order to save mankind? In the 'History of Christianity in the Light of Modern Knowledge', we read:

"The gnostic writings have come down to us mixed up with later additions from many sources, and it is hard to separate out the original pre-Christian doctrines. But the Savior seems generally to be a third, the other two being God the Father and some such being as the Divine Wisdom (Sophia) or 'Spirt'..... The method of redemption is sometimes that of the dying or suffering God, as he appears in the oldest agricultural religions; sometimes that of the 'righteous man' in Plato, who is happy though he be condemned of men and in the end impaled or crucified. In general the whole conception is influenced by astrology. In some Gnostic systems, for example, the Savior descends, by his own will or that of the Father, through all the spheres of the planets, the Father.....or it may be the Soul, the divine Sophia or Wisdom who has forgotten her true nature."

"Many details might be added to illustrate the various forms taken by the Savior religions, and the curious and often beautiful speculations which they engendered. But the main root of them seems to be a feeling of disillusion or despair of the world; the feeling of men in the presence of forces which they can neither control nor understand. They cry to their God because there is none other to hear or help them..... They seek to be saved not by 'justice' or 'wise conduct', but by some act of purification, some intensity or adoration. The forms and theories are

merely those which happen to be supplied by old tradition or by the customs of some foreign heirophant, perhaps from Egypt or Babylon."

As a comparison between Mithraism and Christianity, we read:

"Yet the similarities between Mithraism and Christianity are striking, and may be taken as signs of the spiritual and psychological needs of the time. Mithraism arose in the East, among the poor, among captives and slaves. It put its hope in a Redeemer, a Mediator who performed some mystical sacrifice. It held a Communion Service of bread and water. It rested on the personal Pistis (Faith or Faithfulness) of the convert to his Redeemer. It had so much acceptance that it was able to impose on the Christian world its own Sun-Day in place of the Sabbath, its Sun's birth day, 25th December, as the birthday of Jesus; its Magi and its Shepherds hailing the divine star, and various of its Easter celebrations."

The above being the background of the theory of redemption, what is left of Christianity.

DID JESUS DIE ON THE CROSS.

The whole philosophy of Christian faith is based on the belief that Jesus died on the Cross. If it is proved otherwise, the whole structure of Christianity would tumble down.

Jesus Christ was the last Israelite Prophet. His message

was addressed to Israelites only. He says: 'I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel'. Jews did not accept him as a true Prophet of God. They opposed him and dragged him into the court. Their main aim was to see him hanged so that they could prove to the world that he was accursed of God and as such he was a false prophet. It is a pity that both Jews and Christians believe that Jesus was crucified to death and consequently he was accursed of God. The only difference is that Jews consider that he was a false prophet and therefore God did not save him from the punishment, whereas Christians have made out a story of salvation of mankind. They believe that Christ has redeemed them from the curse of the law. In the Bible we read: 'Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree.'

.....(Galatians 3 :13)

According to the Holy Quran revealed to the Holy Prophet Muhammad, the Founder of Islam, both Jews and Christians are wrong in their beliefs regarding the death of Jesus Christ on the Cross. It says: "And their saying, 'We did kill the Messiah, Jesus, son of Mary, the Messenger of Allah', whereas they slew him not, nor crucified him; and those who differ therein are certainly in a state of doubt about it; they have no definite knowledge thereof, but only follow a conjecture; and they did not convert this conjecture into certainty'. Mark the words, 'and they did not convert this conjecture into certainty.'"

.....(The Quran 4:158)

The story of crucifixion mentioned in the Bible is full of

contradictions. It rather leads to the conclusion that Jesus did not die on the cross. The historians are not definite about the facts mentioned in relation to the crucifixion of Jesus Christ. Under the caption, 'Crucifixion and Resurrection,' we read the following account in the 'History of Christianity in the Light of Modern Knowledge':

"It is not out of place to ask from whom were gathered such details as we have of the story of the crucifixion of Jesus? It was not the apostles, for they had fled. Peter is blamed for denying his Lord, but after all showed some courage and devotion to follow as far as High Priest's courtyard. Still he was not, and does not claim to have been, a witness of the crucifixion itself. Certain things are reported as having been seen by the Galilian women who watched from afar, but ventured nearer when the crowd had dispersed and someone was taking down their Master's body: Mark two Maries and a certain Salome. Further, Simon and Cyrenian who was commandeered to carry Jesus's cross, is called by Mark the father of Alexander and Rufus, two otherwise unknown personages, whom we may presume to have afterwards become believers and who were able to bring to the community the tale they had heard from their father. It is enough to attest the general outline of the story, not enough to make sure of details.

"Jesus suffered in silence. He gave a great cry at the end; some medical writers have thought that this was a final paroxysm, a literally broken heart. And

a little earlier, Mark says, about three O'clock, he said something in a loud voice which Christian tradition believed to have been the opening words of the twenty second Psalm. It is a cry of despair, 'My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken me?' This, as it stands, is a sentence from Scripture. The ancient text of Mark current in the West is even more poignant, for it makes Jesus say "Why hast Thou put me to shame?"

If it was the plan of God, as is believed by the Christian theologians, that He sent down His only begotten Son, on earth to die an accursed death in order to save mankind from the punishment of sins, then why did he utter a cry of despair, "My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken me?", or "why hast Thou put me to shame?" As a matter of fact he was not prepared for such an ignominious death. This is why he utters cries in the above words, seeking the help of God Almighty. Elsewhere he says: 'Abba, Father, all things are possible unto Thee, take away this cup from me, nevertheless not what I will, but **what** Thou Wilt.' He knew that the will of God was to save him, and from the knowledge that he had received from God, he had prophesied beforehand that God would save him from the death on the Cross in the same way as He had saved Jonah in the belly of the whale. Did he not say:

'An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign, and there shall no sign be given to it, but the sign of the Prophet Jonas: For as Jonas was three days and three nights in the Whales's belly, so shall

the son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth.' (Mathews, 12:39-40)

Imagine how confident Jesus was when he made this prophecy. If he dies on the Cross, he is definitely proved to be a false prophet. Is it not written in the Scriptures:

“When a prophet seeketh in the name of the Lord, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which the Lord hath not spoken, but the Prophet hath spoken it presumptuously: Thou shalt not be afraid of him.”

Jonas entered the belly of the Whale alive, he remained in that belly alive. Obviously it was a sign of Jonas. God was with him. Any person who is swallowed by a fish, dies. It is God Almighty alone who can protect a person from death in such circumstances. Jonas was protected because he had a mission from God for his people. After the incident of the Whale, he went back to his nation to convey the message of God to them for which he was commissioned. Similarly Jesus Christ did not die on the Cross. He entered the heart of the earth alive, remained there alive and came out alive. God protected him, first, to give a defeat to his enemies who wanted to see him die an accursed death, and second, to enable him to go in search of the lost tribes of Israelites and convey the message of God to them. If Jesus does not die on the Cross, surely it is a sign of the truth of Jesus Christ. This shows that God Almighty was with him. He did not allow his enemies to succeed in their evil designs against His Prophet. Could Pharaoh with all

his might kill Moses and annihilate the Israelites? This was the sign of God for Moses. Those who witnessed this sign, rightly sang the song of the glory of their Lord. Thus Moses said:

“Thy right hand, O Lord, is become glorious in power: thy right hand, O Lord, hath dashed in pieces the enemy.”

“And in the greatness of Thine Excellency Thou hast overthrown them that rose up against Thee. Thou sendest forth Thy wrath, which consumed them as stubble.”(Exodus, 15:6-7)

“The Lord is my strength and song, and He is become my salvation.” (Exodus, 15:2)

Surely, the God of Moses also came to the rescue of Jesus Christ and saved him from death on the Cross. Will Christian scholars give due thought and consideration to this aspect of their belief?

PROPHECY OF ISAIAH.

In the book of Isaiah, we read:

“Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise him; He hath put him to grief; when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand.” ..(Isaiah 53:10)

This prophecy of Isaiah clearly indicated that Jesus would

not die on the Cross. He would of course receive bruises, and would be put to grief. Mark the words, 'when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand.' Does this not indicate that his followers will mistakingly consider that Jesus gave his life 'as an offering for sin' whereas he would be saved, given a long life, marry and have his children born to him? If this interpretation is not correct, then what does, 'he shall see his seed' mean and what does 'he shall prolong his days' indicate? It may be noted that the construction of these verses is such that no other meanings can fit in. For instance if any one says that the words, 'he shall see his seed' and 'he shall prolong his days?' are used in spiritual sense, what relationship do these words have to the phrase, 'when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin'?

In fact, Jesus Christ did not die on the Cross. As it was prophesied he had received some bruises in his hands and feet. The wounds were healed and he went in search of 'lost sheep of the house of Isreal', the ten tribes which were scattered in Afghanistan and Kashmir (India). He lived the rest of his life in those tracts and having accomplished his mission died a natural death at the age of one hundred and twenty years. His tomb has been discovered in Khanyar Street in Sirinagar in Kashmir. A detailed account of his journey to Kashmir is given in the book 'JESUS IN INDIA' by HAZRAT AHMAD, the Promised Messiah. The book was originally written in Urdu language and subsequently translated into English. The books, 'Where Did Jesus Die?' by J. D. Shams Ex-Imam of

LONDON Mosque, and 'Tomb of Jesus' by late Dr. M. M. Sadiq, Ahmadiyya Muslim Missionary of America also throw flood of light on the hidden life of Jesus after the incident of the Cross. Coming back to the Biblical account of the crucifixion of Jesus Christ, we find that Pilate who conducted the case against Jesus was influenced by his wife who sent a message in the court asking her husband not to harm Jesus as she suffered in a dream many things because of him. What does this indicate? Was it the plan of God to save Jesus Christ from his death on the Cross or otherwise? Surely he wanted to save him. This is why, he caused the wife of Pilate to see the above mentioned dream. We also find that Pilate was influenced by his wife, so much so that he washed his hands before the multitude saying, 'I am innocent of the blood of this person, see ye to it'. Various events mentioned in the Bible in connection with the incident of crucifixion of Jesus provide sufficient circumstantial evidence to show that Pilate secretly tried to save Jesus. He not only tried to save him but also treated him sympathetically. Whereas every malefactor had to carry his own cross that of Jesus was carried by another man. We also find that wine or vinegar mixed with myrrh was given to Jesus. This mixture was intended to render him less sensible to pain. We also see that Jesus remained on the Cross for only three hours. Such a short period was not sufficient for a person of his age and physical stature to die. It can, therefore, be safely presumed that the unconsciousness which followed the administration of vinegar was mistaken for death. The fact that the body of Jesus was handed over to one Joseph of Arimathea who was a secret disciple of Jesus also goes to show that everything was ac-

ording to plan. This disciple keeps the body in spacious Sepulchre which was hewn out of a rock. We also notice that the legs of Jesus were not broken. When one of the soldiers pierced the side of Jesus, blood and water came out. Is it not a sufficient indication that Jesus was still alive?

Someone may say that it is clearly mentioned in the Bible that Jesus 'gave up his ghost' and that his legs were not broken because he was dead already. The words, 'he gave up ghost' occur in the verse 30 of John:19. Let us examine the statements contained in the subsequent verses of the same chapter of St. JOHN. Verses 32, 33 and 34 are reproduced below:

32. Then came the soldiers, and brake the legs of the first and of the other which was crucified with him.
33. But when they came to Jesus, and saw that he was dead already, they brake not his legs:
34. But one of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side, and forthwith came there out blood and water.

Mark the word 'But' occurring in verses 33 and 34. In both places it means, 'To the contrary'. The reason why the word 'But' is used in the verse 33, is that in the verse 32 it is mentioned that the soldiers broke the legs of the two thieves, but contrary to this statement we find in the verse 33 that the legs of Jesus Christ were not broken. Similarly the use of word 'But' in the verse 34 shows that the statement succeeding it is contrary to the one preceding it. In the verse 33 we find the statement that the legs of Jesus Christ were not broken because, the soldiers saw that 'he was dead already'.

Now contrary to this statement we find in the verse 34 that when his side was pierced, 'forthwith came out blood and water' that is to say he was alive. Otherwise what was the significance of piercing his side when he had already appeared dead to the soldiers? The only significance that one can think of is that the soldier who pierced the side of Jesus wanted to ascertain whether he was actually dead or alive. The result of the experiment, 'forthwith came out blood and water,' is a good evidence for his being alive. Blood does not flow from an already dead body.

We also read in the Bible that Jesus left the sepulchre before the third day had dawned because when Mary Magdelene and Mary the mother of James came to see the sepulchre they found it empty. It is also mentioned that after leaving the sepulchre Jesus moved about secretly, lest Jews should have him arrested again. On one occasion Jesus shows his disciples his hands and feet and says, 'Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself, handle me and see, for a spirit hath no flesh and bones, as ye see me have.' Let those who still believe that Jesus was raised from the dead pause for a moment and consider these words of their Master and decide for themselves why he lays so much stress on his bodily form. Is it not a clear indication that Jesus did not actually die on the Cross and that the body of flesh and bones which he showed to his disciples was the same corporeal body which he had before the incident of the Cross. It further shows that he was still subject to the earthly laws of nature. He felt hungry and ate broiled fish and honeycomb with his disciples. Let those who still believe that Jesus rose from the dead and

ascended to heaven, where he is not merely alive but reigns in the right and might of God, say whether he went up in the heaven in the body of flesh and bones or in spirit. No sane person can ever imagine that the corporeal body of Jesus went up in heaven. It is not the body but the spirit that matters. If they say that Jesus went up in spirit, then how, when and where was his body disposed of? The only logical conclusion is that the story of ascension of Jesus Christ to heaven has no foundations. It is not only repugnant to human reasoning but also not proved by history. How is it that the historians get skeptic when they have to write anything about the resurrection and ascension of Jesus Christ? In 'Life of Christ' by Hall Caine, we read: "Thus the three Ascension stories in Mark, Luke, and Acts conflict as to the time when they occur. In the Gospels of Mark and Luke the Ascension takes place on the same day as Resurrection. Did Luke after writing his Gospel find out that he had made a mistake, and did he correct it in Acts? If the Ascension of Jesus took place after his Resurrection in the presence of Gospels and in Acts there is the astonishing fact that Mathew and John must both have been present at it, and yet they say nothing about it. The Ascension is only reported by Mark in his Gospel and by Luke in his Gospel, and by Luke (apparently in Acts) and yet neither Mark nor Luke could have been an eye witness of the event. If Mark is considered the mouthpiece of Peter the answer is that he only records the Ascension in his second version of the Resurrection and with none of the incidents given by Luke and no reference to the Mount of Olives as the scene of Ascension, but clear indication of a totally different place—the room in which the Apostles dwelt in Jerusalem. If again, Luke is to

be understood as having given an account inspired by Paul, there is the fact that Paul himself was not an eye witness of the Ascension from the Mount of Olives. The effect of the two Gospels which do not mention the Ascension, Mathew and John, is that the story of the life of Jesus on earth tails off to a vague and insufficient obscurity. It closes rather than ends."

He further states: "I think the story of the Ascension is of much later date than the rest of the story of the life of Jesus, and was probably designed to meet the objections of the sceptics of the end of the first century, who were saying that Jesus had never died at all, resuscitated and then carried to some secret place, perhaps to some Essene monastery."

The above quotation on the one hand shows that every word in the Bible cannot be considered as authentic and on the other hand it mentions a historical fact that at the end of the first century there were such groups of people who believed that Jesus did not die on the Cross and that he had recovered from the state of unconsciousness and carried to some secret place.

(To be continued)



The world suffers today from maladjustment. The most grievous is the disparity between man's material resources and his spiritual poverty. In recent years the process of the exploitation of the forces of nature has been sharply accelerated but the evolution of man's inner self has not kept pace with material advancement. There has been a steadily increasing divergence.

A living faith is needed to bring about adjustment and co-ordination between all aspects of human activity. The principles upon which this coordination must be based and the implementation of which alone human faculties and capacities may be combined in beneficent cooperation are set out in the Holy Quran. The great need of the age is the exposition and interpretation of these principles as applicable to the pattern and problems of human life with which we are faced today. To create confidence and inspire faith this interpretation must proceed on the basis of Divine revelation. In the absence of such revelation the needed evolution cannot be achieved. Also, mankind must have set before it the example of a life based on these principles and illustrating their beneficent application and operation.

All this had been foreseen and provided for in Islam. We find further confirmation of this in the fact that all great faiths had foretold the advent of a Prophet in this age to fulfil these needs and purposes.

This Prophet appeared at Qadian (India) in the person of Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad (1835-1908) founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement. He was a devout Muslim and a devoted follower of the Holy Prophet of Islam. His mission was to re-establish perfect communion between man and his Maker through a fresh interpretation of the Holy Quran and the example of his own life.

He presented to the world the true meaning and teachings of Islam and invited mankind to establish direct communion with God by conforming their lives to these teachings. The message proclaimed by him is very Islam itself. It is based wholly and entirely upon the teachings contained in the Holy Quran and illustrated in the life of the Holy Prophet of Islam. The interpretation of Islam is called AHMADIYYAT and the movement initiated by Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad is known as the Ahmadiyya Movement.

THE
MUSLIM SUNRISE

A quarterly magazine of the faith of Islam, founded by
Dr. Mufti Muhammad Sadiq in 1921, published by the
AHMADIYYA MOVEMENT IN ISLAM, Inc.

Editors:

Abdul Rahman Khan Bengalee, 2522 Webster Ave.,
Pittsburgh, Pa.

Basharat Ahmad Munir, Box 201, Athens, Ohio.

Subscription Rates:

USA and Canada: \$2.00. India, Pakistan: Rs 12.
U.K., Europe: 15 Shillings. Single Copies: \$0.50

Printed at the Fazl-i-Umar Press, Box 201, Athens, Ohio

Published by
The AHMADIYYA MOVEMENT IN ISLAM, Inc.,
2141 Leroy Place, N. W.,
WASHINGTON, D. C.

Address enquiries pertaining to subject matter
to the Editors.