

Touched by an Asura

(The Origin of Islam)

I

Wotan

The question of evil, and its wretched sequelae of hatred, suffering, pain, cruelty, terror and death, has beguiled Man since he began to use his intellect to try and comprehend, to form a tenuous grasp on the world around him, his own place in it, and crucially, what he might become. It is this hope, this ancient dream of a glorious future, that aids him in his sojourn through a world of clear limitation; it tells him that surely what he sees cannot be all there is, that not only is he superior to the rest of the evolution preceding him, but indeed, there is something above his existence for him to strive for. It is to Man's mind, of course, that these thoughts eventually present themselves; and it is here that much of his progression takes place. But in the initial phase of mankind's evolution out of the animal consciousness towards something greater, mind is primarily used for practical matters – concerning survival, basic necessities, with the focus on the physical body, the food sheath as it may also be described; soon afterwards the thought waves that come to predominate his mind are those concerned with the desires of life, its passions, likes and dislikes, hatreds, possessions, need for interchange with others, its own particular form of love based on attachment, its fears and strengths – all of this belonging to the Vital plane or world of human existence.

It is difficult to understate the importance of the Vital plane, as it is *the* primary level of consciousness for most mortals; the difference here between humanity and its animal predecessor is the complexity of life movements, thanks in great part to the evolution of thought and its influence on the vital patterns. Yet it is also in this mental process where we find the distinction between the Vital and Mental human: the former unquestioningly receives – primarily of the ordinary life movements – thoughts, while the latter *thinks*, seeks to actually challenge, understand, change the thought waves that enter his individual system. The primary method by which this mental activity works, by which thinking takes place, is through compartmentalization, the dissection of a subject into its aspects – this is the foundation of thinking. Naturally, the true working of the mind leads to a neutral stance on most matters, considering all sides and not just the reflexive thoughts that immediately come to the surface; it is the Vital mind that on the other hand attaches to one particular viewpoint, depending upon the preferences of the individual ego.

In relation to the Vital mind, the mind proper is, in its elementary and uninfluenced state, one of a manifested truth in the sum of its parts. But the thinking mind is incapable of experiencing the Highest Truth in its whole, because its tendency to compartmentalize, the source of its often exceptional strength and conquests, remains a form of division; therefore while the mind can understand the separate parts, it cannot actually *experience* the unlimited Truth. However, even with this restriction, the mind still remains the current apogee of the arduous evolution of Nature (Prakriti): For if the mind in its own basic function is a limited entity, nevertheless is it quite capable of becoming a receptive field for experiences and realizations far superior to its own station or that of the superficial Vital. And beyond these experiences or realizations, the mind in mortal is also – indeed more so - receptive to ideas. Of course, ideas can present to the mind from different parts of the being as well, from the lower vital (and its crude desires) on upwards; but as the mind is the natural seat of knowledge (and the vital the seat of power), the thinker, the one who wishes to expand his understanding beyond the personal needs or desires, naturally gravitates towards ideas and experiences originating from above the ordinary mental planes. Some of these planes where higher ideas birth include the expansive Higher Mind - from here many a great philosopher has been in contact, has drawn and grown from. Of course, even greater forms of wisdom can also arrive to the mind in the form of Revelation, Intuition (as opposed to

instinct, which is of the Vital), Inspiration, and Discrimination.

If the mortal seeks to develop his mind into a receptive field for these higher forms of wisdom, eventually these regions become integral to his evolving consciousness, as the secret reality is that these planes *always* belonged to him. Ordinarily, however, their content is only presented upon the front of his consciousness intermittently, from behind a veil – it is not a steady and uninterrupted flow. Inevitably, the most advanced of mortals will access these dominions at will, experiencing them as innate to themselves. For most, however, the elevated region that might predominate is the higher mind, lower than the four Intuitive Mind powers – and even the Illumined Mind - that are *above* the higher mind. Yet it is through this intermediate mental stage that man can begin to discern between what he considers right and wrong, becoming conscious of the error and fallacies of human and animal nature, aware that the world he inhabits is one of numerous and significant imperfections. It is here as well – although this occurs in the Vital man as well – that he becomes cognizant of things greater than himself, transcending even wider concepts such as the nation, the formulation of which undoubtedly played a crucial role in the material creation that humanity belongs to. And perhaps, he muses, it is Someone, some Person or God that supports all of this, that does not perish like Man himself undoubtedly will.

To this God or Gods the thinker may ascribe numerous attributes that he either thinks or intuitively as belonging to the Divine. Or, if the individual has openings to the Intuitive Mind, he may have concrete experiences helping to further his understanding of the Divine nature. In reality, the human is capable of having such experiences, accelerating his growth, expanding himself, distinguishing attributes of the Divine, because the mortal contains within a Portion of the Divine, hidden to the external consciousness that he or she is usually preoccupied with. This, of course, is the Soul contained deep within, the Pure Purusha, unblemished by the Ignorance and Falsehood that often characterize Man's superficial consciousness. Because Man contains God within, he – even the most barbarous type – has the inherent or latent potential for transformation into something stupendous. And it is precisely due to this Soul in Man, this eternal and undivided part of God, that Man eventually is able to Know of, Realize, become one with the Divine qualities that indeed are his true Person. This Soul or Purusha takes birth into numerous forms of Prakriti with the eventual purpose of a full manifestation of its inherent qualities, to the extent that these qualities might predominate even in the physical plane, the least evolved of Nature's creation. This growth occurs in what is known as the Psychic Being (not to be confused with “psychics” of the modern world). The Soul itself, the Purusha, has no inherent need for growth, because it is already Pure, Indestructible, and Self-Blissful. However, in order to manifest Itself into a gross material consciousness at times directly in opposition to its principles, the Psychic – an extension of the Soul - must develop gradually through numerous types of experiences. It is thus that reincarnation becomes fundamental, for such a manifestation clearly would be very difficult to attain in a mere lifetime or two.

It is through – primarily – the experiences of life, along with – in varying degrees but pivotal nevertheless - the mental exposure to different ideas, inspirations, illuminations, revelations, and intuitions, that the Purusha develops the Psychic, beginning to gain control of the material existence. Initially this command is not present, as the Purusha remains mostly a Witness to the vital and mental play of the human, absorbing whatever truth is contained within the experiences of the individual. Progressively, the Psychic matures, begins to influence the mortal it inhabits, throwing itself into the play of forces and thoughts that make up the individual's nature. From mere Witness to a subtle influence on things from behind the veil, the Soul, in the highest of evolved mortals, begins to exact a conscious power, more and more present in the front of that particular human's awareness. This is done, to use the language of the Seers, through the flowering of the *manomayapurusha* and *pranamayapurusha*, the mental and vital extensions of the Soul that respectively constitute the Psychic.

The primary means used by these two – and usually, it is the manomayapurusha that becomes active – is the separation of the ordinary consciousness from its normal concentration on the usual thought and life patterns: First, the patterns are observed; later, they are – if needed - corrected, replaced, destroyed, or converted.

This process is indispensable, as naturally, the Psychic Being seeks to have, in the *front* of the material consciousness of the individual system, the profound qualities belonging to the Purusha. Attributes such as kindness, goodness, humility, self-giving without desire for reward or recognition, calmness in thought and action, joy (as opposed to pleasure), self-surrender and aspiration towards the Divine, lack of hatred or malevolence, a sense of inherent equality or *samata* with all of creation, right speech and thought and action, fearlessness, devotion, sincerity, cessation of personal desire or vanities, an inner understanding with others, open-mindedness without a loss of discipline, recognition of the truth in diversity and oneness at the same time, and of course, a rapid discernment between Psychic and non-Psychic circumstances and forces. Eventually, full Knowledge and Realization of the Soul is possible, bringing about a Pure Unity of Consciousness with *all* of creation, rather than a separate existence as the Divine, because one has of course Realized that his or her true Divine nature is without separation, One with all.

The exquisite qualities of the Psychic, however, are often in stark contrast to what one observes in the world, a place at times full of chaos, terror, confusion and abject darkness. For if on the one hand we have the growing Psychic presence, the development of the Soul's Puissance in evolved individuals, a Divine entity that is intrinsically of a Supreme Truth and a profound peace, on the other hand we have a world marked by disharmony, with violent clashes of forces, nations and personalities; full of misunderstanding, with men selfishly tending to their personal ambitions and “interests” and vanity, susceptible to rage and jealousy, ungratefulness, clannishness, lust, greed, hatred and fear. Bereft of clarity, without inner vision or direction, man fumbles around, erroneously searching for the Supreme Truth in material and psychological objects or limited mental or vital ideals, bound to the earth by attachment to the senses (including mental ideas), only partially conscious of who he really is, only partially influenced by his secret Purusha, unable to experience that All is He, without separation of consciousness.

And those are but the features of Ignorance or *avidya*, a mixture of forces affecting humanity, ranging from the Psychic to the immortal Gods and Goddesses whose natural station is well above the ordinary human consciousness, to the previously described ordinary forces of Nature, to movements more sinister. It is the latter element that, while influencing the minds and actions of many mortals, does not usually take complete hold of one, given the Law of Equilibrium that provides some counter. But if Falsehood does predominate in a mortal, he is no longer the field of a mixture of forces – whether Divine, great, good, ordinary, low, demonic, or otherwise. No longer is he – and this is the crucial difference between the Ignorance and Falsehood – merely unaware or only partially conscious of a Divine Truth or Being: gone is his place on the long, circuitous, arduous path to something greater. When Man decides to live by the principles of Falsehood, he begins to think and act in direct opposition to the Divine Truth, Consciousness, Light, Power, and Beauty. And because he is now hostile to the Supreme and the Psychic qualities of existence, he becomes an aggrandizement of all of the debased characteristics of the lower ego: His ambitions, vanities, lusts, rages, hatreds, are no longer of the ordinary patterns common to mortals - they assume a macabre intensity, unchecked by the higher Light of the Soul or similar guiding principles. It is thus that all sorts of evil become possible, for it is always the Light and Truth of the Soul within that actively contravenes such repugnance.

* * * *

When the thinking individual, whether by a process strictly of the mind, or as a result of life experiences, begins to formulate distinctions – whether or not in the terms of the Soul, Ignorance, or Falsehood – between the different psychological characteristics of existence, troublesome questions emerge. For if we suppose that there is a Supreme, Omniscient, Immortal, Blissful, Illimitable, Benevolent Divine behind the creation of the Cosmos, whose Portion each individual secretly contains within themselves, and if we look at the luminous qualities of the Psychic Being – the progressive extension of the Immortal Soul into material Nature – that stand in arrant contrast to the falsehood and evil in the world, we may ask: How could the creation of the Omnipotent Divine be fraught with so much that is the opposite of an immortal deity? How is it possible that this world, the creation of an all-powerful God, is one where He or She or It has seemingly little control over, in the sense of changing the fundamental problems that still plague His creation?

To answer this question, to try and comprehend how hatred and evil can be allowed to exist in a genesis of an Omnipotent Consciousness, it must first be emphasized that all of creation, all of this that we see and hear, smell and touch, think and feel, all occurs due to the implicit sanction of the Divine. This is the Truth concretely experienced and expressed to others by the Yogin of India, from the great Rishi's of the Veda to Seers of more recent times. It is the *experience* to them – which presents as a grand idea or belief to mortals not at their level of Consciousness – that Brahma (to use one name out of many) is the Supreme Divine, in whom is contained all of creation, including apparent oppositions. Indeed, both Purusha and Prakriti are known to be of Brahma, although Purusha is the fully Self-Conscious Divine, while Prakriti is the Divine *working towards* that Self-Consciousness, manifesting through many stages from involved matter to primitive inanimate life, to animal life, human life, and the many gradations of mind leading to the Divine Consciousness. Thus if there is evil and falsehood in the terrestrial existence, it has been implicitly sanctioned – the Divine does not Actively or Consciously perform acts of evil – as a possible outcome (though not necessarily a permanent one) of the manifestation.

The conscious experience of this Truth by the Yogin – that of the Divine at the very least implicitly assenting to evil and falsehood, the most degraded *potentialities* of consciousness – is in contrast to the narrative of the Semitic religions – that of a strict duality between God and a Satan or Devil. The crucial flaw in the latter tale of existence, of course, is that it predisposes to an irreparable separation and division, that entities are completely in opposition to the Divine while having *absolutely* no connection to God, when in fact, in the experience of the Yogin, at *the* Supreme Consciousness (and only at this level of experience), what are - correctly - known as falsehood and evil within earth, cannot be anything *but* Him when transcending the earthly individual consciousness. Veritably, the two troublesome principles contain the *Conscious* Divine in them (highly involved of course) as a *potentiality*, and can conceivably be *converted* or at least worked through to their elevated opposing principle. The failure to recognize the inherent Unity or Oneness behind all of creation – including evil and falsehood - is indeed the elementary failing of the Abrahamic account of existence.

To understand further this profound Unity, another of life's fundamental questions must be examined: Why? Why all of this creation? Such a question – understandably given its magnitude – cannot, per the experience of the Yogin, be addressed using the ordinary means of expression of the human consciousness. For a truly comprehensive and integral answer can only be found when the consciousness ascends and lives in the Divine Consciousness. Such a profundity can only be partially expressed to the limited receiving faculties of ordinary mortals; it would be somewhat like trying to explain complex human thought to a primate – the latter does not have the capacity for a thorough understanding. The human however, even those with ordinary capacities, represents a better receptive system for the – albeit partial - conception of the Supreme Consciousness (which is beyond mere thought), than the animal is for human thought. This is because the mind of mortals, as alluded to

earlier, is capable of far more expansion than an animal mind fixed in its grooves. Thus the Divine, and reasons for creation, can be fairly well conveyed - even if the *complete* Knowledge can only be attained by experience of the Divine Consciousness - to Man through language or expressed thought: And it is through human language that the experiences of the Yogin are presented to us.

Of the numerous descriptions put forth by the Yogin, one of the possibilities – and they can only be thus for the intellect – for creation that strikes as likely, is the Will of a Solitary, Self-Conscious Divine to Self-Consciousness in a Multiplicity of Forms, with a fundamental Unity of Consciousness between the Solitary state and the Multiplicity. Basic multiplicity and diversity, let us recall, are fundamental facts of Prakriti, the active governing body behind thought, action, emotion, force and form. Nowhere in Nature do we find anything that is exactly the same as something else; at the very least there are subtle differences in some part of the constitution of the individual system, whether man or animal, plant or amoeba. Yet behind all of this creation, there exists a Solitary Divine Being, the Silent Brahma as per the Yogin experience. And it is according to this creation that He has slowly willed Himself to be expressed through infinite forms, to even be actively Self-Conscious in the Multiplicity, rather than His usually involved or at most partial consciousness behind the veil of the surface existence. As for subsequent questioning of the reasons behind this Will-to-be, that can only be experienced, not answered in terms understandable to the mortal level of awareness.

* * * *

In the beginning, the present, and the end, there has been, and always will be, Brahma, the Immortal and Supreme Creator, an Indescribable who has nevertheless been immaculately expressed by the Yogin as Satchitananda: the four-fold Truth-Existence-Knowledge, Consciousness-Force, Life-Being, Bliss-Love. It is He – or She or It - who is the source of creation, who is beyond the manifestation, yet contains it within Himself. But the Silent Brahma – rather than His aspect of Dynamic Brahma, which we will discuss later - does not take an actively conscious role in the creation, though it would cease to exist without His assent or support. Instead, the process is delegated to Prakriti, the Executor, who while at heart is but one and the same with Brahma, also has Her distinct status in the reality of things. It is Prakriti, Nature-Soul, Nature-Force, Nature-Consciousness, who directly governs every aspect of the world we inhabit, from the cellular level, to life-force, to thought. It is She who has been tasked with the grand aspiration, preparing the stage for the possibility of pure Divine Consciousness in the Multiplicity of forms.

But this ascent remains something She is striving towards; at present, there exists a separative consciousness throughout the vast majority of her manifestation. Indeed, from the inception of material existence, there has existed this division, this lack of awareness of the true divinity behind the cosmos, the true source – by *implicit* consent – of even pain, suffering, hatred, falsehood, misery and all of the other negative qualities associated with evil. For – per Yogin knowledge and experience – at the beginning the Supreme Mother manifested Herself as Prakriti, a United and Creative aspect of Brahma - He of the four-fold Satchitananda quality -, and, understanding Prakriti's task, sent out *conscious* emanations of each of the four Aspects into creation. Thus Divine Truth-Existence, Consciousness-Force, Life-Being, and Bliss-Love, were supposed to have been present in the manifestation at the outset. But as the very nature of the manifestation had a *separate* quality to it, like how an arm and a leg are separate aspects of one united physical body, what happened next was that these four fundamental qualities of Brahma, once emanated into the Creatrix of Prakriti, lost sight of this inherent unity and, *conscious* of their own power upon earth, took the separation to be the full truth of things.

Thus they began to act according to their own personal preferences and power, instead of remaining aware of their true status - a united extension of the Supreme Mother.

And just as Brahma himself is not merely an abstract concept, but an all-encompassing and – crucially - Conscious entity, so too were these four emanations conscious (note the lower case rendering) entities, with a certain conception of self, just as the mortal has a particular formulation of himself. These original four emanations that lost their conscious connection to Brahma, are known in India, and to Yogin experience, as the Asuras, with the four original ones identified by Yogin as the Asura of Falsehood, the Asura of Death, the Asura of Inconscience, and the Asura of Suffering, all in respective opposition to the Truth-Knowledge-Existence, Life-Being, Consciousness-Puissance, and Bliss aspects of a United, Supreme Brahma. And it is through these Vital world (where they reside) entities - whose 'descent' into a separative consciousness was known by God, in his Infinite Wisdom, as a clear possibility (Yogin have also described this 'fall' according to the word "accident") of the manifestation - and their influence or possession of mortals receptive to their ideas and motive-force, that all evil in the world originates.

Having understood the inevitable consequences of this original schism, and needing to maintain the Law of Equilibrium along with providing additional Conscious Powers to actively guide the grand aspiration toward Brahma in the Multiplicity, subsequently the Divine Mother, the secret Shakti, emanated into the play of forces the Gods and Goddesses - Divine Powers or Personalities of Herself (She is none other than Brahma), often with distinct attributes between themselves, but unlike the Asuras fully Conscious of the Truth that all reality, including the particular God or Goddess, is but one aspect of the Supreme Brahma. Thus a God contains within Himself, and is Consciously United with, all other Gods or Goddesses, and of course the Supreme Brahma transcending the level (the Overmind above the Intuitive Mind) from where the Gods and Goddesses work. The Gods and Goddesses are also consciously aware of their Unity with *all* of creation, including the Asuras who are paradoxically their enemies (but only in the planes of existence - everything below the Overmind - where the complete Oneness and Unity of all is not part of the overall *awareness* of Reality).

Though the Gods and Asuras are, in the most profound of Consciousness', United, in the state of separative consciousness which mortals reside in, we have the Gods on one end of the spectrum of consciousness - Immortal, Divine in themselves, Powers of the Silent, Blissful, Non-attached Brahma; and on the other end are the original four great Asuras and other lesser beings of falsehood, conscious only of their separateness and division, refusing to acknowledge the possibility that an integral existence lies beyond their own egoistic formation. While the Gods and the Asuras can be considered the two poles of the non-Psychic Beings influencing the world, they are not the only forces at play. The Psychic – absent from *either* the Gods or the Asuras – is of course potentially *the* most powerful element in the terrestrial (neither the Gods or Asuras reside in the material plane) formation, depending on the development of the particular individual's Psychic. But these three elements are far from the only ones, as the manifestation upon earth is not just limited to a duality of a physical-material reality that mortals feel, see, hear and smell during their days, versus a Divine existence well above this. There are numerous intermediate planes and entities, with the Vital and Mental regions comprising the general spheres which, along with the material plane, provide the bulk of influence upon man. All of these worlds, mostly subliminal to Man, are rarely understood by him; to Man, thoughts and emotions, force and desire, sensation and ideas, are all created by – or belong to - *himself*, perhaps – if we are to take a modern thesis – by the cells within his body: He often believes himself to be in full control, yet this is far from the truth of things.

For it is not really the human who creates his thoughts and feelings, life-forces or energies, or sensations. These functions of reality are primarily the workings of Nature channelling through the particular individual system, mostly from her Universal Mind and Universal Vital, the two primary

worlds of Prakriti along with the physical plane. The Psychic worlds and the Overmind region (the Divine plane including the Golden Lid separating the manifestation from the Supreme) from where the Gods and Goddesses function, are generally less influential upon humanity's daily consciousness. The Universal Mind and Vital are not Divine like the Psychic and Overmind, although they are indeed of a much broader consciousness than the limited one of ordinary mortals. And it is here, primarily in the Vital worlds, that the non-material beings, including the great Asuras, inhabit. Along with the four original Asuras, the other entities of the non-material world who stand in direct opposition to the Divine Truth are lesser Asuras, Rakshasas, and Pishachas. While all reside in the occult vital plane, the Asuras act in men through the *mentalized* vital, the Rakshasa the ordinary vital, and the Pishacha the lower vital. It is the Asura that is the most dangerous of these entities, because he can gain a certain intellectual control of the mind – though it is still the vital mind, not the actual mind – while the latter two primarily work as forces, without the elaborate mental rationale or justifications native to the Asuras.

Indeed that is precisely how the Asuras (especially one of them in particular) work – through an intellectual aggrandizement of the ego of an individual or group, with twisted rationales put forth to justify all of the deformed or devolved vital inclinations mankind is prone toward, including the lower sense-based desires, but primarily the ambitions and vanities of the ego - the inclination of the individual or group for a vital-material power that revels in its perceived sense of superiority to ‘others’, a force that subsequently seeks to impose this gargantuan feeling upon the ‘other’ irrespective of the terror that occurs. The Asuras only need for man to more intensely follow the general outline of his unregenerate ego or limited sense-of-self. By effecting the aggrandizement of the ego-nature of man, the Asuras easily succeed in their primary purpose - preventing or at least significantly delaying the possible Psychic or Divine transformation of mankind and the terrestrial existence; for the latter outcome is exactly what the Asuras do not want, as it would end their reign upon earth and the power – by way of the subservience of mortals to their influence or possession – that feeds their own ego.

The ego consciousness, the most extreme perversion of which is native to the Asuras, is both a natural byproduct – manifesting in their limited and separative sense of self – of the original ‘fall’ of Satchitananda into the evolving material existence, and a means by which Prakriti Herself secretly uses mortals to complete Her work. For if the ego consciousness is with significant faults, it is also necessary at a certain stage of development to help organize the human, to develop a consistency to the emotional and thought patterns entering his system. Without this organization, humanity would be without direction, without even worldly ambitions to strive for, and nothing great would ever be done. Thus in much of the evolution, it suits an individual's purpose – and that of Prakriti – to let the influence of his Purusha remain from behind the veil. While this Purusha is in fact the true Individual, with humanity's restricted sense of self – the ego – merely a development of Prakriti to allow for *organization* and potential growth, it does not necessarily mean that mankind is without some individual will, that he or she is only a plaything of forces and thoughts – whether they be of evil, lower, inner, higher, or divine origin. For the very fact that there are so many factors at work behind the external mind and body of man, trying to influence or even take hold of him, means that there must be some mechanism by which humans, each as an – until their Psychic takes control – individual system of Prakriti, actually makes coherence of these variables.

Therefore within each individual system Nature has allowed the element of what is known to the thinker as ‘free will’. But this is not completely free, as man is – unless having a rare birth with a fully developed Psychic – made of physical, vital and mental material or “sheaths” belonging to Prakriti *but individualized* for the system, all of which to a certain degree predetermine the types of emotional and thought patterns he will have, along with his physical constitution. Obviously, his environment will play a strong role in this, but that is also not entirely a matter of free choice for the individual ego, as it

is the Soul that has decided the particular birth. The 'free will' that has been gifted to the ego by Prakriti at large, is better characterized as the *choices* the individual has in each unique situation. For while the element of destiny has its truth, there are many lines that the mortal may follow, some more arduous than others; it is up to him or her to determine which of the options – and one often only has a small number – to choose. Thus the individual ego must decide which thoughts to let circulate, which vital movements or desires to follow. And it is the choices the person makes that will ultimately determine his or her capacity to transform into something greater.

* * * *

But Man in his limited consciousness is prone to the usual cyclical patterns of the ordinary vital and mental nature he is born into; and as the Asuras only call for him to lead an intensified version of his standard desires and ambitions, it follows easily that the Asuric entities still reign upon Earth, for the profound change called for by the Psychic Being is often deemed too difficult by mankind. Thus if most mortals do not become directly possessed or even heavily influenced by an Asura due to the individual's sheer incapacity (the Asura, like the Divine, needs a mortal sturdy enough to receive his force), the human nevertheless remains quite susceptible to being overrun by, or falling under the spell of, different *mortals* who themselves are in closer contact with an Asura. It is by this method that these emanations work upon the material plane, via a strong influence or possession over a relatively small amount of humans: through these channels or mediums, they permeate the general atmosphere of the environment or group the particular individuals reside in. As such an arrangement would imply, the Asura – primarily the Asura of Falsehood per Yogin experience – works through nations or conscious groupings for furtherance of his aims – that of creating chaos, destruction, terror, pain, anguish, and most importantly, obstructing the Divine work. Whether through war with other nations, or by the creation of a dark and restrictive climate within the nation, the Asura uses groups of men for his purpose, appealing to the lower egoistic nature of the group through the individual mediums or instruments that he has direct command over.

It is through the Asura of Falsehood's primary need of nations - their ability to initiate war - that we may find one of the obscure reasons or purposes behind the Divine sanction, His tacit permission allowing that such entities might exist and influence His material creation. For war, while not always related to direct Asuric machinations, or not even necessarily arising from his mere influence, can be used for the eventual formation of something greater, closer to the Psychic truth of things, in its aftermath. Of course, the war itself – emerging after all efforts to prevent it are rejected by mortals - would naturally bring with it all of the hatred, misery and horror the Asura finds pleasurable and feeds off, but the extraordinary pressure put forth by the Asura upon the earth would by the Law of Equilibrium demand a response, facilitated by the Gods and Goddesses working through human and national instruments receptive to their influence – mixed as it likely would be with other vital and mental formations or waves. Through this battle an expansion of consciousness, love, power, joy, knowledge may very well arise - the dawn emerging after the darkest night.

If the Asura has this hidden – including to him - purpose in a global sense, he also unconsciously provides a certain utility to the individual. For as the latter has been given the element of free will or choice between limited options, the Asuric influence is there as a test, a stern examination of which direction the mortal takes. At many turns in his life, the mortal may be presented with avenues that could take him down the path towards evil, away from his Soul or the Self (Atman) above, the two directions of his ultimate destiny. Especially if an individual is practising *sadhana*, the conscious spiritual discipline in which one actively seeks Self-Realization or complete awareness of his Purusha,

his true Individual, this Asuric test is exacting. In such a practice, the Asura and similar hostile forces are covertly - these emanations are not aware of their secret purpose - used to test the purity, knowledge, fearlessness and other Psychic qualities of the sadhak (spiritual disciple), to see if such an individual can become a fully secure instrument for God, or if he will be faulty, not fit for the Self-Consciousness. Or, if not fit at first, these hostile forces can be useful in helping transform the sadhak – through his appropriate and Psychic reaction to contact with them, even after a ‘fall’ – into a stronger *adhar* or foundation for God.

* * * *

But the Asura is unconscious of the Supreme's acquiescence to his continued function; in his limited egoistic state of separateness, his prime motivation for action is to continue his current rule upon earth, where mortals are for the most part subservient to their desires, vanities and ambitions. This particular quest of the Asura is of course conjoint with his aim of preventing any Divine manifestation upon the planet. Mortals are used by him as instruments for this preeminent objective, along with feeding his own ego, his own sense of self, and especially his insatiable lust for power. If his historic ability to bring shock to an often *tamasic* or inert world brings with it the possibility of an eventual change for the good, this is *not* his intention – it occurs in spite of his perverse will. Out of the four original Asuras, it is the Asura of Falsehood that - per Yogin experience - uses, actively guides *certain* nations to perpetuate his rule, though the other Asuras of course have benefited from nations with inclinations opposite to the Divine. And of the four, the Asura of Falsehood is indeed the current ruler of mankind, the false King upon Earth. It is he, along with the Asura of Death, of the four original ones, who seek to actively influence the terrestrial consciousness. For - again per Yogin knowledge and experience - both the Asura of Inconsciousness and the Asura of Suffering were converted, transformed back into their involved and secret Divine principle. As these occult conversions were recent developments, we have generally seen, in modern times, a progressive expansion of consciousness and joy in the World. Of course, given that we are at the germinal stages of this profound advance, it is only natural that there will be a continued working through, with unpleasant movements coming to the surface to be eliminated or transformed, of both Inconscience and Suffering. But as these Asuras have been converted, the destined result is clear.

The Asuras of Falsehood and Death, on the other hand, remain intransigent; the latter might even be a necessary evil at this point, given man's ignorance of the ultimate aspiration – thus Death as a universal force is needed to dissolve the current form housing the Soul, from which the individual consciousness will move into the next life or state of existence. Nevertheless, just as the Asura of Falsehood is unconscious of any secret purpose behind his action, it is the same for the Asura of Death. Thus by illnesses and other means, Death brings about the expected end to the mortal, at once feeding its own power and ego. The Asura of Falsehood meanwhile, continues in his aim to prevent the emergence of Divine Truth in the manifestation, whether through the individual human or in swaths of men. As he was present at the origin, the means by which he gathers hold of certain mortals, and crucially, nations or groups, come quite freely, having long been perfected by him. And from time to time, a nation will fall under the grip of the Falsehood he seeks to perpetuate, confusing its vital ambitions and force with that of its Nation-Soul, seeking to impose itself upon others, eager to destroy those it deemed not of the Falsehood it erroneously believed to be ‘truth’, in the process dragging the world with it to the precipice.

Tasked with bringing to fruition the stupendous aspiration, this great evolution of consciousness from involved cellular material and other forms of matter, through progressive stages of existence to the Divine, Prakriti has proceeded – at least to our human perception of time – gradually, painstakingly, and cautiously. From the beginning, she has allowed for an enormous variety of movements to play out, to expand to their limit, if indeed they were to have an end. It is because of her mechanism allowing for the flowering of numerous potentialities that we have such exquisite variety within her workings, from inanimate objects and partial life, to the richness of the animal life and the complexity of mortals. Of course, within this diversity are distinct changes of consciousness, noted by those who have studied Her endeavour. Indeed, there appear to be certain pivotal transitions in Her creation, including the transformation from primate into humanity, heralding the arrival of thinking - a sudden surge in the capacity of mind and subsequently, of consciousness. These rapid changes of consciousness, rare throughout the history of Time, stand in contrast to the usual working of Prakriti.

This is because such crucial ascensions are in fact a direct undertaking of the Supreme Brahma – departing from his usual Neutral (Silent) Witness state and going beyond the typical work of the Gods and Goddesses - to bring about a surge of consciousness, rather than the studied movement of Prakriti. For this purpose, the Divine consciously chooses an individual – it is a quite natural for major transformations or expansions in knowledge, love, power, and consciousness, to occur in a solitary unit of Prakriti first, with the after-effects proceeding on to the group or even the rest of the species. In India, these particular individuals are identified as Avatars, unique even from those who obtain *moksha* or liberation from the human consciousness into Self-Realization. At all significant points in Prakriti's evolution, an Avatar has taken birth to open a higher level of the manifestation, consciously closer to the Divine. An obvious example of this phenomenon is of course the first mortal – heralding the sudden break from the primate, the ascent from the limited animal consciousness to that of a much broader mentality.

Although one might expect, with the vast abundance to Her creation, to see multiple distinctions in consciousness between various species in the manifestation, these breaks are few and far between. Indeed, one Indian tradition only calls for a total of ten Avatars – with most *not* of a Self-Realized variety (for instance, Lord Rama), but certainly of a marked advancement from previous creations of Prakriti - in the billions of years of the planet. Thus it is in epochs that Prakriti – marked on each end by an active Divine hand – moves in her extraordinary assignment. But in the life of Man, limited as he is by the sheer number of years he lives (unaware, as most are, of their immortal Soul within, or even of past lives – although the latter is part of Prakriti's design so that knowledge of the past life does not obstruct the unique growth sought by the Psychic in the current life), by the veil covering his consciousness of Self or Purusha, and by either his lack of belief in - or a sheer inadequacy of earthly material offering data upon - the history of creation, he looks at things based on his own era, a relatively smaller window of time.

And it is the transition period between this current era and the last one that we must appraise – for that climacteric contained within it the direct working of the Asura of Falsehood. We are of course referring to the tumultuous events that took place in Europe in the first half of the twentieth century, the nadir of which was the rise to power of Nazi Germany and its horrors, depravities, and obscurantism - its unadulterated evil. But before we can examine the Nazis, we must first look at the general atmosphere in Europe in the years and decades preceding their hegemony; for the Nazis did not spring forth from a vacuum, with a *weltanschauung* mysteriously divergent from their more enlightened European relatives. Such an ideology, such a nation-state, cannot coalesce without the necessary ingredients

having been present for quite some time. And it was from the prevailing intellectual climate in Europe that certain Nazi ideas were derived, found affinity with, fortified into an ideological bulwark. And of all the psychological attributes that can be associated with the Asuric influence, it is the aggrandizement of the group ego that is the most dangerous - Europe of that era was rife with this.

Perhaps we must take a more sympathetic view, with our advantage of time and an understanding of humanity's current limitation, of the crudeness to the European mentality during those times. After all, in his semi-evolved state Man usually associates himself with his vital nature, even if it is of a mentalized turn. Thus for the European brought up in the climate prior to the great wars, he was undoubtedly the pinnacle of his species. For how else could he have conquered vast territories in all corners of the globe, imposing himself upon the natives of the Americas, Africa and Asia? Given that he had conquered them, naturally that made him inherently superior to them, predisposing him to both rule his subjects and enlighten them. But this was a misidentification of cultural or civilizational superiority with geopolitical power. For if we take the cultured man to be the one unsatisfied with his current state of inner consciousness, seeking to expand his understanding of his own nature, secretly or consciously aspiring to his own divinity, and at once expressing this developing awareness of his inner and higher nature in numerous creative forms, we can see clearly that this is distinct from the standard individual of political power: the latter is concerned with his external state, his financial status, the ability to satisfy his personal ambitions and desires, the welfare of persons under his patronage, the amount of territory he controls – all typical of the ordinary vital idea of expansion.

In Europe of the time, this typical increase of the Vital was also the ambition of the nation-state, with each country not only imposing itself upon the other continents, but also competing with one another for the position of preeminent global power. Prior to the two World Wars, if these ambitions were clearly present, there remained enough intellectual control and Psychic counter-weight to prevent the massive storm bubbling beneath the surface. But the check on the vital expanse became less and less, with the tendency toward basic ambitions and interests eventually emerging as the primary will to be of the European. With such a disposition, strife was inevitable, for if man inclines to the Vital at the expense of the Psychic element, eventually the Vital will override any moral control, economic trade, political alliances or treaties. This growth of the European Vital of the time was greatly aided by its collective intellect, for not only was its intelligentsia propagating the ‘civilizing’ mission of its nations, along with promoting disciplines such as Eugenics that sought to ‘scientifically’ prove the inferiority of “non-White” races, they had also disassociated themselves from significant cultural tenets previously espoused. Gone – or at least under-emphasized - were the gains of the Enlightenment, that of the use of the rational mind to freely examine all aspects to the world, whether of religious, ethical, political, social or mystical character. Philosophy and science were aids to this previous exploration, not tools to provide ‘evidence’ of a preconceived notion. This was because the European intellectual during the Enlightenment lived closer to his inner mind, with a firmer sense of its true neutrality and many-sidedness.

A similar fate was also met by the inner or higher vital elements common to the European culture, some of which were based on the finer aspects of its religious heritage. The emphasis on the qualities of virtue, egalitarianism, universal love, beauty, and self-sacrifice, all diminished rapidly with the rise of crude political power and notions of the superiority of the “White” race. In place of these values, the intellectuals in Europe also professed a different superficial ideal – one based upon utilitarianism, the cult of comfort, and the satisfaction of the base senses; gone was any exploration of potential unconscious or hidden realities – only what was sensed was real, otherwise it could not exist. While beliefs such as the existence of the Soul were also at times scoffed at by those of the Enlightenment, the difference between that era and the pre-World War climate, was that men of the former still believed in ideas closer to the inner truth of things. For it is not necessary that the individual believe in God in

order for them to have psychological attributes of the inner mind or inner vital, or even Psychic qualities. Indeed, sometimes those with religious belief in a deity remain in their other aspects crude, un-Psychic and dangerous to others.

While the *intelligentsia* prior to the Great War did not generally have this crude sort of religious belief, neither did it have much of the Psychic or inner qualities of the Enlightenment. Bereft of both the inner and higher guidance from its leading minds, the continent naturally regressed to the ordinary vital impulse. On the national level, this led to each state increasingly associating their identities with their respective ambitions; and as all the major European nations had their own global interests often in direct conflict towards one another, war was always a possibility, because it is one of the likeliest outcomes of the group desire to dominate upon other groups, a vital impulse countered by Prakriti through her Law of Equilibrium. Thus the inevitable climax – or so it surely must have been – with its massive loss of life through war, famine and genocide; the millions also permanently disabled; the destruction of the Empires of numerous nations involved; the loss of territory for the vanquished countries; the blow to ideas such as the benefit of capitalism to world peace. Yet all of this did not bring about the profound introspection needed to prevent its recurrence.

Of course, there were a few who took the terrible aftermath as fuel for an attempt at change; among the more notable responses included the creation of the League of Nations and the promotion of pacifism in some quarters. But the latter had little influence over the population at large for whom war was still an unrefined impulse, or for a political class that viewed it as politically expedient, a gambit undertaken for the expansionary drive. And the League of Nations, while having the stated objective of preventing war, had at its disposal the tools of disarmament, negotiations, arbitration, and closer communication of nations; nowhere did they attempt to address the inner psychology leading men and nations to war. Without such knowledge and subsequent transformation of the impulse to war, no true change can be effected by such organizations: This was especially so at the time, because even after all of the destruction and misery, little global reflection took place, including among the victorious nations, for whom the aftermath was but a way to further their global ambitions and interests. Might is right was the motto, and the loss of the defeated party was food for the continued enlargement of the victors. And if the victors could perhaps also curtail any future attempts at expansion by the defeated, then this was to be done as well. Thus the great game continued onward, with the ideas and collective intellect that allowed for such a calamity remaining with barely a dent to its edifice.

If there was at most only a partial appreciation among the victors of how the general climate of vital ambition, domination, and materialism led to the Great War, in post-war Germany there was practically no illumination at all, the searchlight of inner reflection having not been turned on, the egoistic reflex deflecting responsibility outwards. While this was the basic stance of a more moderate German nationalism, one refusing to accept the nation's aggressive role in the War, an extreme mindset began to emerge in the post-war Weimar Republic, permeating the general atmosphere alongside the narrative of the then majority. In the *weltanschauung* or worldview of the extremists, it was not simply a matter of refusing to accept responsibility for a war they had lost – to this faction, fantasy and myth were the means of repressing the secret humiliation of having lost so much in power and pride. To them, the Germans had not really been defeated; rather, they had been betrayed by elements within the German populace. This became known as the “Stab-in-the-Back” (*dolchstoß*) hypothesis explaining the ‘defeat’ of the Germans, and was met with either acceptance, or little argument, by the majority, as it is the nature of the unrefined, insecure, prideful vital ego to instinctively grasp for a narrative rendering military losses as having nothing to do with its own failings: For how could it be so imperfect as to taste defeat?

One set of Germans in particular were at the receiving end of much of the conspiracy theories flowing freely throughout the German public. For the Jewish community living in Germany of the time, they

were now to blame for not only the unnecessary – so it was claimed – capitulation towards the Allied Powers, but also for each and any moral, social or economic ill effecting Germany – all dependent on which way the wind was blowing, instead of any factual basis. Inevitable is this culmination, whether it is in the individual or group, if the mindset does not involve self-reflection; without it, any insecurities, failures, supposed defects and struggles, will be blamed upon outside parties ‘conspiring’ to prevent the individual or group from their birthright of success and power, when the primary reasons lie within. This lack of introspection in Weimar Germany, this inability to analyse – even if it meant that the answer was in the mirror - the root egoistic causes of the war, the aftermath, and any economic or cultural issues, is precisely what allowed for the increasing possibility that something even more sinister would take hold of the nation. Indeed, as all of these theories were being propagated, little of the relatively more moderate elements made any concerted effort to address the problem at its source. Intellectual opposition was limited by the fact that the “moderate” elements shared much of the prejudice of the “extremists”, even if the former did not believe in some of the violence or aggression of the latter, or had differences in policy tools.

This ingrained prejudice - along with sheer stupidity, inertia and cowardice - was also a factor in the partial response of the Government to extremist parties, including the latter's use of explicitly violent branches. Yet if the fanatics certainly sought to harness the prevailing mood to take control politically, they did not rely solely upon, or obtain motivation and direction for their actions, from group feeling or instinctive prejudice alone. Indeed there was a strong intellectual component shaping the ideology of their leadership, some of whom also sought to formulate their own – mentalized - vital constructions in writing, with the most infamous example emerging in Adolf Hitler's *Mein Kampf*. But before we consider Hitler's prison-scribed narrative, we must first examine other crucial intellectual works that arose from and stimulated the growth of the vital prejudices, hatreds, vanities and narcissism of the European nations, culminating in quite possibly the most dangerous nation-vessel the Asura of Falsehood has ever developed.

* * * *

If ideas are perhaps the most potent of means by which truths of the Divine are presented to the ordinary man, by which he transforms himself, ascending from his partially conscious mortality towards his real Person, they can also be the seed of his descent into evil and degradation. For even the greatest of ideas are not the Divine Truth-Existence – at best they are a representation or reflection of God's truth in human form. And not all ideas, of course, originate from the higher or inner regions of humanity – Man is presented with a stupendous range of ideas from a near infinite variety of sources. It is the psychological nature of the idea, and the manner in which Man receives it (if at all), that determines its force upon him. Humanity, however, is often not suitably conscious enough to discern the nature of an idea, where it emanates from, or what it represents. Sometimes, ideas presented to humans are the exact opposite of the truth of things, but are portrayed to be, and taken as, the absolute truth. The most dangerous of these ideas are the ones that appeal near-instantly to the Vital, yet also provide ‘evidence’ – however hastily obtained or inappropriately examined – to support the idea, perhaps helping to solidify a mere hypothesis into a more elaborate yet still invalid theory, the shoddy foundations of which remain invisible to parties with neither the desire nor the capacity to realize the house of cards they mistook for palatial opulence.

It was thus in Europe of the latter half of the nineteenth century that a dangerous idea began to permeate the minds of certain scholars, who by way of their status of unquestioned authority, and because of their general agreement with each other, allowed for this particular idea's augmentation into

a “theory”, helping to facilitate its overwhelming acceptance in both the European and North American populations. It was only natural that this theory was embraced among these nations, as it offered an official, ‘scholarly’, ‘scientific’ explanation as to why their race ruled - indeed, brought all light into - the world. For the contemporary White races were the pure descendants – so it was claimed – of a historic “Aryan” race that, with perhaps one or two rare and insignificant exceptions, gave to the world all of its higher forms of civilization. The word itself (Aryan) was taken from some of the first contact European scholars had with the ancient nation of India. For in their study of the Rig Veda - the verbal manifestation of the Rishi's mystic experiences passed down orally through countless millennium -, they found multiple descriptions of a group known as the Arya destroying the Dasyu.

It was here that the Europeans had chanced upon – or so they thought – their breakthrough. For it had to be a White “Aryan” race invading India from the North to subjugate the dark-skinned “Dasu” races. Otherwise how could one explain the fine flowering of wisdom best exemplified in later Indian scripture such as the Upanishads and Bhagavad Gita. Surely the dark Indians of modern time, beholden as they were to their White British masters, could not have been the pure-blooded ancestors of the men who brought to the world such profundities – it was a paradox that the Europeans could not reconcile. Thus the ‘identification’ of an “Aryan” race documented in the Rig Veda was proof that modern Indians were but a national miscegenation of the invading White Aryans with the Dark Dasu – the racial mixing inevitably leading to India's decline. This particular concoction of the Veda describing an actual race or ethnicity, through the use of the word Arya, was popularized in no small part due to the translations of the German philologist Max Muller, even if the English philologist William Jones was the first to propose the idea a century earlier.

By the time Max Muller arrived at Oxford University to continue his study of Sanskrit, there was a growing recognition that this particular script was the ancestral language of the Indo-European language group; it was with this in mind that Muller, having already translated the Upanishads, took to the task of translating the Veda. What he found within was of a quite different nature to the Upanishads he had previously translated, with the latter works being of a quality appealing to the higher mind and the intellect, as its truths are expressed in a manner that philosophical minds find more harmonious. The Veda, on the other hand, offers its truths in a different style, one not easily conducive to the intellect of the European scholars, Muller included, of the time. For while the Veda is the expression in human language of the truths the Rishis experienced in their luminous planes of existence, unlike the Upanishads, the Veda cannot be comprehended strictly in the literal sense, as any proper understanding of the Veda must begin with the basic understanding that, *at the very least*, in the mystic stanzas of the Veda, the descriptions put forth are to be taken in emblematic fashion.

Of course, to the Rishi, these were not mere symbols being vocalized; instead, what they presented were Truths of, at its *foundation*, the higher Intuitive mental regions (where visions and revelations occur), along with the Overmind and Superconscious planes – the two regions of the Divine Consciousness - of existence rarely accessible to the ordinary mind that, due to its lack of experience, must first *receive* the form of expression in an allegorical manner, potentially later to *experience* the truths in totality. But many are without even the basic insight to the allegorical nature of Vedic lyrics, nor its subtle presentation of profundities, for they have neither the innate mental capacity nor requisite tutelage to hint at the experience of the Rishi. Even men of a fine intellect, which Muller undoubtedly had, interpret the Veda incorrectly, as they do not have the correct *type* of intelligence; rather than the intuitive or inspirational, they are of the rational or deconstructive mind, much more likely to mistake the apparent for the actual. It was thus that Muller, someone naturally of this latter bent of mind and influenced by ideas of the time blindly theorizing the belief systems of the ancients, would take the Veda in a concrete fashion.

When Muller translated the Veda, he found incantations to Gods and Goddesses describing these

entities in similar vein to the deities of other ancient cultures. The Vedic King of the Gods, Indra, is equipped with the thunderbolt just as the Greek God Zeus; Surya is the Sun God; Agni is the Lord of Flame; Varuna – like the Greek Poseidon – rules the waters; even animals like horses (ashvins) and cows have verses dedicated to them. Adequately translating the text, Muller would fail in his interpretation, having stormed the Bastille yet unable to appropriately use what was contained within. To him, the Veda confirmed his view of the ancients - they were mere Nature worshippers, barbarians who could not see beyond their senses, could not reason or deduce, without creativity or comprehension of ideas or concepts such as salvation. He did, however, grant that the Vedic presentation of deities was marginally better than the contemporary Hindu worship, writing, “But as far as the popular conceptions of the deity are concerned, the Vedic religion, though childish and crude, is free from all that is so hideous in the latter Hindu pantheon.” (Georgina Muller, *The Life and Letters of Right Honourable Friedrich Max Muller*, 1902, p. 362) Yet was this a curious expression of arrogance, because Muller also *admitted* to a difficulty in translating the scripture: However, instead of relating that to a deficiency of his own mind or capacity, he ironically projected his deficient insight upon the Veda, attributing to it a quality only those of a superficial understanding would conclude:

Some portions, I confess, I consider as hopeless, as likely to resist all attempts at interpretation, but there is no reason to despair. The Rig-Veda is the most ancient book of the Aryan world. Every Hymn, every verse, every word that can be deciphered in it is a gain. **These Hymns represent the lowest stratum in the growth of the human mind** that can be reached anywhere by means of contemporaneous literature. (Georgina Muller, *The Life and Letters of Right Honourable Friedrich Max Muller*, 1902, p. 271)

But the Veda is not the communication of the savage – it is the sublime expression of luminous Seers. And like many poets subsequent – including those not of their elevated consciousness – to them, the verses are multi-layered, open to numerous interpretations, with the most sublime understanding available to those with a keen intuition or having prior awareness or *experience* of the true subtle nature to their words and descriptions, those seeing past the superficial aspects of their incantations. To them, the cows are beams of the Supreme Light; the fire is the centrepiece in the altar of psychological surrender (of attachments that objects in the flame are to represent) of the devotee to the Divine (through which the Psychic grows); the ashwins are the pure vital life force; and the thunderbolt is the sudden descent of Divine inspiration or illumination into the comparatively dark recesses of the mortal's mind. It was not the Rishis who lacked the vision to see beyond the apparent truth of things – instead it was Muller and other European intellectuals and scholars following him who could not transcend the partial light of reason towards deciphering the Unfathomable of the Rishi.

Because of this incapacity, this lack of inner perception, when Muller came across the Arya of the Veda, he near immediately concluded that this group of men - depicted as destroyers of the Dasyu - were a racial or ethnic group, the common ancestor for much of the classical world, including the Indians and the Greeks. Yet surely, mused the man who *admitted* to an inability to interpret portions of the scripture, these illustrious forefathers were not of Indian origin – from the North a section of “Aryans” *must* have entered into India from the outside, bringing with them the Vedic culture:

I only recognize one chronology for India, the four literary periods of the Veda, which bring us to at least 1500 b. c., and even at that time show us a formulated system of divinities and even priestcraft. Before this time the schism of Brahmans and Zoroastrians had taken place. And long before this, even, the schism between the Aryans tracking north-eastward and those tracking southwards took place; and before the nomadic Greeks separated from the nomadic Indians, centuries must have passed. There seems no doubt that the South Aryans (later on divided into Indians and Zoroastrians) had settled together in Bactria. (Georgina Muller, *The Life and Letters of Right Honourable Friedrich Max Muller*, 1902, p. 179)

The Aryans however, are not a grouping of men in the material sense, in the way that divisions are created according to geographical location or sheer physical appearance, or even spoken language. The Aryans of the Veda – befitting the allegorical manner in which it must be initially read by those of the human consciousness - are men or women endowed with certain psychological qualities, dignified humans of strong Psychic natures, with aspirations to bask in a greater light, a higher truth. It is in this quest that they come across hostile obstructive forces – of both psychological and occult origins – that they must destroy. These *occult* forces include the Dasyu of Vedic experience – they are not, in the primary interpretation of the scripture, a physical grouping of people standing in opposition to a barbarian horde migrating or invading from lands far away. But for Max Muller, the presumption of a primitive nature to ancient worship was accompanied by his egoistic belief in the supremacy of Christianity, the ‘true’ religion to have been offered to mortals. It was his belief that the rule of the European in India was in strong part due to his more enlightened religious values, and accordingly that it would be only appropriate that these principles be imparted upon the Hindus, that the latter be divorced from their ancient spiritual heritage – indeed Muller wrote precisely this in a letter to his wife Georgina:

The translation of the Veda will hereafter tell to a great extent on the fate of India and on the growth of millions of souls in that country. It is the root of their religion, and to show them what the root is, I feel sure, is the only way of uprooting all that has sprung from it during the last 3000 years. (Georgina Muller, *The Life and Letters of Right Honourable Friedrich Max Muller*, 1902, p. 328)

Many of Muller's correspondents were well aware of the value of his philological endeavour toward the promotion of Christianity among the heathen Hindus. One of them, Dr. Pusey, explicitly stated that the German's work would be an excellent tool by which to convert the Hindus:

I cannot but think then that your labours on the Vedas – while they attest to your wonderful power in mastering this ancient Sanskrit...and while they evince, as I understand, great philological talent, beyond the knowledge of Sanskrit itself – are the greatest gifts which have been bestowed upon those who would win to Christianity the subtle and thoughtful minds of the cultivated Indians...**Your work will form a new era in the efforts for conversion of India, and Oxford will have reason to be thankful that, by giving you a home, it will have facilitated a work of such primary and lasting importance for the conversion of India, and which, by enabling us to compare that early false religion with the true,** illustrates the more than blessedness of what we enjoy. (Georgina Muller, *The Life and Letters of Right Honourable Friedrich Max Muller*, 1902, pp. 237-38)

Another correspondent, the Bishop of Calcutta, gave a more detailed rationale as to how the translation of the Veda could facilitate such conversions – namely, by providing the Christian missionaries with intellectual ammunition against Hindu Pandits:

I feel considerable interest in the matter, because I am sure that it is of the greatest importance for our missionaries to understand Sanskrit, to study the philosophy and sacred books of the Hindus, and to be able to meet the Pundits on their own ground. (Georgina Muller, *The Life and Letters of Right Honourable Friedrich Max Muller*, 1902, p. 236)

The fact that such sinister intent was being discussed even prior to Muller completing his work, negates any claim of true neutral scholarly activity upon which such academic endeavours should commence. It is an especially pertinent point when we consider that Muller, like his European peers, shared this deceitful motive of using the Veda to destroy Hinduism and promote Christianity. As he wrote in a letter to Chevalier Benson, the means by which he intended to assist this task was through learning the Sanskrit language, helping him to combat the native “priestcraft” and show them the barbarity of the

Veda:

I do not at all like to go to India as a missionary, that makes one dependent on the parsons; nor do I care to go as a Civil Servant, as that would make me dependent on the Government. **I should like to live for ten years quite quietly and learn the language, try to make friends, and then see whether I was fit to take part in a work, by means of which the old mischief of Indian priestcraft could be overthrown and the way opened for the entrance of simple Christian teaching**, that entrance which this teaching finds into every human heart, which is freed from the ensnaring powers of priests and from the obscuring influence of philosophers. Whatever finds root in India soon overshadows the whole of Asia, and nowhere could the vital power of Christianity more gloriously realize itself than if the world saw it spring up there for a second time, in a very different form from that in the West, but still essentially the same. (Georgina Muller, *The Life and Letters of Right Honourable Friedrich Max Muller*, 1902, p. 192)

While Muller did not wish to become one, he clearly understood the importance of missionaries in the great vital – and his preoccupation with “vital power” foreshadowed what was to come - ambition of having Christianity overtake the different religions. In an additional letter to Chevalier Benson, he enthusiastically supported the sinister misuse of the Veda for missionary intentions, writing, “Nevertheless, of course I shall be glad if the Rig-Veda is dealt with in the Edinburgh Review, and if Wilson would write from the standpoint of a missionary, and would show how the knowledge and bringing into light of the Veda would upset the whole existing system of Indian theology, it might become of real interest.” (Georgina Muller, *The Life and Letters of Right Honourable Friedrich Max Muller*, 1902, p. 112) This disruption of Indian “theology” - an insufficient characterization, because the Sanatana Dharma is fundamentally a “religion” of sublime mystic experiences -, so imagined Max Muller, was to bring about the expansion of Christianity throughout Asia, with India as its fountainhead. And though we will certainly find his devious ambition to have led to the most disastrous of results, Muller's zealous belief left him blind to the consequences, and he proceeded accordingly, at one point informing the Dean of St. Paul's, “I have myself the strongest belief in the growth of Christianity in India. There is no country so ripe for Christianity as India, and yet the difficulties seem enormous.” (Georgina Muller, *The Life and Letters of Right Honourable Friedrich Max Muller*, 1902, p. 332) Muller was so fanatical about bringing Christianity to India that he even declared himself ready to lay down his life for this particular cause!

After the last annexation the territorial conquest of India ceases – what follows next is the struggle in the realm of religion and of spirit, in which, of course, centre the interests of the nations. India is much riper for Christianity than Rome or Greece were at the time of St. Paul. The rotten tree has for some time had artificial supports, because its fall would have been inconvenient for the government. But if the Englishmen come to see that the tree *must* fall, sooner or later, than the thing is done, and he may mind no sacrifice either of blood or of land. For the good of the struggle I should like to lay down my life, or at least to lend my hand to bring about this struggle. (Georgina Muller, *The Life and Letters of Right Honourable Friedrich Max Muller*, 1902, p. 191)

Muller envisioned, as the ideal result of this “struggle”, a different type of Christianity emerging from its contact with India, one closer in quality to the ancient Christianity he imagined to be its true spirit:

What I feel very deeply when I have to argue with such men, is that the Christianity which conquered the world was very different from our hardened and formularized Christianity, and that the old tree will never bear transplanting into a new soil, though the young seed would probably grow up on Indian soil into as wonderful a tree as anything we have seen as yet in the history of Europe. (Georgina Muller, *The Life and Letters of Right Honourable Friedrich Max*

Muller, 1902, p. 331)

Harbouring both the idea of the ancient religions as primitive ones, and a desire for Christianity to reign supreme over Hinduism, it was inevitable that he interpreted the Veda according to that defective framework. Thus even the historical timeline of the Veda had to acknowledge the Christian perception of time - that of a very young planet created in a miniscule amount of years, a hypothesis established through scholarly examination of the Bible during that era. Muller, by way of his imagined history, implicitly acknowledged that the Veda – and its timeline - was being scrutinized through the lens of the period's most powerful narrative – it was not necessary that he state that the influential force of the time was heavily Christian, because that was understood:

The Collection of Hymns of the Rig Veda was completed towards 1000 B.C. **That cannot of course be proved like $2+2=4$ but it as sure as all our knowledge of these times can be.**

(Georgina Muller, *The Life and Letters of Right Honourable Friedrich Max Muller*, 1902, p. 144)

It was this specific timeline, fantasized – Muller openly admitted that he had no proof for his theory! - by a ‘honourable’ scholar without, as one would ideally expect from a researcher, any hint of actual evidence (the equivalent of writing that two plus three equals seventeen yet proceeding as if this concoction was an established fact of mathematics), along with the presumption of a *physical* Aryan race sharing a common lineage, that came to predominate the discourse in European intellectual circles. Initially, as unquestionably clear from Muller's letters, the perfidious intent was to use the Veda as further ‘proof’ of the primitive nature of Hinduism, as a destructive propaganda tool for procuring converts to Christianity. But the drive for such conversion, whether motivated by a deluded belief in the exclusive truth of a ‘saviour’ mission, or out of a hatred or disdain towards the different religion, contains in its very psychology something antithetical to the central manifested feature of the Hindu religion, whether that aspect is described in Vedic allegories or narratively expressed in the later scripture of the Upanishads and Bhagavad Gita.

It is in the latter where we find the greatest postulation, by Sri Krishna himself, of the truth of Dharma, the basis of the Hindu religion. And as with many of the terms or deities of the Veda, this tenet was mistranslated by the European overlords of the time - and is often erroneously done so today – as meaning “duty”. But Dharma is not something forced or utilitarian; it is the free-flowing and inherent law of one's inner nature. This is not the same as “duty”, which is something governed by external laws or customs, whether societal or legal or a general moral consensus – all of which are not necessarily of one's nature. It is this Sanatana Dharma, the universal law of one's inner being, that is the religion of India; it is a law that recognizes each individual's inner being as different from the next, and subsequently, understands that fixed external laws can never be the complete answer for the developing individual, because the law of the inner being is closer to one's Soul than any external law – meaning that for the individual to realize his Purusha, to live from that Consciousness, he must first follow his particular *svadharma*. Indeed, it is actually dangerous for a person to imitate the law of another, because as Sri Krishna told Arjuna on the plains of Kurukshetra, “It is better to follow one's natural law (svadharma), even though faulty, than an alien law perfectly. Even death in following one's natural law is better; perilous is it to follow an alien law.” (Bhagavad Gita 3:35)

One might, after reading this eternal wisdom, ponder how the possibility of remaining alive would be deemed inferior to the practice of *svadharma*. But when we consider again the Soul moving from life to life, through different natures, it becomes clear that the Soul undoubtedly has a particular aim in mind when it choose a system, if we will, to assume – at minimum - Witness state within. Thus in order for the Purusha – rather than the ego - and the evolving Psychic to gain the most out of the life, the individual is best served following the lines of his inner natural law, irrespective of the potential end result or how that might look from the outside. For to practice *svadharma*, one will as a matter of

course approach life from the internal standpoint, looking outwards, absorbing the external stimuli that suits the individual law and rejecting that which goes against. This inner law is an evolving one, quite capable of receiving truths from the world, including contact with other mortals, to foster the development of the nature and the Psychic. But this ability should not be confused with a complete change in the law – evolution is a process, not an abrupt and disconnected change that leaves the person with no connection whatsoever to his previous conception of self. The Imperial European however, in his delusion of grandeur, believed that he might bring about a complete change to the nature of the Indian, creating for the latter, through external power, a completely different law of being, an artificial way of living. This desire was best articulated by Abbe J.A Dubois, a contemporary of Max Muller's – the latter would write the foreword to Dubois' primary work describing the Hindu, a work explicitly detailing his bold ambition to destroy the Hindu, reshaping him (they fancied themselves Gods, the Europeans!) into a Brown European Christian:

Therefore, to make a new race of the Hindus, one would have to begin by undermining the very foundations of their civilization, religion, and polity, and by turning them into atheists and barbarians. Having accomplished this terrible upheaval, we might perhaps offer ourselves to them as lawgivers and religious teachers. But even then our task would be only half accomplished. After dragging them out of the depths of barbarism, anarchy and atheism, into which we had plunged them, and after given them new laws, a new polity, and a new religion, we should still have to give them new natures and different inclinations. Otherwise we should run the risk of seeing them relapse into their former state, which would be worse, if anything, than before. (Abbe J.A Dubois, *Hindu Manners, Customs and Ceremonies*, p. 96)

But this is an ambition of sheer fantasy, because just as the individual has his *svadharma* or inherent law, so does each nation in the world have its natural group law, its own particular nature. Nations are not – in their deeper truth - just masses of men speaking a common language, distinct in land mass through divisions of water or mountain ranges or political lines on a map. Each true nation also has a certain group dharma; indeed it was inevitable that this would be a resultant construction of Prakriti – albeit a fluid one, because group inner laws, like in the individual, are never fixed things. The dharma of the nation, after all, goes along with the reality of a Soul taking birth in different lives to gain varied experiences of benefit to the burgeoning Psychic Being. Such a fundamental need of the Purusha would naturally entail having diverse national make-ups from which the Soul can choose a birth in a particular individual body. As the individual is connected to the group, accordingly there are a myriad of national dharmas, complex sub-national dharmas even, that go along with the individual's *svadharma* – all of this diversity helpful for the Psychic.

Thus in the realm of nations, each having – if they are conscious enough - its own peculiar dharma, the same message of the Bhagavad Gita applies to the group as for the individual - that of not aping the law of another if it is not one's own inherent law. It is here that we see how this European Christian quest for conversion is in truth adharmic, because it seeks to impose – in this particular case through the manipulation of scripture and psychological operations – its narrative and ideology upon the other, to externally stamp upon the native lines of belief and living and action that he must follow, seeking to use shame or fear – whether psychological or material – to coerce or pressure the native to comply. The false Evangelical idea of Christianity as the sole truth, that all *must* be saved by Christ (but only after a conversion to Christianity) - and that this is the only means for salvation -, stands in opposition to Dharma in its universal aspect. Indeed, as expressed most clearly by Dubois above, the Europeans knew exactly how adharmic their task was - that the conversions proposed were artificial, an unnatural type of conversion.

For when one seeks to follow his own internal law of being - something that cannot be rigidly defined in an external or objective sense, with the path taken often encompassing intuition, subtle

discrimination and other types of subjective faculties - one realizes that others have their own law of being or inherent law of nature to follow. The same principle applies towards separative sub-groups and nations, and easily will include any externally created religious distinctions. Thus the idea of separate *religious* groups was non-existent in the ancient land of Bharat: it took foreigners, raised in a different psychological environment, to even classify the natives as “Hindu”. This absence of objectified – dependent on performing certain rituals or believing solely in certain scriptures or dogma – religious exclusivity is fundamental to the practice of the Sanatana Dharma. Indeed, the follower of dharma may seek to incorporate certain ideas or beliefs he encounters in his study of other religions, but not at the expense of rejecting different ideas that an exclusionary religion demands he deny, as this goes against the inherent plasticity and diversity of the law he follows.

But this religious chauvinism, the antithesis of the Eternal Law, was perhaps the most powerful force driving the ambition of Max Muller, clouding his vision, corrupting his work, obscuring him from a deeper understanding of that which he was studying. Instead of the Veda revealing itself to him, the Word of the Rishis was to fit *his* loose historical schema, to support a collective and *predetermined* European answer to the mysterious past. Thus Muller's work, along with helping to promote Christianity as the superior religion, would also support a Christian idea of the world having only existed for a mere thousands of years. Yet if this religious exclusivity was intrinsic to Muller and represented the underhanded motive for his work, it was his secondary promotion of the idea of an ethnically distinct “Aryan” *race* that - along with the ‘evidence’ supporting the Christian timeline of real and imagined events - brought about the formation of a different, more virulent, type of triumphalism.

* * * *

For if Muller initially conceived of the idea of “Aryan” migrations from a common ancestral homeland into India and lands west of India, later would this be described by him, and his peers, in terms of an invasion into India from the Northwest of the country. The Veda, of course, provided ‘evidence’ in the form of the Arya defeating the Dasu, the supposed – according to the European fantasies - original inhabitants of India. But the Arya of the Veda were not defeating a physical group of people – they were defeating psychological and occult concealers of the Truth, destroying the usurpers of a higher Light. If the Dasu were distinct entities in themselves, they were not of the ordinary terrestrial existence, but of subliminal planes of which the Rishis were conscious. But as the ‘scholars’ were unable, and unwilling, to attempt to comprehend the vantage point of the Rishi (which at the very least, to the ordinary mortal, would be an allegorical understanding of Vedic terms), the idea of an Aryan Invasion of India became widely accepted among European academics and intellectuals, rapidly transmitting its way into the general public. At a superficial level, one can understand how it gained popularity; here was a nation that had been subjugated for half a millennium prior to British rule, one that had been invaded numerous times in recent history, with multiple foreign parties holding dominion – surely the British were just the latest in an endless line of conquerors?

But this view of things represents a failure to recognize the way in which Prakriti moves in individuals, nations and all other manifestations of her creation. It is best understood in the Hindu realization of the Divine in the trine aspect of Creation, Preservation, and Destruction. It is through this trinity – one of many experiences of God - that we also see the fundamental character of Prakriti, reflecting a Divine truth in the earthly manifestation – for with each of her creations, comes preservation and some form of destruction. But this latter outcome is never a finality, as within destruction the seed of a new creation germinates: it is thus that Prakriti works in cyclical fashion, in both the individual throughout his life

and inevitable death, and in the nation. Failing to acknowledge this easily appreciated reality, the Europeans mistook what they observed in India to be the sign of a perpetual state of invasion which they were merely continuing, when in fact they had arrived during the destructive part of the nation-cycle. To the Europeans, raised in a culture based on dichotomies of heaven and hell, believers and unbelievers, a more integral view of history and life was incomprehensible – what was present now had to have been the truth of the past. Such a view was characteristic of an inability to recognize the curve of time, taking the era during which they arrived in India to be a fixed line, the apparent reality to be the complete truth. But all nations rise and fall – this is the nature of life; the difference between nations lies in their respective arcs, and the values they practice at their peaks.

Without this broader vision of the greater cycle of nations, the Aryan Invasion Theory became accepted dogma. But with it came plenty of missing pieces, questions arising on both the past and the present. As a result of this void, the pernicious sickness that had gradually been conquering the general intellectual atmosphere found a channel by which to bring about the inevitable schism of the Europeans from their previous Psychic influence. What had initially been a theory of benefit mostly for religious propaganda now became the fountainhead for new ideas on race – with skin colour emerging as the determinant principle. And India, once again, would prove fertile ground for the history imagined by the European; this time, it was the variance in her people's skin tone that was of magnified importance. For the European had observed in India that the people of the south, speaking languages not – in their limited analysis – of the same family as the Indo-European class, and - to their eye – of a darker skinned tone, offered further proof that the European interpretation of the Veda was indeed accurate. If Northern Indians were of a lighter skin colour than their Southern counterparts, surely the North Indians were descendants of the “Aryans,” and South Indians the original “Dasu” inhabitants of the subcontinent, forced south after having lost to the Aryan invaders - the Veda, after all, described the Dasu as “dark”, the Aryans as “light”.

These descriptions however, are again meant for the intellect to interpret allegorically: The Aryans are those who bask in the spiritual light, following the path of Truth. The Dasu are those who obstruct the Aryan in his quest for the supreme light – the latter are the propagators of falsehood and obscurantism. The actual physical skin colour of either party was never even considered by the Rishi, for this battle of the Arya and Dasu takes place at minimal on a psychological level. The Europeans, having interpreted the Veda concretely, primitively swallowed this imagined Aryan invasion whole; from it also came their hypothesis on the decayed state of India they saw - that it was a result of the mixing between the invading, pure, white, Aryan race and the dark natives: India was a land of mixed races, and this explained its subjugation. The unadulterated “Aryan” Europeans, at that point the supreme powers in the world, were surely meant to rule and enlighten the planet: It had always been so, from the time of the ancestral Aryan. From this we find the secret rationale – that of power – for the promotion of the Aryan Invasion Theory, irrespective of how much it was couched in terms of cultural attributes including religion. For it was the global power held by the European that explained the popularity of the idea of a historic invasion: It gave the European both pride in being the ‘pure’ descendants of the original Whites, who had brought – supposedly – with them from Central Eurasia all of the cultural treasures associated with the ancient civilizations, and also justified their imperial designs. After all, if their ancestors had brought civilization to a variety of different lands, then surely they were here to continue the “Aryan” work, and to take, as was their birthright, the spoils of such power, including the adulation and slavery of the “inferior” races.

There was something within the constitution of the pure White race that made them uniquely capable of creating great civilizations – this was the grand idea of Arthur de Gobineau, a French Diplomat, as proposed in his mid-nineteenth century book, *An Essay on the Inequality of the Human Races*. It was here that the world received the first articulation of a distinct - and irreversible - separation of humanity

based upon skin tones – white, yellow, black and mixed. All of the higher qualities were attributed to the Whites; if the other races indeed had certain capabilities, or had previously created civilized societies, either it was due to an influx of White invaders, or it was not quite of the greatness of White or Aryan civilizations. Completely enthralled with the global power of the European of his time, without a true understanding of power's cyclical nature, Gobineau, attributing all of history's great cultures to either the Aryan race or their marauding parties, did not deem the other races capable of developing such civilizations on their own. For these races did not even share a common *species* with the White race!

We must of course, acknowledge that Adam is the ancestor of the White race. The scriptures are evidently meant to be so understood, for the generations deriving from him are certainly white. This being admitted, there is nothing to show that, in the view of the first compilers of the Adamite genealogies, **those outside the white race were counted as part of the species at all.** (Arthur de Gobineau, *An Essay on the Inequality of the Human Races*, p. 118)

Gobineau explicitly stated his belief that the different races were separate from each other, and of “permanent” types:

The reader will not fail to see that the question on which the argument turns is that of the permanence of types. If we have shown, as it were, that the human races are each, as it were, shut up in their own individuality, and can only issue from it by a mixture of blood, the unitarian theory will find itself hard-pressed. It will have to recognize that, if the types are thus absolutely fixed, hereditary, and *permanent*, in spite of climate and lapse of time, mankind is no less completely and definitely split into separate parts, than it would be if specific differences were due to a real divergence in origin. (Arthur de Gobineau, *An Essay on the Inequality of the Human Races*, p. 125)

Even if the races did, as other parties were arguing, indeed share a common ancestor, what was pertinent was their present “absolute” separateness:

Whatever side, therefore, one may take in the controversy as to the unity or multiplicity of origin possessed by the human species, **it is certain that the different families are today absolutely separate**; for there is no external influence that could cause any resemblance between them or force them into a homogeneous mass. (Arthur de Gobineau, *An Essay on the Inequality of the Human Races*, p. 133)

Similar to how Max Muller and his philological peers could only see the surface or apparent meaning in the Vedic verses, so too was Gobineau preoccupied with the more superficial aspects of reality, of both the present stature of the “inferior” races and their physical form in relation to Whites – form representing permanent evidence of the “eternal” separation of the races:

The strict and unassailable permanence of form and feature to which the earliest historical documents bear witness would be charter and sign-manual of the eternal separation of races. (Arthur de Gobineau, *An Essay on the Inequality of the Human Races*, p. 140)

Having declared the separation of the races to be “permanent” and “eternal”, it naturally followed that he could see no avenue by which the “inferior” races could ascend to equality with the White race. Thus it was useless to even attempt to civilize them, as Muller and other missionaries were inclined, for Christianity – the crucial means by which Muller and like-minded Europeans would attempt the civilizing process – was impotent in that regard. Gobineau would write, “Christianity neither creates nor changes the capacity for civilization,” (Arthur de Gobineau, *An Essay on the Inequality of the Human Races*, p. 66) also adding, “Once more, Christianity is not a civilizing power.” (Arthur de Gobineau, *An Essay on the Inequality of the Human Races*, p. 76) Thus what had initially been an

enterprise to try and – misguidedly – save the Native from himself, by offering a supposedly higher religion, inevitably devolved into racialism, because the Europeans held Christianity as integral to their civilization, identified historical Biblical figures as White, believed it to be a prime reason for their power at the time, and deemed it their peculiar task to enlighten the rest of the inferior races; yet any conversions of the inferiors could never be truly satisfying, for such conversions were part of the attempt – however much it was intellectualized in strictly religious tones - to Europeanize the native, with Christianity thought to be an important part of that process. But this goes against the truth of Dharma, that one can never truly become the *human* nature of another, because it is not one's own law. Europeans like Gobineau, instinctively understanding that such a full conversion was impossible, concluded that the “inferior” races simply did not have the capacity, and thus were, and always had been, separate from and lower than the Whites.

It was this particular – to the era - idea of separateness, the seed of which was planted by European Christian missionaries in their quest to save the heathen Hindu, crystallizing in an obsessive identification with the White race, that provided the direct opening for the Asura of Falsehood, even if it was to only become apparent many decades later. For to view others as eternally separate and inferior goes against the truth of *samata*, the inherent unity of all existence that is the reality of the Purusha. It is more suitable to the restricted vital consciousness of the Asura that misidentifies its limitation with the transcendent. Gobineau had articulated – as had certain writers before him including Dubois – this characteristic of the aggrandized vital ego. And as European power consolidated throughout the world, so did the proliferation of writers proposing the type of racial theories Gobineau espoused. One of these authors, Houston Stewart Chamberlain, an Englishman raised in Germany and married to the daughter of the famous composer Wagner, penned in 1899 the highly influential treatise on race, *The Foundations of the Nineteenth Century*, in which he summarized the European distortions of the Veda:

Be that as it may, wherever the Aryans went they became masters. The Greek, the Latin, the Kelt, the Teuton, the Slav - all these were Aryans: of the aborigines of the countries which they overran, scarcely a trace remains. **So, too, in India it was “Varna,” colour, which distinguished the white conquering Arya from the defeated black man, the Dasyu, and so laid the foundation of caste.** It is to the Teuton branch of the Aryan family that the first place in the world belongs, and the story of the Nineteenth Century is the story of the Teuton's triumph. (Houston Stewart Chamberlain, *The Foundations of the Nineteenth Century*, xiii/introduction)

Having established the historical precedent of glorious conquests by the White race (through the erroneous translation of *Varna* as physical race based on skin colour, when in fact it refers to *non-hereditary* groupings based on one's svadharma and *function* within society), Chamberlain would also declare, irrespective of whether the races all descended from the same source, that the White “Aryan” race were the deserved rulers of the world:

The races of mankind are markedly different in the nature and also in the extent of their gifts, and the Germanic races belong to the most highly gifted group, the group usually termed Aryan. Is this human family united and uniform by bonds of blood? Do these stems really all spring from the same root? I do not know and I do not much care; no affinity binds more closely than elective affinity, and in this sense the Indo-European Aryans certainly form a family...Physically and mentally the Aryans are pre-eminent among all peoples; for that reason they are by right, as the Stagirite expresses it, the lords of the world. Aristotle puts the matter still more concisely when he says, “Some men are by nature free, others slaves”; this perfectly expresses the moral aspect. (Houston Stewart Chamberlain, *The Foundations of the Nineteenth Century*, Division II, p. 542)

Chamberlain emphasized in particular the superior qualities of the Teutons, the ancestors of the

Germans, viewing this branch of the “Aryans” to be its finest and purest. Madison Grant, an American anthropologist and lawyer, would expand further on this hypothesis in his widely read 1916 work, *The Passing of the Great Race*. In it, he advocated the belief in “Nordic” superiority to other races, including other Caucasian ones. Grant was part of a growing movement in both America and Europe to promote racial purity or “hygiene”. This form of scientific racism, Eugenics, was based upon both the belief in the inherent superiority of the White races and the ideas of the Englishman Francis Galton, who believed in the selective reproduction of desirable human qualities, including race. By this point in time, the Asura of Falsehood's infiltration into the psychological atmosphere was such that not only were the books of Chamberlain, Grant and other authors of Eugenic and racist works widely read by the common Western public, these men, unlike with previous writers such as Gobineau, also had a direct influence over the political decision-making of the time.

In the case of Grant, he was able to guide the content of the American Immigration Act of 1924 along with anti-miscegenation state laws throughout the country. Adolf Hitler even sent a letter to him describing *The Passing of the Great Race* as his “Bible.” (Jonathan P. Spiro, *Defending the Master Race: Conservation, Eugenics, and the Legacy of Madison Grant*, 2009) But if Hitler could only admire Grant from afar, he was but a short trip away from Chamberlain, who was feted by the German elite and military well before the ascent of the Nazi Party. The appeal of the latter's ideas to the German psyche was so profound that he found himself in correspondence with Kaiser Wilhelm II, who saw to it that *The Foundations of the Nineteenth Century* was not only read by the German army, but also incorporated into the school curriculum, assuring the indoctrination of ensuing generations of German Youth. (Allan Chase, *The Legacy of Malthus: The Social Costs of the New Scientific Racism*, 1977, pp. 91-92) Thus prior to the rise of Adolf Hitler, a key proponent of the birthright of “Aryan” rule over the inferior races had been welcomed with open arms into the mainstream of German life, just as the cult of scientific racism and Eugenics was being received by the general populace – albeit with some criticism by disagreeing authors – in the rest of Europe and America.

Subsequently, it can be safely concluded that the ideology of Adolf Hitler did not emerge out of an intellectual vacuum, and was not the invention of one mortal – he was merely tapping into the general intellectual atmosphere of two continents, including his own nation where the ideology of the Aryan master race was most fervently received, given its appeal to the childish vanities of its citizens. For Germany, more than any other Western nation of the time, identified itself with its vital ego; and in the works of Gobineau, Grant, Chamberlain and others, it found apparent intellectual support or mentalization for what was at heart an error of the Vital rather than an eternal truth. But for a historically insecure nation, having just suffered the most injurious wound to their pride, it was far simpler to fall back into the comforting narrative of their greatness, seeking solace in lies that allowed them to avoid any self-reflection on their role in World War I or the humiliating prospect of admitting defeat in the war. Indeed, such was their aversion to accepting defeat, that in Germany immediately after the war, vanquished by the Allied Forces, having signed the Treaty of Versailles requiring them to pay reparations and cede significant portions of their territory, having had Kaiser Wilhelm II and others tried for war crimes, there developed a rapidly accepted idea that Germany had *not* actually lost the war. Instead, the Army had been “betrayed” by civilians back home, forced to surrender due to the latter's duplicity rather than any actual defeat in battle. This myth, the aforementioned *dolchstoßlegende*, became popular in military and conservative circles, who blamed socialists, communists, Jews, and politicians of the newly formed Weimar Republic, for what they perceived to be an unnecessary surrender. And as the theory provided the population a way to escape the sense of inferiority that comes with losing a war, belief in its accuracy was embraced quickly and unthinkingly.

Adding to this already toxic mix of denial, lies, hubris and falsification of history, was a large-scale economic crisis during the first few years after the war, with the Government defaulting on reparation

and other payments, along with hyperinflation effecting daily life, among the many difficulties. It was during this turbulence that Adolf Hitler, son of a civil servant, himself a failed painter and ordinary infantryman, would begin his ascent to power.

* * * *

Unlike the Avatar, the rare, embodied direct descent of the Supreme Consciousness within the material existence to bring to fruition a specific Truth and elevation of consciousness, the Asuras do not actually embody the individual unit, in the sense that they identify a particular mortal to assume an internal vantage point from, or in the possibility of materializing into the human form. For the Asuras, like the Divine, are of a force magnitudes greater than the *ordinary* human is capable of receiving *directly*, even if the Asuras are indeed the evil, false, obscure, disharmonious, oppositions to the Divine Truth, Light, Bliss, and Consciousness. While the Divine Force is Infinite in comparison to the Asuras, both are of a intense nature relative to humans; thus even if their respective psychological characteristics greatly differ, for mortals to have contact with either, the practice of *certain* similar principles are required. And while the Divine on rare occasions takes direct birth as an Avatar, embodying the mortal form, this does not mean that the Asura is incapable of such – and it should be understood in a concrete sense – a thorough use of the human, whose physical form would become equivalent to the clothing on the ordinary person.

It is simply that the Asura *prefers* not to manifest directly into individuals in the way the Divine does in highly limited circumstances (as the Avatar rather than the Self-Realized). What the Asura, especially the Lord of Falsehood, inclines toward, per Yogin Knowledge, is to take occult *possession* (distinct from an embodiment) of *multiple* individuals simultaneously, each of whom are impelled - through varied means including direct contact in the occult planes of existence – to do his bidding. An individual may even directly *see* the Asura (but in the occult or subliminal vital plane of existence it actually resides in, behind the ordinary play of the world), though the entity may present itself to the mortal in a variety of forms, perhaps pretending to be God, or taking a form that might appear Divine. The Asura prefers to possess rather than embody for a couple of reasons, first of which is the practical issue of what it is trying to control: the human creation of Prakriti is simply, expect perhaps for a handful in history, too poor of a material for the Asura to manifest into, with significant limitations or obstructions preventing it from manipulating events in the terrestrial plane in the way it is used to doing. In comparison, the Divine has at His disposal the Soul and the Psychic within the human, the former of which is actually a Portion of God and of an infinitely greater power than the Asura; these make it significantly easier – though it remains rare - for the Divine to incarnate, as no mortal contains within himself a portion of the Asura! Indeed, the very fact of the human containing a Psychic in itself leads to the Asura retreating from such an embodiment, averse as he is to the Divine Presence and Truth.

The second reason the Asura of Falsehood prefers possession is due to strategic reasons, based upon his knowledge of the tendency of mortals to recoil to their base nature. For among the many lower predilections of men is their inclination towards subservience and mental inertia. It is this that attracts them to what is known as groupthink, the unquestioned following of a leader admired by the rest of the group. Of course, such a tendency does contain within it the possibility of a higher use, because it is often transformed - in those with developed Psychic beings – into devotion and surrender to the Guru, the Realized Divine on Earth. But in the ordinary human life, it is a process by which the Asura or different vital emanations can take hold of groups of mortals for their ill designs. As most men are creatures of their vital, the mass is prone to follow men of a strong vital character, men undoubtedly

having personal, political, military, and social power. Unfortunately, men with vital power may not always be enlightened or cultured, and are often with only a small connection to the *pranamayapurusha* that the genuinely great rulers of history have been governed by.

While these latter heroic figures led their followers, citizens and soldiers on to a greater material power that superficially appears similar to the conquests of barbarians, behind their march to power was the aspiration for a society based upon the highest of ideals – and a Higher Power secretly using the leader to enact a greater truth. Such rulers became vessels for the Highest Power to create, protect and expand the blossoming civilization, the secret purpose of which was to move closer to bringing the Divine into the ordinary life, allowing men the environment through which their Psychic – the *manomayapurusha* and *pranamayapurusha* – could possibly develop an increasing dominion over the ordinary nature. These men may have allowed for their followers to obtain the fruits of life, the spoils of war, the luxurious items the lower nature is fond of, and even the allowance of a certain amount of narcissism, but these aspects were at heart secondary to the sublime ideals that they fought for, that their cultures were founded upon.

The life of man, however, is full of ambition and pride, vanity and jealousy, desire and fear. If this is the base by which he is moved, it becomes quite obvious that he might often seek a ruler – and the ruler, having been raised among similar types, would profess these tendencies – whose appeal to power was based entirely upon these characteristics. And as these lower qualities are what the Asura of Falsehood wants men to live by – to prevent the flowering of the Divine in life, obstructing man from his true Reality –, it follows that he would want to possess individuals with both the capacity to rule (or greatly influence masses of men), *and* the narrowed consciousness that believes the lower nature as the greatest truth of things. These men do not necessarily have to be in control politically, though it is easier for the Asuric work to be done through men in such positions. Nor does it have to be strictly a solitary individual, although the Asura is not going to directly possess swaths of men. Instead, the Asura will possess a select number of individuals (unknown to each other) at a time – something he would have difficulty doing if he incarnated into a body – who then proceed to move the masses in the Asuric direction. It is in this fashion that he grabs hold, without actually entering the terrestrial plane of existence, of the general atmosphere, taking control of groups of men, using them – often unconsciously to the mortal blinded by the intensification of his lower nature – for his purpose, discarding them like a rag when finished.

But such possessions do not occur overnight, for as with the seeker on the golden or right handed path to the Realization of his or her Soul, the person becoming the plaything of the Asura must have a certain development in order to absorb the occult and subtle experiences that he is not initially ready for. Such a preparation is not necessarily even done by the Asura; rather, multiple reasons abound for man to cultivate the mediumistic capacity for occult experience, at a latter stage choosing – whether conscious of the Asura's true nature or not – to submit to him. Such a process in the vast majority of cases takes time, requiring many factors; rare is it for the mortal to, from an early age in life, have capacity for a continuous stream of occult, subtle, or mystic experiences, that a possession by the Asura or, in the higher type, a Realization of the Soul, would entail. Thus was the case with Adolf Hitler, for whom hardly anybody examining his status in the early twentieth century would have imagined to become as powerful as he did, eventually holding the fate of Europe – and through its colonies, the world – in his hands. After all, his adult life was marked by an inability to establish himself as an artist in Vienna, and an overall ordinary service to his country's war effort. There were no apparent signs that he could be capable of leading his nation to war, conquering much of Europe, and of course, ordering genocide.

But to look at his external achievements or his social background as indicators of both his ability to rule and the likelihood of possession, would only be a superficial examination. Of fundamental importance

in an analysis of these matters is the evaluation of his overall psychology and his personal habits, with the former undoubtedly influencing the latter, both necessary to develop the human as a medium or instrument of non-physical entities. In the case of his daily practices, we must first look at his attitudes towards substances (food or otherwise), sexual relations, and other practical matters such as sleep and daily routine. The study of such habits is necessary for it is an indication as to the discipline – or lack thereof – of the individual. Some amount of discipline in these areas is necessary, in the vast majority of cases, to have actual occult or mystic experiences, and – most importantly – to have a continuous stream of them. In the case of Realizing and living under the Sovereignty of the Soul, one must be able to practice a comprehensive and unwavering discipline with regards to food, substances, sexual relations, sleep, *in addition* to the required higher psychology and beliefs that aspire towards that elevation of the consciousness from the ordinary movements. Continuous contact or possession by the Asura, on the other hand, would only require a *certain* amount of stringent personal discipline yielding the initial vital stability needed to receive such an enormous force – the Asura, however, does not necessarily require the same discipline after the aperture has been secured.

In Hitler's case, it is documented that he was a rare drinker, later to be completely abstinent. Such teetotaling is often necessary for the human to be able to absorb direct contact or influence from massive vital forces, though smaller occult entities might be able to, in haphazard fashion, influence even a frequent drinker. As alcohol – and tobacco, something Hitler abstained from - leads to disorder, indiscipline, and a degradation of the physical health, it stands in opposition to the robustness needed when *initially* seeking mystic experiences. In the same way, improper sleep, or the lack of a consistent daily rhythm, departs from the necessary order needed. Vegetarianism, something Hitler practised to a significant degree, has been long understood by mystics and occultists to be of benefit to their practice; the best way to describe this effect, is to consider it in terms of essential “heaviness” and “lightness”; a vegetarian diet can be considered lighter upon the body, promoting good health and a consciousness less concentrated upon the physical functioning, more subtle, allowing for the possibility of varied subliminal experiences. Finally, sexual activity has long been known by saints, mystics, and occultists in numerous cultures, to be abstained from if one is seeking extranormal experiences or realizations. Complete abstinence is necessary for one seeking to realize the Soul or the Self, otherwise the mystic ‘falls’ and must work again to regain the higher experiences that prepare for the Ultimate Consciousness; such abstinence can be of important use – though not absolutely necessary – for contact or possession by Vital entities such as the Asura, as it promotes the vital stability needed, because indulgence of the sexual impulses can be compared to a cup leaking from its bottom. But if the medium or instrument has requisite discipline in other departments, or, in rare births, simply a natural occult capacity irrespective of having total discipline, a lack of total control of the sexual impulse or other factors may not necessarily obstruct the *Asuric* possession, for though the Asura is a force greater than the ordinary mortal, it nevertheless pales in comparison to the Soul in man, the immortal Portion within.

While these are some of the primary aspects of ordinary life that are looked at by occultists and mystics in their respective journeys, Hitler did not practice such discipline for the sake of a preconceived quest for something extraordinary. Rather, Hitler's practices were shaped, at least initially, from an ethical and moral basis. Thus if we consider the possession of Hitler by the Asura, the Lord of Falsehood, it will have occurred without necessarily an original intent on the part of Hitler, but rather through the mixture of the aforementioned daily practices, perhaps some later addition of techniques like meditation or even his rumoured drug use (both of which can create a *rudimentary* opening to the subliminal planes), and the most crucial of all elements – the psychology of the man himself. For it is the latter that indicates in what direction man will use his – in rare cases - naturally present or progressively developed mediumistic capacities. Such receptive ability is only indicative of the mortals *potential* to be an instrument – how man guides his instrumental status is part choice, part psychology, and also

dependent on an inherent or taught aptitude to discriminate between divine, psychic, intermediate, hostile, and evil beings or influences one encounters in the occult worlds. Of these components, it is his psychology, his aspirations, his beliefs, that will determine if he walks the golden path to the purest of all, if he meanders without reaching his destination, or if he decides to engage the abyss.

Crucial are these qualities, for they give profound insight into the development of his Psychic Being, central to man in his quest to find God and his Soul. If the Psychic is active, Man naturally develops both a Psychical sensitivity and psychological attributes that are closer to the Soul. Of these qualities we again recall the ideal of *samata* - inherent equality among all creation. Self-giving, calmness, sincerity, kindness, humility, lack of personal ambition, lack of greed, movement away from the lower desires, non-maliciousness, are also some of the psychological characteristics of those moving towards the highest truth. Of particular importance – and this is automatic to the Psychic – is if one is inclined to surrender his thoughts and actions to the Divine, willing to part with attachment to both his faults and positives. Such faith will not only help purify the seeker's nature, it will also safeguard him from becoming attached toward or misguided by any entity he might encounter in the occult realms, for the surrender will not only decrease his attachment to his ego, it will also increase in him an inherent – Psychic – discrimination between right and wrong movements or emanations.

But if the nature is unregenerate or only partially refined, attached to the ego nature, or *chooses* to follow the lower nature, mistaking it for the supreme ideal, danger lurks, especially if such a psychological basis is combined with a strong personal discipline. Thus was the case with Adolf Hitler, who if throughout much of his adulthood seemed destined for a dull and irrelevant life, did in these earlier years contain the crude psychological material and vital robustness that the Asura of Falsehood could shape, progressively influence and eventually possess, fashioning for himself an obedient and impressionable instrument, the latest of his playthings used to perpetuate his reign upon earth.

* * * *

If it was only to be many years later that Hitler finally achieved concrete external power, displaying by his subsequent actions obvious signs of an Asuric possession, his 1925 manifesto, *Mein Kampf* (My Struggle), written soon after his imprisonment in 1923 for political crimes, offers unmistakable evidence that the Asura had captured this instrument well before the Third Reich. For within this mixture of autobiography and treatise we find copious documentation of the primitive psychological material required by the Lord of Falsehood, with much of it present even before his military service. In it, one observes such crucial elements of naked personal ambition, pathological hatred towards others, envy, narrow-mindedness, quickly resorting to violent solutions, and excessive pride in his race, to name but a few. These, combined with his openly stated plans to manipulate the populace *and* exterminate others – intentions that cannot have formulated overnight – show that the internal development of Hitler's psychology towards Falsehood had been cultivated for years – perhaps even before an overt possession in the subliminal plane - by his dark master.

Of the key psychological features, perhaps the most intransigent – although *Mein Kampf* is notable for its uncompromising nature – is the hatred expressed within it. If *samata* is the foundation of a true inherent unity and love, the recognition of all creation as secretly existing as one in multiple forms, hatred is the opposite, the marking of a person far removed from Psychic influence. And Hitler was full of malevolence, primarily against those he deemed to have been enemies of the Germans, those whom he blamed for their “loss” in the War. Of all the groups he directed his venom towards, his hatred of “the Jew” was unrivalled, to the point where it crossed the line of reality into outright paranoid

delusions. And though Hitler spent a good amount of time detailing his belief that Jewish machinations precipitated Germany's capitulation to the Allied Powers, his enmity was actually formed during his time in Vienna, the period of his first interaction with them on a regular basis - Vienna of the time was an ethnically diverse city, the centre of the Hapsburg Empire. But such diversity only increased in Hitler an already well-formulated German Nationalism, along with the belief that others were hindering the full growth and expression of the German. It was in Vienna that he began to view the Jews as key players in this obstruction, describing them as “parasites” and promoters of decadence among the Germans. But there were worse features to his paranoia – in the Jew, he had found the hidden hand controlling the sordid elements of Vienna life:

What soon gave me cause for very serious consideration were the activities of the Jews in certain branches of life, into the mystery of which I penetrated little by little. Was there any shady undertaking, any form of foulness, especially in cultural life, in which at least one Jew did not participate? On putting the probing knife carefully to that kind of abscess one immediately discovered, like a maggot in a putrescent body, a little Jew who was often blinded by the sudden light. (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 42)

By using descriptions such as “parasite”, “maggot”, “rascals” (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 182), “an incarnate denial of the beauty of God’s image in His creation,” (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 146) “the incarnation of Satan and the symbol of evil,” (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 254) Hitler exposed the primitive nature to his mentality, the distance between him and the fundamental truth of *samata*, the closeness to a rigid and vulgar separateness promoted by the Asura of Falsehood. The pathological nature of his hatred, already viewing Jews as equivalent to things most consider vile and disgusting, continued unchecked. As his life experiences accumulated, as he read more of the literature written by others sharing his prejudices, both his abhorrence and subsequently, his paranoia - for intense malice to the ‘other’ naturally leads one to attribute all kinds of supposed acts and conspiracies upon that particular group, functioning as a way to redirect one's own failings upon them and lazily avoid internal reflection – grew more complex. If initially the Jews were only the proponents of morally degrading activities in Vienna, later he concluded them to be the puppet-masters behind a vast international conspiracy:

This is rendered all the more impossible because the forces which now have the direction of affairs in their hands are Jews here and Jews there and Jews everywhere. The trend of development which we are now experiencing would, if allowed to go on unhampered, lead to the realization of the Pan-Jewish prophecy that the Jews will one day devour the other nations and become lords of the earth. (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 351)

In their quest to subjugate Germany, the Jews had used the political means of Marxism, which to Hitler was nothing but an outward construct to further the Jewish ambition of both hurting the German war effort and eventually conquer the world:

Marxism, whose final objective was and is and will continue to be the destruction of all non-Jewish national States...While the flower of the nation's manhood was dying at the front, there was time enough at home at least to exterminate this vermin. But, instead of doing so, His Majesty the Kaiser held out his hand to these hoary criminals, thus assuring them his protection and allowing them to regain their mental composure. (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 140)

Indeed, the stated ideal of the Marxist movement – that of helping the lowly worker – was but a pretence to enslave and annihilate non-Jewish races:

Thus arose a movement which was composed exclusively of manual workers under the leadership of Jews. To all external appearances, this movement strives to ameliorate the conditions under which the workers live; but in reality its aim is to enslave and thereby

annihilate the non-Jewish races. (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, pp. 250-251)

Nothing in *Mein Kampf* offers any actual personal experience whereby a Jewish individual informed him of a plot to exterminate non-Jews, nor did Hitler provide any facts confirming that “the Jews” had made such a plan. The closest ‘evidence’ he used in support of his theory was the document, *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, a text elaborating in depth the processes the Jews planned on using to control the world; nowhere in this book is there any description of a solution to exterminate or annihilate the non-Jews. Much more importantly, it had, by the time Hitler decided to pen his manifesto, been proven to be a forgery, and after extensive analysis shown to be a work of plagiarism. But such a deconstruction is of no use to one of Hitler's mentality – for him, it had the opposite effect, solidifying his stance!

How much the whole existence of this people is based on a permanent falsehood is proved in a unique way by ‘The Protocols of the Elders of Zion’, which are so violently repudiated by the Jews. With groans and moans, the Frankfurter Zeitung repeats again and again that these are forgeries. **This alone is evidence in favour of their authenticity.** (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 240)

The Frankfurter Zeitung was far from the only party describing the forgery of *Protocols*, thus for Hitler to make such a statement illuminates in no small part the nature of his mind. While Hitler professed to be a descendant of the great “Aryan” civilization, his mentality was not even of the rational or intellectual bent, let alone the suprarational intuitive or revelatory nature that defines the Vedic Arya. Instead, he was decidedly of the lower vital, where one is attached his own preconceptions, refusing to even look rationally at things, twisting evidence to support one's opinion rather than forming a thesis on the basis of facts. Thus the Protocols were authentic if they provided justification for his hatred, and they were true if they were proved to be false, for if the Jew or his ally said it was false, it must then be a real document! There is no logic behind such reasoning, because it is not reason; it is sub-rational or infrarational, of the lower vital that clings to any ‘proof’ allowing it to continue exulting in hatred. Such an instinctive aversion to examining evidence that goes against one's lower vital impulses, when *incessantly practised* as Hitler did, is another sign of at least the Asura of Falsehood's influence, for genuine rationality, while not in itself the highest truth, is a great check against the excesses of the lower vital that the Asura lures men with.

If he could only offer scant amounts of actual written works supporting his paranoid delusions of Jewish hegemony and diabolical plans to exterminate the German, with regards to his general ideas of race and the history of civilization, Hitler did have as supposed evidence the writings of the likes of Chamberlain and peers. In Hitler's description of race, we find their indelible imprint, especially in Hitler's belief in the fantasy of White Aryan tribes spreading out from a mythical homeland, invading multiple countries of inferior peoples:

Aryan tribes, often almost ridiculously small in number, subjugated foreign peoples and, stimulated by the conditions of life which their new country offered them (fertility, the nature of the climate, etc.), and profiting also by the abundance of manual labour furnished them by the inferior race, they developed intellectual and organizing faculties which had hitherto been dormant in these conquering tribes. (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 228)

Having read Chamberlain, the natural successor to Dubois – the latter himself the inevitable result of Muller's subterfuge -, having taken completely to the purported historical facts and resulting conclusions, Hitler would of course believe in both the “Aryan” as Lord of the World – with the need of slaves for his cultural outpouring -, and the error in intermixing between the Aryans and inferior races. Using this fabricated knowledge of history, Hitler commented on the idea of skin tone indicating Aryan involvement, presumed evidence of which was visible in India:

But finally the conquering race offended against the principles which they first had observed, namely, the maintenance of their racial stock unmixed, and they began to intermingle with the subjugated people. Thus they put an end to their own separate existence; for the original sin committed in Paradise has always been followed by the expulsion of the guilty parties. **After a thousand years or more the last visible traces of those former masters may then be found in a lighter tint of the skin which the Aryan blood had bequeathed to the subjugated race,** and in a fossilized culture of which those Aryans had been the original creators. (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 228)

Regarding miscegenation, Hitler ascribed the term of “sin”, something historically associated with ‘divine’ punishment, which of course he also agreed with:

In short, the results of miscegenation are always the following:

- (a) The level of the superior race becomes lowered;
- (b) physical and mental degeneration sets in, thus leading slowly but steadily towards a progressive drying up of the vital sap.

The act which brings about such a development is a sin against the will of the Eternal Creator. And as a sin this act will be avenged. (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 223)

To prevent such “sin”, the political state envisioned by Hitler would devote its primary resources to the aim of protecting the – “Aryan” – race. Indeed the failure of Germany to thrive was precisely due to its negligence in safeguarding and promoting its “Aryan” heritage:

The ultimate and most profound reason of the German downfall is to be found in the fact that the racial problem was ignored and that its importance in the historical development of nations was not grasped. For the events that take place in the life of nations are not due to chance but are the natural results of the effort to conserve and multiply the species and the race, even though men may not be able consciously to picture to their minds the profound motives of their conduct. (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 221)

It is in Hitler's extreme obsession with “blood” and physical characteristics determining a race that we see additional evidence of his Asuric possession. For if the Lord of Falsehood primarily chooses to work through usurping nations, it entails that he create a means by which the nation can develop an *exaggerated* sense of itself, a grotesque vital movement that promotes the idea of an eternal superiority over different groups or nations, rather than the Nation-Soul that is conscious of its unity with all other nations. In Nazi Germany, as articulated by Hitler, it was the exaggeration of physical attributes, the belief in “purity” of an allegedly historic racial type, that fed this vital aggrandizement. Such was its extent that Hitler audaciously wrote, “A people that fails to preserve the purity of its racial blood thereby destroys the unity of the **soul** of the nation in all its manifestations.” (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 265) In characterizing the “purity” of racial blood as the strict criteria for the Soul of a nation, we find another falsehood to his ideology, for while it is true that physical characteristics are often important in defining a nation, the Soul or Divine support behind a nation, just as in man, cannot be restricted to any physical or vital quality. To misidentify the vital or physical with the Soul of the Nation to such an extreme is assuredly falsehood, one that Hitler supported through eugenic ideas:

Every crossing between two breeds which are not quite equal results in a product which holds an intermediate place between the levels of the two parents. This means that the offspring will indeed be superior to the parent which stands in the biologically lower order of being, but not so high as the higher parent. For this reason it must eventually succumb in any struggle against the higher species. Such mating contradicts the will of Nature towards the selective improvements of life in general. The favourable preliminary to this improvement is not to mate individuals of

higher and lower orders of being but rather to allow the complete triumph of the higher order. The stronger must dominate and not mate with the weaker, which would signify the sacrifice of its own higher nature. Only the born weakling can look upon this principle as cruel, and if he does so it is merely because he is of a feebleness of nature and narrower mind. (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, pp. 222-23)

In Hitler's weltanschauung, it was the "Aryan" who was the highest species, with the other races belonging to an inferior stock. Life and all of its riches were only for the supreme race; it was their inherent right to subjugate the "inferior" type. For that, according to Hitler, was the iron law of nature, that the strong should dominate and eliminate the weak:

But if that policy be carried out the final results must be that such a nation will eventually terminate its own existence on this earth; for though man may defy the eternal laws of procreation during a certain period, vengeance will follow sooner or later. A stronger race will oust that which has grown weak; for the vital urge, in its ultimate form, will burst asunder all the absurd chains of this so-called humane consideration for the individual and will replace it **with the humanity of Nature, which wipes out what is weak in order to give place to the strong**. Any policy which aims at securing the existence of a nation by restricting the birth-rate robs that nation of its future. (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, pp. 113-14)

This was the brute vital law the Asura of Falsehood propagated through Hitler, the apparently eternal truth of existence that Man in his foolish aspiration thought he might overcome:

Let me explain: Man must not fall into the error of thinking that he was ever meant to become lord and master of Nature. A lopsided education has helped to encourage that illusion. Man must realize that a fundamental law of necessity reigns throughout the whole realm of Nature and that his existence is subject to the law of eternal struggle and strife. (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 194)

This struggle would only see the victory of the strong and powerful; there could not be an alternative destiny. But to misidentify the eternal with one aspect of the vital life, to take it as the whole and as the fundamental truth, is another sign of the Asuric possession. For if it is true that in Nature, physical or military strength – both of which Hitler repeatedly references – has its partial truth in the *lila* or play, to declare it the highest ideal is falsehood in multiple directions: As a negation of *samata*, the Soul's equality between all existence, it fails to recognize the inherent oneness between "strong" and "weak": As a claim to the Truth, it exaggerates the importance of vital strength, forgetting that man is much more than external power – he is a Soul beyond struggle, basking in eternal peace: In its own vital field, with regards to the strong "wiping" out the "weak", this iron law fails to take into account the curious cases of numerous "weak" species in nature continuing to survive in the face of predators: Considering at last the history of nations, for which Hitler generously applied the law, it does not comprehend at all the patently evident cycle of humanity, the rise of politically weak nations, the fall - and revival - of previously strong ones.

The magnification of the strong overpowering the weak was not the only degradation Hitler proposed to humanity as an alternative from its true height of spiritual bliss: in the Asuric instrument's philosophy, "ruthless" Nature was also creating man in his "highest" form of "efficiency":

Nature herself tends to check the increase of population in some countries and among some races, but by a method which is quite as ruthless as it is wise. It does not impede the procreative faculty as such; but it does impede the further existence of the offspring by submitting it to such tests and privations that everything which is less strong or less healthy is forced to retreat into the bosom of the unknown. Whatever survives these hardships of existence has been tested and tried a thousandfold, hardened and renders fit to continue the process of procreation; so that the

same thorough selection will begin all over again. By thus dealing brutally with the individual and recalling him the very moment he shows that he is not fitted for the trials of life, Nature preserves the strength of the race and the species and raises it to the highest degree of efficiency. (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, pp. 112-113)

Such ideas – the discarding of the weak, the peak of man characterized by his efficiency as a race – strongly indicate the Asuric consciousness. In the former, we see the clearly non-Psychic quality of mercilessness, because the mortal with a developed Psychic will not seek to exploit or exterminate those weaker than him: Indeed it is precisely those whom he will try and offer succour, for he inherently understands that through non-egoistic assistance – whatever the fashion – he aids *himself*, because it is Himself that he is truly helping. Or, if he does not actively assist, he will at least feel pity or maintain a calm Psychic neutrality, living in the truth of samata. In the latter Nazi falsehood, the idea that Man's loftiest status is his efficiency as a race seeks to negate the truth of humanity's highest potential – the Realization of the individual Purusha; it also promotes the frankly barbarous notion that in order for mankind to advance, they must become like a cog in a machine – an absolute perversion of humanity's unlocked spiritual greatness, an inevitable result of the intellectual cult of utilitarianism that in reality aims to negate the true aim of Prakriti, which is the Divine transformation of the triple-sheath rather than the exaggeration of that particular consciousness as the highest truth of existence.

Efficiency and strength above all other considerations were not the only primitive elements of Man's existence that Hitler elevated to lofty status; in another example, he wrote, “In the end the **instinct of self-preservation** alone will triumph.” (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 115) Such a philosophy is perhaps the ultimate nadir from the luminous heights of the Vedic Aryan, the seeker of the Supreme Consciousness, the aspirant who has since the time of the Upanishads invoked the sublime mantra, *Satyamevayajate* (Truth alone is the Victor). Hitler instead took the utilitarian to be the greatest, claiming that an “Aryan” is great because of his communal role, writing, “The greatness of the Aryan is not based on his intellectual powers, but rather on his willingness to devote all his faculties to the service of the community.” (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 231) But the Vedic Aryan is a spiritual disciple who – contrary to the popular stereotypes of sadhaks – while not necessarily needing to completely forgo relations with the community, simply cannot devote *all* of his or her faculties to them. For as the spiritual quest is to find the individual Self or Soul, its foundation must be internal and solitary. And it is at the end of this lofty aspiration that the Arya finds the profound peace, Consciously free from the discord of the world, one with his true greatness. Far indeed was Hitler from this glorious aspiration of the ancients:

A time will come, even though in the distant future, when there can be only two alternatives: Either the world will be ruled according to our modern concept of democracy, and then every decision will be in favour of the numerically stronger races; or the world will be governed by the law of natural distribution of power, **and then those nations will be victorious who are of more brutal will** and are not the nations who have practised self-denial. ...Nobody can doubt that this world will one day be the scene of dreadful struggles for existence on the part of mankind. Before its consuming fire this so-called humanitarianism, which connotes only a mixture of fatuous timidity and self-conceit, will melt away as under the March sunshine. Man has become great through perpetual struggle. **In perpetual peace his greatness must decline.** (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 115)

If we take Satchitananda as the Supreme state of existence, a perpetual *shanti* or peace, then we see here another explicit example of the Asuric possession of Hitler. For Man is greatest when he is close to, or living from, the Divine Truth of his being, of which peace is one quality; to thus declare peace as the opposite of greatness, to actually *reject* peace, is abject falsehood. And to describe will in the term of “brutal” illustrates again the savage element raised up in Hitler by the Asura of Falsehood, because

unlike the Asuric will – brutal, iron, without mercy – the Divine Will in life seeks to uplift, to transform, to internally strengthen the individual and mass without the need to subjugate; it is the Asura whose will is for the persistent accumulation of raw external power and oppression. The Asura does not seek transformation as the Divine does; instead, he desires the continuation of his reign – therefore humanity must remain rooted to egoistic ambition and pride and desire. Hitler, carefully crafted Asuric instrument that he was, eagerly promoted the ideal of the savage, because Nature apparently could not be mastered:

The real truth is that, not only has man failed to overcome Nature in any sphere whatsoever but that at best he has merely succeeded in getting hold of and lifting a tiny corner of the enormous veil which she has spread over her eternal mysteries and secret. He never creates anything. All he can do is to discover something. He does not master Nature but has only come to be the master of those living beings who have not gained the knowledge he has arrived at by penetrating into some of Nature's laws and mysteries. Apart from all this, an idea can never subject to its own sway those conditions which are necessary for the existence and development of mankind; for the idea itself has come only from man. Without man there would be no human idea in this world. The idea as such is therefore always dependent on the existence of man and consequently is dependent on those laws which furnish the conditions of his existence. (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 224)

But this is precisely the opposite of the Truth of the Rishi, for whom the Arya, the enlightened spiritual aspirants, could progressively overcome the obstacles of his birth nature, uniting at last with his Purusha, his secret birthright. There would be no sadhana, no yoga, even none of the discoveries or ideas that Hitler sought to belittle, without this hope of something greater – a promise that in reality is Psychic in origin, a means to guide man from behind the veil towards his spiritual destiny. It is the Asura of Falsehood that seeks to exterminate belief in this great transformation, to blind man from his deepest and highest Self, to declare him as nothing except his ambition and pride and desires, to belittle his aspiration by asserting, through mediums such as Hitler, that “Yet far harder is the lot of him who believes that he can overcome Nature and thus in reality insults her. Distress, misery, and disease are her rejoinders.” (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 226) This was the “Aryan” ideal of Hitler: the cult of base instinct and self-preservation, the iron and pitiless law of the strong, the chaos of the surface waves of the vital. It was a ‘truth’ that only saw the physical form, a humanity marked by an inability to create – as if the Soul, the source of all brilliance, ceased to exist. Hitler's vision of genius was actually the most egregious of insults – man as a machine, a system standing alone rather than a burgeoning Psychic supporting an individualized creation of Prakriti. The nadir of his ideal of man as an apparatus, this supposedly luminous “Aryan” truth of all creation, was found in his conception of the State composed of the uniform mass. In Hitler's world-view, the State's purpose was to preserve the racial mass, helping to promote its mass instinct of self-preservation and self-interest, along with the subjugation of those it deemed inferior:

In principle, the State is looked upon only as a means to an end and this end is the conservation of the racial characteristics of mankind. Therefore on the volkisch principle we cannot admit that one race is equal to another. **By recognizing that they are different, the volkisch concept separates mankind into races of superior and inferior quality.** On the basis of this recognition it feels bound in conformity with the eternal Will that dominates the universe, to postulate the victory of the better and stronger and the subordination of the inferior and weaker. (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, pp. 297-98)

By permanently separating mankind into superior and inferior races, Hitler certainly rejected the truth of samata whereby one recognizes that though one group might be currently superior to another in political terms, deep within they do share a united truth. It is a recognition that helps to restrain the

superior group from gross excesses caused by an exaggerated sense of their superiority, but as Hitler – thanks to his acceptance of the lies of Indologists - utterly rejected the possibility, mere racial identity quickly progressed to a deranged obsession, and Hitler was keen to utilize the Nazi state to promote his idolatry of the White race. One of the ways, as mentioned, by which he planned on using the State for this end, was through the practice of Eugenics championed by the writers who inspired him. In *Mein Kampf*, Hitler displayed no pity for the physically or mentally inferior citizens, and favoured forced sterilization of physically degenerate or mentally ill Germans, hoping to promote the “stronger” and eliminate the “weaker” gene pool. Such was his desire for the supposedly superior “Aryan” genes that he even rejected certain eastern Europeans that spoke *German*, writing, “Among us, **nobody would think of taking these unhygienic immigrants from the East for members of the German race** and nation merely because they mostly speak German.” (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 304) The use of the term “unhygienic” shows clearly the influence of writers such as Madison Grant, and how the discipline of Eugenics had been fully incorporated into Hitler's weltanschauung. And just as these writers provided inspiration and support to his ideas, so did other nation-states of the time:

At present there exists one State which manifests at least some modest attempts that show a better appreciation of how things ought to be done in this matter. It is not, however, in our model German Republic but in the U.S.A. that efforts are made to conform at least partly to the counsels of common-sense. By refusing immigrants to enter there if they are in a bad state of health, and by excluding certain races from the right to become naturalized as citizens, they have begun to introduce principles similar to those on which we wish to ground the People's State. (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 341)

Eugenics, along with a belief in the historic supremacy of an “Aryan” race, the misinterpretation of the goal of Nature's process of evolution, the paranoia toward the Jew, and the degradation of mankind to the status of cogs in a machine, were all key components in the Western intellectual atmosphere from which Hitler could justify his ambitions, convincing himself and others of the worthiness of his cause. None of these ideas were created through his mind alone – it was the bent of his vital pride, ambition and jealousy, that *latched on* to these well-formed ideas, all of which were present long before his ascent to power. Most crucial of all was the Indologist falsification of an “Aryan” race based on skin colour, for without this “greatest” race of Nature, there was no aim to her process of evolution, no historic rationale to isolate the Jew, no explanation for the failure of the darker breeds. It was this fabricated “Aryan” race, this gross misinterpretation of the Veda by Muller, that Hitler, just as Chamberlain before him, believed should rule. And it was not only in Germany that Hitler desired such an “Aryan” rule, as the “eternal will” of the State was not limited to promoting just the “stronger” race of a heterogeneous nation, such as the “Aryan” German over the German Jew; rather, the “Aryans” were also to impose themselves on the world:

We all feel that in the distant future many may be faced with problems which can be solved only by a superior race of human beings, a race destined to become master of all the other peoples and which will have at its disposal the means and resources of the whole world. (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 298)

But before Hitler could attempt to fulfil the Asuric ambition of subjugating the “inferior” races, to use them as slaves, he had the small problem of actually gaining hold of the German state, sitting as he was in a prison cell. However, as the Asura of Falsehood is quite intelligent – though its intellect is an extreme perversion of the Divine Wisdom – the means by which this nefarious conquest would take place, this victory of the “strong”, had already been presented to the mind of Hitler. If he did not, at the time, have the concrete power he longed for, the methods he intended to use in obtaining it were clear, guided by the practical Asuric intelligence which understands the lower nature of men and how it can be cleverly manipulated. It was in no small part due to this Asuric perspective, this understanding of

Man's tendency to recoil from the heights into his lower vital, that Hitler narrowed in on the dark art of propaganda. For if Nazi Germany's propaganda machine tends to be associated most prominently with Joseph Goebbels, the Minister of Propaganda for the Third Reich, Hitler himself was a master of it well before he met the man who would later work for him. Indeed, when reading *Mein Kampf*, one finds that Hitler is most self-assured when describing his understanding of propaganda and how he intended to use it; absent are the anxiety and paranoia that stalk his description of the other tenets to his *weltanschauung* – the creeping fear that his professed knowledge of the absolute truth of things was but a delusion.

For Hitler to have such confidence in the effective use of propaganda should not come as a surprise, because unlike questions concerning the ancient past, or the inscrutable design of Prakriti, or even the grand potential of humanity, this peculiar dark art belongs to the lower nature, and its impact lies in its appeal to mankind's base instincts and rudimentary vital ego. With a medium like Hitler, characterized by a strong vital instinct and a mind capable of receiving a large quantity of information but without the depth and equanimity to absorb things disagreeable to his own egoistic preferences, it was only natural that he sought to understand the processes by which to appeal to the - although to him it was a higher ideal! – lower nature in his fellow “Aryans”. And as his mediumistic qualities - including this strong identification with the lower vital ego along with a developed external mentality – allowed him to be progressively influenced and later possessed by the Asura of Falsehood, it follows that he was to gain a keen insight into the particular mechanisms – but not its relation to the grand scheme of things – of propaganda.

Because if it is the Purusha deep within that inspires humanity to the heights, that seeks the transformation of what mankind is born with, the Asura of Falsehood on the other hand desires that humanity remain rooted to its base, as the metamorphosis into the Divine, or even Divine Realization without subsequent Supramental transformation of the birth instruments, is precisely what the Asura does not want – it is this that he strives against. Thus he appeals to the lower vital nature, for if this is not transformed or rejected, Man will remain in his station, perhaps not even progressing to a belief in higher non-spiritual ideals which in truth are closer to the Psychic inside of him. As the Asura knows what primitive qualities are alluring to humanity, so should his instruments be proficient in the dark art of propaganda, a fantastic method to ensnare a herd of prey, let alone one particular person. And it was this superficial knowledge that gave Hitler the advantage over his political opponents, because he understood the crucial fact that the best form of propaganda is a message evoking shallow *feelings* rather than thinking:

Here the art of propaganda consists in putting a matter so clearly and forcibly before the minds of the people as to create a general conviction regarding the reality of a certain fact, the necessity of certain things and the just character of something that is essential. But as this art is not an end in itself and because its purpose must be exactly that of the advertisement poster, to attract the attention of the masses and not by any means to dispense individual instructions to those who already have an educated opinion on things or who wish to form such an opinion on grounds of objective study - because **that is not the purpose of propaganda, it must appeal to the feelings of the public rather than to their reasoning powers.** (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 147)

Feelings, of course, are of the Vital; it is easier to move masses of men through egoistic vital movements of the group, keeping messages simple, as complexities and nuances are more difficult for the mass to comprehend, and without such easy understanding no scope for vital action is possible, as momentum dissipates in the process of analysis, a function of the thinking mind:

The more modest the scientific tenor of this propaganda and the more it is addressed exclusively to public **sentiment**, the more decisive will be its success. ...The receptive powers

of the masses are very restricted, and their understanding is feeble. On the other hand, they quickly forget. Such being the case, all effective propaganda must be confined to a few bare essentials and those must be expressed as far as possible in stereotyped formulas. These slogans should be persistently repeated until the very last individual has come to grasp the idea that has been put forward. If this principle be forgotten and if an attempt be made to be abstract and general, the propaganda will turn out ineffective; for the public will not be able to digest or retain what is offered to them in this way. Therefore, the greater the scope of the message that has to be presented, the more necessary it is for the propaganda to discover that plan of action which is psychologically the most efficient. (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 148)

His emphasis on repeating uncomplicated themes again displays an Asuric type of insight into the superficial aspects of mankind's nature, including the lower vital movements and sentiment, along with the external mind of man – habitual by nature - that thrives on repetition. The purpose of said repetition was to continue to present a particular idea to the forgetful external mind, ensuring its imprint on its target; the ideas of course, were to be elementary– with vital ambition, pride, and fear among the easier themes for the masses to repetitively receive:

Propaganda must be limited to a few simple themes and these must be represented again and again...only constant repetition will finally succeed in imprinting an idea on the memory of the crowd. (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 151)

Of course, the principle of repetition can alternatively be used to instil in the mass an acceptance of grand ideals, even those of the higher vital. While this is often time-consuming, it more importantly requires having an individual centre of Prakriti who *believes* in such principles. Hitler was decidedly not of this character; indeed throughout *Mein Kampf* he – befitting his philosophy of “might is right” – incessantly chastised the intellectual class more likely to promote ideals such as equality and peace, describing them as “weaklings” and “cowards”, downplaying any possible influence they were reputed to have on great uprisings such as French Revolution (he forgot, of course, the work of great French writers prior to it). Hitler wrote that the German people owed its army “everything” (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 218), and opposed any form of intellectual debate, the latter rejection perfectly consistent with the Asura of Falsehood's dominion over him, for debate is an activity closer to the genuine mind, seeking to absorb different viewpoints, opinions and data, all to try and gain a more comprehensive understanding. The Lord of Falsehood is a being of the Vital world, and such debate is dangerous to his aims, as even if debate fails to fully expose falsehood, it has the potential to disperse the force or momentum of the Asuric movement through rational dissection: better to plough straight ahead without heed to the thoughts of others, incessantly repeating until the mass has been turned. Indeed, Hitler blamed the failure to appropriately apply propaganda as a key reason why World War I was lost:

More than once I was tormented by the thought that if Providence had put the conduct of German propaganda into my hands, instead of into the hands of those incompetent and even criminal ignoramuses and weaklings, the outcome of the struggle might have been different. (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, pp. 153-54)

This failure belonged to the German press' appeal to loftier ideals such as humanitarianism, pacifism, and the like. Hitler on the other hand, preferred to foster excitement and enthusiasm, vital emotions often leading to instability, especially when they assume hold of a baying mass. And with unbalance easily arrives the recoil into base ambitions, pride, jealousies, hatred, fear and paranoia:

I was only too well acquainted with the psychology of the broad masses not to know that in such cases a magnanimous ‘aestheticism’ cannot fan the fire which is needed to keep the iron hot. In my eyes it was even a mistake not to have tried to raise the pitch of public enthusiasm still higher. Therefore I could not at all understand why the contrary policy was adopted, that is

to say, the policy of damping the public spirit. (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 139)

Cool, dispassionate, rounded reason is simply not apart of any Asuric propaganda; the ability to stand back from one's subjective sentiments or feelings, to try and understand things from many sides, are all uncharacteristic of an Asuric turn, which evokes lower subjective feeling along with falsities. Thus, whether for Hitler or any other Asuric instrument, “**propaganda must not investigate the truth objectively**”, (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 150) because if it did, the movement could be robbed of its momentum by the light of reality on its ignorance and falsehoods. And if truth is not to be investigated objectively, if one's subjective sentiment or feeling is automatically going to be taken as the absolute ‘truth’, if these - the more superficial and least likely to have Psychological influence - alone determine the message sent out to the masses, inevitably the propaganda will contain within, be dominated by, lies. But as long as one repeats the lie over and over, per the maxim of Goebbels, “people will come to believe it.” It was thus a foundation of overt – as opposed to the subtleties of Muller and other Indologists - lies and falsehood that Hitler sought to convey to his fellow countrymen, to impress upon them the greatness of a mythical “Aryan” race of whom they were supposedly the pure descendants. And what better way to do so than from the mass assembly, where one's fellow “Aryans” would also be present:

Mass assemblies are also necessary for the reason that, in attending them, the individual who felt himself formerly only on the point of joining the new movement, now begins to feel isolated and in fear of being left alone as he acquires for the first time the picture of a great community which has a strengthening and encouraging effect on most people...if the manifest success and the consensus of thousands confirm the truth and justice of the new teaching and for the first time raise doubt in his mind as to the truth of the opinions held by himself up to now - then he submits himself to the fascination of what we call mass-suggestion. (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 371)

Through these congregations, Hitler – and by proxy the Asura of Falsehood - had found an avenue towards gaining hold of the general German atmosphere, playing on the weakness of the individual, his fear of isolation, the need to belong, the strength in numbers, the herd mentality that mankind is prone toward. And every herd has, needs even, a shepherd. Just as the Asura understood this ordinary law of nature well, so did his instrument:

For this reason it is advisable first to propagate and publicly expound the ideas on which the movement is founded. This work of propaganda should continue for a certain time and should be directed from one centre. When the ideas have gradually won over a number of people this human material should be carefully sifted for the purpose of selecting those who have ability in leadership and putting that ability to the test. It will often be found that apparently insignificant persons will nevertheless turn out to be born leaders. (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 442)

This particular mechanism of Prakriti - the use of the individual centre to move the mass - can of course be sublimated for higher aims. In India, the Self-Realized Guru will have devotees; at a secular level, the teacher will have his pupils; even at the political level, if the leader's character is one with a strong Psychic component, then much good can arise by way of his followers. Once again, it is the psychology and the type of force behind the individual that will determine how he uses the ordinary mechanisms of Prakriti, whether he will be like Caesar or Hitler, Yuddhisthira or Duryodhana, Rama or Ravana. If Hitler's psychology was lilliputian, petty, egoistic, paranoid, brutal and unstable, he was nevertheless – in no small part due to the Asuric possession – cunning and unscrupulous, knowing full well how to use Nature's operations for the Asuric ambitions:

A revolutionary conception of the world and human existence will always achieve decisive success when the new weltanschauung has been taught to a whole people, **or subsequently**

forced upon them if necessary, and when, on the other hand, the central organization, the movement itself, **is in the hands of only those few men who are absolutely indispensable to form the nerve-centres** of the coming State. (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 445)

If force was to be used to impose the *weltanschauung*, it would need the guidance and direction from one key individual centre:

At a time when the majority dominates everywhere else a movement which is based on the principle of one leader who has to bear personal responsibility for the direction of the official acts of the movement itself will one day overthrow the present situation and triumph over the existing regime. That is a mathematical certainty. (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 449)

Having explicitly stated his desire to overthrow the existing regime, propaganda was but one of the tactics he intended on using toward that aim, for the toppling of a government requires more than just the stirring of emotions. Indeed when Hitler wrote that he intended to force his view on the populace, he had behind this no hesitation in using physical violence to impose Nazism upon any disagreeing party, describing it as the key component in the fight against Marxism, Hitler's primary internal political enemy:

To sum up, the following must be borne in mind: That every attempt to combat a *weltanschauung* by means of force will turn out futile in the end if the struggle fails to take the form of an offensive for the establishment of an entirely new spiritual order of things. **It is only in the struggle between two Weltan-schauungen that physical force, consistently and ruthlessly applied, will eventually turn the scales in its own favour.** It was here that the fight against Marxism had hitherto failed. (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 142)

While physical violence in itself does not necessarily herald evil or falsehood, it is – as ever – the psychology behind the violence that signifies its particular quality. Physical violence can often be used for lofty purposes such as self-defence, defeating tyranny, and of course, destroying nations whose foundation is falsehood. But it requires a subtle discrimination to determine when and where to use violence, in order for it to be directed in support of such higher truths. When Hitler writes of both a “consistent” and “ruthless” use of physical violence, it once more illuminates the Asuric intent behind his strategy, because violence should be a selective measure, and his particular choice of the word “ruthless” speaks again of his pitiless and cruel nature. Such was his impulse to use violence, that even those who merely displeased him through their words were worthy of having their necks snapped – this was his solution for the German journalists who reported on World War I:

Instead of catching these fellows by their long ears and dragging them to some ditch and looping a cord around their necks, so that the victorious enthusiasm of the nation should no longer offend the aesthetic sensibilities of these knights of the pen, a general Press campaign was now allowed to go on against what was called ‘unbecoming’ and ‘undignified’ forms of victorious celebration. (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 139)

While a leader may justifiably deem it necessary to seek some amount of control over the press during times of war, and may seek to limit the press' information and guide them to promote a united message in support of the war effort, it is something entirely different to glorify an impetuous rush to *kill* those who might speak of ideals (as opposed to actual treasonous material). Hitler's instant resort to violent measures when dealing with written words exposes his strongly infrarational nature, a consciousness limited to the lower egoistic reactions, applying the law of the strong to all categories in life, refusing to recognize the potential truth behind the *weltanschauung* of another. Or, if offering some conciliatory recognition of the opponent's truth, it is only to be done in terms suitable to one's egoistic preference. Thus Hitler's astonishing statement, evidence of a complete lack of irony and introspection, that peace would be excellent, but only after the superior race enslaved the rest of humanity!

The pacifist-humanitarian idea may indeed become an excellent one when the most superior type of manhood will have succeeded in subjugating the world to such an extent that this type is then sole master of the earth. (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 225)

As can be seen in the type of propaganda he wished to disseminate and his free application of violence to conquer the streets from the Marxists, Hitler was willing to use all sorts of primitive means to acquire power. And the lure of the type of power Hitler desired – raw, with the crude need to lord over others – is the primary avenue by which the Asura of Falsehood impels his instruments, deluding them into believing that earthly strength alone represents the ultimate source of greatness. Accordingly, Hitler believed that power was the *only* requisite to building an empire:

Germany herself was a magnificent example of an empire that had been built up **purely by a policy of power**. Prussia, which was the generative cell of the German Empire, had been created by brilliant heroic deeds and not by a financial or commercial compact. And the Empire itself was but the magnificent recompense for a leadership that had been conducted on **a policy of power and military valour**. (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, pp. 129-130)

But before he could revive the German Empire, he had to first become its leader. And in his nation's democratic institution, he had found a system by which, along with the use of cleverly crafted propaganda and street intimidation, he could ascend to power. Of course, as his loyalty was to power on Asuric terms, democracy – in its purest form a vehicle for the expression of a nation's will – was just a means to an end, to be destroyed after it served its purpose, just as the Asura of Falsehood devours the men he possesses once their usefulness to him ceases:

Because of this principle, our movement must necessarily be anti-parliamentarian, and if it takes part in the parliamentary institution it is only for the purpose of destroying this institution from within; in other words, we wish to do away with an institution which we must look upon as one of the gravest symptoms of human decline. (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 270)

Just as he intended to deceitfully use democracy, also present was his stance of dissimulation toward other nations he planned on allying with. Hitler, when describing his belief that pre-war Germany should have partnered with England, wrote, “This policy would have involved a period of temporary self-denial, for the sake of a great and powerful future.” (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 120) While national alliances are not the same as personal friendships, in the mind of Hitler the dissolution of such partnerships was justified by more than mere political or economical advantages. For it was not Germany alone that the Jews secretly controlled; in France, the historical enemy of the Germans, all political actions directed against their neighbour were done at the behest of the Jew:

The French people, who are becoming more and more obsessed by Negroid ideas, represent a threatening menace to the existence of the white race in Europe, because they are bound up with the Jewish campaign for world-domination. For the contamination caused by the influx of Negroid blood on the Rhine, in the very heart of Europe, is in accord with the sadist and perverse lust for vengeance on the part of the hereditary enemy of our people, just as it suits the purpose of the cool calculating Jew who would use this means of introducing a process of bastardization in the very centre of the European Continent and, by infecting the white race with the blood of an inferior stock, would destroy the foundations of its independent existence. ...France's activities in Europe to-day, spurred on by the French lust for vengeance and systematically directed by the Jew, are a criminal attack against the life of the white race and will one day arouse against the French people a spirit of vengeance among a generation which will have recognized the original sin of mankind in this racial pollution. (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 477)

In England, the will of the Jew was similarly preventing the possibility of an Anglo-Teutonic alliance:

The English situation is not so favourable. In that country which has 'the freest democracy' the Jew dictates his will, almost unrestrained but indirectly, through his influence on public opinion. And yet there is a perpetual struggle in England between those who are entrusted with the defence of State interests and the protagonists of Jewish world-dictatorship. (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 487)

In Russia, the great work of its superior Germanic element was being destroyed from within by the Jew:

...the Slav element in Russia, but was much more a marvellous exemplification of the capacity for State-building possessed by the Germanic element in a race of inferior worth. Thus were many powerful Empires created all over the earth. More often than once inferior races with Germanic organizers and rulers as their leaders became formidable States and continued to exist as long as the racial nucleus remained which had originally created each respective State. For centuries Russia owed the source of its livelihood as a State to the Germanic nucleus of its governing class. But this nucleus is now almost wholly broken up and abolished. The Jew has taken its place. (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 500)

While we have focused on his marked paranoia, in *Mein Kampf* there are actually numerous passages in which Hitler expresses a certain practical understanding to geopolitics and how nations might interact with others dependent upon circumstances. Yet the frequency by which his attention turned to the supposed Jewish global ambition – described by him in one instance that “the Jew will never spontaneously give up his march towards the goal of world dictatorship or repress his external urge” (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 505) – of world conquest and destruction of the White race, it gives one pause. For how do we explain the seemingly abrupt transition from the mostly normal – with certain obviously extreme tendencies – ideas on statesmanship, to patently bizarre accusations?

* * * *

All that one expresses, whether in speech, art, written word, or even non-verbal intimations, can be a window into one's inner psychological life - the thoughts, emotions, aspirations and beliefs of an individual. The written word, especially when compared to ordinary speech, is often an excellent opening into the mental and vital life, for it tends not to be rushed like the customary means of communication; because of this, it is more thorough, and can mitigate erroneous conclusions arising from less comprehensive types of exchange. In *Mein Kampf*, Hitler's characterization of the Jews is, as previously noted, of primary importance in exposing the hatred and pettiness of his nature, including the primitive human tendency to scapegoat, in itself a sign of the absence of introspection which is the foundation of internal growth. Yet if these are the primary themes to be gleaned from Hitler's description of the Jew, when we consider his paranoid delusions regarding Jewish global ambitions, we find within different material of crucial significance. For even if he was merely rephrasing a belief held by many Europeans of the time, the sheer volume of emphasis, the obsession with it, is illuminating - with the Jew representing the material object upon which Hitler projected his own unconscious (or partially conscious) ambitions, the darkness he was possessed by, and his – unconscious, for he had no self-awareness – feelings of inferiority. Carl Jung, the renowned psychoanalyst who lived during the time period, was one of many to note general feelings of inferiority held by past and contemporary Germans to his era, and how this could manifest outward upon the 'other':

I am by no means the first to have been struck by the inferiority feelings of the Germans...The condition can easily lead to a hysterical dissociation of the personality, which consists

essentially in one hand not knowing what the other is doing, in wanting to jump over one's own shadow, and in looking for everything dark, inferior, and culpable *in others*. (Carl Jung, *After the Catastrophe*)

Indeed, in *Mein Kampf* one finds numerous examples of Hitler's inferiority complex (though he would hardly admit that the Germans were inferior in any way), as seen in his specific antagonism toward both the French and the Jew. Regarding the former, he mocked the characterization of them as a “culture-nation”, in doing so betraying his jealousy:

What got still more on my nerves was the repugnant manner in which the big newspapers cultivated admiration for France. One really had to feel ashamed of being a German when confronted by those mellifluous hymns of praise for ‘the great culture-nation.’ (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 54)

He also noted that the press inordinately praised Jewish authors, and seemingly only criticized German writers:

Its brilliant theatrical criticisms always praised the Jewish authors and its adverse, criticism was reserved exclusively for the Germans. ...The light pin-pricks against William II showed the persistency of its policy, just as did its systematic commendation of French culture and civilization. (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 57)

With such feelings of inferiority, an over-sensitivity to criticism, an extreme pride in his German heritage, and of course, his intense hatred, it was quite natural for Hitler to have had what Jung characterized as a “hysterical dissociation”. If we are to describe this in a simpler fashion, we might say that Hitler had an unbalanced personality and mentality: such individuals are much more likely to be possessed by the Asura of Falsehood (who may also be the key player in creating the imbalance, in order that he might capitalize on it) or different hostile beings of the Vital world subconscious to Man's external awareness. As nearly all mortals are susceptible to these entities – because of their call to the lower nature that ordinary humans have to some degree – it requires that the individual have a Psychic, mental or higher vital balancing check on these tendencies. Acknowledging the clear possibility of such vital beings possessing men, Jung turned to the ancient Germanic ‘god’ of Wotan - characterized more by his vital fierceness than the luminous qualities of the Vedic deities - as a truer explanation of the rise of Nazism, and as a predisposing factor behind the Nazi projection upon the Jew:

Wotan is a restless wanderer who creates unrest and stirs up strife, now here, now there, and works magic. He was soon changed by Christianity into the devil, and only lived on in fading local traditions as a ghostly hunter who was seen with his retinue, flickering like a will o' the wisp through the stormy night. In the Middle Ages the role of the restless wanderer was taken over by Ahasuerus, the Wandering Jew, which is not a Jewish but a Christian legend. **The motif of the wanderer who has not accepted Christ was projected on the Jews, in the same way as we always rediscover our unconscious psychic contents in other people.** At any rate the coincidence of anti-Semitism with the reawakening of Wotan is a psychological subtlety that may perhaps be worth mentioning. (Carl Jung, *Wotan*)

It must be specifically noted that the Jungian psychic refers to the totality of consciousness, of what one is aware of, and that one is unconscious of, all of which exists in the individual and the collective, whereas the Psychic Being is the term we are using to describe the psychological qualities, consciousness and experiences belonging to the Soul in the individual alone, and extending itself into the mental, vital and physical fields of that particular human. While Hitler did not have a Psychic, he, at least by the time of writing *Mein Kampf*, did have an extraordinary connection to the normally unconscious. His statements upon the Jew, and even his descriptions of the “Aryan”, reveal to us the hidden ambition that he was still only partially conscious of, because if *Mein Kampf* makes the rare

disclosure acknowledging his desire for global domination, it is not a consistently explicit theme; nor do these occasional sentences fully encapsulate the scope of what he intended. Instead, the full breadth of his Asuric depravity is found in his projections upon the Jew and his exaltation of a fabricated “Aryan” heritage.

Of course, part of why Hitler did not repeatedly make such categorical declarations in *Mein Kampf* was initially because of the practical matter of his then lack of political power; secondly the potential reactions arising from such disclosures. Sitting in a prison cell, the possibility of world conquest was remote; the need of the hour was to expand his influence and power within Germany first. And to reveal such ambitions would only increase the resistance from other parties opposing his desire to subjugate. Nevertheless, as a primitive, vacuous individual with neither introspective nor Psychic qualities, the designs of which he rarely stated unequivocally are yet easily observed when we take the Jew as the group upon which *his* nefarious ambitions were *projected*. Thus when Hitler writes, “The great leaders of Jewry are confident that the day is near at hand when the command given in the Old Testament will be carried out and the Jews will devour the other nations of the earth,” we find both a paranoid delusion *and* the unconscious declaration of *Hitler's* intent - the Asura of Falsehood grabbing hold of one party to subjugate the other by his iron will. When Hitler characterizes the Jews as seeking to be “Lords of the Earth”, we find the apt description of the Asura to whom he was beholden. And when he describes – in the following passage - the Jewish race as using the German to preserve, expand, and rule the world, it was the latter that Hitler himself desired after his initial task of strengthening the “Aryan” German race:

The Jew did not possess the slightest traces of the German character. He had only acquired the art of twisting the German language to his own uses, and that in a disgusting way, without having assimilated any other feature of the German character. Therefore his command of the language was the sole ground on which he could pretend to be a German. It is not however by the tie of language, but exclusively by the tie of blood that the members of a race are bound together...He aimed at both, preservation and expansion; for the higher he could climb the more alluring became the prospect of reaching the old goal, which was promised to him in ancient times, namely world-rulership, and which he now looked forward to with feverish eyes, as he thought he saw it visibly approaching. (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 244)

It was not merely world-conquest that was projected upon the Jew; even his justifications for propaganda were also assigned to this benighted party, because to Hitler, the Jews showed “consummate skill in manipulating public opinion and using it as an instrument in fighting for their own future” (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 488) – this of course, precisely the stated aim of Hitler's own use of the dark art! In these projections, one finds not only the tactics and ambitions of Hitler, but also indicators as to the nature of his personality. For instance, when he describes the Jew as an “international maggot in the body of the nation,” (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 425), the use of such a word again indicates a small, primitive personality - for the cultured man or the enlightened Arya does not refer to others in such a degrading fashion: Only one having such a blighted nature uses virulent and spiteful language to describe others – it is the small man's form of self-reflection. In these projections upon the Jew of his own global ambitions, and his paranoid delusions of Jewish infiltrators into every nation, we also find a justification for Hitler to order an attack on any state, even potentially allied ones. Because as the Jew was seeking to control the world, even nations like Japan were susceptible to their alleged machinations:

As a result of his millennial experience in accommodating himself to surrounding circumstances, the Jew knows very well that he can undermine the existence of European nations by a process of racial bastardization, but that he could hardly do the same to a national Asiatic State like Japan. Today he can ape the ways of the German and the Englishman, the

American and the Frenchman, but he has no means of approach to the yellow Asiatic. Therefore he seeks to destroy the Japanese national State by using other national States as his instruments, so that he may rid himself of a dangerous opponent before he takes over supreme control of the last national State and transforms that control into a tyranny for the oppression of the defenceless. (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 488)

Already hypothesizing, on scant evidence, the Jewish control of nations like France and England, to then even consider that the Japanese could also be under their control was a sign that *all* nations would remain under his suspicion of being tainted by the Jew. Germany having once aligned with Japan, it was indeed possible that Hitler, if he ever rose to power, would consider partnering with them again. But that did not mean they, or anyone else, could be trusted; for in the back of his mind would lurk the possibility of the Jewish element, and his paranoia could easily provide subjective justification for an attack on those previously fighting alongside him - an unconscious use of a supposed Jewish ambition to justify what in truth was solely his own - and the Asura of Falsehood's - craving. And though such attacks on Axis powers would not happen during his life, that was only a matter of circumstance, not of any inherent affinity. For it is the nature of both the Asura, and the psychological manifestation of paranoia, to continue devouring, to find new people to destroy, as war and death and chaos are what the Asura of Falsehood feeds on.

Indeed, if the Hitler's "first objective" was not "to build up the idea of the People's State but rather to wipe out the Jewish State which is now in existence", (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 351) the Asura of Falsehood does not wish to stop at exterminating one particular group, because once he fashions an instrument ready to base his command of a State upon the foundation of falsehood, the Asura naturally will guide this puppet to subjugate other groups and states, turning them as well into lands where falsehood reigns. This is how he seeks to prevent the growth of the Psychic in Man, to prevent the manifestation of the Divine Truth in the physical plane of existence. Such falsehood, obscurantism, lies and exaggerated egotism are against the spiritual ideals of the Vedic Arya, the spiritual warriors well-differentiated from the false "Aryan" contrived by Western academia and its sophisticated mythologists, who fabricate fact and theory to suit their biases. Such concoctions however, are not without repercussions, and in Hitler we find the inevitable outcome of a hypothesis based upon unchecked racial pride and an openly stated desire to convert the Hindu.

For if Hitler did not focus much on the so-called Aryan Invasion Hypothesis' *religious* triumphalism, he nevertheless took an extreme pride in the myth of a "White" *race* marauding down to subjugate darker skinned natives. But that was an inevitable consequence, as the destructive seed had already been planted, because to have created such a hypothesis while admitting, in Muller's own words, both a difficulty interpreting the Veda *and* preconceived biases, is the hallmark of an inferior scholarship, which should instead proceed from the foundation of a neutral mentality rather than infrarational bigotry. The study of the Veda should have fostered a rich, cerebral and truly academic environment of substantial learning: Instead, the legacy of Max Muller and the early Indologists will be forever tainted by the rise of Nazism - a *direct* result of their machinations, of their *conscious* desire to destroy Hinduism and increase the growth of Christianity over its corpse. It is this legacy that the modern Indologists continue to propagate in a more subtle manner, maintaining the basic outline of a depraved theory that secretly paved the way for the progressive influence of hostile vital beings over the European populace.

For what Max Muller and company had actually done was provide intellectual support for vital prejudices, rather than reaching a conclusion through pure academic study. And as the ordinary citizens of Europe had 'academic' support for their infrarational beliefs, the power of these forces increased unchecked, inevitably leading to more destructive and egoistic urges. The denouement of such biased 'scholarship' can only promote the turn of the lower ego, the denigration of the 'other', the belittling of

a culture that these writers did not actually understand, so profane was their interpretation of the scripture. While Muller himself may have had enough of the Psychic sensitivity and a lack of political power to oppose any heinous actions, by the time of Chamberlain, writers of works similar to Muller and Dubois were personally extolling the “Aryan” race's supreme status to influential leaders: and what these writers lacked in the ability to move the mass they made up for in their appeal to the leader's ego. In the case of the Fuhrer, whatever they – primarily Chamberlain – wrote of the ancient “Aryan” was embraced in totality. As he was heavily influenced by these writers, Hitler imagined in the historic “Aryan” preconceived notions of their life, rather than what the Vedic Aryan is:

And the swastika signified the mission allotted to us - the struggle for the victory of Aryan mankind and at the same time the triumph of the ideal of creative work which is in itself and always will be anti-Semitic. (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 384)

To use the swastika, a mystic image of the spiritual consciousness attained through a psychological or *spiritual* victory, as representative of anti-Semitism, of the oppression and subjugation of another set of mortals, reveals again the Falsehood of which Hitler preached, the lies and distortions inspired by the works of European Indologists. For the Vedic Aryan will never aspire to treat his fellow man or creature with contempt – it is *samata* that he seeks, the Soul in himself and all other humans, the Self in all of creation whether inanimate or abject. The Vedic Aryan is to fight against the forces of evil that are psychological and occult in origin; it is not a race of man that he fights, yet alone enslave. And if *samata* is a truth profounder than mere tolerance, an equality based upon a shared spiritual consciousness rather than higher vital ideals of fraternity, it can nevertheless at least manifest in the spirit of tolerance, for this is closer to its truth than intolerance. Hitler, however, exalted intolerance as a virtue!

Christianity was not content with erecting an altar of its own. It had first to destroy the pagan altars. It was only in virtue of this passionate intolerance that an apodictic faith could grow up. And intolerance is an indispensable condition for the growth of such a faith. (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 352)

This was symptomatic of Hitler's reversed or inverted ‘knowledge’ of culture and life, the oppositions to truth expected from an instrument of the Asura of Falsehood. This turn, this antipodal falsehood claiming to be truth, was best symbolized in the actual swastika the Nazi used, with its position at a forty-five degree angle - giving it the impression of left-handedness, the “left hand” path being the mystic language for a journey fraught with chaos and suffering - and the actual swastika itself painted black, an occult colour often representing falsehood. Also present are the harshness of its lines and the lack of other imagery that often surrounds subcontinental swastikas, representing an iron will that the Nazis sought to impose. It was all an astonishing degradation, a shadow of the Vedic Arya – a group far different to the obsessive Nazi “Aryan”, the latter preoccupied with his “racial stock” and community, his quest to humiliate others. The ancient Vedic Aryan was on an individual journey to spiritual heights; he hardly was thinking of his community. In fact, throughout most of India's history, the undertaking of sadhana was the one allowable reason for the breaking of familial and societal bonds, the *only* acceptable justification for a sojourn into the mountains or forest, for leaving worldly endeavours and finding the Guru for instruction and worship.

If the Nazis had truly been a ‘master race’ as they claimed, they would not have sought oppression, for they would have inherently accepted *samata*, and understood that there *is* a level of equality between races and nature-forms, where all develop along their own lines in a natural progression, perhaps with some active guidance, but with no extreme measures to try and impose one's *inherent* law upon another – for that is the antithesis of dharma. But in the world of Hitler, an Asuric flood into the vital play of man, full of hardness and cruelty, opposites reigned supreme and hatred was light, pity was mocked and God was strength alone, torture was a supposed means to an ancient utopia, joy was to be trampled

under the boots of the bitter and small, and intolerance was the virtue presented at the shrine of the temple of Falsehood. If intolerance was an austerity, if the separation of humanity into superior and inferior races was the permanent truth, if only the strong should prevail, if miscegenation was a crime against God, and if the contaminated Jews were the most crucial element obstructing the rise of “Aryan” Germany, then surely a purification was to proceed by eliminating the impure:

The nationalization of the masses can be successfully achieved only if, in the positive struggle to win the soul of the people, those who spread the international poison among them are exterminated...If we are to free the German people from all those failings and ways of acting which do not spring from their original character, we must first get rid of those foreign germs in the national body which are the cause of its failings and false ways. (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 265)

It was this extermination, this genocide of the Jews and different races or peoples of “inferior” stock, that was to be his great work, his act of God announcing the dawn of a golden age, the return of an “Aryan” stock free of pollutants:

At the beginning of the War, or even during the War, if twelve or fifteen thousand of these Jews who were corrupting the nation had been forced to submit to poison-gas, just as hundreds of thousands of our best German workers from every social stratum and from every trade and calling had to face it in the field, then the millions of sacrifices made at the front would not have been in vain. On the contrary: If twelve thousand of these malefactors had been eliminated in proper time probably the lives of a million decent men, who would be of value to Germany in the future, might have been saved. But it was in accordance with bourgeois ‘statesmanship’ to hand over, without the twitch of an eyelid, millions of human beings to be slaughtered on the battlefields, while they looked upon ten or twelve thousand public traitors, profiteers, usurers and swindlers, as the dearest and most sacred national treasure and proclaimed their persons to be inviolable. (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 518)

Having hated the Jew from his time in Vienna, where mistrust grew into suspicion, having embraced the racial theories popular throughout the Western world, having lived in a culture where hardness and efficiency were valued supreme, equipped with a personal nature devoid of introspection or Psychic qualities to discern between inherent right and wrong, favouring sentiment and iron laws over wider ideals, yet with a strong enough personal discipline to absorb the secret cosmic forces, an already Asuric-influenced nature would accelerate to a possessed vessel when faced with the shock of losing World War I. Because to have formulated, on the basis of paranoid delusions, hastily made assumptions about the war, general prejudices, and an hypersensitivity to criticism - in other words, out of nothing -, a coldly stated plan to commit genocide against these surely, all of them, enemies of the German state, is a definitive sign of Asuric possession. For one has to be far separated from the Psychic consciousness (or rather, the Psychic must not be active within one) to so casually call for a genocide, to not even consider why it might be an inherently wrong form of action, to not look for another way to counter what at best was a difference of opinion (but primarily paranoid delusions and projections upon the ‘other’), to fail to restrain oneself from the impulsive resort to plots of snapping necks and poison-gas.

With this psychological sense of separateness, with a thick contempt for higher ideals, with strength alone as his perceived pinnacle of existence, with pride and power his twin godhead, the Asura of Falsehood had fashioned the perfect instrument in the chaos of World War I's aftermath. And if Hitler did not at the time have the political power, this was a mere formality – the Asura knows the means by which to obtain power, and any slave of his is bound to follow his occult commands towards that goal, hoping to eventually enjoy the potential fruit. But it is a mirage of power, this fruit, a grand folly committed by the individual who – likely unbeknownst to him, even if there is direct occult contact – becomes the instrument of the opposite of the Divine. For as it is the Asura's law to propagate hatred -

the psychological foundation of a separative consciousness that eventually allows him to use his instruments to tear apart and devour mankind in his wake -, if initially in the medium's rise to power there is a clarity of purpose, it is precisely due to this twin-seed of spite and aggrandized vital power supporting the movement, that an inevitable destruction and misery attends him who chooses to take the Asura as Lord.

Indeed, it is a mystic law that the Asura will always lose - *Satyamevajayate*, Truth alone is the Victor. While the Asura might be a power more potent than much of what those without Divine Realization can muster, the Psychic – if man chooses to live from its depth – is connected to a force infinitely supreme, the Portion of the Divine Who has consented for both the possibility of evil and the conscious Asuric entities; this of course means that those seeking to oppose the Asuric influence or possessed nation will eventually receive the secret Divine aid to untangle the hold the Asura periodically obtains on certain masses of men. And the means by which the Divine defeats the Asura is through his Achilles heel: the loss of balance. For though there is a preliminary organization behind any Asuric intrigue, the imbalance will eventually materialize, and the Inversion of Truth will be reminded again that his destiny is to lose to the Divine Forces, the Gods and Goddesses opposing his manipulations through their own terrestrial vessels. When he becomes aware of the inevitable collapse, the Asura seeks to create as much chaos as possible, bring as much suffering and death before he exits the scene, at which point he snaps the neck of the instrument he is using, moving on to the next or concentrating more of his energy on other instruments currently possessed by him. For the Asura does not care for man, not one bit for his ideals or aspirations, nor even his materialism or quest for power, as - seen the case of Hitler - he knows that the external power of this particular mortal was only the result of *his* goading and occult commands.

While the Asura will eventually leave the scene in a blaze of pyrotechnics, this does not occur until the men of non-Asuric nations, spurred on by the Gods, seek to heroically respond. But until this fightback, the Asura continues devouring all that stands in his path - using hatred as the fundamental fuel for this annihilation. Yet as hatred is irrational, as it sustains a beast that only wishes to destroy, it is not something that can be controlled for long, for such balance comes from the internal mind and vital, from a calm and peaceful foundation – from the Psychic in man. If he instead chooses the path of hatred, continues to let grow within him the Asuric appetite to destroy the ‘other’, the supposed inferior races, he will not rest with just his original target. This is because a continued indulgence in hatred and slaughter does not – cannot - result in a greater peace, as Hitler incredibly believed. To the contrary, it only leads to additional killings and a broader genocide. This is the pattern of movements of the lower vital, *especially* when taken hold of by Asuric or hostile vital forces, to continue repeating themselves, often with increasing intensity; if there is any cessation of the rhythm, it is a transient exhaustion of the tendency – soon will it return if the foundation of hatred remains. As Hitler did not have an active Psychic, and as the Asura had also invaded the general German atmosphere, the malevolence had no internal check, and it was to be much later before he came across strong resistance - of an external variety.

Without higher ideals, without a Psychic Being (which naturally withdrew in response to his evil), Hitler in reality was attached more to antipathy and genocide - impositions upon the ‘other’ - than the German race he professed his devotion toward, even if this latter attachment was used to incite the emotions of the mass, even if he sincerely believed in the mythical “Aryan” race. For enmity and ethnic cleansing are closer to the raw vital power craved by those under possession or influence of the Asura of Falsehood; racial theories are simply mental justifications, means to an end for a depraved vital craving. Because of this, there was always the potential for the racial theories to be altered slightly, for different rationales to emerge justifying the extermination of even those who previously were included in the ‘superior’ race. It was this devouring pattern that Martin Niemoller famously described with

regard to the rise of the Nazis:

First they came for the communists,
and I didn't speak out because I wasn't a communist.

Then they came for the trade unionists,
and I didn't speak out because I wasn't a trade unionist.

Then they came for the Jews,
and I didn't speak out because I wasn't a Jew.

Then they came for me
and there was no one left to speak out for me.

Thus what started out as a vile hatred of the Jews and other assigned inferior races like the Roma, would have – if unchecked by the Allied Powers and millions of heroic soldiers from their colonies – eventually led to the death of those previously of his own “Aryan stock”, through some imagined pretext, perhaps conjured up by the same academic class who created the myth of a White “Aryan” race. This is because for one to hate, one *always* needs the ‘other’ to channel one's malice upon; and if one seeks to kill the group that is despised, when the initial party is successfully eliminated, another group will eventually take its place to be hated and possibly eliminated. Indeed, Hitler would refer to his own Germans as “imbeciles” in one passage of *Mein Kampf*, and as mentioned, even refused Eastern European German stock, both hints of the direction that was possible, because Hitler loathed the ‘other’ more than he loved himself or the German.

For how could he have loved himself, or have been at peace, seeking harmony with others? It is from the Psychic that humans love, and even if this Divine Love gets distorted and mixed in the field of variable forces, yet for the man with the Psychic influence there will remain refined qualities hinting at the purest love. But if there is no Psychic Being or influence, or if there is no Divine entity in place of it, then there can be no peace for the vessel, as it becomes the recipient of an enormous torture by entities not at all interested in subjective peace or joy for their plaything. And if hatred is the *raison d'être* that galvanizes the instrument, at any point in time this animus can turn inward, the other becoming the self, genocide mutating to suicide. Thus came the inevitable finale for Hitler, having retreated to a bunker, alone with his consort, under invasion from all sides, his dream of “Aryan” hegemony stamped by the bombs and the march of the enemy. For irrespective of the armies he controlled, the masses seized by his every word, the fear he elicited from nations he crossed, in the hidden occult reality, Hitler was close to nothing, of no intrinsic value, a near non-existent entity, a shadow that was quickly discarded by the emanation he had mistaken for God.

* * * *

In the time of the Vedic Rishi, the age of Seers and mysteries, there existed an intimate contact with what is now unconscious to the vast majority; the veils dividing the worlds were transparent, removed even, for the most enlightened. If the ordinary mortal did not have the mystic vision of the Seer, he had at least an innate intuition telling him that the varied experiences of the enlightened were of the highest quality, were to be acknowledged in a serious manner, to be believed. While such recognition and faith would not necessarily lead an ordinary man of the time to Self-Realization or a tangible understanding to what the Seer was describing, even the partial understanding was capable of leading the worshipper to obtain distinct openings to the inner worlds, to universal forces of varied natures. It was thanks to these residual apertures that mankind in the period subsequent to the age of truth expressed through the

mystic word, could yet still receive the truths of the age of epics, whose works are full of what are now erroneously derided as mythical figures.

But as the effervescent greatness and knowledge of the ancients slackened, following a rhythm of Prakriti where from each height there comes a non-permanent fall, Man in turn began to seek greatness and joy and knowledge in progressively external manners; in the case of the latter, intuition and inspiration made way for the burgeoning of intellect in the great minds, the superficial vital mind in the mass. And as the overall consciousness of the leading minds has moved from the subtle to the gross, so has the identification of truth moved from the intuitive and revelatory, to the philosophy of the higher mind, down to the baseness of the sense-organs. Thus the intellectual of the modern age, from the dawn of industrialization and mercantilism, has concentrated his tremendous capabilities in promoting the cults of comfort and utilitarianism, political power and the pursuit of wealth, the play of passions and pride of the ordinary rajasic ego. All of these qualities – as espoused by the modern intellectual - are united by their separation from the internal and higher part of the natures, let alone the profound depth of the Purusha and peak of the Self.

But the modern intellectual, as a general rule, does not consider the latter as serious possibilities, for their intellect is geared towards what is in front of them, what is tangible. Subsequently, not only do many intellectuals scoff at the idea of God, they also react with perplexity to the notion of subliminal worlds or entities having their influence and possible power over the lives of mortals. Thus the complete inability to predict - and the shock at the immensity of the crimes - the power of Adolf Hitler. For how could such a monstrosity emerge in the heart of the so-called civilized world? Of course, not every intellectual is the same, and if the general train of thought is in one direction, there will always be those secure in their own nature, describing a world according to their law, whether or not that coincided with the intellectual turn of the time. With regards to the rise of Nazism, one European willing to try and see past the apparent state of things was the aforementioned Carl Jung: Even prior to World War II, Jung sought to look beyond economic, political or ordinary psychological factors to explain the phenomenon of Hitler. In his search, he found, as mentioned, the ancient Germanic god Wotan as a finer explanation than the mainstream consensus being put forth:

We are always convinced that the modern world is a reasonable world, basing our opinion on economic, political, and psychological factors. But if we may forget for a moment that we are living in the year of Our Lord 1936, and, laying aside our well-meaning, all-too-human reasonableness, may burden God or the gods with the responsibility for contemporary events instead of man, **we would find Wotan quite suitable as a casual hypothesis. In fact, I venture the heretical suggestion that the unfathomable depths of Wotan's character explain more of National Socialism than all three reasonable factors put together. There is no doubt that each of these factors explains an important aspect of what is going on in Germany, but Wotan explains yet more.** He is particularly enlightening in regard to a general phenomenon which is so strange to anybody not a German that It remains incomprehensible, even after the deepest reflection. (Carl Jung, *Wotan*)

Wotan is the “the god of storm and frenzy, the unleasher of passions and the lust of battle; moreover he is a superlative magician and artist in illusion who is versed in all secrets of an occult nature.” (Carl Jung, *Wotan*) This “god” of fury and passion did not merely sit on a throne in the heavenly regions:

Perhaps we may sum up this general phenomenon as *Ergriffenheit* - a state of being seized or possessed. The term postulates not only an *Ergriffener* (one who is seized) but, also, an *Ergreifer* (one who seizes). **Wotan is an Ergreifer of men**, and, unless one wishes to deify Hitler - which has indeed actually happened - he is really the only explanation. (Carl Jung, *Wotan*)

The description of Wotan as “seizing” or “possessing” men, as the storm and frenzy, is quite accurate in describing the result of the hold of hostile vital beings such as the Asuras, Rakshasas or Pishachas over certain men. In the case of the Asura of Falsehood however, the “storm and frenzy” would only apply to the external manifestation, the misery and destruction left in the wake of his rule. For the Asuras – and even some Rakshasas, as the example of Ravana shows - themselves are often quite controlled, highly disciplined, capable of strenuous *tapasya* (an intensive austerity through psychological discipline) that the mass (as opposed to individual centres such as Hitler) are likely incapable of replicating. But in the *aftermath* of their possession, it is the fury and the terror of the lower vital, the tortuous drama or “scenery” as Jung would describe it, that predominates:

Houston Stewart Chamberlain is a symptom which arouses suspicion that other veiled gods may be sleeping elsewhere. The emphasis on the Germanic race - commonly called “Aryan” - the Germanic heritage, blood and soil, the Wagalaweia songs, the ride of the Valkyries, Jesus as a blond and blue-eyed hero, the Greek mother of St. Paul, the devil as an international Alberich in Jewish or Masonic guise, the Nordic aurora borealis as the light of civilization, the inferior Mediterranean races - all this is the indispensable scenery for the drama that is taking place and at the bottom they all mean the same thing: **a god has taken possession of the Germans and their house is filled with a “mighty rushing wind.”** It was soon after Hitler seized power, if I am not mistaken, that a cartoon appeared in Punch of a raving berserker tearing himself free from his bonds. A hurricane has broken loose in Germany while we still believe it is fine weather. (Carl Jung, *Wotan*)

But such an outcome was inevitable, for the German had answered the seducing call of the Asura of Falsehood, taking their collective vital ego to be the profoundest of truths, the infrarational urge to domination and power as the ultimate goal in life, the obsession with racial types and inferior “species” as the height of wisdom. Just as the Psychic Being in Hitler withdrew from its house, having seen the coming storm, so too did the German Nation-Soul have to retreat from the scene, unable to prevent what its people were so intent on invoking. The road that had been paved by the likes of Muller and Chamberlain was what Hitler was leading his sheep upon, the German nation following “a mediumistic Fuhrer over the housetops with a sleep-walkers assurance, only to land in the street with a broken back.” (Carl Jung, *After the Catastrophe*) Indeed well before the vanquishing of the Nazi state, it was clear to Jung that an explanation for the German phenomenon must go beyond the normal rationalistic outlook of the modern intellectual:

Our mania for rational explanations obviously has its roots in our fear of metaphysics, for the two were always hostile brothers. Hence, anything unexpected that approaches us from the dark realm is regarded either as coming from outside and, therefore, as real, or else as an hallucination and, therefore, not true. **The idea that anything could be real or true which does not come from outside has hardly begun to dawn on contemporary man.** For the sake of better understanding and to avoid prejudice, we could of course dispense with the name “Wotan” and speak instead of the furor teutonicus. **But we should only be saying the same thing and not as well, for the furor in this case is a mere psychologizing of Wotan and tells us no more than that the Germans are in a state of “fury.”** We thus lose sight of the most peculiar feature of this whole phenomenon, namely, the dramatic aspect of the Ergreifer and the Ergriffener. **The impressive thing about the German phenomenon is that one man, who is obviously “possessed,” has infected a whole nation to such an extent that everything is set in motion and has started rolling on its course towards perdition.** (Carl Jung, *Wotan*)

Indeed, while the psychology of Hitler – or other instruments seized by the Asura of Falsehood - is very important in diagnosing the malady, these remain symptoms, not the source: to ignore the possibility of actual conscious entities working upon man from, in the cosmic reality, behind the scenes, promotes

only a continued ignorance that can hinder the development of humanity – all of whom are susceptible to the influence of hostile beings if the Soul has yet to take its rightful place as Ruler of the individual's consciousness. Because Jung decidedly leaned to the possibility of unconscious (to humanity) forces having their role in the play of Man, he understood that it was more than just chance, more than just physiology, that explained the constellation of symptoms characterizing Hitler:

All these pathological features – complete lack of insight into one's own character, auto-erotic self-admiration and self-extenuation, denigration and terrorization of one's fellow men (how contemptuously Hitler spoke of his own people!), projection of the shadow, lying, falsification of reality, determination to impress by fair means or foul, bluffing and double-crossing – all these were united in the man who was diagnosed clinically as an hysteric, and whom a strange fate chose to be the political, moral, and religious spokesman of Germany for twelve years. Is this pure chance? (Carl Jung, *After the Catastrophe*)

Indeed, Jung observed in *Mein Kampf* indications that Hitler had long been “seized”:

But the infamies of his book, once it is shorn of its Schwabinger brand of bombast, make one suspicious, **and one cannot help wondering if the evil spirit had not already taken possession of this man long before he seized power. Round about 1936, many people in Germany were asking themselves the same question; they expressed fears that the Fuhrer might fall a victim to “evil influences,” he dabbled too much in “black magic”, etc.** (Carl Jung, *After the Catastrophe*)

It was entirely this seizure, this immense channel between Hitler and the unconscious forces or worlds, that gave rise to his astonishing, yet accurate, decisions:

[Interviewer] *I suppose that would apply to the three really critical decisions he made, each of which involved the acute danger of war: when he marched into the Rhineland in March, 1936, and into Austria in March, 1938, and when he mobilized and forced the Allies to abandon Czechoslovakia. Because in each one of these cases we know that many of Hitler's highest military advisers warned him against doing it, since they believed the Allies would resist, and also that if war came Germany would be bound to lose.*

Precisely! The fact is that Hitler was able to judge his opponents better than anyone else, and although it appeared inevitable that he would be met by force, he knew his opponents would give in without fighting. That must have been the case especially when Chamberlain came to Berchtesgarden. There for the first time Hitler met the elder British statesman.

As Chamberlain proved later at Godesberg, he had come to tell him, among other things, not to go too far or Britain would fight him. But Hitler's unconscious eye which so far has not failed him, read so deeply the character of the British Prime Minister that all the later ultimatums and warnings from London made no impression whatever on his unconscious: Hitler's unconscious knew – it didn't guess or feel, it knew – that Britain would not risk war. Yet Hitler's speech in the Sports Palace when he announced to the world a holy oath that he would march into Czechoslovakia October first, with or without permission of Britain and France, indicated for the first and only time that Hitler the man, in his supremely critical moment, had fear of following Hitler the prophet.

His Voice told him to ahead, that everything would be all right. But his human reason told him the dangers were vast and perhaps overwhelming. Hence for the first time Hitler's voice trembled; his breath failed. His speech lacked form and trailed off at the end. What human being would not be afraid in such a moment? In making that speech which fixed the destiny of perhaps hundreds of millions of people, he was a man doing something of which he was deathly

afraid but forcing himself to do it because it was ordered by his Voice. (Diagnosing the Dictators, *C.G. Jung Speaking: Interviews and Encounters*, 1978, pp. 120-121)

While this is an excellent description of how Hitler's access to the unconscious led to “the Voice” - of the Asura of Falsehood – commanding him to make ‘decisions’, and how the last slivers of individualism and free will in him hesitated at what he had been ordered to do, Jung in this conversation slightly circumvented the main issue. In another interview, he was able to directly state the matter at hand:

There are two types of dictators – the chieftain type and the medicine man type. Hitler is the latter. **He is a medium. German policy is not made; it is revealed through Hitler.** He is the mouthpiece of the gods as of old. ...**You remember the story of how, when Hitler was being pressed by other Powers not to withdraw Germany from the League of Nations, he shut himself away for three days, and then simply said, without explanation: “Germany must withdraw!” That is rule by revelation.** (The Psychology of Dictatorship, *C.G. Jung Speaking: Interviews and Encounters*, 1978, p. 93)

This, including the idea of Hitler's status as the mouthpiece of the “gods” (mortals, in their ignorance, have often described Asuric or other hostile vital beings like Wotan as “gods”), is one of the most illumined and accurate depictions of Hitler's reality, identifying his status as a medium, a mere puppet, along with providing a crucial example of how his decision making was not based on rationality or even strategy. It was instead constructed upon him *waiting* for the Asura of Falsehood to present himself to Hitler (in the subliminal – hostile vital beings are not seen or heard through the *physical* sight or audition - planes of which Hitler was able to access) and *infrarationally* – for there certainly exist revelations of a superior or profounder quality - reveal to the Fuhrer what he must do, providing Hitler with an order that he was certain to follow. If it took days or weeks for that infrarational revelation, it was irrelevant, because Hitler knew that the Asura of Falsehood – Hitler believed him to be God, having been deceived by the manner in which the Asura appeared to his occult sight - had guided him to great success before.

Returning to our examination of Jung's analysis of Hitler, we also find the former to have had the insight to discern between the natures of dictators, to look at the character of the man, and not just the extent of his power, in determining the type of force behind:

So you see, while Hitler is a medicine man, a form of spiritual vessel, a demi-deity or even better, a myth, Mussolini is a man, and therefore everything in Fascist Italy has a more human shape than it has in Nazi Germany, where things are run by revelation. Hitler as a man scarcely exists. At any rate, he disappears behind his role. Mussolini, on the contrary, never disappears behind his role. His role disappears behind Mussolini.

I saw the Duce and the Fuhrer together in Berlin the time Mussolini paid his formal visit; I had the good luck to be placed only a few yards away from them, and could study them well. It was entertaining to see Mussolini's expression when they put on the goose step. If I had not seen it I should have fallen into the popular delusion that his adoption of the German goose step for the Italian army was in imitation of Hitler...On this occasion it was done magnificently and it pleased Mussolini so much he broke out laughing and clapped his hands. When he got back to Rome afterwards, he introduced the goose step and I am convinced he did it solely for his own aesthetic enjoyment. ...

In comparison with Mussolini, Hitler made upon me the impression of a sort of scaffolding of wood covered with cloth, an automaton with a mask, like a robot, or a mask of a robot. During the whole performance he never laughed; it was though he were in bad humour, sulking.

He showed no human sign. His expression was that of an inhumanly single-minded purposiveness, with no sense of humour. He seemed as if he might be the double of a real person, and that Hitler the man might perhaps be hiding inside like an appendix, and deliberately so hiding in order not to disturb the mechanism.

What an amazing difference between Hitler and Mussolini! I couldn't help liking Mussolini. His bodily energy and elasticity are warm, human, and contagious. You have the homely feeling with Mussolini of being with a human being. With Hitler, you are scared. You know you would never be able to talk to that man; because there is nobody there. He is not a man, but a collective. He is not an individual; he is a whole nation. (Diagnosing the Dictators, *C.G. Jung Speaking: Interviews and Encounters*, 1978, pp. 126-128)

This apt comparison between Hitler and Mussolini underlines the great play of cosmic forces, the *lila* that acutely takes place in certain individuals who either by nature, or by conscious or unconscious tapasya, have subliminal channels to non-material worlds, including but not limited to the Divine. Certain individuals, especially those craving power, often have openings in some fashion to the Asura of Falsehood. When this occurs, it is the Psychic in man that acts in opposition to the Asuric pull, to try and balance, hopefully reject, this exaggeration of the lower ego. It was the respective differences in the actions of their Psychic Beings that Jung observed; Hitler had none, which is why he had no true individuality, no element of having a real personality – he was only a mechanical instrument maintaining a heartbeat, waiting for his Asuric overload to dictate a course of action. In contrast Mussolini, for all his faults such as being *influenced* by hostile vital forces, had clear qualities of a human, including evident happiness, an ability to find amusement in things, aestheticism, and seeming effluent warmth. All of these qualities speak of some element of joy in life: joy, as opposed to the pleasures of the lower vital, originates from the Psychic in man, the extension of the Purusha who, let us recall, *is Ananda*.

If Jung certainly had the rare and exceptional ability to intuitively conceive of an occult reality to Hitler's rise, to discern between the differences of “human” qualities and whatever Hitler was, and crucially, to describe a man waiting for a “revelation”, he nevertheless hesitates – like Hitler in his Czechoslovakia speech - when faced with the magnitude of what “revelation” and “hearing a Voice” entailed. For though Jung clearly saw a huge unconscious role in the world of Hitler, he chose to term it in the form of the “German collective” - that it was the German nation who Hitler heard, they who spoke to him as a single unit. Thus to Jung, the voice goading Hitler was not of a specific being, it was “of the collective unconscious, especially of his own race.” (Diagnosing the Dictators, *C.G. Jung Speaking: Interviews and Encounters*, 1978, p. 139) While Jung was correct in his belief of Hitler's unusual channel into the normally unconscious realms, he erred – as seen below - in presuming that a collective could so accurately direct the actions of an individual:

Now, the secret of Hitler's power is not that Hitler has an unconscious more plentifully stored than yours or mine. **Hitler's secret is twofold: first, that his unconscious has exceptional access to his consciousness, and second, that he allows himself to be moved by it.** He is like a man who listens intently to a stream of suggestions in a whispered voice from a mysterious source and then *acts upon them*. In our case, even if occasionally our unconscious does reach us as through dreams, we have too much rationality, too much cerebrum to obey it. This is doubtless the case with Chamberlain, but Hitler listens and obeys. The true leader is always *led*.

We can see it work in him. He himself has referred to his Voice. **His Voice is nothing other than his own unconscious, into which the German people have projected their own selves...** That is why he makes political judgements which turn out to be right against the opinions of all his advisers and against the opinions of all foreign observers. When this happens, it means only that the information gathered by his unconscious, and reaching his

consciousness by means of his exceptional talent, has been more nearly correct than that of all the others, German or foreign, who attempted to judge the situation and who reached conclusions different from his. And of course, it also means that, having this information at hand, he is willing to *act* upon it. (Diagnosing the Dictators, *C.G. Jung Speaking: Interviews and Encounters*, 1978, pp. 119-120)

But Jung in this conversation actually provides evidence as to why the collective unconscious - versus an individual occult entity - was less likely to have guided Hitler. For he notes that Hitler's decisions went against the opinions of both his advisers and foreign observers, yet turned out to be correct. It is precisely in this example that we find decision making contrary to the ordinary grooves of thought – the usual patterns that the masses would adhere to. This fits perfectly with one of the truths of Nature – that of the individual leading the masses, rather than the opposite. It is in the individual, for better or worse, in which intellectual, spiritual, moral, and vital formations are conceptualized, later to be brought into the play of the terrestrial existence. From then on the masses will follow; thus it was incorrect to give to the ordinary German masses so much unconscious power to provide Hitler with the astonishing decision-making ability that he held, even if Hitler, in his *public* announcements, implied that the “Voice” that he heard was that of the German nation - when in fact it was of the Asura of Falsehood.

The reason that Jung saw in the German people such similarities to Hitler was because of the means by which the Asura of Falsehood chooses to work – strongly influencing or grabbing hold of certain individual centres, using them to permeate his falsehoods into the atmosphere of the nation, upon which the collective begins to *echo* the ideology initially endorsed by the select individuals. Thus if the German collective was not the actual source of Hitler's frighteningly astute political and military judgement, at the very least they did *reflect* upon him the exaggerated vital ambition and pride to which they were both attached. This mass reflection, the “mirror” that Jung spoke of, was a symptom, not the diagnosis. Both were under the spell of the Asura, the difference was the degree of intensity; Hitler was indeed sensitive to the German collective, but this did not explain his power. Rather, it was an actual – though subliminal - entity that Hitler was in contact with, whom he *saw* and *heard*, who commanded him, as in the decision to withdraw from the League of Nations. And though Hitler believed the Asura to be God, this confusion is commonplace, because the hostile beings of the Vital world often pretend to be God or an emissary of God – the better to obtain full obedience from the instrument, who subsequently *believe* that they are doing the divine work.

It requires either the Guru, or else a subtle discrimination or discernment to inherently see through whatever mask or glittering vital light the hostile being or Asura may take in his occult appearance to the mortal, because these entities will do whatever it takes to gain control of a mortal, to enjoy the chaos and destruction and misery (this is what they perversely take delight in) that they bring to fruition through their instruments, leaving the mortal to suffer the repercussions when the hostile beings tire of the play and move on to different instruments. The requirement to deal with the aftermath is necessary for the mortal, not the hostile being, because the former has a Psychic Being trying to evolve in the terrestrial world, while the latter are fixed non-terrestrial entities. In the case of the Asura of Falsehood, immortality is another characteristic, having been present from the beginning of creation. It is so with other beings of the non-terrestrial planes - they are typical and not capable of the progressive growth of man with his Psychic: they can, however, request transformation from their shadow state into an extraordinary luminous counterpoint, as is what happened with two of the original Asuras.

Though they are without the Psychic that transforms, as they - especially the Asura of Falsehood - have been around for the full span of time, it follows that they clearly understand the lower nature of mankind, and have a certain practical intelligence related to earthly patterns. Accordingly, the Asura was able to command Hitler into making decisions that while appearing rash, were yet calculated to

achieve maximum gains. It was this conscious, guiding hand that brought Hitler his success, not the German collective, as the latter only followed their Fuhrer - they did not, and could not, lead him. Thus he cannot be considered to be their projection; at most he was a figurehead, though not really of the German nation - for the real Teutonic nation, like all other nations, does not belong to the exaggerated vital consciousness of the Asura. It was not the true nation that the world witnessed in the rise of Nazi Germany, whose ambition and pride was but an aggrandizement of qualities present in all ego formations, collective or individual. Ambition, pride, satisfaction of material desires, forcefully imposing oneself upon others, are not the foundation of true individuality in either the individual or collective. It is the discovery of, the living from, an inherent natural law (from the inner being), that defines the beginning of true individualism, in both the solitary unit and the nation.

It was not the nation that was the “monster”, as Jung would conclude; rather, it was a monstrosity that captured the mind, imagination, and actions of the German nation, thanks in no small part to its men confusing their external vital for individuality. Indeed, when this happens, the “nation” actually *loses* its individuality and status as a nation, for it has become possessed by a force it is barely conscious of. When true nationalism, on the other hand, is followed, the inherent laws of other nations are both recognized and respected, as the country following its svadharma will intuitively understand that other nations, like itself, have their own svadharma. This is because by following their *inner* law, a country finds itself closer to its Nation-Soul, just as a man living according to his svadharma will be near to his Purusha. And any growing cognizance of the Soul automatically leads to the eternal truth of the Mahapurusha behind all men and all nations – the Soul, of course, as the eternal Portion of a solitary Divine supporting all existence. This awareness will readily lead to the understanding that, if there is a solitary Divine presence hidden beneath all, then all nations are at heart united with each other, therefore why should one nation seek to, without provocation, *impose* itself - to subjugate, to force into slavery, another nation that is at heart itself?

It was this inability to *fully* accept the occult reality of distinct, conscious, non-terrestrial entities (rather than vague unconscious collectives) dictating the actions of certain men, that marked the limitation of Jung's otherwise exquisite analysis. He could not fully commit himself to the final step, the ultimate conclusion to what he had observed. But perhaps this was one bridge too far, as Jung, irrespective of his immense intuitive aptitude, nevertheless had grown up in a environment dismissing such unconscious possibilities. It was this background of his that made him lapse into a thesis of collective unconscious, rather than the reality of Hitler as the vessel of a *conscious*, occult Asuric behemoth. But we can consider this to be a small point, as Jung's intuitive attributes led him, and us, to as close an understanding of the events of those times as would be possible for those raised in non-mystic backgrounds. And while he was not raised in a culture immersed in the knowledge of a broad range of mystic or occult realities, and if this did indeed prevent him from a complete understanding of a reality that only a few would have been cognizant of anyway, he had still tremendous openings to these subtle worlds. And it was not only his waking state intuition – from his dream state flowed profound truths to his consciousness, including one quite remarkable 1939 dream:

He [Carl Jung] told of their [Switzerland] great anxiety in 1939 over the Hitler-Stalin pact, which made it look as if they would be swallowed up without doubt. He said he had had a dream at that time:

He found himself in a castle, all the walls and buildings of which were made of trinitrotoluene (dynamite). Hitler came in and was treated as divine. Hitler stood on a mound as for a review. C.G was placed on a corresponding mound. **Then the parade ground began to fill with buffalo or yak steers, which crowded into the enclosed space from one end. The herd was filled with nervous tension and moved about restlessly.** Then he saw that one cow was alone, apparently sick. Hitler was concerned about this cow and asked C.G what he thought of it. C.G

said, "It is obviously very sick." **At this point, Cossacks rode in at the back and began to drive the herd off. He awoke and felt, "It is all right."**

He emphasized that Hitler was treated as *divine*. Consequently, he felt, we had to view him like that, that Hitler is not to be taken primarily as a human man, but as an instrument of "divine" forces, as Judas, or, still better, as the Antichrist must be. That the castle was built of trinitrotoluene meant that it would blow up and be destroyed because of its own explosive quality. The herds of cattle are the instincts, the primitive, pre-human forces let loose in the German unconscious. They are not even domestic cattle, but buffalo or yaks, very primitive indeed. They are all male, as is the Nazi ideology: all are the values of relationship, of the person or individual, are completely repressed; the feminine element is sick unto death, so we get the sick cow. ...The Cossacks are, of course, Russians. From that, C.G said, he deduced that Russia – more barbaric than Germany, but also more directly primitive, and therefore of sounder instinct – would break in and cause the overthrow of Germany. (*From Esther Harding's Notebooks: 1948*, pp. 180-182)

Indeed, one can describe this dream as suprarationally revelatory, in which Jung's consciousness was opened to luminous mental planes – in this case the Intuitive Mind - of which the Vedic Rishi accessed with ease. These levels are below the Satchitananda that the Rishi united with, but are nevertheless nearer to the Divine than the intellect or higher mind, and as this relatively exalted form of consciousness is both closer to the Rishi's Consciousness, and can be the basis for a partial expression to other mortals (Satchitananda cannot be expressed in totality, for it is beyond ordinary mortal capacity to thoroughly understand - it must be experienced), it was from there that their Word often flowed, the consciousness by which they conveyed profound truths to their disciples. And it is that region of consciousness that is pertinent to understanding Jung's dream, especially when we consider the sick cow and the anxious herd. As Jung was primarily governed by his higher mind, he rightly looked at the cow in archetypal sense, since that was his place of consciousness. But the cow has both a deeper mystic truth and a different reality when we consider the Veda. For the Vedic cows are the herds of the Sun, the beams of the Light or Truth which they – just as the corresponding Sun is to the Light and Truth – are a mystic *object* within the Intuitive Mind (where the mystic accesses suprarational revelation and inspiration), yet an *emblem* to the ordinary mind. And in the Veda, this cattle are stolen by the Dasyu and other Concealers such as the Vritras or Panis, whom undoubtedly include the Asura.

It is the Vedic Aryan who must then invoke the Gods to aid him in destroying the Panis and recover the herd of cattle, to remove the obstacle obstructing him from the great gift of Light and Truth that the cattle is. From that perspective, we can understand that Jung's dream was but an opening into the higher – rather than the *infrarational* revelatory planes accessed by Hitler - revelatory planes of consciousness, and that Hitler was the agent of the Asura of Falsehood, who had captured the manifestation of light and truth, enclosing them in a fortified castle. The sick individual cow was dying, just as the Truth and Light would perish in the *material* existence (it would nevertheless eternally remain behind all of creation) if the Nazis realized their ambitions: the herd was nervous because they sensed the fate awaiting them. The dynamite marking the borders of the castle were further indications of the assault of the Asura on Light and Truth, of a world on the verge of implosion. And the Russians were the agents (though not Divine themselves) of the Gods arriving to release the Light and Truth from the clutches of darkness and falsehood - the occult conflict playing out in the terrestrial existence.

This was the hidden truth of Jung's dream, the secret reality of a war waged in perpetuity, unconscious to man for as long as creation, when the first Asuras lost connection with their source, misperceiving their separation to the Divine as the entire truth of things¹. Indeed the Vedic term for war, *gavasti*, when translated directly means the "search for cows" or the "going for cows", something the European interpreted literally instead of figuratively, arrogantly assuming that they were reading about cattle-

herders instead of the Overmind Gods and Goddesses helping the true Arya – of whatever nation or race - to both uncover and protect the manifested Light. And though the Asura's have been attempting to destroy the Light – only to end up hiding it, because the Light is Indestructible - since the dawn of existence, it has been nearly as long that the Gods and Goddesses have worked silently to counter the Asuric machinations. It is through their guidance, or by means of the Psychic's inherent discernment and its calm and consistent rejection of the Asuric influence, that Man maintains both his humanity and his potential for spiritual progress: It is in this latter promise that the Asuric purpose upon earth assumes most significance.

For though the Asura, from time to time, can seize a mortal willing to believe his lies, obedient to his every command, addicted to the vital power that emerges from this possession, and, having the necessary attributes to obtain external authority and impose an Asuric ideology on vast swaths of humanity, these are yet rare births. And if the Divine implicitly – but not directly - sanctions the possibility of an Asuric instrument driving men to terror, evil, death, chaos and suffering, leading to an inevitable response and progress from the intensity of the clash of opposing forces (consider, for example, the more secure and enlightened post-war world that emerged after World War II), it remains the individual wherein the indirectly sanctioned workings of the Asura are of the most use, because irrespective of the glorious results of the war, including the distinctly more accepting and peaceful age that has followed - especially in Europe which housed the majority of the war theatre -, it is still within the individual that the most illustrious gains are to be had from any contact with, or influence from, the Asura.

But this occurs in an opposite fashion to the result of Hitler's contact – for it is the comprehensive *rejection* and transcending of the Asuric psychology or subtle occult influence that will lead to the greatness of man. This secret use of the Asura and other hostile beings by God – unbeknownst to them, of course – are fundamental at a certain level to progressively facilitate and provide challenges for the movement of the Soul constrained by the ego to the Soul free from all bondage. It is thus that the spiritual seeker or sadhak is tested, perfected - the Psychic growing more and more powerful, depending of course upon the response to whatever Asuric or hostile influence comes his way. As with their origin, it is not that God *directly* sends these hostile forces to test these mortals; it is just that he *implicitly* allows them to have the potential to occultly influence or control them, so that God can identify the wheat from the chaff, the more *stable* adhar (receiving vessel) from the seeker still beholden to inherently unstable vital influences that if allowed access, can potentially ruin a sadhana and obstruct the *permanent* elevation into the Divine Consciousness – the ultimate aspiration.

By *implicitly* using these forces to test the purity of the instrument, the Divine is also looking to facilitate protection against the misuse of the immense Divine Puissance that accompanies any spiritual journey – such misappropriations can lead to disaster for the individual if it is turned for even minor egoistic desires (a sadhana, after all, is specifically designed to transcend the ego consciousness into the Supreme Consciousness), let alone Asuric or hostile purposes. It was precisely due to this that the mystic verses of the Vedic Rishi, in its higher meaning rather than the superficial forms in which it may be primitively understood, is defined by an *internal* and *individual* war that is being played out in the non-terrestrial fields of the noble Arya. Far from the profane understanding of men like Max Muller, who could only see the outward and *intentional* misdirect, who could only interpret a conclusion already formed in their mind, are the depths of the Vedic wisdom. Indeed, it was from Muller and other Indologists that the seed – because the Asura, unlike the Rakshasa or Pishacha, often works through the intellect, turning it away from its higher or deeper possibilities of function – of Nazism was planted, imperceptibly penetrating its way into the general European consciousness, the Asura knowing that soon enough, he would have an instrument available capable of bringing into life the ultimate degradation of the Vedic Arya.

While the Asura of Falsehood had to wait patiently over the course of decades for the necessary climate to descend upon Europe in its breadth, to the point when he could proceed beyond his influence upon Indologists like Muller, by the time he began shaping Hitler into his slave, the atmosphere was perfectly suited for the individual centre of power to find his Asuric ideology aggregated by the echoing masses. And with the medium of Hitler the equivalent of a supple little automaton, the Asura had found perhaps the perfect instrument, one capable of receiving his master – God, as Hitler presumed - in the occult planes, willing to obey his lord's word over all others, enthralled by the intoxicating power that occurred both from contact with his lord and from the adulation of a nation, utterly without the check of a Psychic that withdrew, and most importantly, completely unaware of the severe consequences that awaited him and his nation, as the ‘god’ he submitted before is always destined to lose. For the Asura, although powerful, is not the only force of power in the world, and Truth will always manifest over his machinations.

But that does not mean he has, or will, cease trying to oppose the intended Divine transformation of the earth, the Supreme work destined to release man from the bondage of his ego, bringing the descent of peace and harmony and all the other glorious truths that humanity, even from the relatively lower height of thought, strives for. And if Hitler was perhaps the most dangerous Asuric instrument effecting the fate of the planet, this does not mean that the Asura of Falsehood will be unable to find other individual centres or instruments in the future, or that Hitler was the first to have been lured by the bait of inverted knowledge² and intoxicating power.

Footnotes

1. The antiquity of the Veda, transmitted orally through generations, can be perceived by the fact that the oldest of hymns actually have segments positively dedicated to the Asuras themselves. This is understandable when we recall that the Asuras are ‘fallen’ emanations of Satchitananda. Thus the early mantras to the Asuras are from *before* they lost recognition of, *and* consciously rejected and fought against, their inherent unity with all of creation. Later on, the Vedic stanzas would no longer seek to invoke the Asuras, because the Asuras had become non-Divine after establishing a permanently separative *and hostile* consciousness (to Brahma), and the Truth of the Veda is to invoke the Supreme Consciousness.

2. One such example, of many including the most pertinent Asuric construct that will be discussed in the next chapter, was the emanation known as Ahura Mazda. This was the entity from whom Zarathustra received his prophetic revelations. *Ahura* and *Mazda* are clear derivations from the Sanskrit *Asura* and *medha*; as the latter means intelligence or wisdom, it was the self-styled ‘Asura of Wisdom’ or ‘Asura of Knowledge’ who was communicating with Zarathustra. And as the result of this contact, while certainly more benign than the rise of Hitler, nevertheless involved the *inversion* of Vedic verses to establish the *Devas* or Gods as enemies not deserving of worship or invocation, we certainly find evidence of an early manipulation by the Asura of Falsehood, one designed to eliminate the Vedic invocation of higher powers and Gods that could yield the aspired Self-Realization.

II

Gabriel

If the European Imperialist, in his fundamental error, mistook the Sanatana Dharma to be a treatise on mankind's duty, his external obligation rather than the essential, inherent, plastic law of his inner being, this was not to be the only distortion to emerge from the Occident's nascent contact with the East. For to interpret dharma as duty could only occur from a mentality sharply differentiated from that it was meeting; from such a world-view came the characterization of the Sanatana Dharma as the “religion” of the “Hindu”. But the idea of religion is a complicated matter, and what it means to the European is a far different proposition than the Sanatana Dharma itself. The contrast, this crucial schism, was due in no small part to a difference in concentration – the West outward, the East inward. While much has changed since the era of Empires, with the world more connected than ever, having more complexities and balance in the external and internal pursuits of both Occident and Orient, and if, in all nations, at all times, there are always men extremely focused – in a general sense – in both directions, at the time in question a sharp contrast was evident between Europe and Asia, most notably in the English contact with the Hindu. It was due to this divergent concentration that religion in the West had, well before the meeting of continents, become characterized by dogma and strict adherence to guidelines from texts, with a formal routine including worship on a particular day of the week, that all men of the faith were to follow. This was, in truth, the external mind favouring fixed rules and order, the superficial vital finding succour in the conformity of the mass.

Though in India the external mind has undoubtedly played a role in the religious and social lives of its people (note the previous era of prominent and unthinking rituals divorced from their ancient meaning and purpose), the actual spiritual texts, and the Guru's past and present, do not, and cannot, set about a fixed external law that all of mankind should follow – rather, it is one's inner lines that guide. The individual is supposed to discover himself, to venture on a subjective journey, proceeding higher and deeper from the inner mind and vital into the corresponding Intuitive Mind and Psychic regions, from which might arrive the rare occurrence of Self-Realization or becoming aware of one's Purusha, the Divine Portion within the terrestrial manifestation. It is at this point that one moves beyond dharma, having liberated oneself from the lower consciousness into the Divine Consciousness. But if this *moksha* or liberation transcends it, the practice of svadharma, the inherent law of one's inner being, is nevertheless fundamental during the journey to that ultimate triumph. Such a supple way of living, a complex and plastic will-to-be, the source of the near-infinite diversity to Hindu practice and beliefs, was too jarring for the Imperial European's bent of mind, his concept of religiosity. What was seen in India was thus absorbed, processed, and articulated in a language comfortable to their preconceived notions of how religion must be.

But the Sanatana Dharma was not the only religion (if we must call it that for the sake of simplicity) the rampaging Imperialist was to encounter on his journeys. For he would find another that appealed instinctively to him, with its familiar idols and rules, its safe organization of the world into black and white parties.

* * * *

If power rises and falls in a cyclical fashion, moving from strength to weakness, conquest to

subjugation, East to West, all with an equally likely return to the former condition, than so too shall knowledge follow such a rhythm. For from the intuitive and revelatory peaks of the ancients, the greatness of the classical world, came first the truths expressed in a narrative yet still luminous fashion – only later came the externalization of consciousness into the superficial intellect and exaltation of the lower vital principles. This pattern – with the exception of the superficial elements - was especially so in the case of the religio-spiritual scriptures of India, the multi-layered Veda leading to the increasingly narrative form of the Upanishads, then the directly postulated truths of the Gita – all containing similar profundities, yet with subtle changes in the expressive consciousness. If this change was somewhat minor, the truly significant descent occurred after the time of the Bhagavad Gita - the misinterpretation of *maya*, known to the Rishi as phenomenal consciousness, as illusion; the recoil from life as a thing to be negated, rather than the transformation sought by the ancients; the continued use of the Vedic rituals for material gains rather than psychological growth; the devolving of an integral spiritual practice to a rigid distinction made between one choice of spiritual paths – *bhakta*, *karma*, *jnani* – without considering the others.

While this latter separation did not take into account man's complex nature, his need for multiple routes and trial and error in his spiritual quest, and while Indian society itself became rigid and life negating, its spiritual seekers and Gurus always understood (*experienced* in the case of the Guru) the inherent Oneness in all. Whatever the difference in presentation of the scripture, whomever the Guru, this fundamental, inherent unity was never distorted, irrespective of how divided the society they resided in became - for the profound spiritual consciousness is never disparate. In Occident lands however, the incipient mystic traditions – such as the Eleusinian mysteries – that produced a small number who experienced the profundities described by the Veda, unfortunately did not have the elements in place enabling a transmission of this wisdom, or the means by which one would go about obtaining it, to subsequent generations. Thus the ancient paths, lost in Europe and West Asia, were maintained in India, but with its mystics by and large practising a world negation that led to a societal result essentially similar to everywhere else – the decline in religio-spiritual consciousness towards obscurantism, towards the law of the brute, the misidentification of spiritual ideals with those of the lower vital. Nevertheless, while the fall that occurred in India led to a withdrawal of some of the Higher force from society, the ancient paths remained in the mountainous retreat of the seeker, in his study of the scripture and the wisdom of the Guru. Thus if the *bhakta* and the *jnani* held the belief that there was no need to incorporate the path of the other, they still knew that each was in secret united with each other, as all Souls are One. Never could they believe otherwise, knowing – unless they believed in Shankara's *maya* – all of creation to be, in secret, Consciously One. It was impossible for them – and for the adherent to Shankara's *maya*, who would still believe in the equality of Souls - to even think of concepts such as “unbelievers” or “heretics” – such ideas antithetical to the effervescent diversity and plasticity they knew to be a truth of existence.

But in the West of Asia, the idea of believers and unbelievers, the faithful and the heretic, the saved and the unsaved, developed at a rapid pace from the end of the mysteries and the subsequently waning influence of the ancient mysticism. And in seventh century Arabia, in a brief yet intense period, the falsehood of an eternally separative consciousness would find its most explicit declaration.

* * * *

As the law of Nature is diversity, evident beyond a shadow of a doubt in Her myriad life-forms, then it supposes that along with form, there should be multiple life energies and thought waves guiding the forms, and that in these latter two elements, we would find a rich collection of both ideas and beliefs

including, undoubtedly, faith in the Divine. While this is Prakriti in her purest outflow, because she has also allowed for the ego principle, and as ego is a limited construct of Herself that often mistakes itself for the whole, then from Conception there has always been the possibility that a time would come when the world's previously tolerant – for lack of a better word – outlook on religious belief, basing itself on the Psychic quality of samata, would degenerate, initially to ignorance, further into falsehood. In Europe and West Asia, the root of this came when the first principle of ego, separation of consciousness, attached itself to matters Divine through the idea and mere name of God. Thus what was experienced by the Rishi as One Supreme deity with numerous Gods, different Personalities rather than distinctly separate entities (though in lower planes of consciousness the Gods and Goddesses have a separate *appearance*, just as the arm looks different to the nose of the same person), was distorted to “Gods” becoming partitioned from each other in the way mankind – to his superficial awareness – is divided. Having thus lost sight of the inherent unity, more attributes of the lower ego began to be attributed to the Divine, the most significant of all the claim of one party that his god was the only true god and that all others are false.

But that belief is in actuality a falsehood masquerading as truth, for to suppose that God can only be confined to one name, one form, one type, is the nadir of thought – that God is like man, a clearly limited entity. Indeed, such a belief brings about precisely the opposite of its claim; instead of an understanding, as in the Sanatana Dharma, that the multiplicity is in reality the whole, the exclusionary religions foster an undivine, separative form of religious belief – unaware that all of creation secretly is one with the Divine, could not subsist without the Divine, belongs to him even in involuted fashion, *is* God. To then presume that God could be imprisoned within, of all things, superficial features such as the name or psychological form of worship, is to exaggerate Man's fragile, impaired, earth-bound, death-destined nature that is based on such a restricted consciousness. God, on the other hand, is limitless, formless yet also capable of infinite form, as one would expect of an Immortal Creator: Why could he not fashion himself into different deities, different Godheads, different aspects and forms in the subtle worlds? To postulate otherwise is to make a mockery out of the conception of God as an Immortal, beyond time and space. Why should he not create multiple Divine emanations that in truth remain eternally Himself? The worshipper would still be praying to a single God, but his channel would differ from the next, just as the actual content of the prayer undoubtedly has some sort of variation between different individuals, *including* those attempting a uniform prayer. It is not that every single thing that God creates is conscious of its own divinity, otherwise humanity would be in a far superior state; it is just that the inherent possibility is always there for the flowering of that Consciousness in Multiplicity. Indeed, in the Overmind regions of Consciousness – Divine, though not exactly Brahma in Illimitable function -, there exist deities that are immortal, living in Satchitananda, yet aware of their status as an Aspect of the one Brahma, and conscious that they contain within other Divine Entities or Personalities that also have the distinct, though not really separate, Aspect of Brahman: These are the Gods and Goddesses as first known to the Vedic Rishis.

In seventh century Arabia however, this Multiplicity of the Divine found itself under assault from a religion which, unlike the Sanatana Dharma, bases itself on rigid, strictly enforced dictates. And if there is any solitary principle upon which Islam is founded, it is the axiom that there is only one God – rather, one mortal formulation of God. For Islam does not, like the Sanatana Dharma, take various deities as created aspects of a singular Supreme. Instead, it declares its peculiar version as the only truth, and all other types or names of worship of an Illimitable God as false. Indeed, in Islam's primary and secondary scripture, the Quran and Hadith respectively, one finds countless examples of this fundamental Islamic tenet. For instance, the former declares, “Allah! There is no god but Him, the Alive, the Eternal.” (Quran 3:02) Similarly, Allah is deemed the – only – protector of Muslims: “The Lord of the East and the West - there is no god but He - therefore take Him for a protector.” (Quran 73:09) He is also the creator – but the *only* existent God capable of such a task: “O men! Call to mind

the favour of Allah on you. Is there any creator besides Allah who gives you sustenance from the heaven and the earth? There is no god but He; whence are you then turned away?” (Quran 35:03) And it is the ‘knowledge’ of Allah that no other God exists other than He: “Your Allah is only Allah, there is no god but He. He comprehends all things in (His) knowledge.” (Quran 20:98)

Of course, these Quran verses only hint at the exclusivity. In others, we find explicit declarations that different Gods are not to be worshipped with Allah: “He is Allah besides Whom there is no god, the Knower of the unseen and the seen. He is the Beneficent, the Merciful. He is Allah, besides Whom there is no god, the King, the Holy, the Giver of peace, the Granter of security, Guardian over all, the Mighty, the Supreme, the Possessor of every greatness. Glory be to Allah from all that they ascribe as partner (unto Him).” (Quran 59:22-23) Indeed the Islamic Prophet Mohammed, and all Muslims, are *commanded* to not worship other Gods alongside Allah: “Those unto whom We gave the Scripture rejoice in that which is revealed unto thee. And of the clans there are who deny some of it. **Say: ‘I am commanded only that I serve Allah and ascribe unto Him no partner.** Unto Him I cry, and unto Him is my return.’ ” (Quran 13:36) Similarly, Muslims are “forbidden” from believing that there are multiple names for God: “Say: ‘I am forbidden to worship those on whom ye call instead of Allah.’ Say: ‘I will not follow your desires, for then should I go astray and I should not be of the rightly guided.’ ” (Quran 6:56) For Allah does not wish that his followers worship other Gods who are in reality nothing but lies: “Now surely, whatever is in the heavens and whatever is in the earth is Allah’s, and they do not (really) follow any associates, who call on others besides Allah. They do not follow (anything) but conjectures, and they only lie.” (Quran 10:66) As different Gods are fabrications who do not exist, “those whom they pray to besides Allah give them no answer, but (they are) like one who stretches forth his two hands towards water that it may reach his mouth, but it will not reach it; and the prayer of the unbelievers is only in error.” (Quran 13:14) The unbeliever, due to his belief in different deities, is not merely erroneous – worse slurs greet him: “And that He will surely establish for them their religion which He hath approved for them, and will give them in exchange safety after their fear. They serve Me. They ascribe no thing as partner unto Me. Those who disbelieve henceforth, they are the miscreants.” (Quran 24:55)

That, however, is far from the most virulent of insults – and more – placed upon the non-Muslim, but before we continue our examination, we must return again to the seed of such denigration - the ignorance of believing in a permanently separate reality. It is especially so in the realm of religious beliefs, for if one takes his idea – clouded almost entirely by the small vital ego – of the spiritual reality to be the sole truth, and if others do not believe in it, a natural result is to perceive the ‘other’ as a liar, a miscreant, or worse. All of this because the unbeliever does not believe in the *name* of Allah, or believes in different *names* of the Divine alongside Allah. Such names, in Islam, are deemed as having no power whatsoever, taken as proof of the fraudulence of gods *not* named Allah, with the Quran in one verse informing, “**They are naught but names which you have named, you and your fathers;** Allah has not sent for them any authority. They follow naught but conjecture and the low desires which (their) souls incline to. And certainly the guidance has come to them from their Lord.” (Quran 53:23) In another passage, Polytheism is deemed a forgery without any authorization from Allah, a belief of “unjust” people:

And We strengthened their hearts with patience, when they stood up and said: “Our Lord is the Lord of the heavens and the earth. **We will by no means call upon any god besides Him, for then indeed we should have said an extravagant thing. These, our people, have taken gods besides Him. Why do they not produce any clear authority in their support? Who is then more unjust than he who forges a lie against Allah?** And when you forsake them and what they worship save Allah, betake yourselves for refuge to the cave. Your Lord will extend to you largely of His mercy and provide for you a profitable course in your affair.” (Quran 18:14-16)

Yet the Quran itself hints at the truth, offering a subconscious glimmer of light in a verse stating, “Allah - there is no god but He. His are the very best names.” (Quran 20:08) While this verse is referring to honorifics such as “giver of peace”, “guardian”, “giver of security”, functions such as these are, in the Sanatana Dharma, assigned to Gods created by a solitary Brahma. The principle trinity itself is distinguished by the triple aspect of Creator, Preserver, Destroyer acknowledged as important to the respective deities, all of whom are yet in truth one Divine and thus contain the other qualities as well. This Multiplicity is of benefit to mortals in their worship, as a particular psychological wish, sometimes even a material wish, is better served when the believer is concentrating on a Divine Personality functioning in His or Her respective Aspect, though they contain all other deities and aspects within them. Thus in the Veda Agni is the God worshipped for the growth of the Divine Will and for the relinquishing of human attachments to increase the Psychic spark, while Surya or the cows are for the growth of Divine Knowledge and Light, to give two examples. In contrast, Islam does not proceed beyond the utterly superficial characteristic of the *name* of a God that is beyond words, thought and mortal action, though He allows the play of all three in his creation. Preoccupied with externals on such a profound subject, Islam nevertheless audaciously demands that those of different beliefs provide evidence that their God is real!

Say: Praise be to Allah and peace on His servants whom He has chosen: is Allah better, or what they associate (with Him)? Nay, He Who created the heavens and the earth, and sent down for you water from the cloud. Then We cause to grow thereby beautiful gardens; it is not possible for you that you should make the trees thereof to grow. Is there a god with Allah? Nay! They are people who deviate! Or, Who made the earth a resting-place, and made in it rivers, and raised on it mountains and placed between the two seas a barrier. Is there a god with Allah? Nay! Most of them do not know! Or, Who answers the distressed one when he calls upon Him and removes the evil, and He will make you successors in the earth. Is there a god with Allah? Little is it that you mind! Or, Who guides you in utter darkness of the land and the sea, and Who sends the winds as good news before His mercy. Is there a god with Allah? Exalted by Allah above what they associate (with Him). Or, Who originates the creation, then reproduces it and Who gives you sustenance from the heaven and the earth. **Is there a god With Allah? Say: “Bring your proof if you are truthful.”** (Quran 27:59-64)

But it is laughable to ask for objective “proof” on the great mystery of the Divine, because comprehensive evidence on the matter is entirely subjective in nature, and the evidence demanded by the Quran can only be objective. As an example, one individual might have a vision of Sri Krishna, yet take it to be a hallucination or fantasy; another might see an occult emanation pretending to be Divine, and believe he has found God or God's emissary. Or, if we remain on the level of a mortal without occult or mystic sight, one man's geological earthquake is another's act of Divine retribution. Just because one believes in a particular God, a particular book, or a certain individual, does not mean that those not of their belief are obligated to bring proof – spiritual beliefs are not meant for the courtroom. In Islam however, such beliefs are indeed to be judged, by Allah of course. And if his order that Muslims not worship any other god beside Allah, known as *shirk*, is violated, it subsequently cannot be forgiven, this sin, this unmitigated evil:

Lo! Allah forgiveth not that a partner should be ascribed unto Him. He forgiveth (all) save that to whom He will. Whoso ascribeth partners to Allah, he hath indeed invented a tremendous sin. (Quran 4:48)

Like all sins in the Abrahamic tradition, *shirk* is associated with the Devil: “And when thou recitest the Quran, seek refuge in Allah from Satan the outcast. Lo! he hath no power over those who believe and put trust in their Lord. His power is only over those who make a friend of him, and those who ascribe partners unto Him (Allah).” (Quran 16:98-100) On multiple occasions, the Quran relates how anyone

praying to gods besides Allah is in fact praying to Satan: “A part has He guided aright and (as for another) part, error is justly their due, surely they took the Satans for guardians beside Allah, and they think that they are followers of the right.” (Quran 7:30) Satan is an “evil” friend that the unbeliever calls upon: “He calleth, beside Allah, unto that which hurteth him not nor benefiteth him. That is the far error. He calleth unto him whose harm is nearer than his benefit; verily an evil patron and verily an evil friend!” (Quran 22:12-13) The female deities worshipped by Polytheists come under specific attack: “Lo! Allah pardoneth not that partners should be ascribed unto Him. He pardoneth all save that to whom He will. Whoso ascribeth partners unto Allah hath wandered far astray. **They invoke in His stead only female deities; they pray to none else than Satan, a rebel.**” (Quran 4:116-117) Yet if Allah, the Creator of all things per the Quran itself, allows for a Satan (surely Allah, as the “Guardian over all”, must have permitted Satan to exist) opposing his each and every move, then why is he incapable of fashioning Himself into multiple Godheads, Conscious of both Himself and the Multiplicity of the Godheads? Why would He, having made a world governed by the law of diversity, be concerned over mortals taking him by multiple names? But if it is Satan, non-Divine in the Abrahamic faiths, behind all polytheistic belief, it belies the importance – to the Muslim believer - of not worshipping another along with Allah: For who would want to be on the side of such a vile creature?

Indeed it is not only in the Quran where we find an incessant emphasis establishing the centrality of this belief to the religion. For in the secondary Islamic scripture known as the Hadith, a series of books compiled by select Islamic scholars – generations after the Quran – to find and record statements attributed to Islam's Prophet Mohammed by his companions, we find the tenet highlighted again and again. In the Sahih Bukhari compilation, considered entirely authentic (*sahih*) – subsequently making it the most important of all of the Hadith collections -, there are countless hadith – including the following, one of dozens verbatim to it - reporting Mohammed as having declared the rejection of Polytheism to be *the* most important Islamic tenet:

Allah's Apostle said: Islam is based on (the following) five (principles):

1. To testify that none has the right to be worshipped but Allah and Muhammad is Allah's Apostle. 2. To offer the (compulsory congregational) prayers dutifully and perfectly. 3. To pay Zakat (i.e. obligatory charity). 4. To perform Hajj. (i.e. Pilgrimage to Mecca) 5. To observe fast during the month of Ramadan. (Sahih Bukhari Volume 1, Book 2, Number 7)

Having established intolerance – because at the very least, the denial to others the right to call the Divine by another name is precisely this – as the first principle of Islam, the authentic hadith additionally help the Muslim to understand just how terrible a sin – as the Quran describes it – *shirk* is. For in his discourse with his followers and companions (from whose sayings the Hadith were eventually collected from both their descendants and other recollectors), Mohammed clarified to them that *shirk* is the *worst* of all sins:

The Prophet was asked about the great sins. He said, “They are: - (1) To join others in worship with Allah, (2) To be undutiful to one's parents. (3) To kill a person (which Allah has forbidden to kill) (i.e. to commit the crime of murdering). (4) And to give a false witness.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 3, Book 48, Number 821)

So crucial is this tenet to the religion that it *alone* is enough to determine whether a man enters Paradise, the ultimate aim of a Muslim:

Allah's Apostle said, “Someone came to me from my Lord and gave me the news (or good tidings) that if any of my followers dies worshipping none (in any way) along with Allah, he will enter Paradise.” I asked, “Even if he committed illegal sexual intercourse (adultery) and theft?” He replied, “Even if he committed illegal sexual intercourse (adultery) and theft.” (Sahih

Indeed, the surah (chapter) Al-Ikhlās of the Quran, which states, “Say: He, Allah, the One...He begets not, nor is He begotten” (Quran 112:01-04), was considered by Mohammed to be the most important of all Quran surahs – nowhere else in the authentic hadith does he describe a chapter as carrying as much importance as he did for this brief yet crucial surah:

A man heard another man reciting (Surat-Al-Ikhlās) ‘Say He is Allah, (the) One.’ (112.1) repeatedly. The next morning he came to Allah's Apostle and informed him about it as if he thought that it was not enough to recite. On that Allah's Apostle said, “By Him in Whose Hand my life is, **this Surah is equal to one-third of the Qur'an!**” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 6, Book 61, Number 533)

Thus as long as one believes exclusively in Allah, denying the existence of multiple names or types or ideas of God, then any other sin – and Islam has many peculiar ones – committed is washed away in the ascent to Paradise. By the extreme importance placed on this dogma, a cult of separation, a permanent schism between the believer and the ‘other’, has been firmly established in the religion and mindset of the Muslim - because if the denial of different Gods or Goddesses or types of worship supersedes everything else the religion propagates, then a separative consciousness is the inevitable – and desired – finality, at least for one who consciously identifies himself with Islam. The falsehood of this belief in the supremacy of Allah as the only name of the Divine is nevertheless unconsciously hinted at by the religion through the subtle anxiety by which it refers to other Gods – namely, in the infamous Islamic chant, “Allah-o-Akbar”, often translated as “Allah is Great” yet in reality meaning “Allah is greater”:

We were in the company of Allah's Apostle (during Hajj). Whenever we went up a high place we used to say: “**None has the right to be worshipped but Allah, and Allah is Greater,**” and our voices used to rise, so the Prophet said, “O people! Be merciful to yourselves (i.e. don't raise your voice), for you are not calling a deaf or an absent one, but One Who is with you, no doubt He is All-Hearer, ever Near (to all things).” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 52, Number 235)

But how is it that Allah is “greater” than other Gods, when it is said on multiple occasions that the other Gods do not exist? It is a sign of the lack of confidence in this theological position that Islam requires constant repetition of the ‘fact’ of the nonexistence of different deities, that Allah is the *only* name of God. It is an insecurity basing itself upon the lower ego that craves the feeling of vital superiority towards other men; when applied to religion, the individual's god or form of worship asserts supremacy over the divergent views of the ‘unbeliever’, the latter of whom is apparently practising falsehood. Thus although the Muslim is told that no other Gods exist, he still revels in the egoistic boast of Allah being “greater” than entities that are supposed to be illusionary! This hallmark of the individual lower vital ego then feeds into the aggrandized group vital ego identifying itself as the preeminent or chosen group thanks to its “greater” God. One hadith in particular displays this crude, mass vital ego in all of its intensification:

On the day (of the battle) of Badr, the Prophet and his companions had caused the Pagans to lose 140 men, seventy of whom were captured and seventy were killed. Then Abu Sufyan asked thrice, “Is Muhammad present amongst these people?” The Prophet ordered his companions not to answer him. Then he asked thrice, “Is the son of Abu Quhafa present amongst these people?” He asked again thrice, “Is the son of Al-Khattab present amongst these people?” He then returned to his companions and said, “As for these (men), they have been killed.” Umar could not control himself and said (to Abu Sufyan), “You told a lie, by Allah! O enemy of Allah! All those you have mentioned are alive, and the thing which will make you unhappy is still there.”

Abu Sufyan said, “Our victory today is a counterbalance to yours in the battle of Badr, and in war (the victory) is always undecided and is shared in turns by the belligerents, and you will find some of your (killed) men mutilated, but I did not urge my men to do so, yet I do not feel sorry for their deed.” **After that he started reciting cheerfully, “O Hubal, be high!” On that the Prophet said (to his companions), “Why don't you answer him back?” They said, “O Allah's Apostle What shall we say?” He said, “Say, Allah is Higher and more Sublime.”** (Then) Abu Sufyan said, “We have the (idol) Al Uzza, and you have no Uzza.” The Prophet said (to his companions), “Why don't you answer him back?” They asked, “O Allah's Apostle! What shall we say?” He said, “Says Allah is our Helper and you have no helper.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 52, Number 276)

Evident here is the childishness, the superficiality behind religious triumphalism, the littleness of the boasts. One party states that Hubal is higher, the next states that no, Allah is higher – no rationale is put forth, as one-upmanship is all that is on display. The Divine however, as Creator of All, naturally is at heart Equal with all, for it is all Him in Truth, though it *appears* not to be. Thus it is nonsense, from the spiritual outlook basing one's perspective from the foundation of the Psychic Being and the truth of samata, to make the Divine an extension of the ego, which is what the two Arab clans did in this battle, each claiming their god to be greater – misrepresenting their little group ego for That beyond time and space. And it was this cardinal falsehood, this separative consciousness, this misidentification of the lower vital ego with the Ultimate Truth, from which spawned a weltanschauung of extreme hostility and danger to those not believing in it – a virulence only hinted at in the previous verses and hadith dealing solely with the supposed primacy of Allah.

* * * *

Though the belief in the exclusivity of Allah, his sole existence over different gods that mortals might dare to imagine are real, is the overriding theme, the bedrock of Islam, this nevertheless does not mark it on a theological basis - other than the sheer intensity by which the tenet is expressed - from its sister religions, the preceding Judaism and Christianity. Yet is it that same fervour by which the separation of Muslim from non-Muslim is stressed, that offers a clue into the uniqueness of the religion, its distinct character from all before and subsequent to it. But to comprehensively fathom Islam's peculiarity first entails an understanding of the origin of the Quran verses: for it was not from the pen of Mohammed, the Prophet of Islam, that the verses emerged. One would hardly have expected so, given that Mohammed was known to be illiterate - “the Prophet who can neither read nor write” (Quran 7:157) - and had hardly made his mark on the world, at least according to the little that is recorded of his life prior to the emergence of Islam. What is known, is that around the age of 40, he was living in Mecca, having married his first wife, Khadija, a widow many years senior to him.

During this period in Mecca, he began to seek seclusion in the cave of Hira near his home, where he would spend time worshipping Allah, one of the primary gods of Arab Polytheism. And it was here that his life, and the history of the world, was to drastically alter – the small, quiet prelude to the waves of upheaval awaiting humanity. For it was in this cave that Mohammed first came into – as recorded in the Quran and Hadith - regular contact with an occult being whom he would eventually describe as an angel, a figure who from that point on, began to reveal to Mohammed what he claimed to be the Word of Allah - revelations that would form the basis of the Quran. On that fateful day, as a Sahih Bukhari hadith informs us, the first few verses of surah Al-Alaq were imparted:

Narrated Aisha:

The commencement (of the Divine Inspiration) to Allah's Apostle was in the form of true dreams in his sleep, for he never had a dream but it turned out to be true and clear as the bright daylight. Then he began to like seclusions, so he used to go in seclusion in the cave of Hira where he used to worship Allah continuously for many nights before going back to his family to take the necessary provision (of food) for the stay. He came back to (his wife) Khadija again to take his provision (of food) likewise, till one day he received the Guidance while he was in the cave of Hira. An Angel came to him and asked him to read. Allah's Apostle replied, "I do not know how to read." The Prophet added, "Then the Angel held me (forcibly) and pressed me so hard that I felt distressed. Then he released me and again asked me to read, and I replied, 'I do not know how to read.' Thereupon he held me again and pressed me for the second time till I felt distressed. He then released me and asked me to read, but again I replied, 'I do not know how to read.' Thereupon he held me for the third time and pressed me till I got distressed, and then he released me and said, 'Read, in the Name of your Lord Who has created (all that exists), has created man out of a clot, Read! And your Lord is the Most Generous. Who has taught (the writing) by the pen, has taught man that which he knew not.' " (Quran 96.1-5). (Sahih Bukhari Volume 6, Book 60, Number 478)

For a man having had – at least as far as the records indicate – no previous mystic experiences, to then suddenly experience the non-material worlds in such an intense manner undoubtedly would have been quite unnerving. Such was his fear of what he had witnessed, that when he arrived home he was trembling, pleading with his wife to cover him, to comfort and reassure him:

Then Allah's Apostle returned with that experience; and the muscles between his neck and shoulders were trembling till he came upon Khadija (his wife) and said, "Cover me!" They covered him, and when the state of fear was over, he said to Khadija, "O Khadija! What is wrong with me? I was afraid that something bad might happen to me." Then he told her the story. Khadija said, "Nay! But receive the good tidings! By Allah, Allah will never disgrace you, for by Allah, you keep good relations with your Kith and kin, speak the truth, help the poor and the destitute, entertain your guests generously and assist those who are stricken with calamities." (Sahih Bukhari Volume 6, Book 60, Number 478)

After recovering from the shock of what he had experienced, Khadija took him to see her cousin who, based upon – from what can be gathered in the Hadith – his knowledge of the Christian Gospel rather than any personal occult experience, informed Mohammed of whom he had actually seen:

Khadija then took him to Waraqa bin Naufil, the son of Khadija's paternal uncle. Waraqa had been converted to Christianity in the Pre-Islamic Period and used to write Arabic and write of the Gospel in Arabic as much as Allah wished him to write. He was an old man and had lost his eyesight. Khadija said (to Waraqa), "O my cousin! Listen to what your nephew is going to say." Waraqa said, "O my nephew! What have you seen?" The Prophet then described whatever he had seen. **Waraqa said, "This is the same Angel (Gabriel) who was sent to Moses. I wish I were young."** He added some other statement. Allah's Apostle asked, "Will these people drive me out?" Waraqa said, "Yes, for nobody brought the like of what you have brought, but was treated with hostility. If I were to remain alive till your day (when you start preaching), then I would support you strongly." But a short while later Waraqa died and the Divine Inspiration was paused (stopped) for a while so that Allah's Apostle was very much grieved. (Sahih Bukhari Volume 6, Book 60, Number 478)

While a previous hadith has Aisha, one of Mohammed's wives, reporting that Mohammed's experiences began in his sleep, it remains possible that the occult openings at the cave of Hira commenced during his waking prayer, while concentrating on Allah. However, given that he spent lengthy periods of time in the cave, it is also more than likely that either this or other experiences occurred in sleep, a period of

the mortal's daily rhythm much neglected and misunderstood. For sleep, unbeknown to the vast majority, is not merely a time of rest. In the Yogin experience, there are three types of consciousness the human traverses through during his normal daily rhythm: The waking consciousness, Supraconsciousness, and dream consciousness. The latter two are usually considered to constitute a single state called sleep, though modern science has shown that there are two distinct portions to this non-waking part of the cycle: Non Rapid Eye Movement and Rapid Eye Movement. It is during a small time of the former, forgotten by the vast majority whose ordinary consciousness is too submerged to combine with the subtle body traversing through the stages of sleep, that the Supraconscious state is briefly experienced; the latter is the supposed ordinary dream state. Yet in both, often what is mistaken for mere imagination, is rather the experience of the subtle body voyaging through different planes of existence. For this is what happens in sleep, with the ordinary waking consciousness submerged in the lower substratum of the individual consciousness, usually unaware of the worlds – including, per Yogin experience, the precious few minutes of the Supreme Consciousness that in reality accounts for the majority of sleep's restorative quality – that the subtle body is journeying through.

It is only in the latter part of sleep, close to the resumption of the waking consciousness, that the subconscious material is encountered by either the subtle body or the submerged waking consciousness, itself having previously – at the beginning of sleep - retreated to the gross physical sheath, nearest of all to the subconscious, now becoming aware of this subconscious material as it begins to emerge from the non-waking part of the daily cycle. The experiences of the subconscious portion of sleep are different than those of the subtle body traversing the Supraconscious and Vital planes of existence: the former does not tend to yield real experience - more often than not it produces a haphazard amalgamation of subconscious impressions formed during the previous waking states. If the impressions are potent enough, or if a mental formation is consistently and strongly held, then instead of a random viewing of impressions, the subconscious part of sleep itself may bring forth a dream seemingly just as real as that of the Vital plane, but in truth not a substantive experience of the occult vital worlds. From the Hadith, we see many examples of Mohammed having vivid dreams of both the subconscious *and* vital planes. While some of his dreams are clearly of the subconscious type, and will be discussed later, his subtle body nevertheless had frequent experiences – with his ordinary consciousness having the capacity to remember them – in the Vital worlds during sleep.

But the dream state was not the only plane of consciousness where Mohammed had contact with the angel Gabriel, as his ordinary waking consciousness was also capable of engaging the subliminal worlds. Indeed, sometime after the first occult meeting with Gabriel in the cave of Hira, – it is not fully clear if this initial contact was while awake or during sleep – a second meeting ensued, this time as he was walking. Another Quran verse was to be imparted upon him during this particular encounter:

Narrated Jabir bin Abdullah:

that he heard the Prophet saying, “The Divine Inspiration was delayed for a short period but suddenly, as I was walking. I heard a voice in the sky, and when I looked up towards the sky, to my surprise, I saw the angel who had come to me in the Hira Cave, and he was sitting on a chair in between the sky and the earth. I was so frightened by him that I fell on the ground and came to my family and said (to them), ‘Cover me! (with a blanket), cover me!’ Then Allah sent the Revelation: ‘O, You wrapped up (In a blanket)! (Arise and warn! And your Lord magnify And keep pure your garments, And desert the idols.’” (Quran 74.1-5) (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 54, Number 461)

The occult encounters with Gabriel would continue from this point on, at times in rapid succession, other times with lengthy pauses in between. It was from these interactions that the Quran was ‘revealed’ to Mohammed, the method by which the message of Allah – as per the Prophet's understanding – was transmitted to him through the angel Gabriel. And though – we will discuss the

topic later in our analysis - according to numerous Quran verses, the plural “We” is used, indicating – with the following and multiple other hadith somewhat supporting the premise – the small possibility that multiple ‘angels’ may have been involved in transmitting to Mohammed ‘revelations’ from Allah, it is clear that Gabriel was at the very least the primary communicator to the Prophet:

Narrated Ibn Abbas:

The Prophet said, “O Gabriel, what prevents you from visiting us more often than you do?” Then this Verse was revealed: ‘And we angels descend not but by Command of your Lord. To Him belongs what is before us and what is behind us.’ (Quran 19.64) So this was the answer to Muhammad. (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 93, Number 547)

Mohammed, having lived forty years without encountering anything close to the experiences that began during his sojourns to Hira, with little preparation for what awaited him, unsurprisingly accepted the speculative nature of Waraqa’s declaration on the identity of the occult being speaking to him. But knowledge and revelations were not the only guidance he would receive – Gabriel also had to instruct him on practical matters emerging from his foray into a new-found dimension:

Sa’id bin Jubair reported from Ibn Abbas (regarding the explanation of the Verse: ‘Do not move your tongue concerning (the Qur’an) to make haste therewith’). He said, “The Prophet used to undergo great difficulty in receiving the Divine Inspiration and used to move his lips.” Ibn Abbas said (to Sa’id), “I move them (my lips) as Allah's Apostle used to move his lips.” And Said said (to me), “I move my lips as I saw Ibn Abbas moving his lips,” and then he moved his lips. So Allah revealed:

‘(O Muhammad!) Do not move your tongue concerning (the Qur’an) to make haste therewith. It is for Us to collect it and give you (O Muhammad) the ability to recite it. (i.e., to collect it in your chest and then you recite it).’ (Quran 75.16-17) ‘But when We have recited it, to you (O Muhammad through Gabriel) then follow you its recital.’ (Quran 75.18) This means, “You should listen to it and keep quiet and then it is upon Us to make you recite it.”

The narrator added, “So Allah's Apostle used to listen whenever Gabriel came to him, and when Gabriel left, the Prophet would recite the Qur’an as Gabriel had recited it to him.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 93, Number 615)

Another hadith informs that these instructions were given by Gabriel as a superior method for retaining the occult messages:

Narrated Ibn Abbas:

The Prophet used to move his tongue when the divine Inspiration was being revealed to him. (Sufyan, a subnarrator, demonstrated how the Prophet used to move his lips) and added. “In order to memorize it.” So Allah revealed: “Move not your tongue concerning (the Quran) to make haste therewith.” (Quran 75.16) (Sahih Bukhari Volume 6, Book 60, Number 449)

Thus from the age of forty until his death, came the gradual formation of the Quran, the Book of Allah's Word, the “right path”: “Thus did We reveal to you an inspired book by Our command. You did not know what the Book was, nor (what) the faith (was), but We made it a light, guiding thereby whom We please of Our servants. And most surely you guide men to the right path - The path of Allah, Whose is whatsoever is in the heavens and whatsoever is in the earth. Now surely to Allah do all affairs eventually come.” (Quran 42:52-53) Gabriel would acknowledge the intermittent nature of the revelations, telling Mohammed, “Surely We Ourselves have revealed the Quran to you, revealing it in portions. Therefore wait patiently for the command of your Lord, and obey not from among them a sinner or an ungrateful one.” (Quran 76:23-24) These meetings, from someone he presumed to be an

angel, motivated him – goaded as he was by Gabriel – to spread Allah's Word, the message, throughout the Arabian peninsula. In fact, the angel ordered him to do precisely that:

O Messenger! Deliver what has been revealed to you from your Lord. And if you do it not, then you have not delivered His message. (Quran 5:67)

Such was Mohammed's absolute faith in the veracity of this angel's message - that it was, as told to him, the Word of Allah -, that the revelations alone became the foundation of what Mohammed would follow, the basis of his very existence:

Say: "I do not say to you that I have with me the treasures of Allah, nor do I know the unseen, nor do I say to you that I am an Angel. **I do not follow aught save that which is revealed to me.**" Say: "Are the blind and the seeing one alike? Do you not then reflect?" (Quran 6:50)

His fidelity to what Gabriel subliminally voiced to him was such that he, as instructed by Gabriel, refused to create his own Quran verses – even if others asked him:

And when you bring them not a revelation they say: "Why do you not forge it?" Say: "I only follow what is revealed to me from my Lord; these are clear proofs from your Lord and a guidance and a mercy for a people who believe." (Quran 7:203)

Mohammed however, was not the first individual to whom Allah had revealed, through his angels, his Word, for as Gabriel informed Mohammed, "Thus does Allah, the Mighty, the Wise, reveal to you, and (thus He revealed) to those before you." (Quran 42:03) Indeed as we shall discover in different verses that Gabriel presented to the Apostle of Allah, the angels had before Mohammed a succession of prophets, including Moses and Jesus and others common to the Christian faith, through whom they had illuminated Allah's Word to mankind. While he shared this prophethood with such renowned historical figures, there was one crucial difference between Mohammed and the previous prophets: As it turned out, Mohammed was the last among them, Allah having decided that there was nothing left to reveal afterwards, with the confirmation of this Islamic tenet enshrined in the Quran:

Mohammed is not the father of any man among you, but **he is the messenger of Allah and the Seal of the Prophets**; and Allah is ever Aware of all things. (Quran 33:40)

This "seal", Mohammed's eternal status as the last prophet, is put forth by Islam's adherents (starting with Mohammed of course) as proof of the finality of Islam's message, pivotal evidence of the religion's standing as the *only* true religion, the one all of mankind should be following. Yet it is this very claim that suggests a conclusion markedly different, perhaps diametrically opposed. For such an assertion is in reality a falsehood, far removed from the truth it pretends to be, as it secretly presumes God to be a limited entity, only able to express His Word in one time period, only capable of offering revelations – rather than the Realization of the Soul – to a paltry number of individuals culminating in a final "messenger". But the Divine is in truth an Illimitable, Unrestricted Entity that can send, at a bare minimum, revelations to numerous mediums in all era's and locations, not merely a Bedouin in seventh century Arabia. Even the wisdom of the Guru's of India, who are the Self-Realized Divine within a human *form*, is not taken as the final message of Brahma, because more Guru's will emerge in different time periods, with more profundities - applicable to their era and beyond - to follow. While Mohammed undoubtedly was a capable conduit for non-material experiences, such ability is not rare – indeed within a significant amount of mankind lies the mediumistic *capacity*. And the ingredients needed to create a human vessel remain similar in any time period or place. Mohammed, taking Gabriel to be an angel of Allah, quick to follow his every command, readily accepted his standing as an instrument, a mere messenger, as that was what Gabriel 'revealed':

Mohammed is but a messenger, messengers (the like of whom) have passed away before him. Will it be that, when he dieth or is slain, ye will turn back on your heels? He who turneth back

on his heels doth no hurt to Allah, and Allah will reward the thankful. (Quran 3:144)

While the Quran and authentic hadith are for the most part consistent in describing Mohammed as simply a messenger, a vessel under the command of Gabriel, we must recall that the instrument is not always cognizant of whom he is in contact with. In Mohammed's case, he accepted at face value the tale put forth to him by Gabriel, that the latter was an angel, an intermediary between Allah and the human receptacle that was supposed to spread Allah's final message. But when we examine the actual message that Gabriel relayed to Mohammed, we find the former to be far from the spiritual emanations that angels are purported to be. Especially if we consider the fundamental tenet of the Islamic religion, and its ludicrous assertion that Allah is the only true name of God - the rest are all lies -, doubts emerge as to Gabriel's claim of a luminous rank. For it was he, after all, who conveyed to Mohammed, along with the rest of Islam's tenets, the idea that all other gods are false, and that to refrain from *shirk* is to have practised the pinnacle of religion:

Narrated Abu Dhar:

The Prophet said, "Gabriel said to me, 'Whoever amongst your followers die without having worshipped others besides Allah, will enter Paradise.' " The Prophet asked. "Even if he has committed illegal sexual intercourse or theft?" He replied, "Even then." (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 54, Number 445)

Such was Gabriel's desire to impart this message, the 'truth' that worship of Allah alone and nothing else - due to the alleged 'falsehood' of the different forms of worship - was the primary avenue to enter Paradise, that he would eventually, per the Hadith, appear before Islam's Prophet in an occult guise of an ordinary mortal, in order to test Mohammed's fidelity to the message:

Narrated Abu Huraira:

One day while Allah's Apostle was sitting with the people, a man came to him walking and said, "O Allah's Apostle. What is Belief?" The Prophet said, "Belief is to believe in Allah, His Angels, His Books, His Apostles, and the meeting with Him, and to believe in the Resurrection." **The man asked, "O Allah's Apostle What is Islam?" The Prophet replied, "Islam is to worship Allah and not worship anything besides Him, to offer prayers perfectly, to pay the (compulsory) charity i.e. Zakat and to fast the month of Ramadan."** The man again asked, "O Allah's Apostle What is Ihsan (i.e. perfection or Benevolence)?" The Prophet said, "Ihsan is to worship Allah as if you see Him, and if you do not achieve this state of devotion, then (take it for granted that) Allah sees you." The man further asked, "O Allah's Apostle When will the Hour be established?"

The Prophet replied, "The one who is asked about it does not know more than the questioner does, but I will describe to you its portents. When the lady slave gives birth to her mistress, that will be of its portents; when the bare-footed naked people become the chiefs of the people, that will be of its portents. The Hour is one of five things which nobody knows except Allah. Verily, the knowledge of the Hour is with Allah (alone). He sends down the rain, and knows that which is in the wombs." (31.34) Then the man left. The Prophet said, "Call him back to me." **They went to call him back but could not see him. The Prophet said, "That was Gabriel who came to teach the people their religion."** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 6, Book 60, Number 300)

Along with incessantly reminding Mohammed that different religious beliefs were false, Gabriel would offer Mohammed a revelation supporting a prevalent idea that he, Gabriel, was an angelic *enemy* of the Jews:

Narrated Anas:

Abdullah bin Salam heard the news of the arrival of Allah's Apostle (at Medina) while he was on a farm collecting its fruits. So he came to the Prophet and said, "I will ask you about three things which nobody knows unless he be a prophet. Firstly, what is the first portent of the Hour? What is the first meal of the people of Paradise? And what makes a baby look like its father or mother?" The Prophet said, "Just now Gabriel has informed me about that." Abdullah said, "Gabriel?" The Prophet said, "Yes." Abdullah said, "He, among the angels is the enemy of the Jews." On that the Prophet recited this Holy Verse: "Whoever is an enemy to Gabriel (let him die in his fury!) for he has brought it (i.e. Qur'an) down to your heart by Allah's permission." (Quran 2.97) (Sahih Bukhari Volume 6, Book 60, Number 7)

Yet if we are to presume them to be spiritual beings, agents of the Lord of all creation, we might expect an angel to propagate the Psychic values of peace and harmony towards all mortals, rather than have its conduit acquiesce to it declaring itself an enemy of a particular group without any significant rationale, because an agent of the Divine should inherently understand the truth of samata. While inherent unity, and qualities of love, benevolence, kindness, peace towards all, are normally expected from angels and Gods and their respective human instrument, in Islam we instead find values decidedly non-Psychic, beginning with the fundamental falsehood of an *irremediable* division (in terms of both worship and between man and God). From this seed of permanent division springs the resulting falsehoods of forcing the individual to live by an external law opposed to his svadharma, refusing to accept other world-views contradicting Islam's own, the belief in the mortality of the Soul, incessant fear, continuous hatred, fixed intolerance, unrelenting harshness, aggrandizement of the group ego, unconscious idolatry, demands to dehumanize and subjugate the other, sexual violence, and calls for genocide and famine of the unbeliever – prototypical, unadulterated evil.

But we should hardly expect otherwise, because as we examine the message of the Quran and the record of the Hadith, it becomes clear that Gabriel was far from an angel: For he is none other than the secret ruler of the earth, the Asura of Falsehood.

* * * *

To the Muslim, the faithful adherent of Islam, the Quran (Qur'an, Koran) is considered the 'Divine Word' of Allah, the final revelations to mankind as communicated to the Prophet Mohammed through the angel Gabriel. It is utterly central to the religion, the source of knowledge and guidance that the Muslim is to shape himself by – as one would expect, given its stature as Allah's concluding, supreme and perfect message for humanity. But the structure of the Quran, the way in which the verses are arranged into book form, presents a significant difficulty for both the Muslim and the examiner of his religion, because the Quran's surahs or chapters are not organized chronologically, with many of the verses within surahs unrelated to each other, corresponding instead to different revelatory phases. Along with this, the actual 'revealed' verses themselves are often presented without context – though in many cases the particulars surrounding a verse are unnecessary to perceive its meaning. Nevertheless, some of the verses require further background information to acquire a more complete understanding of its particulars.

It is in this function that the first necessity of the Hadith emerges, and it was for this reason that numerous scholars in generations subsequent to the time of Mohammed travelled far and wide to listen to and read narratives of the Prophet's life, seeking not only further clarification of Quran verses, but also to learn more about the way Mohammed lived - and accordingly, how a proper Muslim should base his own life. Of the six major Hadith collections, Bukhari's – amassed during his journey

throughout the Abbasid Empire - is considered the most authentic (with Sahih Muslim the second most reliable), as he only included a fraction of the hadith he collected, making sure that the secondary narrators had actually met the companion of the Prophet who was providing the recollection. Also, many of the narrations included in his volume are repeated by different sources, helping to solidify their legitimacy. Along with its irreplaceable contribution to the historical record of Islam and the formation of the religion, the psychology of Mohammed and Gabriel themselves, and their awareness of their own importance, are clearly defined. Indeed the most important hadith in Sahih Bukhari is the one detailing Mohammed's declaration that if his followers do not follow his "tradition in religion" – i.e., hadith –, then they were consequently "not from" him:

Narrated Anas bin Malik:

A group of three men came to the houses of the wives of the Prophet asking how the Prophet worshipped (Allah), and when they were informed about that, they considered their worship insufficient and said, "Where are we from the Prophet as his past and future sins have been forgiven." Then one of them said, "I will offer the prayer throughout the night forever." The other said, "I will fast throughout the year and will not break my fast." The third said, "I will keep away from the women and will not marry forever." Allah's Apostle came to them and said, "Are you the same people who said so-and-so? By Allah, I am more submissive to Allah and more afraid of Him than you; yet I fast and break my fast, I do sleep and I also marry women. **So he who does not follow my tradition in religion, is not from me (not one of my followers).**" (Sahih Bukhari Volume 7, Book 62, Number 1)

Thus a Muslim finds himself with a different avenue to disbelief (kufr), one that contains an additional component to the deviance of *belief* found in the worship of different Gods besides Allah; because to fail to follow Mohammed's tradition is to renege on certain *actions* that go beyond his refusal to practice *shirk*, extending past revealed verses to include things such as his daily habits. While the Hadith are not at quite the level of the Quran (as the latter is the 'Word' of the 'one true god'), by declaring himself separate from those not following his tradition, the Hadith become just as important in defining the rules constituting a 'true' Muslim. Of course, his companion's recollections are not the only evidence supporting Mohammed's fundamental standing – Gabriel (as the alleged mouthpiece for Allah) himself endorsed the paramount significance of basing one's life upon the example set forth by the Prophet, for as he intransigently revealed to mankind in the Quran, "**Certainly you have in the Messenger of Allah an excellent exemplar for him who hopes in Allah and the latter day and remembers Allah much.**" (Quran 33:21)

This exaltation of the rare individual fits perfectly with the *modus operandi* of the Asura of Falsehood, because he understands that it is not enough to simply have documented communications from God. As man is generally a creature of his vital, he will reflexively follow the example of a mortal he can identify with sooner than he will choose to live only according to the idea, even the one presumably revealed by God. Knowing the nature of man, the Asura needed to fashion a living example of the religion he was creating, promoting in this individual the exaggeration of the lower ego and its excesses and depravities, facilitating the bondage of his followers to mankind's historically limited arc. But in order for the Asura to begin sculpting a human reflection (a prophet in this case) for his manufactured 'religion', he had first to impress upon his medium the magnitude of whom the latter was in contact with. In doing so, the Asura went beyond the initial awe of the first encounter and his presentation to Mohammed while in the sky - on another occasion displaying himself to Mohammed in his "actual" occult form:

Narrated Masruq:

I asked Aisha "What about His Statement: 'Then he (Gabriel) approached And came closer, And

was at a distance Of but two bow-lengths Or (even) nearer?’ ” (53.8-9) She replied, “It was Gabriel who used to come to the Prophet in the figure of a man, **but on that occasion, he came in his actual and real figure and (he was so huge) that he covered the whole horizon.**” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 54, Number 458)

Gabriel would, in reference to this particular experience, consider it worthy of an infrarational revelation to Mohammed, relaying to his instrument that Allah had said, “And he is in the highest part of the horizon.” (Quran 53:07) It was a communication made to provide ‘Divine’ confirmation of the former's stature. Having, in the occult planes, heard and seen so much - including the sheer physical size of Gabriel – in such an intense fashion, a vessel like Mohammed stood in both wonderment and trepidation at the enormity of the emanation dictating infrarational revelations (Mohammed, of course, believed the revelations to be from God!) to him, with both the forcefulness of the experience and the sheer visual size of the Asura of Falsehood solidifying his belief in the message being sent, because it *had* to be an intermediary of Allah, this stupendous power, this large and magnificent figure ‘revealing’ the great truths of Allah to a simple Arab who had never imagined that such meetings could ever happen.

But physical size, or a capacity to authoritatively present oneself to a mortal and make him subservient, are not necessarily markings of an angelic or divine nature in either terrestrial or occult beings. This is incontrovertible when we consider the experience of the Yogin – that of the Purusha or Soul described as not larger than the size of a thumb. Its visible size, of course, a pale comparison to its illimitable spiritual magnitude. The Yogin experience (and, for that matter, that of other global mystics throughout the classical world) also holds the Asura to be a figure of enormous material size when viewed by man in the former's subliminal form – indeed a similar attribute was given to the Titan, the one towering over the world, by the ancient Greek mystic. And while this Titan or Asura would use his actual appearance and the daze of the occult opening to quickly impress upon Mohammed the former's magnitude as an “Angel” and status as a worthy occult intermediary between Mohammed and Allah, and though the Quran and Hadith provide countless examples of the centrality of permanent separation to the Islamic religion, there is nevertheless another psychological attribute – rampant throughout the Islamic scripture – in particular that marks Islam as a creed designed by the secret ruler of earth, the aggrandizer of ego, all to keep man attached to his whip and his leash.

* * * *

The Asura of Falsehood, sovereign that he is, knows fully well how to keep man enslaved, or at least not fully free from him: one would expect this, remembering that he has been present from the beginning and, immune as he is to the cycle of life and death of humanity, has therefore had the entire history of creation to perfect his methods. And if the end result of a direct Asuric hand in earthly events is characterized by excessive violence and suffering, this manifestation is not in itself the favourite means of the Asura of Falsehood to prolong his rule, as rather than mere terrestrial outbursts and chaos, he favours the use of fear to incarcerate mankind, in the understanding that it is the psychology of man that will determine who he is and what he will become – thus if one is to create a slave, fear is the fundamental psychological trait to promote in the captive. It is fear that pulls man from the heights whereupon he truly belongs; that clouds his understanding; that poisons his heart; that makes him irrational – perhaps lashing out in such a state; that obstructs a truer love between his fellow humanity and himself.

And as there is in humans, thanks to their Psychic, a fundamental inclination, whether large or small, to

worship God, the Asura of Falsehood by way of his instrument Mohammed, cleverly appropriated this tendency by emphasizing the need to *fear* Allah, to tremble before the terrifying god, as fear was the essential psychological gateway needed to keep the believer affixed to the Islamic religion and its accompanying consequences. Thus Gabriel would infrarationally reveal to Mohammed, “**They only are the (true) believers whose hearts feel fear when Allah is mentioned**, and when His revelations are recited unto them they increase their faith, and who trust in their Lord.” (Quran 8:02) Mohammed was also told, “You warn only those who fear their Lord in secret and keep up prayer.” (Quran 35:18) Those who follow the command to fear Allah are to be rewarded: “(As for) those who fear their Lord in secret, they shall surely have forgiveness and a great reward.” (Quran 67:12) This was the “knowledge” – fear as the path to the Divine! – that Gabriel passed on to the final Prophet: “Those of His servants only who are possessed of knowledge fear Allah; surely Allah is Mighty, Forgiving.” (Quran 35:28) It is Allah, He alone, that should be feared by mankind:

O children of Israel! Call to mind My favour which I bestowed on you and be faithful to (your) covenant with Me, I will fulfil (My) covenant with you; **and fear none but Me**. And believe in what I have revealed, verifying that which is with you, and be not the first to deny it, neither take a mean price in exchange for My communications; and Me, Me alone should you fear.
(Quran 2:41)

Thus as one might expect, the believer is not to fear others including mortals – only Allah should have that power over him: “And when you said to him to whom Allah had shown favour and to whom you had shown a favour: ‘Keep your wife to yourself and be careful of (your duty to) Allah’; and you concealed in your soul what Allah would bring to light, and you feared men, and **Allah had a greater right that you should fear Him**.” (Quran 33:37) Mohammed was also told, “**Fear not the people and fear Me**, and do not take a small price for My communications, and whoever did not judge by what Allah revealed, those are they that are the unbelievers.” (Quran 5:44) For surely – at least according to Islam - it is the evil Satan causing the believers to fear others instead of Allah: “It is only the Satan that causes you to fear from his friends, but do not fear them, **and fear Me if you are believers**.” (Quran 3:175) Of the humans not to be feared, specific mention is given to the non-Muslims:

Forbidden to you is that which dies of itself, and blood, and flesh of swine, and that on which any other name than that of Allah has been invoked, and the strangled (animal) and that beaten to death, and that killed by a fall and that killed by being smitten with the horn, and that which wild beasts have eaten, except what you slaughter, and what is sacrificed on stones set up (for idols) and that you divide by the arrows; that is a transgression. This day have those who disbelieve despaired of your religion, so fear them not, and fear Me. This day have I perfected for you your religion and completed My favour on you and chosen for you Islam as a religion; but whoever is compelled by hunger, not inclining wilfully to sin, then surely Allah is Forgiving, Merciful. (Quran 5:03)

The believers, in contrast to the devious unbelievers, are those who, when reminded of Allah's communications, “fall down in prostration and celebrate the praise of their Lord, and they are not proud. Their sides draw away from (their) beds, **they call upon their Lord in fear** and in hope, and they spend (benevolently) out of what We have given them.” (Quran 32:15-16) The pious Muslim, the one who uneasily invokes Allah, has in that regards the example of both the last messenger and those preceding Mohammed: “There is no harm in the Prophet doing that which Allah has ordained for him. Such has been the course of Allah with respect to those who have gone before, and the command of Allah is a decree that is made absolute. Those who deliver the messages of Allah and fear Him, and do not fear any one but Allah; and Allah is sufficient to take account.” (Quran 33:38-39) Although the prophets and angels have the power to intercede for mankind after death, they nevertheless similarly “tremble” before the mighty Allah: “He knows what is before them and what is behind them, and they

do not intercede except for him whom He approves and for fear of Him they tremble.” (Quran 21:28) The angels are also specifically mentioned as fearing Allah, the reason – instead of greater psychological factors like love – for their obedience to him: “And whatever creature that is in the heavens and that is in the earth makes obeisance to Allah (only), and the angels (too) and they do not show pride. **They fear their Lord above them and do what they are commanded.**” (Quran 16:49-50) Of course the powerful angels should be frightened by Allah, because if we take Gabriel's assertions to be true, Allah is, in his very essence, pure fear!

And they will not heed unless Allah willeth (it). **He is the fount of fear.** He is the fount of Mercy. (Quran 74:56)

But the description of the Divine as the spring of all fear only confirms the falsehood of Gabriel's communications to Mohammed. This is because fear in itself is a quality opposite to that characterizing God, as it is based on a limitation – including the primal fear of death, the great anxiety stalking Man during his ephemeral lifetime – that the Divine does not have. Why would the Divine have one iota of fear, or be the *direct* source of it, when He is Immortal, Invincible, Omnipotent, Omniscient, Pure Bliss and Joy? He has no death to look forward to, no suffering to hide from, no anxieties over a lack of knowledge, therefore why would he have his creation peak at such a state where that becomes his primary characteristic? And if it is ludicrous to think of the Immortal having any association with such a quality, it then follows that He should be a fount of strength and courage rather than trepidation, the latter being the shadow of the former, just as the Asura of Falsehood is the shadow of Brahma. And if the Divine is That without fear, if She has engendered all of this universe to bring a Consciousness of Herself in Multiplicity, and if He has – to facilitate this grand aspiration of Conscious Unity with the Divine – placed a portion of Himself within humans, then it is also a falsehood to declare that mortals must fear God - why should they fear something that they are in truth One with? Yet it was precisely this terror that Gabriel sought to propagate – that mankind should tremble before an entity that is actually him, latent though this realization is, hidden behind the ordinary consciousness. To bring about this psychological state, to create this apprehension, to paralyse the believer and hold him hostage to all of the tenets of the Islamic religion he was formulating, Gabriel gave Mohammed a concrete reason for his followers to dread Allah – the spectre of an eternal punishment in hellfire.

It is this – potentially - horrible fate that explains the paradox of Allah being a “fount” of fear *and* mercy, and the incessant demand that Muslims believe only in Allah, rejecting all other “Gods” or forms of worship. For the fear of Allah is inextricably linked with the terror of his punishment, even if other declarations to fear him were communicated by Gabriel in a more ambiguous fashion. In the vast majority of cases however, the believer is warned of a calamitous fate awaiting him if he dares to believe in another God or disbelieves in Allah, as “those who disbelieve and reject My communications, they are the inmates of the fire, in it they shall abide.” (Quran 2:39) Wealth or other worldly means cannot safeguard the unbeliever from his destiny: “(As for) those who disbelieve, surely neither their wealth nor their children shall avail them in the least against Allah. And these are the inmates of the fire, therein they shall abide.” (Quran 3:116) The unbeliever's enjoyment in life is also of no protection for them against the hellfire: “Let it not deceive you that those who disbelieve go to and fro in the cities fearlessly. A brief enjoyment! Then their abode is hell, and evil is the resting-place.” (Quran 3:196-97) Hell is indeed the rightful place for the unbeliever: “Allah hath promised those who believe and do good works: Theirs will be forgiveness and immense reward. And they who disbelieve and deny Our revelations, such are rightful owners of hell.” (Quran 5:9-10) The non-Muslims may revel arrogantly in their disbelief during the life, but they will receive a painful lesson afterwards: “And (as for) those who reject Our communications and turn away from them haughtily - these are the inmates of the fire they shall abide in it.” (Quran 7:36) Any good deed an unbeliever may complete will be of no avail in the afterlife: “And (as to) those who reject Our communications and the meeting of the

hereafter, their deeds are null. Shall they be rewarded except for what they have done?" (Quran 7:147)

The reward for the unbeliever, of course, remains the hellfire: "And on the day when those who disbelieve shall be brought before the fire (it will be said): 'You did away with your good things in your life of the world and you enjoyed them for a while, so today you shall be rewarded with the punishment of abasement because you were unjustly proud in the land and because you transgressed.' " (Quran 46:20) It is a finality from which they cannot escape: "Think not that those who disbelieve shall escape in the earth, and their abode is the fire. And certainly evil is the destination!" (Quran 24:57) It is this doom that is referred to in other verses noting the supposed fraudulence of ascribing other deities along with Allah: "And on the day when He shall call out to them, 'Where are (those whom you called) My partners?' They shall say: 'We declare to Thee, none of us is a witness.' And away from them shall go what they called upon before, and they shall know for certain that there is no escape for them." (Quran 41:47-48) And if the unbeliever foolishly chooses to call upon his Gods, he will not receive an answer back – with the exception of the responding hellfire: "And on the day when He shall say: 'Call on those whom you considered to be My partners.' So they shall call on them, but they shall not answer them, and We will cause a separation between them. And the guilty behold the Fire and know that they are about to fall therein, and they find no way of escape thence." (Quran 18:52-53) This was the warning Mohammed was burdened with presenting to mankind: "Say: 'O people! I am only a plain warner to you. Then (as for) those who believe and do good, they shall have forgiveness and an honourable sustenance. And (as for) those who strive to oppose Our communications, they shall be the inmates of the flaming fire.' " (Quran 22:49-51) Those who fail to heed his warning will only be ashen-faced, unable to receive the mercy bestowed upon Mohammed and his followers: "And they say: 'When shall this threat be (executed) if you are truthful?' Say (O Mohammed): 'The knowledge thereof is only with Allah and I am only a plain warner.' But when they shall see it nigh, the faces of those who disbelieve shall be sorry, and it shall be said, 'This is that which you used to call for.' Say (O Mohammed): 'Have you considered if Allah should destroy me and those with me - rather He will have mercy on us. Yet who will protect the unbelievers from a painful punishment?' " (Quran 67:25-28)

The believing Muslims, on the other hand, are the "truthful and faithful", with a destiny far superior to the unbeliever: "And (as for) those who believe in Allah and His messengers, these it is that are the truthful and the faithful ones in the sight of their Lord. They shall have their reward and their light. And (as for) those who disbelieve and reject Our communications, these are the inmates of the hell." (Quran 57:19) The pious are of the right hand, removed from the vault of fire that punishes in the afterlife: "These are the people of the right hand. And (as for) those who disbelieve in our communications, they are the people of the left hand. On them will be Fire vaulted over (all round)." (Quran 90:18-20) The believers are the followers of the Quran, which provides clear guidance to them, saving them from the aimless wandering of the non-Muslim, the loser: "Ta Sin! These are the verses of the Quran and the Book that makes (things) clear. A guidance and good news for the believers, Who keep up prayer and pay the poor-rate. And of the hereafter, they are sure. As to those who do not believe in the hereafter, We have surely made their deeds fair-seeming to them, but they blindly wander on. These are they who shall have an evil punishment, and in the hereafter they shall be the greatest losers." (Quran 27:01-04) The holy book, if followed correctly, keeps the believer in good standing, to receive the splendid news withheld from the disbeliever (*kafir*): "Surely this Quran guides to that which is most upright and gives good news to the believers who do good that they shall have a great reward. And (as for) those who do not believe in the hereafter, We have prepared for them a painful chastisement." (Quran 17:09-10) The advent of hell, along with confirming the unbeliever's status as the loser, provides a reminder of their general unhappiness: "Therefore I warn you of the fire that flames: None shall enter it but the most unhappy, who gives the lie (to the truth) and turns (his) back." (Quran 92:14-16) But of course they should be unhappy, because the gods they pray towards are apparently that which they actually hate:

And they ascribe to Allah what they (themselves) hate and their tongues relate the lie that they shall have the good. There is no avoiding it that for them is the fire and that they shall be sent before. (Quran 16:62)

This dreadful finale will be presented to the unbeliever on the Day of Judgement, the afterlife Hour on which the rest of his eternal existence is decided. It is a Day that the kafir, indifferent as he is to the exclusivity of Allah, dismissive as he is of the infrarational revelations of the Quran, is naturally wont to reject, with an outcome most ghastly:

Woe on that day to the rejecters, Those who deny the Day of Judgement. And none denies it but the transgressor, the sinful one. When Our communications are recited to him, he says: "Stories of those of yore." Nay! Rather, what they used to do has become like rust upon their hearts. Nay! Most surely they shall on that Day be debarred from their Lord. Then most surely they shall enter the burning fire. And it will be said (unto them): "This is that which ye used to deny." (Quran 83:10-17)

This is the Day in which humans are occultly resurrected, brought up to Heaven - that is, of course, if they believe in Allah's exclusivity: "As for those who disbelieve, lo! if all that is in the earth were theirs, and as much again therewith, to ransom them from the doom on the Day of Resurrection, it would not be accepted from them. Theirs will be a painful doom. They will wish to come forth from the Fire, but they will not come forth from it. Theirs will be a lasting doom." (Quran 5:36-37) The association of "ransom" payments with religious and spiritual outcomes is found in another verse that describes the fate of the disbelievers: "For those who respond to their Lord is good. And (as for) those who do not respond to Him, had they all that is in the earth and the like thereof with it they would certainly offer it for a ransom. (As for) those, an evil reckoning shall be theirs and their abode is hell, and evil is the resting-place." (Quran 13:18) The very use of the word ransom is instructive, as it introduces the crimes of kidnapping and extortion into the domain of religion, illuminating us on the primitive psychology supporting the Islamic religion, in which the "ransom" is gleefully rejected in the name of afterlife "justice" for disbelief:

Say: "Tell me, if His punishment should overtake you by night or by day, What then is there of it that the guilty would hasten on? And when it comes to pass, will you believe in it? (It will be said) 'What! Now (you believe), when (until now) you wished to have it hastened on (through disbelief)?' Then it shall be said to those who were unjust: 'Taste abiding chastisement; you are not requited except for what you earned.' " And they ask thee to inform them (saying): "Is it true?" Say: "Yea, by my Lord, verily it is true, and ye cannot escape." **And if every soul that has done injustice had all that is in the earth, it would offer it for ransom, and they will manifest regret when they see the chastisement and the matter shall be decided between them with justice and they shall not be dealt with unjustly.** (Quran 10:50-54)

The notorious Day is implied to be an exhaustive examination of the infidelity of the *kuffar* (unbelievers): "And on the day when He shall gather them together, **(when it will seem) as though they had tarried but an hour of the day**, recognizing one another, those will verily have perished who denied the meeting with Allah and were not guided." (Quran 10:45) The denial of the Day of Judgement is deemed to be symptomatic of the deceitful nature of the kafir: "Cursed be the liars, Who are in a gulf (of ignorance) neglectful. They ask: 'When is the day of judgement?' (It is) the Day on which they shall be tried at the fire. (It will be said to them): 'Taste your persecution! This is what you would hasten on.' " (Quran 51:10-14) So frightful is the day in question that the non-Muslim will wish himself to be a speck of dust rather than an ordinary mortal: "Surely We have warned you of a chastisement near at hand: the day when man shall see what his two hands have sent before, and the unbeliever shall say: 'O! Would that I were dust!'" (Quran 78:40) This is the judgement Allah has no choice but to impose because of their denial of his exclusivity: "Say (O Mohammed, unto the

disbelievers): ‘My Lord would not concern Himself with you but for your prayer. But now ye have denied (the Truth), therefore there will be judgement.’ ” (Quran 25:77) Excuses are of no use on the Day of Judgement – the unbeliever is to be rewarded for his deeds: “O you who disbelieve! Do not urge excuses today; you shall be rewarded only according to what you did.” (Quran 66:07) The brutal Islamic reality, however, is that the activities of the unbeliever during the life are irrelevant, because irrespective of the works or actions he undertakes upon earth, they are of no avail on the Day when the principal criteria for “judgement” revolves around the question of exclusive belief in Allah:

On that day we shall present hell to the disbelievers, plain to view, Those whose eyes were hoodwinked from My reminder, and who could not bear to hear. Do the disbelievers reckon that they can choose My bondmen as protecting friends beside Me? Lo! We have prepared hell as a welcome for the disbelievers. Say: “Shall We inform you who will be the greatest losers by their works? Those whose effort goeth astray in the life of the world, and yet they reckon that they are doing good work.” **Those are they who disbelieve in the revelations of their Lord and in the meeting with Him. Therefore their works are vain, and on the Day of Resurrection We assign no weight to them. That is their reward - hell, because they disbelieved,** and made a jest of Our revelations and Our messengers. (Quran 18:100-106)

But this is a far cry from the karmayoga of the Bhagavad Gita, the psychological surrendering of one's actions or works to God, with the aspiration of using this surrender as a passage to a Supreme and Conscious Unity with said Creator. This is a path that extends to all who believe in God, irrespective of name: in fact, depending upon the attachment the individual has to ‘his’ work, it can also function in an Atheist. For karmayoga is a process by which the individual's central being transforms the ordinary attachments to actions or work, progressively becoming less affected by success or failure, ‘virtue’ or ‘vice’. All works, regardless of quality, are offered to the Divine to facilitate the transition from the egoistic consciousness to that of one's Soul or Self. Thus what one might consider to be a ‘failure’, if offered sincerely, can be crucial on the path to a greater consciousness. At the very least, the surrender can purify the current consciousness, lessening the ordinary reactions that characterize human nature, allowing one to proceed closer and closer to the Psychic (in this sense the Atheist may ironically obtain spiritual gains from his work, unaware as he is to the process). Using Sanskrit terminology, the individual will eventually function mostly in the *sattvic* (balanced, goodness, focused on psychological purification, internally peaceful) mode of consciousness, including his works, rather than the usual *rajasic* (passion, kinesis) mode that predominates in humanity. It can also – though this is considered an inferior outcome – lead one to the transient heavenly realms of the afterlife, once again because of karmayoga's inclusivity of varied forms of worship or outcomes aspired by a practitioner. In Islam however, works mean nothing if one does not believe in Allah alone, and the Day of Judgement renders such people as “losers”:

And they say, “There is naught save our life of the world, and we shall not be raised (again). If thou couldst see when they are set before their Lord!” He will ask, “Is not this real?” They will reply, “Yea, verily, by our Lord!” He will say: “Taste now the retribution for that ye used to disbelieve.” They indeed are losers who deny their meeting with Allah until, when the Hour cometh on them suddenly, they cry, “Alas for us, that we neglected it!” They bear upon their backs their burdens. Ah, evil is that which they bear! (Quran 6:29-31)

This is the Hour that the unbeliever mocks, that he ignores while living, the Hour that is as real as Allah himself. Yet they choose to doubt it, unsure as they are about things beyond life:

As to those who disbelieved (it will be said unto them): “What! Were not My communications recited to you? But you were proud and you were a guilty people.” And when it was said, “Surely the promise of Allah is true and as for the hour, there is no doubt about it,” you said: “We do not know what the hour is, we do not think (that it will come to pass) save a passing

thought, and we are not at all sure.” And the evil (consequences) of what they did shall become manifest to them and that which they mocked shall encompass them. And it shall be said: “Today We forsake you as you neglected the meeting of this day of yours and your abode is the fire, and there are not for you any helpers. That is because you took the communications of Allah for a jest and the life of this world deceived you.” So on that day they shall not be brought forth from it, nor shall they be granted goodwill. (Quran 45:31-35)

If the unbeliever is sceptical of such a Day, neither can a Muslim be entirely sure himself, as belief is one thing, certainty another. For to have incontrovertible knowledge of the afterlife, an event taking place in his future, is impossible for the ordinary mortal stuck in his limited consciousness. Because of the difficulty in presenting “proof” – as the Quran notes the unbelievers to historically demand – Gabriel chose the tactic of constant repetition of the ‘fact’ of a Day of Judgement, cleverly using Mohammed's fear of an eternal punishment as a means to essentially bombard his subject into believing this ‘Divine’ message, overwhelming any rational objection. While spiritual matters are often beyond the orbit of rationality, beliefs that are unquestioned, inflexible, repetitious and based on a fear of the unknown, are distinctly infrarational. And when we examine the idea of a Day of Judgement, we find another transfer of man's peculiarities upon the Divine, especially when we consider again – and this view is shared by the Abrahamic faiths – that God is the creator of humans. For if God has allowed, engendered the emergence of mankind as the superior form of consciousness throughout Prakriti, knowing full well that Her creation is progressively seeking to move towards a higher form of consciousness, then why would he be quick to *eternally* punish mankind for a ‘disbelief’ that quite naturally emerges out of a limited consciousness?

Similarly, the idea that heaven is the only purpose behind life, and that the primary requirement to achieve this aim is to exclusively believe in Allah, strikes one as intrinsically false, a simplistic conclusion to the subtleties and complexities of the Cosmos. Heaven in the Islamic description, as will be shown later, is characterized by much of the pleasurable objects of the material world the believer has come from – nowhere is there any indication of an elevation of *consciousness*. And to ‘judge’ that the unbeliever be thrown into a perpetual fire due to his mere disbelief immediately brings forth the hallmark of the lowest and most superficial of the ego, the part used by the Asura of Falsehood to prolong his rule. For it is the nature of mankind, not God, to desire vengeance upon the ‘other’ for subjective disagreements, to seek punishment for their divergence in opinion or deeds or whatever fancy of the lower ego. It is a stance in actuality based upon the insecurity of his own egoistic insufficiency - anger at himself yet directed outward - of not being the sole proprietor of truth. Thus the association of this rage with the Divine - that not only is the believer correct, but God will also be punishing the unbeliever! The reality, however, is far less sadistic, and exponentially more nuanced. Indeed if we assume the sliver of truth present in the Islamic formulation of the Divine – that of Man returning to God –, we can, after crucially taking into account that this ‘return’ is a Unity of Consciousness rather than a placement of mortals in a heaven or hell both characterized by a separative consciousness to God *and* fellow mortals, detail the actual process by which any ‘punishment’ occurs during the course of consciousness from its most primitive form, to the intermediary stage of ordinary humanity, back to the Creator.

For Brahma, knowing the gulf between Himself and life upon earth, understands the difficulty of transforming human nature to Divine, and has acquiesced to the mode of reincarnation used by Prakriti - the use of different lives and experiences for the growth of the Psychic culminating in Self-Realization, with the subsequent possibility of transforming the base earthly nature to that of God. Given that a partial or separate being is prone to error, falsehood and disbelief, it predisposes the Supreme to have a mechanism – delivered via Prakriti of course – to return the individual to a path directed back to the Self or Soul. It is in this function that Karma proceeds, this that the mechanical

process of Prakriti works toward, rather than the fanciful notions attributed to Karma by modern global popular culture. Basing our view off of the latter's misconceptions, we might erroneously presume that Karma could mean, for example, that if an individual were to be of the type to yell and scream at others, that his karma would be to return the next lifetime to receive the same sort of treatment. For if some actions committed upon earth might need to be actually experienced in the same or a later life, this is not always the case, and is actually a superficial functioning of Karma. While Self-Realization is the ultimate purpose, Karma is primarily of use to bring about a change in the earthly consciousness-mode or *gunas* from the tamasic (dark, unconscious) to the lower rajasic, then the higher rajasic, finally arriving in the sattvic of which is usually – the higher rajasic is capable but it is a bit more preoccupied with externals - the basis of an attempt to Realize one's Soul or Self.

Divergent from that luminous Realization, the experience of Yogin and Sages instructs us that there is indeed the possibility of sojourns in hell-like *patalas* (underworlds or netherworlds) or even hell after the life (for the most severe actions). The crucial distinction between Hinduism and Islam is that the former understands these worlds to be *transient* experiences for the individual consciousness, because unlike the Abrahamic religions, Sanatana Dharma does not exaggerate the importance of sin, as that only serves to permanently degrade man from his true heights. Even a visit to *naraka* or hell is designed to bring about a transformation of the consciousness rather than eternally punish. The need for the perpetual chastisement of the Abrahamic religions is due to the fallacy that there are belief and thought crimes that mankind can commit that are such an affront to God that he deems it worthy of the most sadistic ‘justice’. The Sanatana Dharma, however, teaches that in reality, there is *nothing* that can truly be an *eternal* affront to the Divine, even that which he would undoubtedly not condone, because as he is the Creator of all existence, as he contains all of this within Himself, it means again that nothing can materialize without at least his acquiescence to the *possibility* of it occurring. Knowing that evil and falsehood and error are possibilities in his grand play, he has also consented for the Laws of Karma and Reincarnation to facilitate the great evolution of consciousness that he patiently awaits. Thus no one is to be *everlastingly tortured*, as that would nullify His impetus for the Multiplicity. In Islam however, there is only one life upon earth, and the looming hellfire stalks those who commit the “sin” of disbelieving in Allah’s exclusivity:

To your Lord on that Day shall be the driving. So he did not accept the truth, nor did he pray,
But called the truth a lie and turned back! Then he went to his followers, walking away in
haughtiness. Nearer to you (is destruction) and nearer, Again (consider how) nearer to you (O
Men!) and nearer. (Quran 75:30-35)

Any mercy bestowed upon the unbeliever by “angels” such as Gabriel, or by Allah, is confused by the disbeliever as belonging to himself. This error, of course, means that they are deserving of a “hard” retribution, rather than more time and lives to become aware of the Divine Grace:

And if We make him taste mercy from Us after distress that has touched him, he would most certainly say: “This is of me, and I do not think the hour will come to pass, and if I am sent back to my Lord, I shall have with Him sure good.” But We will most certainly inform those who disbelieved of what they did, and We will most certainly make them taste of hard chastisement. And when We show favour to man, he turns aside and withdraws himself. And when evil touches him, he makes lengthy supplications. Say: “Tell me if it is from Allah, then you disbelieve in it, who is in greater error than he who is in a prolonged opposition?” (Quran 41:50-52)

This impatience with mortals is another example of how the message delivered by Gabriel is characteristic of egoistic aggrandizement rather than God, because it is the former which is marked by an impulsivity based mostly upon the belief that the current life is the only one. And as the Asura of Falsehood is the source of the most vulgar of all egoistic inclinations, eternal punishment – as outlined

in the following selection - was concocted by him to be the appropriate riposte for an ordinary turn of humanity, a forewarned chastisement appealing to a messenger of an unrefined mentality. Having established the Day of Judgement on which this eternal punishment begins as solely belonging to Allah, the Asura would also reveal that the other gods are to disown their worshippers on said Day:

Yet of mankind are some who take unto themselves (objects of worship which they set as) rivals to Allah, loving them with a love like (that which is the due) of Allah (only) - those who believe are stauncher in their love for Allah - Oh, that those who do evil had but known, (on the day) when they behold the doom, that power belongeth wholly to Allah, and that Allah is severe in punishment! On the day when those who were followed disown those who followed (them), and they behold the doom, and all their aims collapse with them. And those who were but followers will say, "If a return were possible for us, we would disown them even as they have disowned us." **Thus will Allah show them their own deeds as anguish for them, and they will not emerge from the Fire.** (Quran 2:165-67)

While this paradox of the nonexistent gods having the capacity to disown their followers is periodically seen in the scripture, before we review additional examples of that, we must further examine the dreaded Day of Judgement on which the believers and unbelievers contend for the affection of their master: "Allah sets forth an example: There is a slave in whom are (several) partners differing with one another, and there is another slave wholly owned by one man. Are the two alike in condition? (All) praise is due to Allah. Nay! Most of them do not know. Surely you shall die and they (too) shall surely die. Then surely on the day of resurrection you will contend one with another before your Lord. Who is then more unjust than he who utters a lie against Allah and (he who) gives the lie to the truth when it comes to him. Is there not in hell an abode for the unbelievers?" (Quran 39:29-32) On this Day of great hardship, the unbelievers are also to turn against one another in the hopes of Allah's forgiveness for their great sin. Alas, it is to be of no avail:

And (unto the evil-doer) his companion shall say: "This (his record) is what is ready with me." (It will be said) **"Do cast into hell every ungrateful, rebellious one, Forbiddener of good, exceeeder of limits, doubter, Who sets up another god with Allah. So do cast him into severe chastisement."** His companion will say: "Our Lord! I did not make him transgress, but he was himself far astray." He will say: "Contend not in My presence, when I had already proffered unto you the warning. My word shall not be changed, nor am I in the least unjust to my servants." (Quran 50:23-29)

In another example of the paradox of the non-existent yet existent gods, Gabriel also infrarationally revealed that not only will these gods disown their followers, they will also verbally declare, on the Day of Judgement, their own submission to Allah:

And on the day when We will raise up a witness out of every nation, then shall no permission be given to those who disbelieve, nor shall they be made to solicit favour. And when those who are unjust shall see the chastisement, it shall not be lightened for them, nor shall they be respited. And when those who associate (others with Allah) shall see their associate-gods, they shall say: "Our Lord, these are our associate-gods on whom we called besides Thee." **But they will give them back the reply: "Most surely you are liars."** And they shall tender submission to Allah on that day. And what they used to forge shall depart from them. **As for those who disbelieve and turn away from Allah's way, We will add chastisement to their chastisement because they made mischief.** (Quran 16:84-88)

If such associates are able to speak to mortals, then it means that they exist according to some type of reality and should be better explained by Allah, or that Allah is such a cruel 'God' that he enjoys playing perverse jokes on the mortals under his domain by tempting them that their gods are real, thus

deepening the punishment, adding insult to injury when the ‘Gods’ subsequently chastise the disbeliever. But such contradictions and clues to the false psychology of Gabriel flew right over the head of an earthly vessel completely submissive to the entity communicating to him, to the Asuric distortion of Allah, for whom Mohammed's devotion had led him to Hira. Enslaved as he had made himself, there was consequently no need – nor did he have any right - to question the ‘Word’ of Allah or his own status as a Messenger, a warner for the unbeliever - the unjust, the sinner - of the Day that beckons:

And warn them, O Mohammed, of the day that draws near, when hearts shall rise up to the throats, grieving inwardly. The unjust shall not have any compassionate friend nor any intercessor who should be obeyed. He knows the stealthy looks and that which the breasts conceal. And Allah judges with the truth, and those whom they call upon besides Him cannot judge aught. Surely Allah is the Hearing, the Seeing. Have they not travelled in the earth and seen how was the end of those who were before them? Mightier than these were they in strength - and in fortifications in the land, but Allah destroyed them for their sins, and there was not for them any defender against Allah. That was because there came to them their messengers with clear arguments, but they rejected (them), therefore Allah destroyed them. Surely He is Strong, Severe in retribution. (Quran 40:18)

Indeed as the verse indicates, Mohammed was not the first messenger to specifically warn mankind of the Day of Judgement. The towns that previously forgot or failed to heed the message became examples for Mohammed and “men of thought” to reflect upon:

He will say: “So (it must be). Our revelations came unto thee but thou didst forget them. In like manner thou art forgotten this Day.” Thus do We reward him who is prodigal and believeth not the revelations of his Lord, and verily the doom of the Hereafter will be sterner and more lasting. Is it not a guidance for them (to know) how many a generation We destroyed before them, amid whose dwellings they walk? Lo! therein verily are signs for men of thought. (Quran 20:126-128)

The stories of the prophets and towns previously destroyed were repeatedly imparted to Mohammed by Gabriel, underscoring to him the historical record of disbelievers suffering the grave consequences of ignoring Allah's messengers. Using these examples, the Asura of Falsehood infrarationally revealed that along with hell, the unbelievers should be reminded of the catastrophic earthly results their disbelief had brought to them. In the case of the Prophet Noah, the non-Muslims that failed to heed his message in the exclusivity of Allah suffered, prior to the obligatory afterlife of hell, an early death by drowning, a genocide also *desired* by Noah:

Surely We sent Noah to his people, saying: “Warn your people before there come upon them a painful chastisement.” He said: “O my people! Surely I am a plain warner to you: That you should serve Allah and be careful of (your duty to) Him and obey me. He will forgive you some of your faults and grant you a delay to an appointed term. Surely the term of Allah when it comes is not postponed, did you but know!” He said: “O my Lord! Surely I have called my people by night and by day! But my call has only made them flee the more. And whenever I have called them that Thou mayest forgive them, they put their fingers in their ears, cover themselves with their garments, and persist and are puffed up with pride. Then surely I called to them aloud. Then surely I spoke to them in public and I spoke to them in secret. Then I said, “Ask forgiveness of your Lord, surely He is the most Forgiving, He will send down upon you the cloud, pouring down abundance of rain, And help you with wealth and sons, and make for you gardens, and make for you rivers. What is the matter with you that you hope not the greatness of Allah? And indeed He has created you through various grades. Do you not see how Allah has created the seven heavens, one above another, And made the moon therein a light, and

made the sun a lamp? And Allah has made you grow out of the earth as a growth, Then He returns you to it, then will He bring you forth a (new) bringing forth. And Allah has made for you the earth a wide expanse, That you may go along therein in wide paths.” Noah said: “My Lord! Surely they have disobeyed me and followed him whose wealth and children have added to him nothing but loss.” And they have planned a very great plan. And they say: “By no means leave your gods, nor leave Wadd, nor Suwa, nor Yaghus, and Yauq and Nasr.” And indeed they have led astray many, and do not increase the unjust in naught but error. **Because of their wrongs they were drowned, then made to enter fire. And they did not find any helpers besides Allah. And Noah said: “My Lord! Leave not upon the land any dweller from among the unbelievers. For surely if Thou leave them they will lead astray Thy servants, and will not beget any but immoral, ungrateful (children).** My Lord! Forgive me and my parents and him who enters my house believing, and the believing men and the believing women, and do not increase the unjust in aught but destruction!” (Quran 71:01-28)

Noah had been urged by Allah to spread the Asuric message, even as he faced the possibility of being stoned for his cause, a form of punishment that, as we shall see later, was continued after the advent of Islam:

The people of Noah rejected the messengers. When their brother Noah said to them: “Will you not guard (against evil)? Surely I am a faithful messenger to you, therefore guard against (the punishment of) Allah and obey me. And I do not ask you any reward for it; my reward is only with the Lord of the worlds. So guard against (the punishment of) Allah and obey me.” They said: “Shall we believe in you while the meanest follow you?” He said: “And what knowledge have I of what they do? Their account is only with my Lord, if you could perceive. And I am not going to drive away the believers; I am naught but a plain warner.” They said: “If you desist not, O Noah, you shall most certainly be of those stoned to death.” He said: “My Lord! Surely my people give me the lie! Therefore judge Thou between me and them with a (just) judgement, and deliver me and those who are with me of the believers.” So We delivered him and those with him in the laden ark. Then We drowned the rest afterwards Most surely there is a sign in this, but most of them do not believe. And most surely your Lord is the Mighty, the Merciful. (Quran 26:105-122)

The ‘angels’ had made clear to Noah, as they would with ensuing prophets such as Salih, that he had been sent by the Lord to inform his people, whether or not they disparaged him as a liar, of the fundamental principle of Islam – that Allah alone has the right to be worshipped. For the people of Salih, it was the terror and wrath of an earthquake, rather than a flood, that devoured the unfaithful:

Certainly We sent Noah to his people, so he said: “O my people! Serve Allah, you have no god other than Him; surely I fear for you the chastisement of a grievous day.” The chiefs of his people said: “Most surely we see you in clear error.” He said: “O my people! There is no error in me, but I am a messenger from the Lord of the Worlds. I deliver to you the messages of my Lord, and I offer you good advice and I know from Allah what you do not know. What! Do you wonder that a reminder has come to you from your Lord through a man from among you, that he might warn you and that you might guard (against evil) and so that mercy may be shown to you?” But they called him a liar, so We delivered him and those with him in the ark, and We drowned those who rejected Our Communications - surely they were a blind people. And to Ad (We sent) their brother Hud. He said: “O my people! Serve Allah, you have no god other than Him. Will you not then guard (against evil)?” The chiefs of those who disbelieved from among his people said, “Most surely we see you in folly”, and “Most surely we think you to be of the liars.” He said: “O my people! There is no folly in me, but I am an messenger of the Lord of the worlds. I deliver to you the messages of my Lord and I am a faithful adviser to you. What! Do

you wonder that a reminder has come to you from your Lord through a man from among you that he might warn you? And remember when He made you successors after Noah's people and gave you growth of stature. Therefore remember the benefits of Allah, that you may be successful." They said: "Hast come unto us that we should serve Allah alone, and forsake what our fathers worshipped? Then bring upon us that wherewith thou threatenest us if thou art of the truthful!" He said: "**Indeed terror and wrath from your Lord have lighted upon you.** What! Do you dispute with me about names which you and your fathers have given? Allah has not sent any authority for them. Wait then, I too with you will be of those who wait." So We delivered him and those with him by mercy from Us, and We cut off the last of those who rejected Our communications and were not believers. And to Samood (We sent) their brother Salih. He said: "O my people! Serve Allah, you have no god other than Him, clear proof indeed has come to you from your Lord. This is (as) Allah's she-camel for you - a sign, therefore leave her alone to pasture on Allah's earth, and do not touch her with any harm, otherwise painful chastisement will overtake you. And remember when He made you successors after Ad and settled you in the land - you make mansions on its plains and hew out houses in the mountains - remember therefore Allah's benefits and do not act corruptly in the land, making mischief." The chief of those who behaved proudly among his people said to those who were considered weak, to those who believed from among them: "Do you know that Salih is sent by his Lord?" They said: "Surely we are believers in what he has been sent with." Those who were haughty said: "Surely we are deniers of what you believe in." So they slew the she-camel and revolted against their Lord's commandment, and they said: "O Salih! bring us what you threatened us with, if you are one of the messengers." Then the earthquake overtook them, so they became motionless bodies in their abode. Then he turned away from them and said: "O my people I did certainly deliver to you the message of my Lord, and I gave you good advice, but you do not love those who give good advice." (Quran 7:59-79)

Noah and Salih were hardly the only messengers to warn their fellow mortals of the doom that awaited them. But as they were met with mostly resistance, the 'angels', obviously with the backing of Allah (surely Gabriel would not dare consider himself above Allah?), proceeded to annihilate those historic unbelievers within the life – an earthly preview of their eternal chastisement:

And certainly We gave Moses the Book and We appointed with him his brother Haroun an aider. Then We said: "Go you both to the people who rejected Our communications." **Then We destroyed them with utter destruction.** And the people of Noah, when they rejected the messengers, We drowned them, and made them a sign for men, and We have prepared a painful punishment for the unjust. And Ad and Samood and the dwellers of the Rass and many generations between them. **And to every one We gave examples and every one did We destroy to utter annihilation.** (Quran 25:35-39)

To Ad went the Prophet Hud with the same warning as Noah – and the same resulting punishment to disbelievers in the earth and in hell:

And to the Ad people (We sent) their brother Hud. He said: "O my people! Serve Allah, you have no god other than He; (Your other gods) ye do nothing but invent! O my people! I do not ask of you any reward for it; my reward is only with Him Who created me. Do you not then understand? And, O my people! Ask forgiveness of your Lord, then turn to Him. He will send on you clouds pouring down abundance of rain and add strength to your strength, and do not turn back guilty." They said: "O Hud! You have not brought to us any clear argument and we are not going to desert our gods for your word, and we are not believers in you. We say naught but that some of our gods have smitten you with evil." He said: "Surely I call Allah to witness, and do you bear witness too, that I am clear of what you ascribe as partners (with Allah) Beside

Him. Therefore scheme against me all together, then give me no respite. Surely I rely on Allah, my Lord and your Lord. There is no living creature but He holds it by its forelock; surely my Lord is on the right path. But if you turn back, then indeed I have delivered to you the message with which I have been sent to you, and my Lord will bring another people in your place, and you cannot do Him any harm. Surely my Lord is the Preserver of all things.” And when Our decree came to pass, We saved Hud and those who believed with him with mercy from Us, and We saved them from a hard chastisement. And this was Ad - they denied the communications of their Lord, and disobeyed His messengers and followed the bidding of every insolent opposer (of truth). **And they were overtaken by curse in this world and on the resurrection day.** Now surely Ad disbelieved in their Lord. Now surely, away with Ad, the people of Hud. (Quran 11:50-60)

The story of Salih, the she-camel and the Thamud tribe was infrarationally revealed to the Prophet twice, as if to emphasize to Mohammed the chastisement for the failure of mortals to recognize signs from Allah:

And to the Thamud (We sent) their brother Salih. He said: “O my people! serve Allah, you have no god other than He. He brought you into being from the earth, and made you dwell in it, therefore ask forgiveness of Him, then turn to Him. Surely my Lord is Nigh, Answering.” They said: “O Salih! Surely you were one amongst us in whom great expectations were placed before this. Do you (now) forbid us from worshipping what our fathers worshipped? And as to that which you call us to, most surely we are in disquieting doubt.” He said: “O my people! Tell me if I have clear proof from my Lord and He has granted to me mercy from Himself - who will then help me against Allah if I disobey Him? Therefore you do not add to me other than loss. And, O my people! This will be (as) Allah's she-camel for you - a sign. Therefore leave her to pasture on Allah's earth and do not touch her with evil, for then a near chastisement will overtake you.” But they slew her, so he said: “Enjoy yourselves in your abode for three days, that is a promise not to be belied.” So when Our decree came to pass, We delivered Salih and those who believed with him by mercy from Us, and (We saved them) from the disgrace of that day. Surely your Lord is the Strong, the Mighty. And the rumbling overtook those who were unjust, so they became motionless bodies in their abodes, As though they had never dwelt in them. Now surely did Samood disbelieve in their Lord. Now surely, away with Samood. (Quran 11:61-68)

This was the great Islamic warning, the apparent summit of religious knowledge, also delivered by Abraham - a crucial figure in the three “monotheistic” Arab religions - to his polytheistic father:

And mention Abraham in the Book; surely he was a truthful man, a prophet. When he said to his father: “O my father! Why do you worship what neither hears nor sees, nor does it avail you in the least. O my father! Truly the knowledge has come to me which has not come to you, therefore follow me, I will guide you on a right path. O my father! Serve not the Satan, surely the Satan is disobedient to the Beneficent Allah. O my father! Surely I fear that a punishment from the Beneficent Allah should afflict you so that you should be a friend of the Satan.” He said: “Do you dislike my gods, O Abraham? If you do not desist I will certainly stone you, and leave me for a time.” He said: “Peace be on you, I will pray to my Lord to forgive you. Surely He is ever Affectionate to me. I shall withdraw from you and that unto which ye pray beside Allah, and I shall pray unto my Lord. It may be that, in prayer unto my Lord, I shall not be unblest.” So, when he had withdrawn from them and that which they were worshipping beside Allah, We gave him Isaac and Jacob. Each of them We made a prophet. (Quran 19:41-49)

Gabriel would also infrarationally reveal to Mohammed additional verses describing the conversation between Abraham and his father, with the following passage alleging the Arabs to worship idols that

were of no assistance to either Abraham's father or his people:

And recite to them the story of Abraham. When he said to his father and his people: "What do you worship?" They said: "We worship idols, so we shall be their votaries." He said: "Do they hear you when you call? Or do they profit you or cause you harm?" They said: "Nay, we found our fathers doing so." He said: "Have you then considered what you have been worshipping, You and your ancient sires. Surely they are enemies to me, but not (so) the Lord of the worlds, Who created me, then He has shown me the way. And when I am sick, then He restores me to health. And He Who will cause me to die, then give me life. And Who, I hope, will forgive me my mistakes on the day of judgement My Lord, Grant me wisdom, and join me with the good. And ordain for me a goodly mention among posterity. And make me of the heirs of the garden of bliss. And forgive my father, for surely he is of those who have gone astray. And disgrace me not on the day when they are raised, The day on which property will not avail, nor sons, Except him who comes to Allah with a heart free (from evil). And the garden shall be brought near for those who guard (against evil), And the hell shall be made manifest to the erring ones, And it shall be said to them: 'Where are those that you used to worship besides Allah? Can they help you or yet help themselves?' **So they shall be thrown down into it, they and the erring ones, And the hosts of the Satan, all.** They shall say while they contend therein: 'By Allah! we were certainly in manifest error, When we made you equal to the Lord of the worlds; And none but the guilty led us astray; So we have no intercessors, Nor a true friend. But if we could but once return, we would be of the believers.' " Most surely there is a sign in this, but most of them do not believe. And most surely your Lord is the Mighty, the Merciful. (Quran 26:69-104)

As the other gods were enemies to Abraham, so too did his descendant Joseph reject the diversity of classical worship, because Allah had not sanctioned this phenomenon:

And it seemed good to them (the men-folk) after they had seen the signs (of his innocence) to imprison him (Joseph) for a time. And two young men went to prison with him. One of them said: "I dreamed that I was pressing wine." The other said: "I dreamed that I was carrying upon my head bread whereof the birds were eating. Announce unto us the interpretation, for we see thee of those good (at interpretation)." He said: "The food which ye are given (daily) shall not come unto you but I shall tell you the interpretation ere it cometh unto you. This is of that which my Lord hath taught me. Lo! I have forsaken the religion of folk who believe not in Allah and are disbelievers in the Hereafter. And I have followed the religion of my fathers, Abraham and Isaac and Jacob. **It never was for us to attribute aught as partner to Allah.** This is of the bounty of Allah unto us (the seed of Abraham) and unto mankind; but most men give not thanks. O my fellow-prisoners! Are many lords better, or Allah the One, Almighty? **Those whom ye worship beside Him are but names which ye have named, ye and your fathers. Allah hath revealed no sanction for them.** The decision rests with Allah only, Who hath commanded you that ye worship none save Him. This is the right religion, but most men know not." (Quran 12:36-40)

After him came the Prophet Shu'aib, who warned the Madyan peoples to cease their worship of allegedly fraudulent gods. Though they would call Shu'aib a liar and a loser, in the end, Gabriel assured Mohammed, it was the Madyan who lost – another earthquake settling the score:

And to Madyan (We sent) their brother Shu'aib. He said: "O my people! serve Allah, you have no god other than Him. Clear proof indeed has come to you from your Lord, therefore give full measure and weight and do not diminish to men their things, and do not make mischief in the land after its reform; this is better for you if you are believers. And do not lie in wait in every path, threatening and turning away from Allah's way him who believes in Him and seeking to make it crooked. And remember when you were few then He multiplied you, and consider what

was the end of the mischief-makers. And if there is a party of you who believe in that with which I am sent, and another party who do not believe, then wait patiently until Allah judges between us; and He is the best of the Judges.” The chiefs, those who were proud from among his people said: “We will most certainly turn you out, O Shu’aib, along with those who believe with you, from our town, unless you come back to our faith.” He said: “What! Though we dislike (it)? Indeed we shall have invented a lie against Allah If we go back to your religion after Allah has delivered us from It, and it befits us not that we should go back to it, except if Allah our Lord please. Our Lord comprehends all things in His knowledge, in Allah do we trust. Our Lord! Decide between us and our people with truth. And Thou art the best of deciders.”

And the chiefs of those who disbelieved from among his people said: “If you follow Shu’aib, you shall then most surely be losers.” Then the earthquake overtook them, so they became motionless bodies in their abode. Those who called Shu’aib a liar were as though they had never dwelt therein; those who called Shu’aib a liar, they were the losers. So he turned away from them and said: “O my people! certainly I delivered to you the messages of my Lord and I gave you good advice. **How shall I then be sorry for an unbelieving people?”** (Quran 7:85-93)

Gabriel was keen to note, in another passage detailing Shu’aib's warning to the Madyan, that they were tempting the same merciless fate that overtook the people of Noah, Hud, Salih, and Lut:

And to the Madyan (We sent) their brother Shu’aib. He said: “O my people! serve Allah, you have no god other than He, and do not give short measure and weight. Surely I see you in prosperity and surely I fear for you the punishment of an all-encompassing day. And, O my people! Give full measure and weight fairly, and defraud not men their things, and do not act corruptly in the land, making mischief. What remains with Allah is better for you if you are believers, and I am not a keeper over you.” They said: “O Shu’aib! Does your prayer enjoin you that we should forsake what our fathers worshipped or that we should not do what we please with regard to our property? Truly you are the forbearing, the right-directing one.” He said: “O my people! Have you considered if I have a clear proof from my Lord and He has given me a goodly sustenance from Himself, and I do not desire that in opposition to you I should betake myself to that which I forbid you. I desire nothing but reform so far as I am able, and with none but Allah is the direction of my affair to a right issue; on Him do I rely and to Him do I turn. And, O my people! Let not opposition to me make you guilty so that there may befall you the like of what befell the people of Noah, or the people of Hud, or the people of Salih, nor are the people of Lut far off from you. And ask forgiveness of your Lord, then turn to Him. Surely my Lord is Merciful, Loving.” They said: “O Shu’aib! We do not understand much of what you say and most surely we see you to be weak among us, and were it not for your family we would surely stone you, and you are not mighty against us.” He said: “O my people! Is my family more esteemed by you than Allah? And you neglect Him as a thing cast behind your back. Surely my Lord encompasses what you do. And, O my people! Act according to your ability, I too am acting. You will come to know soon who it is on whom will light the punishment that will disgrace him and who it is that is a liar, and watch, surely I too am watching with you.” And when Our decree came to pass We delivered Shu’aib, and those who believed with him, by mercy from Us, and the rumbling overtook those who were unjust so they became motionless bodies in their abodes, As though they had never dwelt in them. Now surely perdition overtook the Madyan as had perished the Samood. (Quran 11:84-95)

Following Shu’aib was the famous Prophet Moses, who in Judaism is considered the most important of all prophets, having authored the Torah, having parted the Red Sea to lead his people away from the Pharaoh's rule. Yet in Islam is he also considered significant, although not to the same extent as

Mohammed, the “Seal” of all Apostles. But as Gabriel related to his vessel, Moses was nevertheless one of the rare mortals who, as a direct result of occult contact with Allah and his angelic intermediaries (thus assuming the status of prophet), attempted to impress upon the kuffar – in the following it is the Pharaoh of Egypt - that Allah alone is to be feared:

Has not there come to you the story of Moses? When his Lord called upon him in the holy valley of Tuwa, “Go to the Pharaoh, surely he has become inordinate. Then say to him: ‘Have you (a desire) to purify yourself? **And I will guide you to your Lord so that you should fear.**’” So he showed him the mighty sign. But he rejected (the truth) and disobeyed. Then he went back hastily. Then he gathered (men) and made a proclamation, saying, “I am your lord, the most high.” So Allah seized him with the punishment of the hereafter and the former life. Most surely there is in this a lesson to him who fears. (Quran 79:15-26)

While there is certainly truth in the notion that the Pharaoh was wrong to declare himself Lord, to take himself to be divine when it was clear that he was associating such a divinity with his *egoistic* self-consciousness rather than his Soul or Self, it nonetheless remains equally a falsehood to link this claim with a double punishment upon earth and in the perpetual hellfire. For if God knows himself to be One – at least in latency - with all of creation, and knows some of his creation to be a work in progress back to Consciousness of Himself, then, completely secure in His fundamental Existence, knowing the Pharaoh's ignorant boast as a possible outcome of *His* permitted world-play, it follows that He would not see the need to bring forth such violent retribution (especially the hellfire) against His creation, damning an individual for eternity. After all, the mere cessation of the Pharaoh's life would be reminder enough of his mortality – to bring forth the violent Islamic retribution is out of proportion to the error, and does nothing to promote the ultimate aspiration of the Divine in Multiplicity upon earth. Indeed if the type of egoism espoused by the Pharaoh is unworthy of an eternal punishment, it is also in actuality a close relative of Islam's egoism, with both committing the mistake of taking one's belief of divinity to the exclusion of other possibilities. The Pharaoh claimed himself to be the sole true god; Islam claims Allah as such. Neither takes into account the diversity of existence, and both seek to punish disputing beliefs, with Gabriel noting to Mohammed the severity of what the ‘angels’, displeased as they were, brought to the Pharaoh and his people. It was a “precedent” for all of humanity:

And certainly We sent Moses with Our communications to Pharaoh and his chiefs, so he said: “Surely I am the messenger of the Lord of the worlds.” But when he came to them with Our signs, lo, they laughed at them. And We did not show them a sign but it was greater than its like, and We overtook them with chastisement that they may turn. And they said: “O magician! Call on your Lord for our sake, as He has made the covenant with you; we shall surely be the followers of the right way.” But when We removed from them the chastisement, lo, they broke the pledge. And Pharaoh proclaimed amongst his people: “O my people! Is not the kingdom of Egypt mine? And these rivers flow beneath me. Do you not then see? Nay! I am better than this fellow, who is contemptible, and who can hardly speak distinctly. But why have not bracelets of gold been put upon him, or why have there not come with him angels as companions?” So he incited his people to make light of Moses, and they obeyed him: surely they were a transgressing people. **Then when they displeased Us, We inflicted a retribution on them, so We drowned them all together, And We made them a precedent and example to the later generations.** (Quran 43:46-56)

In another verse discussing the warnings delivered by the prophets Moses and his brother Aaron, Gabriel again chose to attribute the dispersal of messengers to the ‘angels’ instead of Allah. Doing so, of course, subtly reinforced the power behind what he was infrarationally revealing, linking it to an entity – himself - Mohammed was seeing (even if it was occult rather than corporeal sight) instead of Allah (who as we shall later learn was beyond the vision of Mohammed):

Then We sent our messengers one after another. Whenever its messenger came unto a nation they denied him, so We caused them to follow one another (to disaster) and We made them bywords. A far removal for folk who believe not! Then We sent Moses and his brother Aaron with Our tokens and a clear warrant Unto Pharaoh and his chiefs, but they scorned (them) and they were insolent people. And they said: "Shall we put faith in two mortals like ourselves, and whose folk are servile unto us?" So they denied them, and became of those who were destroyed. (Quran 23:44-48)

The 'angels' also declared to a subsequent prophet, David, that the "fire" will hold the disbelievers to "account" *after* they have been destroyed in the earth:

O David! Surely We have made you a ruler in the land, so judge between men with justice and do not follow desire, lest it should lead you astray from the path of Allah. (As for) those who go astray from the path of Allah, they shall surely have a severe punishment because they forgot the day of reckoning. And We did not create the heaven and the earth and what is between them in vain. That is the opinion of those who disbelieve then woe to those who disbelieve on account of the fire. Shall We treat those who believe and do good like the mischief-makers in the earth? Or shall We make those who guard (against evil) like the wicked? (Quran 38:26-28)

Though one might possibly take this for a denouncement of desire as a whole, given Islam's acquiescence – as will be made abundantly clear - to the most perverse of desires, the above declaration of 'Allah' is in actuality a warning to not let desire interfere with proper obedience of Islamic commandments, rather than a genuine call to transcend desire. But before we discuss this core element of Islam, we must continue our examination of its frequent utilization of historic tales of disbelievers, with Gabriel in another example describing to Mohammed the story of the Prophet Solomon's - the heir to David - encounter with the Sheba, where we find a rare conversion from which the Sheba are spared the Islamic hellfire:

And Solomon was David's heir, and he said: "O men! We have been taught the language of birds, and we have been given all things. Most surely this is manifest grace." And his hosts of the jinn and the men and the birds were gathered to him, and they were formed into groups. Till, when they reached the Valley of the Ants, an ant exclaimed: "O ants! Enter your dwellings lest Solomon and his armies crush you, unperceiving." So he smiled, wondering at her word, and said: "My Lord! Grant me that I should be grateful for Thy favour which Thou hast bestowed on me and on my parents, and that I should do good such as Thou art pleased with, and make me enter, by Thy mercy, into Thy servants, the good ones." And he reviewed the birds, then said: "How is it I see not the hoopoe or is it that he is of the absentees? I will most certainly punish him with a severe punishment, or kill him, or he shall bring to me a clear plea." And the hoopoe tarried not long, then said: "I comprehend that which you do not comprehend and I have brought to you a sure information from Sheba. Surely I found a woman ruling over them, and she has been given abundance and she has a mighty throne: I found her and her people adoring the sun instead of Allah, and the Satan has made their deeds fair-seeming to them and thus turned them from the way, so they do not go aright. That they do not make obeisance to Allah, Who brings forth what is hidden in the heavens and the earth and knows what you hide and what you make manifest: Allah, there is no god but He: He is the Lord of mighty power." Solomon said: "We will see whether you have told the truth or whether you are of the liars: Take this my letter and hand it over to them, then turn away from them and see what (answer) they return." **(The Queen of Sheba) said (when she received the letter): "O chieftains! Lo! there hath been thrown unto me a noble letter. Surely it is from Solomon, and surely it is in the name of Allah, the Beneficent, the Merciful; Saying: 'Exalt not yourselves against me and come to me in submission.'**" She said: "O chiefs! Give me advice respecting my

affair. I never decide an affair until you are in my presence.” They said: “We are possessors of strength and possessors of mighty prowess, and the command is yours, therefore see what you will command.” She said: “Surely the kings, when they enter a town, ruin it and make the noblest of its people to be low, and thus they (always) do. And surely I am going to send a present to them, and shall wait to see what (answer) do the messengers bring back.” So when he (the envoy) came to Solomon, the King said: “What! Will you help me with wealth? But what Allah has given me is better than what He has given you. Nay, you are exultant because of your present. Go back to them, so we will most certainly come to them with hosts which they shall have no power to oppose, and we will most certainly expel them therefrom in abasement, and they shall be in a state of ignominy.” He said: “O chiefs! Which of you can bring to me her throne before they come to me in submission?” One audacious among the jinn said: “I will bring it to you before you rise up from your place. And most surely I am strong (and) trusty for it.” One who had the knowledge of the Book said: “I will bring it to you in the twinkling of an eye.” Then when he saw it settled beside him, he said: “This is of the grace of my Lord that He may try me whether I am grateful or ungrateful; and whoever is grateful, he is grateful only for his own soul, and whoever is ungrateful, then surely my Lord is Self-sufficient, Honoured.” He said: “Alter her throne for her, we will see whether she follows the right way or is of those who do not go aright.” So when she came, it was said: “Is your throne like this?” She said: “It is as it were the same, and we were given the knowledge before it, and we were submissive (to Allah).” And what she worshipped besides Allah hindered her, surely she was of an unbelieving people. It was said to her: “Enter the palace; but when she saw it she deemed it to be a great expanse of water, and bared her legs.” He said: “Surely it is a palace made smooth with glass.” She said: “My Lord! surely I have been unjust to myself, and I submit with Solomon to Allah, the Lord of the worlds.” (Quran 27:16-44)

Notable in this passage is a reference to the *jinn* (or *djinn* or *genies*), supernatural figures as conceived by the ancient Arabs, whose presence was also incorporated into Islam and of whom Mohammed certainly believed in. Indeed Mohammed was to have contact with the jinn, a term whose etymology clues us into their origin, as the root word for it means “to hide” or “to conceal”. While this certainly establishes them as entities hidden from the corporeal vision, additional verses that we will eventually analyse note them to often be inimical – to the point where many are punished in hell - to the ‘angels’ along with Allah and his prophets, facts that identify them – along with their lower vital psychology – to be hostile entities of an inferior power to the Asuras. But Mohammed was primarily hostage to the Asura of Falsehood, from whom he was taught the message of prophets previous to him, including Jonah, whose people were – like the Sheba - spared the torment of disgrace due to their acceptance of Allah’s message: “If only there had been a community (of all those that were destroyed of old) that believed and profited by its belief as did the folk of Jonah! **When they believed We drew off from them the torment of disgrace in the life of the world and gave them comfort for a while.**” (Quran 10:98) Of course, it was rare that a historic town met with a happy resolution - the afterlife fate of the town of Baal, having rejected the Prophet Ilyas, was the minimum punishment:

And Ilyas was most surely of the messengers. When he said to his people: “Do you not guard (against evil)? What! Do you call upon Baal and forsake the best of the creators, Allah, your Lord and the Lord of your fathers of yore?” **But they called him a liar, therefore they shall most surely be brought up (for punishment).** But not the servants of Allah, the purified ones. And We perpetuated to him (praise) among the later generations. Peace be on Ilyas. (Quran 37:123-130)

But a more immediate penalty was delivered to the majority of towns previous to Mohammed's life, the ones rejecting their prophets who stood before them with the decreed commandments: “And when We

wish to destroy a town, We send Our commandment to the people of it who lead easy lives, but they transgress therein. Thus the word proves true against it, so We destroy it with utter destruction. And how many of the generations did We destroy after Noah! And your Lord is sufficient as Knowing and Seeing with regard to His servants' faults.” (Quran 17:16-17) Indeed was this the history referred to when Gabriel infrationally revealed to Mohammed that though all of the Prophets who had come before him were denied and mocked, yet in the end those same rejecters only found themselves ruined:

And how many a prophet have We sent among the ancients. And there came not to them a prophet but they mocked at him. Then We destroyed those who were stronger than these in prowess, and the case of the ancients has gone before. (Quran 43:06-08)

All in the name of “light” and “truth” was this historic Islamic destruction, these perversely glorified acts of hatred and cruelty, the alleged workings of a merciful ‘God’ and his angelic henchmen. Yet are these examples, put forth by the Asura of Falsehood to inform his slave – and make him fearful - of the ancient nature to Islam, in reality the inversion of wisdom and Divine justice. The infrational revelations – documenting, as they do, the destruction of those who simply refused to listen or change a belief in a deity who should transcend the very characteristic of belief, let alone the restriction of belief to one name – are also the mere beginning of our examination of the Asuric depravity that defines Islam, the sordid vessel through which the worst of the Vital world seeks to usurp the ultimate aspiration of the Divine Consciousness in the Multiplicity.

* * * *

There was an obvious psychological reason for Gabriel to incessantly (as one can see from the number of verses devoted) ‘reveal’ this supposed history, as it represented a highly effective means to strengthen the fear of both the perpetual hellfire and the earthly punishment (from Allah *and* his angels) in Mohammed and all subsequent Muslims, and also functioned as a form of perverse motivation - a type of historical impetus - to get Mohammed to do Gabriel's bidding. For to continuously ‘reveal’ the examples of past prophets could only encourage Mohammed's belief in the urgent necessity of his mission and his particular uniqueness as the “Seal” of the prophets. It was a method for Gabriel to infuse his vassal with courage even when the latter was weak politically, had few followers, and was dealing with indifference, amusement and scorn from the kuffar. But as fear is the well-tried stratagem of the Asura, nearly all of the verses describing the attempts of prior prophets contain within a warning, implicit or explicit, of the hellfire - the emphasis on the negative rather than a call to a positive aspiration. And if the verses previously noted certainly warn both the unbeliever and believer alike of the spectre of Judgement Day and the finality of the hellfire, additional infrational revelations offer more detail into the salacious nature of Islam's hell.

These are the communications that utterly cemented fear into the Prophet, and continue to do so with modern Muslims, for they leave unambiguous the horrific nature of hell. Beginning with the fire itself, more grotesque qualities were afforded to hell by the Asura of Falsehood. In it, unbelievers are described as the “fuel” of fire: “(As for) those who disbelieve, surely neither their wealth nor their children shall avail them in the least against Allah, and these it is who are the **fuel of the fire**. Like Pharaoh's folk and those who were before them, they disbelieved Our revelations and so Allah seized them for their sins. And Allah is severe in punishment. Say (O Muhammad) unto those who disbelieve: ‘Ye shall be overcome and gathered unto Hell, an evil resting-place.’ ” (Quran 3:10-12) If the gods of the unbelievers were real, the latter would not have to function in such a similarly revolting manner: “And it is binding on a town which We destroy that they shall not return. Until, when Gog and Magog

are let loose, and they hasten out of every mound, And the True Promise draweth nigh. Then behold them, staring wide (in terror), the eyes of those who disbelieve! (They say): ‘Alas for us! We (lived) in forgetfulness of this. Ah, but we were wrong-doers!’ Lo! ye (idolaters) and that which ye worship beside Allah are fuel of hell. Thereunto ye will come. If these had been gods they would not have come thither, but all will abide therein. Therein wailing is their portion, and therein they hear not.” (Quran 21:95-100) Unbelievers are debased to the level of stone, as both accelerate the perpetual chastisement: “And if you are in doubt as to that which We have revealed to Our servant, then produce a chapter like it and call on your witnesses besides Allah if you are truthful. But if you do (it) not and never shall you do (it), then **be on your guard against the fire of which men and stones are the fuel; it is prepared for the unbelievers.**” (Quran 2:23-24)

The fire itself is described as all-encompassing, on the faces and backs of the unbelievers: “Had those who disbelieve but known (of the time) when they shall not be able to ward off the fire from their faces nor from their backs, nor shall they be helped. Nay, it shall come on them all of a sudden and cause them to become confounded, so they shall not have the power to avert it, nor shall they have respite.” (Quran 21:39-40) Gabriel also gave it the description of a “double” fire, one that comes from above and below, the bed and the covering: “Who is then more unjust than he who forges a lie against Allah or rejects His communications? (As for) those, their portion of the Book shall reach them, until when Our messengers come to them causing them to die, they shall say: ‘Where is that which you used to call upon besides Allah?’ They would say: ‘They are gone away from us.’ And they shall bear witness against themselves that they were unbelievers. He will say: ‘Enter into fire among the nations that have passed away before you from among jinn and men.’ Whenever a nation shall enter, it shall curse its sister-people, until when they have all come up with one another into it, the last of them shall say with regard to the foremost of them: ‘Our Lord! These led us astray therefore give them a double chastisement of the fire.’ He will say: ‘Every one shall have double’, but you do not know. And the foremost of them will say to the last of them: ‘So you have no preference over us, therefore taste the chastisement for what you earned.’ Surely (as for) those who reject Our communications and turn away from them haughtily, the doors of heaven shall not be opened for them, nor shall they enter the garden until the camel pass through the eye of the needle; and thus do We reward the guilty. **They shall have a bed of hell-fire and from above them coverings (of it).** And thus do We reward the unjust.” (Quran 7:37-41)

In a similar portrayal, Gabriel infrarationally revealed the inferno as coming from above and beneath the feet: “Say: ‘Allah is sufficient as a witness between me and you; He knows what is in the heavens and the earth. And (as for) those who believe in the falsehood and disbelieve in Allah, these it is that are the losers.’ And they ask you to hasten on the chastisement. And had not a term been appointed, the chastisement would certainly have come to them. And most certainly it will come to them all of a sudden while they will not perceive. They ask you to hasten on the chastisement, and most surely hell encompasses the unbelievers; **On the day when the chastisement shall cover them from above them, and from beneath their feet;** and He shall say: ‘Taste what you did.’” (Quran 29:52-55) But it was not enough to simply describe it as an eternal punishment, or to reveal it as double and enveloping; further ingraining the fear, Gabriel proclaimed that if the blaze ever abated, more was to follow, the justified “retribution” for disbelief: “And whomsoever Allah guides, he is the follower of the right way, and whomsoever He causes to err, you shall not find for him guardians besides Him. And We will gather them together on the day of resurrection on their faces, blind and dumb and deaf - their abode is hell. **Whenever it begins to abate We will add to their burning. This is their retribution because they disbelieved in Our communications** and said, ‘What! When we shall have become bones and decayed particles, shall we then indeed be raised up into a new creation?’ Have they not seen that Allah Who created the heavens and the earth is Able to create the like of them, and hath appointed for them an end whereof there is no doubt? But the wrong-doers refuse aught save disbelief.” (Quran 17:97-99)

Of note in the previous verse is the Islamic theme of Allah's retribution, a revenge that has been historically threatened to mankind for the 'crime' of rejecting the message, with verses like the following describing it as potentially occurring *during* the lifetime: "The people of Noah and Ad, and Pharaoh, the lord of spikes, rejected (messengers) before them. And Samood and the people of Lut and the dwellers of the thicket; these were the parties. **There was none of them but called the messengers liars, so just was My retribution.** Nor do these await aught but a single cry, there being no delay in it." (Quran 38:12-15) Another passage similarly identifies Allah as the veritable "Lord of Retribution": "Is not Allah sufficient for His servant? And they seek to frighten you with those besides Him. And whomsoever Allah makes err, there is no guide for him. And whom Allah guides, there is none that can lead him astray: **is not Allah Mighty, the Lord of retribution?** And should you ask them, 'Who created the heavens and the earth?' They would most certainly say: 'Allah.' Say: 'Have you then considered that what you call upon besides Allah, would they, if Allah desire to afflict me with harm, be the removers of His harm, or (would they), if Allah desire to show me mercy, be the withholders of His mercy?' Say: 'Allah is sufficient for me; on Him do the reliant rely.' " (Quran 39:36-38) That Allah is so heavily associated with the lower vital emotions of wrath and revenge is another sign of the Asura of Falsehood's imprint, especially when this wrath is undertaken against *truths* such as myriad forms of belief, instead of against genuinely horrendous crimes such as the genocide of non-Muslims because of their mere disbelief.

But the Asura of Falsehood had quite specific reasons for repeatedly declaring Allah to be the Lord of Retribution, as evident in the following verse: "**Surely they who disbelieve in the communications of Allah shall have a severe chastisement; and Allah is Mighty, the Lord of retribution.**" (Quran 3:04) It is a verse that provides a succinct explanation for the Asura's decision, as it associates Allah's revenge with disbelief (of Allah and the Quran) *and* a "severe chastisement" that – and we have only partially discussed it – is of a most wicked quality. For as we already know, Gabriel first and foremost required that Mohammed, his instrument, live in a state of fear of which was then transmitted upon his followers. And what better way to make his instrument fearfully obedient than to warn him of a supernatural deity's violent *revenge* for 'disbelief', the same terror of a perpetual inferno additionally motivating the "warner" to – beyond fulfilling the commands told to him by Gabriel – go forth and preach the message to those around him, attempting to prevent *them* from meeting the severe fate earned by their *shirk*. Mohammed, in complete stupefaction and unthinking obedience to the Asura who possessed him, accepted the frightening infrarational revelations without any modification, including communications that reduced humanity to the level of coal for the furnace: "On the day when We say unto hell: 'Art thou filled?' And it saith: 'Can there be more to come?'" (Quran 50:30)

Along with this spiteful chastisement characterized by endless debutantes to the furnace, the kuffar are also to be humiliated on their way to that fire, brought into hell upon their very faces: "And the Messenger cried out: 'O my Lord! Surely my people have treated this Quran as a forsaken thing.' And thus have We made for every prophet an enemy from among the sinners and sufficient is your Lord as a Guide and a Helper. And those who disbelieve say: 'Why has not the Quran been revealed to him all at once?' Thus, that We may strengthen your heart by it and We have arranged it well in arranging. And they shall not bring to you any argument, but We have brought to you (one) with truth and best in significance. **(As for) those who shall be gathered upon their faces to hell**, they are in a worse plight and straying farther away from the path." (Quran 25:30-34) Mohammed confirmed this Islamic fact to one of his companions: "A man said, 'O Allah's Prophet! Will a Kafir (disbeliever) be gathered (driven prone) on his face?' The Prophet said, 'Is not He Who made him walk with his legs in this world, able to make him walk on his face on the Day of Resurrection?'" (Sahih Bukhari Volume 8, Book 76, Number 530) Naturally, as one might expect of those driven to hell on their very faces and then beset by the fire, the kafir is marked on the Day of Resurrection by his blackened face:

Say: "O my servants! Who have acted extravagantly against their own souls, do not despair of the mercy of Allah; surely Allah forgives the faults altogether, surely He is the Forgiving the Merciful. And return to your Lord time after time and submit to Him before there comes to you the punishment after which you shall not be helped. And follow the best that has been revealed to you from your Lord before there comes to you the punishment all of a sudden while you do not even perceive, Lest a soul should say: 'O woe to me! For what I fell short of my duty to Allah, and most surely I was of those who laughed to scorn.' Or it should say: 'Had Allah guided me, I would certainly have been of those who guard (against evil).' Or it should say when it sees the punishment: 'Were there only a returning for me, I should be of the doers of good.' Aye! My communications came to you, but you rejected them, and you were proud and you were one of the unbelievers." **And on the day of resurrection you shall see those who lied against Allah - their faces shall be blackened. Is there not in hell an abode for the haughty?** And Allah shall deliver those who guard (against evil) with their achievement; evil shall not touch them, nor shall they grieve. Allah is the Creator of every thing and He has charge over every thing. His are the treasures of the heavens and the earth. And (as for) those who disbelieve in the communications of Allah, these it is that are the losers. Say, O Mohammed: "What! Do you then bid me serve others than Allah, O ignorant men?" **And certainly, it has been revealed to you and to those before you: "Surely if you ascribe a partner to Allah, your work would certainly come to naught and you would certainly be of the losers."** Nay! But serve Allah alone and be of the thankful. And they have not honoured Allah with the honour that is due to Him. And the whole earth shall be in His grip on the day of resurrection and the heavens rolled up in His right hand. Glory be to Him, and may He be exalted above what they ascribe as partner (with Him). And the trumpet shall be blown, so all those that are in the heavens and all those that are in the earth shall swoon, except such as Allah please. Then it shall be blown again, then lo, they shall stand up awaiting. And the earth shall beam with the light of its Lord, and the Book shall be laid down, and the prophets and the witnesses shall be brought up, and judgement shall be given between them with justice, and they shall not be dealt with unjustly. And every soul shall be paid back fully what it has done, and He knows best what they do. And those who disbelieve shall be driven to hell in companies until, when they come to it, its doors shall be opened, and the keepers of it shall say to them: "Did not there come to you messengers from among you reciting to you the communications of your Lord and warning you of the meeting of this day of yours?" They shall say: "Yea! But the sentence of punishment is fulfilled against the unbelievers." It shall be said: "Enter the gates of hell to abide therein. So evil is the abode of the arrogant." (Quran 39:53-72)

As with slaves in a mostly bygone era of humanity, the 'angels' have equipped fetters by which to restrain the unbeliever: **"Surely We have prepared for the unbelievers chains and shackles and a burning fire."** (Quran 76:04) The kuffar will blame each other for their own failure to exclusively believe in Allah, attempting in vain to put on a brave face prior to the shackles and the pyre: "And We have not sent you (O Mohammed) but to all the men as a bearer of good news and as a warner, but most men do not know. And they say: 'When will this promise be (fulfilled) if you are truthful?' Say (O Mohammed): 'You have the appointment of a day from which you cannot hold back any while, nor can you bring it on.' And those who disbelieve say: 'By no means will we believe in this Quran, nor in that which is before it.' But couldst you see when the unjust shall be made to stand before their Lord, bandying words one with another! Those who were reckoned weak shall say to those who were proud: 'Had it not been for you we would certainly have been believers.' Those who were proud shall say to those who were deemed weak: 'Did we turn you away from the guidance after it had come to you? Nay, you (yourselves) were guilty.' And those who were deemed weak shall say to those who were proud. 'Nay, (it was) planning by night and day when you told us to disbelieve in Allah and to set up

equals with Him.’ And they shall conceal regret when they shall see the punishment. **And We will put shackles on the necks of those who disbelieved.** They shall not be requited but what they did.”

(Quran 34:28-33) The chains on their necks are but a marker of the severity of Allah's punishment to the heinous disbeliever: “And if you would wonder, then wondrous is their saying: ‘What! When we are dust, shall we then certainly be in a new creation?’ **These are they who disbelieve in their Lord, and these have chains on their necks, and they are the inmates of the fire - in it they shall abide.** And they ask you to hasten on the evil before the good, and indeed there have been exemplary punishments before them. And most surely your Lord is the Lord of forgiveness to people, notwithstanding their injustice. And most surely your Lord is severe in punishment.” (Quran 13:05-06) The bondage and the conflagration are all part of a dreadful promise of which Allah is the Guarantor:

So think not that Allah will fail to keep His promise to His messengers. Lo! Allah is Mighty, Able to Requite (the wrong). On the day when the earth will be changed to other than the earth, and the heavens (also will be changed) and they will come forth unto Allah, the One, the Almighty, **Thou wilt see the guilty on that day linked together in chains, Their raiment of pitch, and the Fire covering their faces, That Allah may repay each soul what it hath earned.** Lo! Allah is swift at reckoning. This is a clear message for mankind in order that they may be warned thereby, and that they may know that He is only One Allah, and that men of understanding may take heed. (Quran 14:47-52)

But the Soul is never ‘repaid’ in such a manner, because the Purusha's true status is that of a portion of *God*. Why would the Supreme seek to hold Himself in perpetual bondage, or set fire to His own face? And even if such an outcome were possible, another falsehood emerges – that of the Soul having the same sensations as humans. For if the purpose of these infrarational revelations by the Asura was to show Mohammed just how much pain and suffering the unbelievers would undergo in hell (and for the Prophet to consequently live in apprehension of doing anything that might lead *himself* into disbelief), the Purusha, as a Portion of Brahma, is absolutely beyond such a limited sense-consciousness – as pain and suffering are due to the partial rajasic awareness of man rather than the Consciousness of the Purusha. Indeed as we shall see, this utterly absurd idea of the Soul being punished was not the only falsehood that Gabriel attributed to It. Yet if such a perversion is even apparent to one who only intellectually understands the real nature of the Purusha, in the Prophet Mohammed, the Asura of Falsehood had an instrument without the ability to discern between the vital and spiritual, making him easily prey to the idea that the Soul was just an extension of the human's vital, susceptible to pain and humiliation. Thus Mohammed feared not only for himself, but also his apparently vulnerable Soul!

If Gabriel used the aforementioned explicit communications as the primary means to elicit this raw terror from Mohammed and ensuing generations of Muslims, he nevertheless at times communicated more implicit reminders. For instance, the disbelievers are not to “profit” on the Day of Judgement: “Say: ‘On the day of judgement the faith of those who (now) disbelieve will not profit them, nor will they be respited. Therefore turn away from them and wait, surely they too are waiting.’ ” (Quran 32:29-30) The kuffar will bear the burden of their “wrongs”, which they shall be “questioned” about on Judgement Day: “And those who disbelieve say to those who believe: ‘Follow our path and we will bear your wrongs.’ And never shall they be the bearers of any of their wrongs; most surely they are liars. And most certainly they shall carry their own burdens, and other burdens with their own burdens, and most certainly they shall be questioned on the resurrection day as to what they forged.” (Quran 29:12-13) The unbelievers are similarly to receive “tidings” of that they reject: “It may be that thou torments thyself (O Muhammad) because they believe not. If we will, We can send down on them from the sky a portent so that their necks would remain bowed before it. Never cometh there unto them a fresh reminder from the Beneficent One, but they turn away from it. Now they have denied (the Truth); but there will come unto them tidings of that whereat they used to scoff.” (Quran 26:03-06) Soon are

the scoffing Polytheists to “know” – an implied reference to the hellfire: “Therefore declare openly what you are bidden and turn aside from the Polytheists. Surely We will suffice you against the scoffers, Those who set up another god with Allah. So soon shall they know.” (Quran 15:94-96) At times Gabriel referred to disbelievers as losers, without mentioning the hellfire that accompanies this pejorative in countless other verses: “Those unto whom We have given the Scripture, who read it with the right reading, those believe in it. And whoso disbelieveth in it, those are they who are the losers.” (Quran 2:121) In different communications the Asura implores the believers to not die as non-Muslims, infrarationally revealing on one occasion, “O you who believe! Be careful of (your duty to) Allah with the care which is due to Him, and do not die unless you are Muslims.” (Quran 3:102) In a similar declaration, Gabriel noted that the kuffar will wish they had been Muslims – naturally, for that would have been protection from the doom: “Often will those who disbelieve wish that they had been Muslims. Leave them that they may eat and enjoy themselves and (that) hope may beguile them, for they will soon know. And never did We destroy a town but it had a term made known. No people can hasten on their doom nor can they postpone (it).” (Quran 15:02-05)

The hellfire, colourfully depicted in the majority of Quran verses offering details of it, subdued in a minority of the Asura's communications related to the afterlife, is the eternal punishment for disbelief, the potential unstated fate (in the latter minority of verses) that the believer is to “guard” himself against: “O people! Guard against (the punishment of) your Lord and **dread the day** when a father shall not be able to avail for his son, nor shall the child be able to avail for his father; surely the promise of Allah is true, therefore let not this world's life deceive you, nor let the archdeceiver deceive you in respect of Allah. Surely Allah is He with Whom is the knowledge of the hour, and He sends down the rain and He knows what is in the wombs; and no one knows what he shall earn on the morrow; and no one knows in what land he shall die; surely Allah is Knowing, Aware.” (Quran 31:33-34) In another verse, Gabriel infrarationally reveals that failure to guard against ‘crimes’ justifying Allah's chastisement (especially the primary cause of it, *shirk*) leads directly to the hellfire: “And when it is said to him, ‘Guard against (the punishment of) Allah,’ pride carries him off to sin, therefore hell is sufficient for him. And certainly it is an evil resting place.” (Quran 2:206) This constant stress on the need for vigilance with regards to Allah and his wrath engenders fear in the Muslim to make sure he does not end up in the flame alongside the Infidel: “**And guard yourselves against the fire which has been prepared for the unbelievers.**” (Quran 3:131)

Though the above verses hint at the psychological aspect of pride (the believer wanting to feel superior to the devious unbeliever), Gabriel's primary motive with such infrarational revelations was to use the manufactured ‘other’ as an accessible – and thereby more effective mechanism to invoke terror, rather than just describing hell as a perpetual fire, because non-Muslims are people almost entirely similar to the believer - example of the fate the believer should fear. Thus the Muslim must guard against this punishment by first believing in Allah's exclusivity and then living according to the deeds considered “good” by the Islamic religion. Or else they will be scattered moths in a never-ending flame: “The terrible calamity! What is the terrible calamity? And what will make you comprehend what the terrible calamity is? The day on which men shall be as scattered moths, And the mountains shall be as loosened wool. Then as for him whose measure of good deeds is heavy, He shall live a pleasant life. And as for him whose measure of good deeds is light, His abode shall be the abyss. And what will make you know what it is? A burning fire.” (Quran 101:01-11) Yet if the kafir is to be reduced to such a state, so will the believer – or at least those who consider themselves Muslim – potentially be brought low on Judgement Day: “And on the day when the trumpet shall be blown, then those who are in the heavens and those who are in the earth shall be terrified except such as Allah please, and all shall come to him abased.” (Quran 27:87)

On some occasions, it is the particular choice of words that Gabriel used, even without accompanying

details on the comeuppance awaiting, that nevertheless engenders the fear the Asura of Falsehood needs to subjugate mortals. Indeed, sometimes the solitary word or verse, considered without the more descriptive passages, is enough to evoke the imagination and panic. Thus when Gabriel communicated, "Whoever brings good, he shall have better than it; and they shall be secure from **terror** on the day", (Quran 27:89) he knew that the imagination of Man is likely to graphically envision a cataclysmic scene. Of course, cognizant as he is of mankind's fickle nature, it predisposed him to make sure, in a different infrarational revelation, that the use of the word terror was firmly associated with the severity of the punishment: "**We shall cast terror into the hearts of those who disbelieve because they ascribe unto Allah partners, for which no warrant hath been revealed. Their habitation is the Fire**, and hapless the abode of the wrong-doers." (Quran 3:151) Along with such couplings, Gabriel directly informed Mohammed of the need to practice repetition, as often seen in his communications of Islam's primary themes - all part of the Asura's relentless efforts to enslave humanity:

Say: "**He has the power that He should send on you a chastisement from above you or from beneath your feet**, or that He should throw you into confusion, (making you) of different parties - and make some of you taste the fighting of others." **See how We repeat the communications that they may understand.** (Quran 6:65)

The understanding, as we are well aware by now, is that humanity must fear Allah and his terror from all angles, in life and after death. Just as he would over a thousand years later in Nazi Germany, the Asura of Falsehood kept his message simple and repetitive, making it appealing to the lower vital, to the base instincts of which fear is native, to the subrational side that exists in the vast majority of an at best partially refined humanity. Such is this crude element of human nature that many mortals presume that if something is repeated often enough, expressed in fantastic or imposing means, that it must be the truth: Or, if initially they ignore or resist attempts at conjuring the depravities of the Vital world, the insufficient psychological strength of the mortal's constitution eventually results in a slackened resistance, and the law of the brute reasserts itself after a constant repetition. This was the method followed in a very different era and nation by Goebbels and Hitler to seduce the Germans, and it was under the weight of this tactic that Mohammed submitted before what he thought to be an emissary of God.

But just as the Sun retains its incandescence when obscured from sight by a menacing storm, so does Truth remain when hidden under the assault of repeated lies. For falsehood is falsehood irrespective of how often it is said to be truth, and the idea of God as an eternal punisher that seeks to promote terror in his permanently separated slaves, is one that can only gather a foothold in man by an incessant promotion. Accordingly, Gabriel repeatedly reminded his messenger and followers of the need to fear Allah, on one occasion communicating, "O mankind! Fear your Lord. Lo! the earthquake of the Hour (of Doom) is a tremendous thing." (Quran 22:01) In another verse, the Day, the Hour and the Fire, were simply referred to as a "threat" that Allah is sure to fulfil: "And most certainly We will settle you in the land after them. This is for him who fears standing in My presence and **who fears My threat.**" (Quran 14:14) It is only destruction that the unbelievers are secretly drawn closer toward: "And (as to) those who reject Our communications, We draw them near (to destruction) by degrees from whence they know not." (Quran 7:18) This was the "threat" that had arrived to all the previous generations of deniers, guilty of the 'crime' of disbelief: "(Others) before them rejected (prophets), as the people of Noah and the dwellers of Ar-Rass and Samood, And Ad and Pharaoh and Lut's brethren, And the dwellers of the grove and the people of Tuba. **All rejected the messengers, so My threat came to pass.**" (Quran 50:12-14) The similarly destructive threat of Judgement Day is one that Gabriel described as bringing great distress, with the obvious implication that it is to be feared: "Therefore woe to those who disbelieve because of their Day which they are threatened with." (Quran 51:60) This Day and its overseer are to fill one with apprehension, because Allah's chastisement is so severe that even

Satan fears it!

And when the Satan made their works fair seeming to them, and said: “No one can overcome you this day, and surely I am your protector.” But when the two parties came in sight of each other he turned upon his heels, and said: “Surely I am clear of you, surely I see what you do not see, surely I fear Allah; and Allah is severe in punishment.” (Quran 8:48)

If the evil Satan is intimidated by Allah, then naturally the ordinary Muslim should be as well. Fear and intimidation – concerning, at least in this stage of our discussion, the afterlife and natural disasters – were to be the twin pillars of the religion Gabriel began formulating in the cave of Hira, crucial to the falsehood he sought to establish. He even specified that fear, a primitive psychological principle deficient in comparison to qualities such as the love of God, is the foundation for a good Muslim, the way to secure the believer from the horrific fire below:

Is he, therefore, **better who lays his foundation on fear of Allah** and (His) good pleasure, or he who lays his foundation on the edge of a cracking hollowed bank, so it broke down with him into the fire of hell. And Allah does not guide the unjust people. (Quran 9:109)

This is the alleged truth that Islam seeks to bring to the unbelievers, a mandatory requirement to construct one's life and beliefs on a fear of a divinity who apparently is waiting for any opportunity – beginning with *shirk* – to unleash terror on the hapless mortal. This is the falsehood the Asura inverted from Truth, the communique sent to countless generations before and after Mohammed. Indeed during those early times - and in the time of the Prophet - Gabriel frankly admitted that much of what his fellow ‘angels’ and he did or said was *specifically* designed to make men fear:

Say: “Cry unto those whom ye assume (to be gods) beside Him. Yet they have no power to rid you of misfortune nor to change.” Those whom they call upon, themselves seek the means of access to their Lord - whoever of them is nearest - and they hope for His mercy and fear His chastisement. Surely the chastisement of your Lord is a thing to be cautious of. And there is not a town but We will destroy it before the day of resurrection or chastise it with a severe chastisement. This is written in the Divine ordinance. And nothing could have hindered Us that We should send signs, except that the ancients rejected them. And We gave to Samood the she-camel - a manifest sign - but on her account they did injustice, and **We do not send signs but to make (men) fear**. And when We said to you that surely your Lord encompasses men; and We did not make the vision which We showed you but a trial for men and the cursed tree in the Quran as well; **and We cause them to fear**, but it only adds to their great inordinacy. (Quran 17:56-60)

Such was the command the Lord of Falsehood held over his unthinking medium Mohammed, that the contradiction of false or unreal gods seeking access to, and fearing, Allah, was not called into question. Of course, as the Asura deliberately intends, from his own words, to make men live in terror of Allah, this root emotion overrides all rational or analytical recognition of inconsistencies. Nevertheless, while Gabriel gave conflicting accounts of the existential basis of other deities, yet was he resolute in underscoring the exclusivity of Allah, the eternal fire handed out to unbelievers, and the need for the believer to fear the wrath of Allah for transgressions. In addition, he consistently demanded the believer to “obey” their Lord or else face punishment, as he infrarationally revealed to Mohammed: “Say: Surely I fear, if I disobey my Lord, the chastisement of a grievous day.” (Quran 6:15) The definition of disobedience as stated in that verse can be interpreted as more than just unbelief; but as one would expect, it is usually linked to the sin of *shirk*:

Say O Mohammed: “I am commanded that I should serve Allah, being sincere to Him in obedience, And I am commanded that I shall be the first of those who submit.” Say: “I fear, if I disobey my Lord, the chastisement of a grievous day.” Say: “Allah (it is Whom) I serve, being

sincere to Him in my obedience. Serve then what you like besides Him.” Say: “The losers surely are those who shall have lost themselves and their families on the day of resurrection; now surely that is the clear loss.” **They shall have coverings of fire above them and coverings beneath them. With that Allah makes His servants to fear, so be careful of (your duty to) Me, O My servants! And (as for) those who keep off from the worship of the idols and turn to Allah, they shall have good news,** therefore give good news to My servants, Those who listen to the word, then follow the best of it. Those are they whom Allah has guided, and those it is who are the men of understanding. What! As for him then against whom the sentence of chastisement is due: What! Can you save him who is in the fire? But (as for) those who are careful of (their duty to) their Lord, they shall have high places, above them higher places, built (for them), beneath which flow rivers. (This is) the promise of Allah: Allah will not fail in (His) promise. (Quran 39:11-20)

Unequivocal to all of these infrarational revelations is the association of Allah's hellfire with the means of making his mortal slaves fear him. Over and over again was this conveyed to Mohammed, the simple Bedouin who chanced upon, while transfixed in a solitary cave, the sham ruler of a partially evolved world. One could hardly have expected him to stand a chance against the most powerful of non-Divine emanations, and thus did Mohammed completely and unquestioningly absorb the message he concurrently was tasked with spreading, one that involved spending his life in fear of the unknown afterlife. But this was a message more likely to have been imparted upon Mohammed than the ordinary man, because of both his occult opening and the similarly shared unrefined discernment. Thus his occult visions of hell, whether through contact with Gabriel or in the dream state, secured in his very cells the terror Gabriel desired, because Mohammed did not have the psychology to rise above the fear. One hadith in particular illustrates this pattern:

The Prophet got up from his sleep with a flushed red face and said, “None has the right to be worshipped but Allah. Woe to the Arabs, from the Great evil that is nearly approaching them. Today a gap has been made in the wall of Gog and Magog like this.” (Sufyan illustrated by this forming the number 90 or 100 with his fingers.) It was asked, “Shall we be destroyed though there are righteous people among us?” The Prophet said, “Yes, if evil increased.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 88, Number 181)

Such was the vividness of the dream that it was likely one of the Vital world Mohammed witnessed, a plane of consciousness where things are not necessarily of the purest quality, and are not always what they seem – thus what one might witness to be hell *may* not in fact be a real occult transpiration: Instead, it can easily be a formation brought about by an occult being that is more than capable of creating such fantastic scenes, though – as we will discuss later – because the Asuras and other hostile entities reside in such regions of the Vital, they can certainly provide a – subliminal - tour of its darker locales. Nevertheless, they can also distort or at least mischievously interpret these experiences, especially when we consider that the Asura of Falsehood is able to put forth the appearance of light that is hardly what its lustre indicates – only the Psychic discrimination can intuit the falsehood of the deceptive presentation. But this crucial discernment was nonexistent in the Messenger – fear was the quality that ruled Mohammed, the apparatus of captivity used by the Asura to drive his slave forward. Such was the effectiveness of this psychological ploy that Mohammed was noted by his child-wife Aisha to repeatedly pray to Allah for protection from the “Divine” fire, along with other afflictions:

Narrated Aisha:

The Prophet used to seek refuge with Allah (by saying), **“O Allah! I seek refuge with You from the affliction of the Fire and from the punishment in the Fire,** and seek refuge with You from the affliction of the grave, and I seek refuge with You from the affliction of wealth, and I seek refuge with You from the affliction of poverty, and seek refuge with You from the

affliction of Al-Masih Ad-Dajjal.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 8, Book 75, Number 387)

The same apprehension that impelled this particular prayer of his, likewise led him to pray extensively when the suggestion came to him that the Hour was at hand:

The sun eclipsed and **the Prophet got up, being afraid that it might be the Hour** (i.e. Day of Judgement). He went to the Mosque and offered the prayer with the longest Qiyam, bowing and prostrating more than I had ever seen him doing. Then he said, **“These signs which Allah sends do not occur because of the life or death of somebody, but Allah makes His worshippers afraid by them.** So when you see anything thereof, proceed to remember Allah, invoke Him and ask for His forgiveness.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 2, Book 18, Number 167)

The constant repetition of the signs portending to an irrepressible chastisement, of the need to tremble before this alleged future, inevitably leads to a Muslim obsession with avoiding such a fate, resulting in compulsive prayer and other mandated ritualistic behaviours, all in the hope of quelling the pathological rage of Allah. But the most fervent of prayer can never eliminate a trepidation that Allah declared to cease only *after* the Day of Judgement. Nor can a truly practising Muslim, bombarded as he is with the commandment to fear the sole supposed deity's wrath, found his life upon any other emotion, especially when a Muslim considers that the Prophet himself was unable, as communicated by Gabriel, to obtain Allah's forgiveness for *his* unbelieving relatives: “Surely you cannot guide whom you love, but Allah guides whom He pleases, and He knows best the followers of the right way.” (Quran 28:56) The context of this verse, related to Mohammed's visit to his dying uncle, a kafir, is presented in the following hadith:

When Abu Talib was in his death bed, the Prophet went to him while Abu Jahl was sitting beside him. The Prophet said, “O my uncle! Say: None has the right to be worshipped except Allah, an expression I will defend your case with, before Allah.” Abu Jahl and Abdullah bin Umayya said, “O Abu Talib! Will you leave the religion of Abdul Muttalib?” So they kept on saying this to him so that the last statement he said to them (before he died) was: “I am on the religion of Abdul Muttalib.” Then the Prophet said, “I will keep on asking for Allah's Forgiveness for you unless I am forbidden to do so.” Then the following Verse was revealed:

“It is not fitting for the Prophet and the believers to ask Allah's Forgiveness for the Pagans, even if they were their near relatives, after it has become clear to them that they are the dwellers of the (Hell) Fire.” (9.113)

The other Verse was also revealed: “(O Prophet!) Verily, you guide not whom you like, but Allah guides whom He will...” (28.56) (Sahih Bukhari Volume 5, Book 58, Number 223)

Another hadith explains in further detail the conversation between the two leading to the infrarational revelation of Quran verse 9:113:

Narrated Said bin Al-Musaiyab from his father:

When the time of the death of Abu Talib approached, Allah's Apostle went to him and found Abu Jahl bin Hisham and Abdullah bin Abi Umaiya bin Al-Mughira by his side. Allah's Apostle said to Abu Talib, “O uncle! Say: None has the right to be worshipped but Allah, a sentence with which I shall be a witness (i.e. argue) for you before Allah.” Abu Jahl and Abdullah bin Abi Umaiya said, “O Abu Talib! Are you going to denounce the religion of Abdul Muttalib?” Allah's Apostle kept on inviting Abu Talib to say it (i.e. ‘None has the right to be worshipped but Allah’) while they (Abu Jahl and Abdullah) kept on repeating their statement till Abu Talib said as his last statement that he was on the religion of Abdul Muttalib and refused to say, ‘None has the right to be worshipped but Allah.’ **Then Allah's Apostle said, “I will keep on asking Allah's forgiveness for you unless I am forbidden (by Allah) to do so.”** So Allah

revealed (the verse) concerning him (i.e. It is not fitting for the Prophet and those who believe that they should invoke (Allah) for forgiveness for pagans even though they be of kin, after it has become clear to them that they are companions of the fire (9.113)). (Sahih Bukhari Volume 2, Book 23, Number 442)

This meeting of kith provides further compelling evidence to the nature of the relationship between Gabriel and Mohammed – that of Possessor and Possessed. Mohammed the mortal clearly had a few flickers of his Psychic Being, otherwise he would not have been desperate to try and ‘save’ his Uncle, and would not have even planned on continuing to pray for him prior to receiving the two infrarational revelations ordering him differently. But as the mentality of the Asura is harsh, unforgiving, remorseless and cruel, and as Mohammed was the relayer rather than the revealer, he obeyed what he thought to be Divine commands, what he believed – because he had no discernment – superior to his genuinely Psychic sparks. Thus the Quran in its entirety, and the Hadith for the most part, can be considered the inevitable result of Mohammed ceding authority from his own Psychic, the extension of the Soul, to an Asura of Falsehood desiring his slaves to tremble in terror, a surrender not to God but to an entity who despises all of humanity – precisely the inversion of the Supreme who loves His creation and seeks humanity to be fearless, illimitable manifestations of the Immortal Portion of Himself that resides deep within them.

* * * *

While fear is the primary mental state the Asura wants his subjects to experience, he is not foolish enough to imagine that he can override hope, itself a fundamental part of existence. Subsequently, we find numerous times, including the following, when Gabriel announced to Mohammed the possibility of mortals arriving at a mindset free of foreboding: “And We send not messengers but as announcers of good news and givers of warning, **then whoever believes and acts aright, they shall have no fear, nor shall they grieve.** And (as for) those who reject Our communications, chastisement shall afflict them because they transgressed.” (Quran 6:48-49) If this may appear to contradict other verses, it actually represents the perfect way to strengthen the bonds of fear, a means by which the Asura of Falsehood utilizes a positive vital tendency for his pernicious objectives. For the narrative of Islam channels hope into the promise of heaven, the attainment of which invariably includes the fear of Allah and his wrath. It is a dichotomy that establishes the Islamic formulation of Heaven and Hell as a reward and punishment mechanism, the carrot and the stick, to induce the Muslim to rigidly adhere to Quran and Hadith dictates that include more than the principle tenets discussed so far. In numerous communications, Gabriel laid bare the carrot for belief, and the stick – or “reward” to the kuffar in the following verses - for disbelief side by side:

Is He then Who watches every soul as to what it earns? Yet they ascribe unto Allah partners. Say: “Name them. Is it that ye would inform Him of something which He knoweth not in the earth? Or is it but a way of speaking?” Nay but their contrivance is made to seem fair for those who disbelieve, and they are kept from the right road. He whom Allah sendeth astray, for him there is no guide. For them is torment in the life of the world, and verily the doom of the Hereafter is more painful, and they have no defender from Allah. **A similitude of the Garden which is promised unto those who keep their duty (to Allah): Underneath it rivers flow, its food is everlasting, and its shade. This is the reward of those who keep their duty, while the reward of disbelievers is the Fire.** (Quran 13:33-35)

In another verse, the competing outcomes are assigned their traditional descriptions: “(As for) those

who disbelieve, they shall have a severe punishment, and (as for) those who believe and do good, they shall have forgiveness and a great reward.” (Quran 35:07) This is the judgement Allah makes between the two parties: “And those who disbelieve shall not cease to be in doubt concerning it until the Hour overtakes them suddenly, or there comes on them the chastisement of a destructive day. The kingdom on that day shall be Allah's, He will judge between them. So those who believe and do good will be in gardens of bliss. And (as for) those who disbelieve in and reject Our communications, these it is who shall have a disgraceful chastisement.” (Quran 22:55-57) The Hour in question is the proverbial fork in the road – one side to the garden, the other leading to doom: “And at the time when the hour shall come the guilty shall be in despair. And they shall not have any intercessors from among their gods they have joined with Allah, and they shall be deniers of their associate-gods. And they will reject their partners (whom they ascribed unto Him). And at the time when the hour shall come, at that time they shall become separated one from the other. Then as to those who believed and did good, they shall be made happy in a garden. And as to those who disbelieved and rejected Our communications and the meeting of the hereafter, these shall be brought over to the chastisement.” (Quran 30:12-16) This is the justified punishment for those turning their back on Allah's final communications, whereas the “good” believers arrive in a deserved garden of “bliss”:

And of men is he who takes instead frivolous discourse to lead astray from Allah's path without knowledge, and to take it for a mockery; these shall have an abasing chastisement. And when Our communications are recited to him, he turns back proudly, as if he had not heard them, as though in his ears were a heaviness, therefore announce to him a painful chastisement. (As for) those who believe and do good, they shall surely have gardens of bliss, Abiding in them, the promise of Allah. (A) true (promise), and He is the Mighty, the Wise. (Quran 31:06-09)

But this garden of “bliss” is not the Satchitananda of the Yogin, the Conscious and Blissful (Ananda) Unity with God. It is instead, as we will later unquestionably observe, a continued separation of consciousness, a concentrated experience of the *vital* joys of life which, while lower representatives of a Divine bliss, are fundamentally incomparable to the Ananda. As the Muslim remains divided in consciousness from Allah in the Islamic heaven (a separation also seen in the Classical and Hindu experiences of Heaven or Svarga), the Asura of Falsehood has no problem using it as the carrot in his reward and punishment dichotomous yoke, because it actually strengthens the parcelling of consciousness that is the root of his very existence. His emphasis, of course, is on the punishment, the negative rather than the positive aspiration, with the ascent to heaven practically a relief rather than a reward. One gathers as much when reading Quran verses such as the following:

Those who disbelieved from among the followers of the Book and the polytheists could not have separated (from the faithful) until there had come to them the clear evidence. A messenger from Allah, reciting pure pages, Wherein are all the right ordinances. And those who were given the Book did not become divided except after clear evidence had come to them. And they were not enjoined anything except that they should serve Allah, being sincere to Him in obedience, upright, and keep up prayer and pay the poor-rate, and that is the right religion. **Surely those who disbelieve from among the followers of the Book and the polytheists shall be in the fire of hell, abiding therein; they are the worst of men.** (As for) those who believe and do good, surely they are the best of men. Their reward with their Lord is gardens of perpetuity beneath which rivers flow, abiding therein for ever. Allah is well pleased with them and they are well pleased with Him. **That is (in store) for him who fears his Lord.** (Quran 98:01-08)

Absolute indeed is the link between the reward of Paradise and fearing Allah, for those terrified of standing in his presence on a Judgement day that determines if the believer reaches the vaunted garden: “And as for him who fears to stand in the presence of his Lord and forbids the soul from low desires, Then surely the garden - that is the abode.” (Quran 79:40-41) So crucial is fear to Islam that Gabriel

explicitly mentioned its disappearance, with heaven an afterthought, as the great dividend for adhering to the religion's commands that includes a rejection of *shirk*: “**Surely those who say, Our Lord is Allah, then they continue on the right way, they shall have no fear nor shall they grieve.** These are the dwellers of the garden, abiding therein: a reward for what they did.” (Quran 46:13-14) The servants of Allah are to be *relieved* of fear on Judgement Day, subsequently entering gardens full of happiness:

And when Jesus came with clear arguments he said: “I have come to you indeed with wisdom, and that I may make clear to you part of what you differ in: so be careful of (your duty to) Allah and obey me. Surely Allah is my Lord and your Lord, therefore serve Him: this is the right path.” But parties from among them differed, so woe to those who were unjust because of the chastisement of a painful day. Do they wait for aught but the hour, that it should come upon them all of a sudden while they do not perceive? The friends shall on that day be enemies one to another, except those who guard (against evil). **O My servants! There is no fear for you this day, nor shall you grieve.** Those who believed in Our communications and were submissive. Enter the garden, you and your wives; you shall be made happy. (Quran 43:63-70)

Indeed, when considering the centrality of fear to Islam, it becomes apparent that heaven and hell are of secondary importance to the Asura of Falsehood's entangling rope, with the real reward identified as the *absence of fear*, the escape into Paradise from the grasp of terror. Similarly, the psychological punishment is more appropriately understood as an imprisonment in perpetual fear, with the constantly reviving fire simply the object causing the panic. Befitting the dichotomous, binary constructed Abrahamic religions that predated Islam's arrival, humanity is ensconced in simply defined categories of thought, emotion and belief characterizing a rudimentary aspect of Nature; from here, mortals are assigned only two potential fates, and are commanded to fit themselves to the external guidelines of a holy book rather than their own internal law - the former *adharma* is the supposed means to obtain a ‘progress’ (into Paradise) only defined by an aggrandizement of ordinary pleasures; all of these features are representative of the severe limitation of the linear religions, a two-dimensional narrative on a far more complex world.

In Islam, this account of competing outcomes is able to support the infrarational revelation, previously noted, of Allah functioning as both merciful and terrifying – the reward his mercy, the spectre of his chastisement the source of grave apprehension. However, while the results of both belief and its absence are repetitively and clearly outlined, the scripture makes apparent that – somewhat contrary to Mohammed's recorded assertion in multiple authentic hadith – *more* than just belief in the exclusivity of Allah is required to feel *fairly* assured (complete confidence is impossible, as we shall unequivocally discover) of Allah's mercy from the hellfire. In one example of this, gratefulness is also included as necessary along with belief to avoid the scalding fire, because as the Asura of Falsehood informed his slave, “Why should Allah chastise you if you are grateful and believe? And Allah is the Multiplier of rewards, Knowing.” (Quran 4:147) If this can be interpreted as gratitude for Allah's mercy from ‘Divine’ retribution, the following verse clearly mandates – to receive Allah’s mercy - “good” actions along with a simple belief in Allah alone:

You will see the unjust fearing on account of what they have earned, and it must befall them. And those who believe **and do good** shall be in the meadows of the gardens; they shall have what they please with their Lord. That is the great grace. (Quran 42:22)

Another Quran passage does not specifically mention belief (instead, it reminds to avoid a departure from the covenant), informing that the believer will enter the gardens with their dear ones who also do “good” in the life:

Those who fulfil the promise of Allah and do not break the covenant, And those who join that which Allah has bidden to be joined and have awe of their Lord and fear the evil reckoning.

And those who are constant, seeking the pleasure of their Lord, and keep up prayer and spend (benevolently) out of what We have given them secretly and openly and repel evil with good; as for those, they shall have the (happy) issue of the abode - The gardens of perpetual abode which they will enter along with those who do good from among their parents and their spouses and their offspring. (Quran 13:20-23)

Performing good deeds, in Islam, is composed of a variety of actions deemed appropriate by the Asura of Falsehood – consequently, as we shall unquestionably find, “good” becomes inverted and the depraved becomes luminous. But before we discuss “good” Islamic deeds, we must examine the accompanying descriptions of such acts, in which we find the parasitic commandment to *fear* the ramifications of not being “good”. Hence the demand to abstain from “illegal” sexual intercourse – as we will eventually discuss, Islam has distorted ideas about sexual activity - has with it the consort of fright of Allah:

Narrated Abu Huraira:

The Prophet said, “Seven people will be shaded by Allah under His shade on the day when there will be no shade except His. They are: (1) a just ruler; (2) a young man who has been brought up in the worship of Allah, (i.e. worship Allah (Alone) sincerely from his childhood), (3) a man whose heart is attached to the mosque (who offers the five compulsory congregational prayers in the mosque); (4) two persons who love each other only for Allah's sake and they meet and part in Allah's cause only; (5) a man who refuses the call of a charming woman of noble birth for an illegal sexual intercourse with her and says: **I am afraid of Allah**; (6) a person who practices charity so secretly that his left hand does not know what his right hand has given (i.e. nobody knows how much he has given in charity). (7) a person who remembers Allah in seclusion and his eyes get flooded with tears.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 2, Book 24, Number 504)

Fear of Allah is also linked to the Islamic tenet of praying while facing the Sacred Mosque in Mecca, as we find in the following verse, one that also reminds Muslims not to fear others, because it is only Allah's wrath that should worry them:

And from whatsoever place you come forth, turn your face towards the Sacred Mosque; and wherever you are turn your faces towards it, so that people shall have no accusation against you, except such of them as are unjust; so do not fear them, and fear Me; that I may complete My favour on you and that you may walk on the right course. (Quran 2:150)

Even minor activities, including the need for provisions on a journey, should, as infrarationally revealed in Quran verse 2:197, involve a foreboding of the one true god's punishment – far important is this quality of Allah's to his grace or blessings:

Narrated Ibn Abbas:

The people of Yemen used to come for Hajj and used not to bring enough provisions with them and used to say that they depend on Allah. On their arrival in Medina they used to beg the people, and so Allah revealed, “**And take a provision (with you) for the journey, but the best provision is the fear of Allah.**” (Quran 2.197) (Sahih Bukhari Volume 2, Book 26, Number 598)

As it was deemed worthy of an infrarational revelation, the requirement of fear in rudimentary activities such as taking provisions, when combined with the incessant vigilance towards Allah's wrath, can be considered part of a “good” Muslim's responsibility to his Creator. The believer, of course, must be careful of this duty – otherwise he faces a dire repercussion:

Allah has prepared for them severe chastisement, therefore be careful of (your duty to) Allah, O men of understanding who believe! Allah has indeed revealed to you a reminder. (Quran 65:10)

The demand of a Muslim to be “good” in the life, to live in fear of Allah's punishment for matters going beyond belief in his exclusivity, stands in opposition to Mohammed's hadith-attributed contention (from his interaction with Gabriel) that belief in Allah alone is enough to enter Paradise. The Quran, however, does not contain an unequivocal injunction allowing the believer this escape route from any ‘bad’ deeds. In fact, as already shown repeatedly, it does quite the contrary; and as the Quran, Allah's ‘Word’, supersedes any hadith, we must consider Mohammed's declaration in the context of how frequently Gabriel communicated “Allah's” hatred of *shirk* to his receptacle. Unsurprisingly, it led Mohammed to view Polytheism as the main sin to avoid, resulting in his conclusion that belief in Allah alone was enough to lead one into heaven, even if other sins were committed. However, if this discrepancy is explained by Mohammed's understandable reaction to an unceasing exposure to dictates concerning *shirk*, there is a more pertinent reason why Gabriel failed to ‘reveal’ such a circumvention of other Quran commandments: Namely, the Asura's need for mortals to live in terror, a base psychological perversion from which all the others may arise to yield an entangled web restricting the growth of consciousness. Thus if Gabriel were to have actually revealed (as a message said to have come from “Allah” instead of under his own name) the exclusive belief in Allah as capable of superseding *all* other misdeeds, the fear needed to prolong the Asuric rule would have found a release through that one solitary belief. But the Asura of Falsehood prefers humanity to live in constant terror, and while the fear of disbelief and the resultant hellfire are his primary means of achieving this, the call for Muslims to practice “good” deeds – or else face the same hellfire - is also a deviously ingenious method of control.

For if *shirk* and the punishment for it are explicitly defined, the practice of being a “good” Muslim is not, by the infrarational Quran revelations at least. Certain indicators are provided, but there are no verses specifying the entire criteria for what constitutes a good or bad believer. Vacuums like this are meant to be filled by the authentic hadith, in which Mohammed is recorded as listing to his companions both good and bad traits. Nevertheless, the Asura did not *reveal* an extensive list, preferring to keep the concept of “good” somewhat amorphous, allowing doubt to creep into even the most fanatical of the faithful. Mohammed's declaration to his companions that the avoidance of *shirk* is enough to attain heaven thus only reinforces *shirk's* primacy to the religion, with the Quran's – ‘revealed’ by Allah, thus superior to all hadith - call for Muslims to be “good” a never-ending means for the Asura of Falsehood to promote a grave uneasiness that can only be removed on Judgement Day. Until then, fear at the very least will remain subconscious to the Muslim's thought and action, lurking in the shadow as he tries to live the life of “good” deeds demanded by his Creator. And as he should, because Allah has declared the “wrong-doer” to be far from the only recipient of the hellfire:

And guard yourselves against a chastisement **which cannot fall exclusively on those of you who are wrong-doers**, and know that Allah is severe in punishment. (Quran 08:25)

When considering this verse and the following hadith, the occasional infrarational revelations promising the believer an existence free of fear cannot be interpreted as permanently removing that terror within the life. For this becomes impossible, even for one genuinely following Islam, when Allah declares some of the “good” to be potential fuel of the fire. Consequently, the believer must frequently contend with an insidious lack of confidence in his own credentials for Paradise: What if he makes a mistake? Will he then be punished? What if Allah decides that his presumed spotless record is unworthy? These are questions that can only be answered on the Day of Judgement, with the believer left a singular recourse to live according to Islam's tenets and hope for Allah's clemency on that fateful hour. As fear of a perpetual disgrace is unavoidable even for the apparently “good” Muslim, he must live a life walking on proverbial eggshells, constantly praying for mercy, begging to be relieved of the

fire on a Day he has yet to experience. A potential outcome, we recall, so severe that occult sight of it made the Prophet recoil in terror. His witnessing of hell, along with the repetitive messages he received concerning it, likely contributed to his disclosure that it, along with Paradise, are very close indeed to the believer:

The Prophet said, “Paradise is nearer to any of you than the Shirak (leather strap) of his shoe, and so is the (Hell) Fire.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 8, Book 76, Number 495)

While he does offer the closeness of Paradise, for once dangling the carrot along with the stick, such an observation still serves to keep the believer on edge, apprehensive of making one little mistake to hasten on the perpetual fire. The believer must, in response to this quandary, resort to obsessive prayer that Allah might grant him mercy and save him from the horrific finale, perhaps attempting to invoke the following verses:

And there are some among them who say: “Our Lord! Grant us good in this world and good in the hereafter, and **save us from the chastisement of the fire.**” They shall have their portion of what they have earned, and Allah is swift in reckoning. (Quran 2:201-202)

In the Hadith as well, we find Mohammed providing an example of Muslims asking their Lord to “save” fellow believers from the flames:

Narrated Abu Sa’id Al-Khudri:

The Prophet said, “You (Muslims) cannot be more pressing in claiming from me a right that has been clearly proved to be yours than the believers in interceding with Almighty for their (Muslim) brothers on that Day, when they see themselves safe.

They will say, ‘O Allah! (Save) our brothers (for they) used to pray with us, fast with us and also do good deeds with us.’ Allah will say, ‘Go and take out (of Hell) anyone in whose heart you find faith equal to the weight of one (gold) Dinar.’ Allah will forbid the Fire to burn the faces of those sinners. They will go to them and find some of them in Hell (Fire) up to their feet, and some up to the middle of their legs. So they will take out those whom they will recognize and then they will return, and Allah will say (to them), ‘Go and take out (of Hell) anyone in whose heart you find faith equal to the weight of one half Dinar.’ They will take out whomever they will recognize and return, and then Allah will say, ‘Go and take out (of Hell) anyone in whose heart you find faith equal to the weight of an atom (or a smallest ant)’, and so they will take out all those whom they will recognize.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 93, Number 532)

Different translations of the previous Quran verses (2:201-202) use “defend” or “guard” instead of “save”, but the meaning is the same, and the idea of Allah “saving” the believer is a telling description. Here, as in the Christian religion, is the idea that mankind must be saved from a negative afterlife fate – that of an unceasing castigation due to his supposed sins or perhaps the whimsy of his Benefactor. This doctrine of the saviour God or his emissary upon Earth, the sole determining factor of humanity's afterlife, is in reality a degradation bestowed upon the race. For it makes the mortal's life a futile exercise that is only a prelude to one simple decision, in which his only control – though not enough to fix the result - is to decide if he believes in the exclusivity of a God called by the name of Allah. Nowhere in such a weltanschauung is there the possibility of a Psychic Being using the experiences of life for its own growth, a progressive endeavour to triumph upon earth and emerge as the sole proprietor of the human vessel. Instead, mankind is restricted to a life of fear that only the separate saviour can withdraw, an existence of doubt and obsessions and rituals to try and minimize his chance of a horrific conclusion. His lonesome instructions to avoid this fate is a book of infrarational revelations prescribing a narrow and rigid group of beliefs and practices that the believer is to

unquestioningly fit himself into, even if it goes against his real nature or inherent law. This is the basis of adharmā, and from such a perilous foundation emerges a violence against one's actual inner law, the manifestations of which lead to an internal turmoil and ensuing self-abuse, to be followed by an inevitable redirection outward upon the 'other'.

* * * *

The non-Muslim is undoubtedly the nearest object upon whom the believer is likely to displace this inner tension, because the disbeliever, according to the holy Quran, is subject to more than just Allah's wrath on the Day of Judgement. Indeed if the hellfire constituted the sole form of attention the Asuric text acknowledged to the kafir, the unbeliever might be able to escape a lifetime living in Islam's strongholds without much trouble. This is because the description of the afterlife – at least in most of the verses concerning it -, even with its graphic imagery, still pertains to an event in the future, providing a modicum of detachment when the believer deals with his rival. Unfortunately, the Asura had much more in store for his designated 'other', including further infrarational revelations of "Allah" that unquestionably show this allegedly supreme creator to be nothing but an aggrandized extension of the unrefined vital ego. The most prominent example, as we have discussed, of this vulgarity involves Islam's absence of the spiritual type of love, a fundamental principle in the Sanātana Dharma in which the path of bhaktayoga fuses the devotee's adoration with the love of his Benefactor. The Hindu religion, unlike its Islamic counterpart, holds that the Supreme loves all of his creation without fail, because He knows, He is, the Truth that all life is but a variable manifestation of Himself. Islam however, declares those who disobey Allah *and* his Seal of the Prophets as *unloved* by the former: "Say: 'Obey Allah and the Messenger; but if they turn back, then surely Allah does not love the unbelievers.' " (Quran 3:32) This absence of love is unsurprisingly linked with the dreadful climax – earthly and afterwards – meted to the Infidel:

Say: "Travel in the land, then see how was the end of those before. Most of them were polytheists. Then turn thy face straight to the right religion before there come from Allah the day which cannot be averted. On that day they shall become separated. Whoever disbelieves, he shall be responsible for his disbelief, and whoever does good, they prepare (good) for their own souls, That He may reward those who believe and do good out of His grace. **Surely He does not love the unbelievers.**" (Quran 30:42-45)

Such is the pettiness of this supposed god that he, when rejected by a mortal, responds with the emotional maturity of a small-minded, jilted lover – devoid is the patience one would expect from an immortal supreme:

Surely those who disbelieve shall be cried out to: "**Certainly Allah's hatred (of you) when you were called upon to the faith and you rejected, is much greater than your hatred of yourselves.**" They shall say: "Our Lord! Twice didst Thou make us subject to death, and twice hast Thou given us life, so we do confess our faults; is there then a way to get out?" It will be replied: "That is because when Allah alone was called upon, you disbelieved, and when partners were given to Him, you believed. So judgement belongs to Allah, the High, the Great." (Quran 40:10-12)

This disbelief of a limited creature is, as detailed in this passage, reason enough for the ostensibly unlimited Allah to direct *hatred* toward the vast majority of mankind: ironic is this quality of Allah when we consider Gabriel's assertion – seen in multiple verses – that Allah himself is the origin of *all* of creation, including those whom he despises. Thus even after we consider the separative nature of

Islam's depiction of Allah's relationship with mortals, we find that the infrarational revelations related to conception, when combined with his hatred of those he sired, ironically confirm Allah to be a 'god' of self-loathing - for what is genesis other than an extension of the Creator? In the Yogin experience of Satchitananda, on the other hand, the Supreme is Realized as Pure Love (not in the ordinary human formulation of the word, but nevertheless without psychological malevolence to either Himself or the superficially perceived 'other'), knowing the material existence as *both* Her creation and Herself, the Truth-Existent-Conscious-Power-Life-Bliss. Thus why – and *how* - would such an immortal entity indulge in Self-hatred?

Islam's contrasting revelry in hatred, with the believers subjected to a pathetic life full of fear and restricted individual growth, is another clear sign of the Asura, who seeks to exaggerate qualities of ignorance, including enmity, that exist to varying degrees in the global populace. What Gabriel did with Islam was to take a natural error and give it doctrinal justification, reinforcing its place in the overriding Muslim group consciousness. Irrespective of this supposed truth clung onto by the Muslim, it is both a falsehood and simply bizarre to ascribe to an Immortal divinity the animus one expects from a savage, rather than the ego-transcending compassion intuitively attributed to God in most formulations of Him. But such benevolence is not a quality of the Asura of Falsehood, devoid as he is of the Purusha that secretly exists even within the most cruel of humans. As Gabriel degraded God and made him a hater, it stands that if even Allah does not love the disbeliever, then why should the Muslim feel sympathy toward his unbelieving counterparts? What consequently occurs is a dehumanization of the disbeliever and an eradication of the Psychic qualities in the believer – evidenced by how coldly the Asura communicated to Mohammed that prayer for his unbelieving relative was useless – that become the foundation for much worse, as we shall see. As part of this dehumanizing process, 'revelations' were brought forth characterizing the kuffar as the "vilest" of those within Allah's sight:

In the manner of the people of Pharaoh and those before them, they rejected the communications of their Lord, therefore We destroyed them on account of their faults and We drowned Pharaoh's people, and they were all unjust. **Surely the vilest of animals in Allah's sight are those who disbelieve:** They would not believe. (Quran 8:54-55)

For the same dehumanizing purpose, *relatively* benign communications depict the infidels as liars: "So that He might make manifest to them that about which they differ, and that those who disbelieve might know that they were liars." (Quran 16:39) The kuffar are also "unjust" for simply refusing to comply with an Islamic opinion: "Nay! These are clear communications in the breasts of those who are granted knowledge; and none deny Our communications except the unjust." (Quran 29:49) However, the majority of infrarational revelations describing the disbeliever use the most abominable language possible, from "vile" to the projection of evil upon them, the 'other':

The likeness of those who were charged with the Taurat, then they did not observe it, is as the likeness of the ass bearing books. **Evil is the likeness of the people who reject the communications of Allah.** And Allah does not guide the unjust people. (Quran 62:05)

In another verse defining the unbelievers as evil and corrupted by Satan, they are also likened to dogs:

And recite to them the narrative of him to whom We give Our communications, but he withdraws himself from them, thus the Satan overtakes him, and he became of those who go astray. And if We had pleased, We would certainly have exalted him thereby, but he clung to the earth and followed his low desire, so his parable is as the parable of the dog - if you attack him he lolls out his tongue, and if you leave him alone he lolls out his tongue. This is the parable of the people who reject Our communications, therefore relate the narrative that they may reflect. **Evil is the likeness of the people who reject Our communications and are unjust to their own souls.** Whomsoever Allah guides, he is the one who follows the right way, and

whomsoever He causes to err, these are the losers. And certainly We have created for hell many of the jinn and the men. They have hearts with which they do not understand, and they have eyes with which they do not see, and they have ears with which they do not hear. They are as cattle, nay, they are in worse errors; these are the heedless ones. (Quran 7:175-179)

The canine, as one would expect given its association with non-Muslims, is an animal vilified in the Islamic religion, not receiving anything close to the near universal admiration afforded to it in different cultures. Indeed Mohammed is recorded as saying that if a believer keeps a dog as a pet, he is sure to lose some of his reward for “good deeds”, enhancing his insecurity over an already uncertain future:

Narrated Abu Huraira:

Allah's Apostle said, “If somebody keeps a dog, he loses one Qirat (of the reward) of his good deeds everyday, except if he keeps it for the purpose of agriculture or for the protection of livestock.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 54, Number 541)

Islam's characterization of the kuffar as dogs, of Allah “hating” them, of their disbelief being the result of a propensity for evil, of their status as the worst of creatures, were certainly ‘revealed’ by Gabriel for the implicit purpose of dehumanizing the unbeliever, moving beyond mere separation to contempt and degradation of the ‘other’. These adjectives destroy any possibility of Islam promoting the truth of samata, in which all humans and creatures like the dog, regardless of beliefs or overall intellectual ability, are inherently one. Without such a foundation there can be no true spirituality, and hatred can eventually fill the void. It is a venom that we continue to find in sermons in the Islamic mosques, with the Imams (Clerics) relaying the great message of hate that accounts for the final ‘Word’. The believer, hearing sermon after sermon, potentially reading on his own verse after verse of hatred, conditioned to associate the kuffar with qualities of evil, dishonour, lying, lost souls, dogs, and even Satan, can hardly be expected to look at non-Muslims in a fashion of genuine trust and camaraderie. At the very least, the latter will become the object of ridicule, a despicable fellow who cannot bring himself to believe. But as Allah explicitly abhors this type of person for that very lack of faith, the Muslim's vanity regarding his supposedly superior theology can turn into a nasty aversion, with the believer imitating his Lord and Prophet.

The resultant hatred is alone enough to blossom into violence, even in a scenario where aggression is – hypothetically - not directly called for, because it is an emotion that overrides the rational or other cognitive restraints on wanton force. Such infrarational violence and its precipitant chaos are key components to prolonging the Asuric rule, often directly caused by his projections of “evil” and “liars” and “falsehood” onto the group he determines to be the ‘other’. Yet are these depictions entirely suitable to himself, especially when we consider instances such as the laughable claim of Allah, the presumed supreme being, personally hating his offspring. This Asuric projection of the most savage components of human ego onto the Divine is both a clear sign of the falsehood of Islam's formulation of God and an explanation – given the Asura's intrinsic character - of the sadistic quality found in certain Islamic descriptions of the hellfire. For if the previous communications are not enough to elicit apprehension in mankind of what potentially awaits, there are yet further verses competing with each other in viciousness and barbarity. In one case, along with the usual companion of fire, we find water playing a prominent role in the hellish life of the unbeliever - unfortunately for him, the water of hell is rather friendly to its traditional enemy:

And if he is one of those on the right hand, (For him is the salutation), “Peace be unto thee”, from the Companions of the Right Hand. And if he is one of the rejecters, the erring ones, **He shall have an entertainment of boiling water And burning in hell.** Most surely this is a certain truth. Therefore glorify the name of your Lord, the Great. (Quran 56:90-96)

In another verse, the kuffar – literally branded prior to being dragged into hell – are described as

rotating between hell (presumably the fire) and boiling water:

So on that Day neither man nor jinn shall be asked about his sin. Which then of the bounties of your Lord will you deny? **The guilty shall be recognized by their marks, so they shall be seized by the forelocks and the feet.** Which then of the bounties of your Lord will you deny? This is the hell which the guilty deny. **Round about shall they go between it and hot, boiling water.** Which then of the bounties of your Lord will you deny? And for him who fears to stand before his Lord are two gardens. Which then of the bounties of your Lord will you deny? (Quran 55:39-47)

The indubitable cure for the inferno, cool water, is infrarationally revealed as being denied to the unbelievers. Additionally, the kuffar are taunted by the believers from Islamic Paradise - spectators sadistically entertained by their pathetic plight from a luxurious vantage above the fray - who callously reject their call for the healing shower:

And the inmates of the fire shall call out to the dwellers of the garden, saying: "Pour on us some water or of that which Allah has given you." They shall say: "Surely Allah has prohibited them both to the unbelievers, Who take their religion for an idle sport and a play and this life's world deceives them." So on that Day We forsake them, as they neglected the meeting of this day of theirs and as they denied Our communications. (Quran 7:50-51)

Clearly, delight in Paradise is not enough reward for the Muslim, with schadenfreude a fundamental part of the heavenly experience: this is the depraved 'spiritual' greatness the believer is to achieve when following Islam. Meanwhile, his opposite is to remain drunk on boiling water throughout an eternal chastisement:

Unto Him is the return of all of you. It is a promise of Allah in truth. Lo! He produceth creation, then reproduceth it, that He may reward those who believe and do good works with equity. **While, as for those who disbelieve, theirs will be a boiling drink** and painful doom because they disbelieved. (Quran 10:04)

But scorching fluid is not enough for aquatic retribution – it is to be alternated with the coldest water imaginable, a correct response for kuffar disbelief or, as Islam puts it, "evil deeds":

Surely hell lies in ambush, A place of destination for the inordinate, They will abide therein for ages. **They shall not taste therein cool nor drink, But boiling and intensely cold water, Reward proportioned (to their evil deeds). For Surely they feared not the account, And called Our communications a lie, giving the lie (to the truth). And We have recorded everything in a book,** So taste (of that which ye have earned). No increase do We give you save of torment. (Quran 78:21-30)

While it strikes one as absurd to imagine Allah and his purported deputies obsessing over every detail, including each 'immoral' thought, in the life of an obviously limited mankind (What a lengthy book this must be!), such verses are sure to increase the Muslim's anxiety over what Allah might deem incidents of "giving the lie". Especially when the believer hears that the water of Hell is additionally used to spite the face:

Say: "(It is) the truth from the Lord of you (all)." Then whosoever will, let him believe, and whosoever will, let him disbelieve. Lo! We have prepared for disbelievers Fire. Its tent encloseth them. **If they ask for showers, they will be showered with water like molten brass which will scald their faces. Calamitous the drink and ill the resting-place!** (Quran 18:29)

The tortuous nature of the chastisement is further evident in the following passage precisely detailing how the scalding water is to be imbibed by the heinous kuffar:

Has not the account reached you of those before you, of the people of Noah and Ad and Samood, and those after them? None knows them but Allah. Their messengers come to them with clear arguments, but they thrust their hands into their mouths and said: "Surely we deny that with which you are sent, and most surely we are in serious doubt as to that to which you invite us." Their messengers said: "Is there doubt about Allah, the Maker of the heavens and the earth? He invites you to forgive you your faults and to respite you till an appointed term." They said: "You are nothing but mortals like us, you wish to turn us away from what our fathers used to worship. Bring us therefore some clear authority." Their messengers said to them: "We are nothing but mortals like yourselves, but Allah bestows (His) favours on whom He pleases of His servants, and it is not for us that we should bring you an authority except by Allah's permission; and on Allah should the believers rely. And what reason have we that we should not rely on Allah? And He has indeed guided us in our ways, and certainly we would bear with patience your persecution of us. And on Allah should the reliant rely." And those who disbelieved said to their messengers: "We will most certainly drive you forth from our land, or else you shall come back into our religion." So their Lord revealed to them: "Most certainly We will destroy the unjust. And most certainly We will settle you in the land after them. This is for him who fears standing in My presence and who fears My threat." And they asked for judgement and every insolent opposer was disappointed: **Hell is before him and he shall be given to drink of festering water. He will drink it little by little and will not be able to swallow it agreeably, and death will come to him from every quarter, but he shall not die. And there shall be vehement chastisement before him.** The parable of those who disbelieve in their Lord - their actions are like ashes on which the wind blows hard on a stormy day. They shall not have power over any thing out of what they have earned; this is the great error. (Quran 14:09-18)

One can only imagine the depraved satisfaction the Asura of Falsehood derives from imagining such a revenge, the type of perversion he seeks – through Islam – to transmit to mortal recipients, this utter fall from Ananda. Gabriel's fascination with cruelty and suffering is so pronounced that he declared to Mohammed the existence of a tree in Islam's hell whose food is specifically designed to boil the stomachs of the unbeliever:

Surely the tree of the Zaqqum Is the food of the sinful, Like dregs of oil, it shall boil in (their) bellies, Like the boiling of hot water. (A voice will cry) "Seize him, then drag him down into the middle of the hell, Then pour above his head of the torment of the boiling water: 'Taste; you forsooth are the mighty, the honourable. Surely this is what you used to doubt.' " Surely those who guard (against evil) are in a secure place, In gardens and springs, They shall wear of fine and thick silk, facing one another. Thus (shall it be), and We will wed them with Houris pure, beautiful ones. They shall call therein for every fruit in security. They shall not taste therein death except the first death, and He will save them from the punishment of the hell. (Quran 44:43–56)

The juxtaposition here between the poisonous food of hell and the beautiful women and fruit awaiting the believer in Paradise is meant as both as a reminder to the Muslim of the carrot and the stick, and a slight upon the disbeliever, a mocking of the latter's religious choice in life. Similarly do we find the following Quran passage detailing how the glorious believers – who as noted are said to deny healing water to the burning disbeliever below them – cruelly taunt their counterparts underneath:

And the dwellers of the Garden cry unto the dwellers of the Fire: "We have found that which our Lord promised us (to be) the Truth. Have ye (too) found that which your Lord promised the Truth?" They say: "Yea, verily." But a crier in between will proclaim: "The curse of Allah is on

evil-doers, Who debar (men) from the path of Allah and would have it crooked, and who are disbelievers in the Last Day.” (Quran 7:44-45)

The sadism of Islam is on full display here, as the believer is to add insult to injury on the hapless ones far below him - surely their wives and gardens are satisfactory enough? But as Islam is excessively focused on retribution and punishment, and as the religion is primarily an avoidance of a negative instead of an ascent to a positive, then even in the heavenly realms will the Muslim remain looking downward, infatuated – and gloating over the suffering of the kuffar – with a hellfire so severe that the disbeliever's skin is continuously replaced so that they can re-experience the torment!

(As for) those who disbelieve in Our communications, We shall make them enter fire. **So oft as their skins are thoroughly burned, We will change them for fresh skins, that they may taste the chastisement.** Surely Allah is Mighty, Wise. (Quran 4:56)

Just as Allah in his ‘wisdom’ allows for a never-ending materialization of the victim's flesh, also in this magical world of Islamic hell, between bouts of fire and boiling water, will the unbeliever's skin literally speak to him, scolding him on his “evil” thoughts:

And on the day that the enemies of Allah shall be brought together to the fire, then they shall be formed into groups. Until when they come to it, their ears and their eyes and their skins shall bear witness against them as to what they did. **And they shall say to their skins: “Why have you borne witness against us?” They shall say: “Allah Who makes everything speak has made us speak, and He created you at first, and to Him you shall be brought back.** And you did not veil yourselves lest your ears and your eyes and your skins should bear witness against you, but you thought that Allah did not know most of what you did. And that was your (evil) thought which you entertained about your Lord that has tumbled you down into perdition, so are you become of the lost ones.” Then if they will endure, still the fire is their abode, and if they ask for goodwill, then are they not of those who shall be granted goodwill. And We have appointed for them comrades so they have made fair-seeming to them what is before them and what is behind them, and the word proved true against them - among the nations of the jinn and the men that have passed away before them - that they shall surely be losers. (Quran 41:19-25)

As the Infidel is unable to restrain himself from the natural diversity of thought that might chance upon Polytheism or Atheism, he will deservedly be chained in hell, choking on the food served therein:

And bear patiently what they say and avoid them with a becoming avoidance. And leave Me (to deal with) the deniers, the possessors of ease and plenty, and respite them a little. **Surely with Us are heavy fetters and a flaming fire, And food that chokes and a painful punishment,** On the day when the earth and the mountains shall quake and the mountains shall become (as) heaps of sand let loose. Surely We have sent to you a Messenger, a witness against you, as We sent a messenger to Pharaoh. But Pharaoh disobeyed the messenger, so We laid on him a violent hold. How, then, will you guard yourselves, if you disbelieve, on the day which shall make children grey-headed? (Quran 73:10-17)

These chains are to be placed on the kafir's neck - a necessary apparatus to drag him to the infamous destiny, the one befitting his practice of assigning partners with Allah:

Have you not seen those who dispute with respect to the communications of Allah: how are they turned away? **Those who reject the Book and that with which We have sent Our Messenger. But they shall soon come to know. When the fetters and the chains shall be on their necks, they shall be dragged Into boiling water, then in the fire shall they be burned. Then shall it be said to them: “Where is that which you used to partner beside Allah?”** They shall say: “They are gone away from us, nay, we used not to call upon anything before.” Thus does Allah

confound the unbelievers. That is because you exulted in the land unjustly and because you behaved insolently. Enter the gates of hell to abide therein, evil then is the abode of the proud. (Quran 40:69-76)

Unlikely though the possibility of escape is, the unbeliever nevertheless remains bound to a lengthy chain while engulfed in the fire, all for the ‘crime’ of disbelieving the exclusivity of Allah:

(The stern command will say): “Seize ye him, and bind ye him, Then cast him into the burning fire, Then thrust him into a chain the length of which is seventy cubits. **Surely he did not believe in Allah**, the Great.” (Quran 69:30-33)

If the shackles and the fire and water were not enough for torture, the gouging of a guilty unbeliever's eyes also went under consideration. However, the Asura of Falsehood decided that this would *lessen* the punishment – he prefers them to witness their tribulations:

Did I not charge you, O children of Adam, that you should not serve the Satan? Surely he is your open enemy, And that you should serve Me; this is the right way. And certainly he led astray numerous people from among you. What! Could you not then understand? This is the hell with which you were threatened. Enter into it this day because you disbelieved. On that day We will set a seal upon their mouths, and their hands shall speak to Us, and their feet shall bear witness of what they earned. **And if We please We would certainly put out their eyes, then they would run about groping for the way, but how should they see?** And if We please We would surely transform them in their place, then they would not be able to go on, nor will they return. And whomsoever We cause to live long, We reduce (him) to an abject state in constitution. Do they not then understand? And We have not taught him (Mohammed) poetry, nor is it meet for him; it is nothing but a reminder and a plain Quran, That it may warn him who would have life, and (that) the word may prove true against the unbelievers. (Quran 36:60-70)

Just as water is unavailable to soothe the flames on the skin of the kuffar, so are the worthy denizens of hell left in a state of thirst - righteous punishment for their Polytheistic belief, even if they might deny their earthly form of worship on the Day:

Have you, then, seen him who disbelieves in Our communications and says: “I shall certainly be given wealth and children?” Has he gained knowledge of the unseen, or made a covenant with the Beneficent Allah? By no means! We write down what he says, and We will lengthen to him the length of the chastisement. And We will inherit of him what he says, and he shall come to Us alone. **And they have taken gods besides Allah, that they should be to them a source of strength; By no means! They shall soon deny their worshipping them**, and they shall be adversaries to them. Do you not see that We have sent the Satans against the unbelievers, inciting them by incitement? Therefore be not in haste against them, We only count out to them a (limited) number (of days). The day on which We will gather the righteous to the Beneficent Allah to receive honours. **And We will drive the guilty to hell thirsty**. They shall not control intercession, save he who has made a covenant with the Beneficent Allah. And they say: “The Beneficent Allah has taken (to Himself) a son.” Certainly you have made an abominable assertion. The heavens may almost be rent thereat, and the earth cleave asunder, and the mountains fall down in pieces, That they ascribe a son to the Beneficent Allah. And it is not worthy of the Beneficent Allah that He should take (to Himself) a son. (Quran 19:77-92)

Along with thirst, the rest of the penalty assigned to the unbeliever *and* the “guilty” of the self-perceived Muslim is, rather than a justified retribution, a brutal torture carrying with it the most superficial of sanction – the ‘crimes’ of thought and belief. Disbelief, after all, is the foundation for the primary chastisement: the inhabitant of hell is “guilty” of a mere internal thought or emotion not corresponding to the ‘truth’ of infrarational revelations occurring in the most minute of time frames. It

is the most absurd of premises, and explains the need of the Asura of Falsehood to repeatedly present to humanity the numerous tribulations awaiting them in hell if they fail to adhere to the preposterous thought patterns and rituals defining Islam. The greater the variation and the more intense the description of the torture, the more likely for mankind – especially the Muslim – to live in fear, trampling any higher cerebral analysis dismissing the text as fear-mongering. Thus along with the fire, the boiling water, the hunger and thirst, came the directly stated threat of unspecified, yet varied, types of sadistic suffering:

This is a reminder. And most surely there is an excellent resort for those who guard (against evil), The gardens of perpetuity, the doors are opened for them. Reclining therein, calling therein for many fruits and drink. And with them shall be those restraining their eyes, equals in age. This is what you are promised for the day of reckoning. Most surely this is Our sustenance; it shall never come to an end. This (shall be so), and most surely there is an evil resort for the transgressors. Hell - they shall enter it, so evil is the resting-place. This (shall be so). **So let them taste it, boiling and intensely cold (drink). And other (punishment) of the same kind - of various sorts.** Here is an army plunging in without consideration along with you; no welcome for them, **surely they shall enter fire.** They shall say: “Nay, but you (misleaders), for you there is no word of welcome. Ye prepared this for us (by your misleading). Now hapless is the plight.” They shall say: “Our Lord! Whoever prepared it first for us, add Thou to him a double chastisement in the fire.” **And they shall say: “What is the matter with us that we do not see men whom we used to count among the vicious?** Was it that we (only) took them in mockery, or have our eyes failed to perceived them?” That most surely is the truth: the wrangling of the dwellers in the fire. (Quran 38:49-64)

That the unbelievers will perceive the Muslims in heaven as “among the vicious” is illuminating, because as we shall eventually observe, the ‘good’ Islamic deeds of the believer are certainly of a heinous quality. But before we address the sanctioned earthly Islamic actions, we must continue our review of how the Islamic mindset – the necessary precondition to the deeds – is fashioned. In another passage dehumanizing the unbelievers, Gabriel relayed that one destruction of the unbeliever is not enough, as the they are deserving of multiple bouts of pain for their grievous sins – the Islamic version of reincarnation:

But they reject the hour, and **We have prepared a burning fire for him who rejects the hour.** When it shall come into their sight from a distant place, they shall hear its vehement raging and roaring. And when they are cast into a narrow place in it, bound, they shall there call out for destruction. **Call not this day for one destruction, but call for destructions many.** (Quran 25:11-14)

The authentic hadith are pivotal in gaining further insight into what exactly constitutes these myriad destructions or tortures promised by the Asura of Falsehood. In them, we find punishment meted to both disbelievers and “hypocrite” Muslims from when they first enter the grave, just prior to the horrible descent into the eternal inferno:

Narrated Anas:

The Prophet said, “When a human being is laid in his grave and his companions return and he even hears their foot steps, two angels come to him and make him sit and ask him: ‘What did you use to say about this man, Mohammed?’ He will say: ‘I testify that he is Allah's slave and His Apostle.’ Then it will be said to him, ‘Look at your place in the Hell-Fire. Allah has given you a place in Paradise instead of it.’ ” The Prophet added, “The dead person will see both his places. **But a non-believer or a hypocrite will say to the angels, ‘I do not know, but I used to say what the people used to say!’** It will be said to him, ‘Neither did you know nor did

you take the guidance (by reciting the Quran).’ Then he will be hit with an iron hammer between his two ears, and he will cry and that cry will be heard by whatever approaches him except human beings and jinns.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 2, Book 23, Number 422)

Proceeding from the graveyard, an individual is to encounter thorns similar to those of Sa’dan in Hell, with even those destined for Paradise suffering greatly from the thorns prior to their ascent:

Narrated Abu Huraira:

The people said, “O Allah's Apostle! Shall we see our Lord on the Day of Resurrection?” He replied, “Do you have any doubt in seeing the full moon on a clear (not cloudy) night?” They replied, “No, O Allah's Apostle!” He said, “Do you have any doubt in seeing the sun when there are no clouds?” They replied in the negative. He said, “You will see Allah (your Lord) in the same way. On the Day of Resurrection, people will be gathered and He will order the people to follow what they used to worship. So some of them will follow the sun, some will follow the moon, and some will follow other deities; and only this nation (Muslims) will be left with its hypocrites. Allah will come to them and say, ‘I am Your Lord.’ They will say, ‘We shall stay in this place till our Lord comes to us and when our Lord will come, we will recognize Him.’ Then Allah will come to them again and say, ‘I am your Lord.’ They will say, ‘You are our Lord.’ Allah will call them, and As-Sirat (a bridge) will be laid across Hell and I (Mohammed) shall be the first amongst the Apostles to cross it with my followers. Nobody except the Apostles will then be able to speak and they will be saying then, ‘O Allah! Save us. O Allah Save us.’

“There will be hooks like the thorns of Sa’dan in Hell. Have you seen the thorns of Sa’dan?” The people said, “Yes.” He said, “These hooks will be like the thorns of Sa’dan but nobody except Allah knows their greatness in size and these will entangle the people according to their deeds; some of them will fall and stay in Hell forever; others will receive punishment (torn into small pieces) and will get out of Hell, till when Allah intends mercy on whomever He likes amongst the people of Hell, He will order the angels to take out of Hell those who worshipped none but Him alone. The angels will take them out by recognizing them from the traces of prostrations, for Allah has forbidden the (Hell) fire to eat away those traces. So they will come out of the Fire, it will eat away from the whole of the human body except the marks of the prostrations. At that time they will come out of the Fire as mere skeletons. The Water of Life will be poured on them and as a result they will grow like the seeds growing on the bank of flowing water.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 1, Book 12, Number 770)

Even the man suffering the least punishment in Hell gets the delight of having his brain boiled:

Narrated An-Numan:

I heard the Prophet saying, “The person who will have the least punishment from amongst the Hell Fire people on the Day of Resurrection, will be a man under whose arch of the feet a smouldering ember will be placed so that his brain will boil because of it.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 8, Book 76, Number 566)

The hadith also relate the destiny – a gutting - of the first individual to release animals in worship of other gods:

Narrated Said bin Al-Musaiyab:

Al-Bahira was an animal whose milk was spared for the idols and other deities, and so nobody was allowed to milk it. As-Saiba was an animal which they (i.e. infidels) used to set free in the names of their gods so that it would not be used for carrying anything. Abu Huraira said, **“The Prophet said, ‘I saw Amr bin Amir bin Luhai Al-Khuzai dragging his intestines in the**

(Hell) Fire, for he was the first man who started the custom of releasing animals (for the sake of false gods).’ ” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 56, Number 723)

Returning to the Quran, we find a passage that somehow manages to out-compete the others in its sadistic quality. In it, the hellfire punishment for disbelief includes a vicious combination of hooked iron rods, fire and boiling fluid - all for a mere belief-crime:

These twain (the believers and the disbelievers) are two opponents who dispute concerning their Lord. **But as for those who disbelieve, garments of fire will be cut out for them, boiling fluid will be poured down on their heads, Whereby that which is in their bellies, and their skins too, will be melted. And for them are hooked rods of iron.** Whenever, in their anguish, they would go forth from thence they are driven back therein and (it is said unto them): “Taste the doom of burning.” (Quran 22:19-22)

Such renderings of the infidel's future are clearly designed both as warnings to the believer to maintain his faith, and for the dehumanization of the unfaithful, assigning to them a desultory status. While the passage above coldly specifies an expected torture that mortals with active Psychic Beings find revolting, in other verses, the unbelievers are degraded with solitary invectives. This is exemplified in a verse describing them as “locusts” walking toward Allah on the Day of Judgement:

And if they see a miracle they turn aside and say: “Transient magic.” And they call (the message) a lie, and follow their low desires. Yet every affair has its appointed term. And certainly some narratives have come to them wherein is prevention - Consummate wisdom - but warnings do not avail. So turn (your) back on them (for) the Day when the Summoner shall invite them to a painful task, Their eyes cast down, going forth from their graves as if they were scattered locusts, Hastening to the Summoner. The unbelievers shall say: “This is a hard day.” (Quran 54:02-08)

The reduction of disbelievers to locusts and dogs, to friends of Satan and evil, to objects of Allah's hatred, is the method by which the Lord of Nations – as he called himself during Hitler's time - gets the believer to justify tormenting his unbelieving brethren. For it is easier to inflict pain upon someone when one thinks them to be inferior and evil, when one's ‘God’ hates them because of said reasons. This perpetual sadism is undoubtedly a sign of the dearth of Purushic influence in Islam, a manifestation of the absence of samata in its teachings. While Islam may prescribe cordiality and warmth between the *genuine* Muslims, its falsehood of absolute separation, of the believer's fundamental superiority, is the spring from which the cruelty originates. And just as the belief in a permanent schism between mankind based strictly on their faith is a falsehood (rather than ignorance), so is the belief in an idea of ‘God’ unceasingly persecuting his very own creation. Besides the irony of Allah hating himself, the Islamic retribution is false in practicality, because the Asura sought to use the existence of vital (including, as we will discuss, Islam's heaven and hell) and mental worlds not belonging to the terrestrial existence, and project upon them experiences unique to the physical world. Hence – and this is in reference to the potential experience of hell – one region of the Vital world mankind might traverse is exaggerated and given qualities only possible on earth. The embellishment is the idea of a perpetual hellfire; the lie is both in the reason (Polytheism) for entering hell and the presentation of it as a place of eternal *physical* suffering.

For if the latter were the truth, one would expect a mortal's body to move with him into the Islamic hell. But the corporeal body remains, present for all to see, upon earth, at once completely void of function after death. It is the consciousness that moves on, whether to hell, heaven, the next life or to the Supreme. While the consciousness in the afterlife can have certain psychological experiences, to truly experience the Islamic hellfire requires a physical body and the same nervous mechanism of pain and pleasure present on Earth. In no way is it certain that the same apparatus is given to the conscious

individual in the Vital planes afterlife; the opposite is likelier, as we can visibly see the physical body after death, and know it to be perishable, subject to Prakriti's cyclical processes. And if vital entities can present to an individual, in *occult* sight, with a human appearance, these – if it isn't a mask or covering used by the emanation – forms are not governed by the same human conception of touch, pleasure and pain, as the form witnessed by the earthly consciousness in its native plane is of a gross, physical, concrete material - that used in the occult realms is a *subtle body* not of the same composition, although it *appears* to be.

Thus it is impossible to then experience the physical and nervous pain associated with fire, boiling water, hunger, hooked skin, and other assorted Islamic retributions, because the mechanism by which these sensations are transmitted remain in the physical plane of existence. Psychological experiences are indeed permitted in the Vital realms where the actual naraka is located, but Gabriel specifically communicated the lie of a ceaseless *physical* anguish. He did this, of course, to sustain fear in his instrument, the Prophet Mohammed, a man without capacity for rational thinking that is a beneficial gateway between the ordinary life and higher spiritual experience, because it helps to develop the discernment necessary to sort through such encounters. While reason is not the only way to manifest such discrimination, it can be a very useful part of one's spirituality - contrary to claims otherwise - from a mental standpoint, strengthening the *manomayapurusha*. Mohammed, without either the mental or vital acumen, was slave to the psychological manipulation perpetuated by Gabriel, conditioned to view the believers in a certain manner irrespective of his own natural tendencies. Such was his apprehension towards the sadistic revenge communicated to him by Gabriel, and his innate penchant towards submission before such a figure, that he dared not alter any of the communications sent to him.

And when Our clear revelations are recited unto them, they who look not for the meeting with Us say: “Bring a Lecture other than this, or change it.” **Say (O Mohammed): “It is not for me to change it of my accord. I only follow that which is inspired in me. Lo! if I disobey my Lord I fear the retribution of an awful Day.”** Say: “If Allah had so willed I should not have recited it to you nor would He have made it known to you. I dwelt among you a whole lifetime before it (came to me). Do you not then understand?” Who doeth greater wrong than he who inventeth a lie concerning Allah and denieth His revelations? Lo! The guilty never are successful. (Quran 10:15-17)

Of course, as he was explicitly warned of the terrible fate for those changing Allah's message, in the end it was Gabriel fortifying the fear by controlling, through infrarational revelations, the thought patterns entering Mohammed. A vicious cycle was created thereby, as ‘Allah’ demanded that his Prophet live in trepidation of Allah's revenge if he dared to make alterations, further attaching him to the communications, increasing his distress over potentially not repeating or failing to follow the messages correctly. In another verse, he was told to avoid unbelievers who were likely to make him try to “forge” against his ‘luminous’ benefactor something other than what was infrarationally revealed to him, a shunning necessary for him to be free of the double punishment – in *both* the earth and the afterlife - warranted for such a crime:

And surely their purpose was to turn you away from that which We have revealed to you, that you should forge against Us other than that; and then they would certainly have taken you for a friend. And had it not been for that We had already established you, you would certainly have inclined to them a little; **In that case We would certainly have made you to taste a double (punishment) in this life and a double (punishment) after death,** then you would not have found any helper against Us. (Quran 17:73-75)

Additionally, the Hadith express a disdain toward those – the Jews and Christians – of the Abrahamic tradition who decided to make such modifications to the pristine scripture:

Narrated Ubaidullah:

Ibn Abbas said, “Why do you ask the people of the scripture about anything while your Book (Quran) which has been revealed to Allah's Apostle is newer and the latest? **You read it pure, undistorted and unchanged, and Allah has told you that the people of the scripture (Jews and Christians) changed their scripture and distorted it, and wrote the scripture with their own hands and said, ‘It is from Allah,’ to sell it for a little gain.** Does not the knowledge which has come to you prevent you from asking them about anything? No, by Allah, we have never seen any man from them asking you regarding what has been revealed to you!” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 92, Number 461)

Such was his fright of the punishment he witnessed – as previously mentioned - through occult sight and in dreams, his fear of Allah's wrath if he dared to change the infrarational revelations, and Gabriel's clear antipathy towards those who did such a thing, that Mohammed justifiably came to consider such an action to be one of the great Islamic sins:

Narrated Abu Bakra:

Allah's Apostle said thrice, “Shall I not inform you of the biggest of the great sins?” We said, “Yes, O Allah's Apostle.” He said, “To join partners in worship with Allah: to be undutiful to one's parents.” The Prophet sat up after he had been reclining and added, “**And I warn you against giving forged statement and a false witness;** I warn you against giving a forged statement and a false witness.” The Prophet kept on saying that warning till we thought that he would not stop. (Sahih Bukhari Volume 8, Book 73, Number 7)

Forged statements can obviously refer to declarations other than those concerning Allah or Islam, but it is clear the most egregious of lies concerns the ‘Word’ of Allah as finalized in the Quran. It is a ‘Word’ that must be unchanged and pure, for the Asura, as previously mentioned, infrarationally revealed, “**My word shall not be changed.**” (Quran 50:29) If Mohammed dared to commit this sin of modifying the scripture, he knew the punishment, because Allah had ‘revealed’ it to him through his supposed intermediary, the ‘angel’ Gabriel, by whose contact Mohammed's fear of ‘Divine’ retribution was infinitely buttressed. For in the Islamic religion, the Asura of Falsehood, speaking as the assumed conduit of the supreme Allah, entrusted to its ‘angels’ the most peculiar of responsibilities: executing the torture of hell. Indeed, while many verses indicate Allah's direct involvement in the punishment, the angels - supposed spiritual beings whom one expects to be above the sadism described in the Quran and Hadith - are also infrarationally revealed to be active participants in the maltreatment, smiting the faces and backs of the guilty kuffar:

When the hypocrites and those in whose hearts is a disease said: “Their religion has deceived them.” And whoever trusts in Allah, then surely Allah is Mighty, Wise. **And had you seen when the angels will cause to die those who disbelieve, smiting their faces and their backs, and (saying): “Taste the punishment of burning.”** (Quran 08:49-50)

Just as they take perverse delight in adding insult to injury, in the following verse – note the plural “We” – the ‘angels’ specifically do not want to kill the disbeliever, because death means the end of the latter's torture, the conclusion to the depraved enjoyment of allegedly spiritual beings:

And (as for) those who disbelieve, for them is the fire of hell. It shall not be finished with them entirely so that they should die, nor shall the chastisement thereof be lightened to them: Even thus do We retribute every ungrateful one. And they shall cry therein for succour: “O our Lord! Take us out, we will do good deeds other than those which we used to do.” Did We not preserve you alive long enough, so that he who reflected would reflect therein? And there came to you the warner, therefore taste, because for the unjust, there is no helper.

Surely Allah is the Knower of what is unseen in the heavens and the earth, surely He is Cognizant of what is in their hearts. He it is Who made you rulers in the land, therefore whoever disbelieves, his unbelief is against himself. **And their unbelief does not increase the disbelievers, in their Lord's sight, in anything except hatred**, and their unbelief does not increase the disbelievers in anything except loss. (Quran 35:36-39)

Present again in this passage is the hatred felt by the Islamic 'god' toward those disbelieving in him - the floor of human emotion attributed upon the Divine. With Allah as the fount of hatred and cruelty, the inflicter of pain, the 'angels' could hardly be conceived of as otherwise, because to have the angels in opposition to their god negates the authority and force of his 'Word'. Thus from the purported peak of the religion flows the river of hate and sadism into the Islamic 'angels', whose own desire to impart suffering onto the disbelievers is so strong that it appears as if they prefer to punish rather than even convert!

Are the people of the townships then secure from the coming of Our wrath upon them as a night-raid while they sleep? Or are the people of the townships then secure from the coming of Our wrath upon them in the daytime while they play? Are they then secure from Allah's scheme? None deemeth himself secure from Allah's scheme save folk that perish. Is it not clear to those who inherit the earth after its (former) residents that if **We please We would afflict them on account of their faults and set a seal on their hearts so they would not hear**. Such were the townships. We relate some tidings of them unto thee (Mohammed). **Their messengers verily came unto them with clear proofs (of Allah's Sovereignty), but they could not believe because they had before denied. Thus doth Allah print upon the hearts of disbelievers (that they hear not)**. We found no (loyalty to any) covenant in most of them. Nay, most of them We found wrong-doers. (Quran 7:97-102)

At the very least, this set of infrarational revelations attest to the lack of adequate warning – even after sending messengers – to the unbelievers of their doom. Yet it strongly hints that the disbelief of those described was *predetermined* by Allah and his trusted angels, the latter of whom were quite pleased to “seal” the hearts and ears of their intended victims, guaranteeing their destruction when one would expect ‘angels’ to try as much as possible to prevent that fate. This passage was hardly the only one concerning cruel retribution enforced upon the disbeliever in hell and earth by Allah or his angels, with different ones specifically mentioning the fate of hunger, including the following infrarational revelations pertaining to historic towns:

And Allah sets forth a parable: (Consider) a town safe and secure to which its means of subsistence come in abundance from every quarter, but it became ungrateful to Allah's favours, therefore **Allah made it to taste the utmost degree of hunger and fear** because of what they wrought. And certainly there came to them a Messenger from among them, but they rejected him, so the punishment overtook them while they were unjust. (Quran 16:112-113)

Similarly in the hellfire, the disbelievers are teased with bitter fruit only offering the illusion of satiety, whereas the true Muslims – as opposed to a “Muslim” who initially believes then “turns back” - drink from goblets while seated on their heavenly thrones:

Has not there come to you the news of the overwhelming calamity? (Some) faces on that day shall be downcast, Labouring, toiling, **Entering into burning fire, Made to drink from a boiling spring, No food for them save bitter thorn-fruit, Which will neither nourish nor avail against hunger**. (Other) faces on that day shall be happy, Well-pleased because of their striving, In a lofty garden, Wherein you shall not hear vain talk. Therein is a fountain flowing, Therein are thrones raised high, And goblets ready placed, And cushions set in a row, And carpets spread out. Will they not then consider the camels, how they are created? And the

heaven, how it is reared aloft, And the mountains, how they are firmly fixed, And the earth, how it is made a vast expanse? Therefore do remind, for you are only a reminder. Thou art not a watcher over them. **But whoever turns back and disbelieves, Allah will chastise him with the greatest chastisement.** Surely to Us is their turning back, Then surely upon Us is the taking of their account. (Quran 88:01-26)

With a soulless, light-less vital entity guiding, informing him that his 'God' subsisted on hatred and cruelty towards those he considers guilty, with Allah's angelic emissaries gleefully undertaking the enjoined torture, why wouldn't the Prophet also have inclined to similarly administer earthly retribution? At the very least, he was driven to wish upon his disbelieving rivals the earthly punishments that were communicated to predominantly occur in the afterlife. The most sadistic of all his requests mimicked the infrarational revelations concerning hunger, with Mohammed praying for Allah to inflict famine upon a set of Arabs refusing to convert to Islam:

Narrated Masruq:

We were with Abdullah and he said, "When the Prophet saw the refusal of the people to accept Islam he said, 'O Allah! Send (famine) years on them for (seven years) like the seven years (of famine during the time) of (Prophet) Joseph.' So famine overtook them for one year and destroyed every kind of life to such an extent that the people started eating hides, carcasses and rotten dead animals. Whenever one of them looked towards the sky, he would (imagine himself to) see smoke because of hunger." (Sahih Bukhari Volume 2, Book 17, Number 121)

In praying for Allah to send famine upon the kuffar, Mohammed was also following the infrarationally revealed example of Moses when the latter prayed for the Pharaoh's people to *not* be granted belief – better for them to experience a painful retribution for disbelief than to become devotees of Allah!

Recite unto them the story of Noah, when he told his people: "O my people! If my sojourn (here) and my reminding you by Allah's revelations are an offence unto you, in Allah have I put my trust, so decide upon your course of action you and your partners. Let not your course of action be in doubt for you. Then have at me, give me no respite. But if ye are averse I have asked of you no wage. My wage is the concern of Allah only, and I am commanded to be of those who surrender (unto Him)." But they denied him, so We saved him and those with him in the ship, and made them viceroys (in the earth), **while We drowned those who denied Our revelations. See then the nature of the consequence for those who had been warned.** Then, after him, We sent messengers unto their folk, and they brought them clear proofs. But they were not ready to believe in that which they before denied. **Thus print We on the hearts of the transgressors.** Then, after them, We sent Moses and Aaron unto Pharaoh and his chiefs with Our revelations, but they were arrogant and were a guilty folk. And when the Truth from Our presence came unto them, they said: "Lo! This is mere magic." Moses said: "Speak ye (so) of the Truth when it hath come unto you? Is this magic? Now magicians thrive not." They said: "Hast thou come unto us to pervert us from that (faith) in which we found our fathers, and that you two may own the place of greatness in the land? We will not believe you two." And Pharaoh said: "Bring to me every skillful magician." So when they cast down, Moses said to them: "What you have brought is deception; surely Allah will make it naught. Surely Allah does not make the work of mischief-makers to thrive. And Allah will show the truth to be the truth by His words, though the guilty may be averse (to it)." But none believed in Moses except the offspring of his people, on account of the fear of Pharaoh and their chiefs, lest he should persecute them. And most surely Pharaoh was lofty in the land, and most surely he was of the extravagant. And Moses said: "O my people! If you believe in Allah, then rely on Him (alone) if you submit (to Allah)." So they said: "On Allah we rely: O our Lord! make us not subject to the

persecution of the unjust people: And do Thou deliver us by Thy mercy from the unbelieving people.” And We revealed to Moses and his brother, saying: “Take for your people houses to abide in Egypt and make your houses places of worship and keep up prayer and give good news to the believers.” And Moses said: “Our Lord! Surely Thou hast given to Pharaoh and his chiefs finery and riches in this world's life, to this end, our Lord, that they lead (people) astray from Thy way. **Our Lord! Destroy their riches and harden their hearts so that they believe not until they see the painful punishment.**” Allah said: “**The prayer of you both has indeed been accepted**, therefore continue in the right way and do not follow the path of those who do not know.” And We made the children of Israel to pass through the sea, then Pharaoh and his hosts followed them for oppression and tyranny, until when drowning overtook him, he said: “I believe that there is no god but He in Whom the children of Israel believe and I am of those who submit.” (It was replied to him) “What! Now! And indeed you disobeyed before and you were of the mischief-makers. But We will this day deliver you with your body that you may be a sign to those after you, and most surely the majority of the people are heedless to Our communications.” (Quran 10:71-92)

If Moses' prayer was nearly identical to the angel's infrarationally revealed disposition to seal the hearts and ears of unbelievers so that they might revel in torturing the latter, Mohammed's prayer for famine was of a more direct cruelty, a desire to inflict pain within his lifetime. It also, per Yogin Knowledge, was a specific sign of Asuric influence, with famine representing a historical means of imparting suffering on mankind. This particular fate is associated more with the Asura of Suffering who recently – again per Yogin experience - annulled himself into the Divine. But as the Asura of Falsehood is Sovereign to the rest, as famine easily suits his ambition and can be considered the opposite of Truth in the physical sheath, and as he can potentially manipulate the mechanisms of Nature by which such a state may arise (he rarely does, as he – befitting his name – prefers psychological control through falsehood), there was no communicated rejection of Mohammed's depraved prayer. The Prophet probably expected its affirmation, ‘knowing’ how prayers such as those of Moses were previously brought to fruition, undoubtedly assuming that Allah would grant his desire for revenge, given the latter's status as the Lord of Retribution. Famine, unsurprisingly, was not to be the only type of vengeance the Prophet desired Allah to fulfil:

Narrated Ali:

On the day of Al-Khandaq (i.e. Trench), **the Prophet said, “(Let) Allah fill their (i.e. the infidels) houses and graves with fire** just as they have prevented us from offering the Middle Prayer (i.e. Asr prayer) till the sun had set.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 5, Book 59, Number 437)

This despicable prayer in response to a relatively minor provocation is a hallmark of the Asura of Falsehood – who exaggerates slights as justification for the most wicked of responses. In other cases of Mohammed praying for Allah's wrath against Infidel opponents, the Prophet desired the assistance – and not just during battle - of Allah against actual military enemies:

Narrated Abdullah bin Abbas:

Allah's Apostle sent a letter to Khosrau and told his messenger to give it first to the ruler of Bahrain, and tell him to deliver it to Khosrau. When Khosrau had read it, he tore it into pieces. (Az-Zuhri said: I think Ibn Al-Musaiyab said, “Allah's Apostle invoked Allah to tear them (Khosrau and his followers) into pieces.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 91, Number 369)

Mohammed similarly responded to curses against him by - instead of adopting the spiritual acceptance one expects of those supposedly with an extraordinary connection to the Divine - cursing back and asking Allah to only answer *his* invocation, of which he felt entitled:

Narrated Abdullah bin Mulaika:

Aisha said that the Jews came to the Prophet and said, “As-Samu Alaikum” (death be on you). Aisha said (to them), “(Death) be on you, and may Allah curse you and shower His wrath upon you!” The Prophet said, “Be calm, O Aisha! You should be kind and lenient, and beware of harshness and Fuhsh (i.e. bad words).” She said (to the Prophet), “Haven't you heard what they (Jews) have said?” He said, “Haven't you heard what I have said (to them)? **I said the same to them, and my invocation against them will be accepted while theirs against me will be rejected (by Allah).**” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 8, Book 73, Number 57)

Even his prayers concerning the elements were considered worthy enough to be answered, such as his wish for rain in support of the believers:

Asbath added on the authority of Mansur, “Allah's Apostle prayed for them and it rained heavily for seven days. So the people complained of the excessive rain. The Prophet said, ‘O Allah! (Let it rain) around us and not on us.’ So the clouds dispersed over his head and it rained over the surroundings.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 2, Book 17, Number 133)

While Gabriel did his best to accommodate Mohammed, it proved impossible to maintain pace with the amount of people and tribes Mohammed desired Allah to curse, leading the Asura to infrarationally order his Prophet to cease with his constant demands:

Narrated Abu Huraira:

Whenever Allah's Apostle intended to invoke evil upon somebody or invoke good upon somebody, he used to invoke Allah (after bowing in the prayer). Sometimes after saying, “Allah hears him who sends his praises to Him, all praise is for You, O our Lord,” he would say, “O Allah. Save Al-Walid bin Al-Walid and Salama bin Hisham, and Aiyash bin Abu Rabia. O Allah! Inflict Your Severe Torture on Mudar (tribe) and strike them with (famine) years like the years of Joseph.” **The Prophet used to say in a loud voice, and he also used to say in some of his Fajr prayers, “O Allah! Curse so-and-so and so-and-so.” naming some of the Arab tribes till Allah revealed: “Not for you (O Mohammed) (but for Allah) is the decision.”** (3.128) (Sahih Bukhari Volume 6, Book 60, Number 83)

There were times when Mohammed went beyond asking Allah to inflict torture upon others; bombarded as he was with the nature of Allah's punishment for non-Muslims, he felt his own army a worthy conduit to manifest the ‘divine’ retribution during the earthly life. In one particular example, he specifically justifies the recourse of burning the kuffar enemy, for it is actually Allah who is handing out the punishment:

Narrated Abu Huraira:

Allah's Apostle sent us in a mission (i.e. an army-unit) and said, “If you find so-and-so and so-and-so, burn both of them with fire.” When we intended to depart, Allah's Apostle said, “I have ordered you to burn so-and-so and so-and-so, **and it is none but Allah Who punishes with fire, so, if you find them, kill them.**” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 52, Number 259)

But to exalt fire as a *specific* form of punishment is, in Yogin experience, a sign of the Asura due to the nature of pain involved, the anguish and disfiguring of burning when compared to relatively benign forms of death such as a solitary bullet or a fatal injection. Degraded into the abyss is the Vedic Aryan's mystic experience of the fire, because to actually use fire to carry out a cruel retribution simply due to thought-crimes, one glorified endlessly in the Quran, requires a sadistic and hateful mentality far beyond the average outlook of a soldier in war. For the noble soldier knows he has to kill the enemy, but does so with a level of equanimity, enjoying the triumph rather than the process leading to it. This is

the normal course of war, with the soldier seeking victory without viewing himself as an instrument of a god's obsession with torture. Mohammed, however, was conditioned to see burning as an appropriate end for the unbeliever, a justified sanction for the latter's 'sin' of disbelief. The Islamic notion of punishment, developed from the communications of the most perverse entity within the Cosmos, is fundamentally different to the 'punishment' we find in a study of the Sanatana Dharma. For in the latter, punishment is administered for the purpose of Karma, the mechanical process of Prakriti by which this correction occurs, though differing significantly in both duration and quality to the Islamic type.

The time afforded to punishment is the most striking of contrasts between the two religions - Islam promising a perpetual retribution, the Hindu religion limiting the extent. The reason lies again in their respective aspirations for the individual – Islam a rigid set of thought and rituals to prevent a future in hell, the Sanatana Dharma an endeavour towards Realization of the Soul. While in Islam the spectre of Allah's revenge lingers in everything the Muslim does, is exalted to a status above even the heavenly realm, with Allah and his angels enjoying the abuse they dispense irrespective of anything else, Karmic punishment is specifically designed to assist the individual grow closer to his true divinity. In the Hindu religion, God rarely takes an active role in Karma, as the latter is a functioning of Prakriti, with its immediate effect to develop the psychological nature of the individual whether in a particular lifetime or through growth of the Psychic that is then carried into subsequent births. As previously mentioned, Karma assists in transitioning the nature from *tamas* (inertia, nescience) to *rajas* (action, passion, kinesis), to higher forms of *rajas* and the *sattvic* (pure, peaceful, calm) consciousness which is generally the foundation for most attempts at spiritual liberation. A karmic outcome is not necessarily a result of punishment, though at times it can be a cosmic reaction to previous acts; but as the Hindu religion is not preoccupied with the concept of "sin", when Karma functions as a punishment, it is primarily an attempt to correct (even to the extent of death) an error or falsehood of the individual consciousness, to transition that consciousness from diversionary paths towards one closer to his *svadharma*, the law by which his nature is progressively conquered by the Psychic. Karmic 'retribution' differs from Islam again in the fact that it is not necessarily physical: the psychology is far more important. Of course, physical outcomes, such as if one literally decides to play with fire, are obviously a part of this mechanical process, but the resultant burning or other similar corporeal manifestation are never eternal. Also, certain severe terrestrial outcomes, such as dying in an avalanche, are considered to arise out of unfortunate circumstances or luck or poor decision-making, rather than a God's *desire* to inflict suffering.

Far then from an infinite torture resulting from "disbelief" is Karma; indeed in the Sanatana Dharma, the Divine is considered to work through or influence great humans, known as *vibhutis*, who are sometimes Atheist. God, in the Hindu experience, is not desperately concerned with disbelief, because He knows that the Psychic often develops most rapidly without ritualistic or dogmatic constraints that unfortunately can accompany religion. And as He has fashioned reincarnation, He understands that trial and error are likely to occur over numerous lifetimes. Thus all experiences are accepted by him, and any Karma that manifests as transient punishment or even retribution, are secretly done out of love for Himself rather than to take sadistic delight in penance. But as the foundation of Islam is a permanent separation between God and mankind (and separate categories of humans), with the latter living in terror of the former, love is a rare consideration to the Asuric religion. Indeed the Asura prefers that the very thought or mention of God be associated with fear; and in his construction of Islam he capitalized on religious and cultural beliefs already present in West Asia, convictions that emerged due to mankind's habit of applying to God his own egoistic tendencies. The Asura of Falsehood took these Arabic postulations and exaggerated them, all to try and create in man a permanent fear of 'Divine Revenge' for *shirk*. Consequently, a mere belief becomes enough to inaugurate the monstrous apparatus greeting the non-Muslim on arrival in Islam's hellfire, a place that in Islam's conception – with its

perpetual savagery and sheer quantity of victims - is the nadir of human thought and imagination, the ultimate fall in religion from the brilliant Truth of the Vedic Rishi.

* * * *

The exclusivity of Allah from the – as we shall discuss – competing yet nonexistent Gods, and the placement of “disbelievers” in a torture chamber known as hell, are not the only spiritual falsehoods that Islam promotes. Along with his erroneous ‘knowledge’ on the names of God and consequences for Polytheism, the Asura similarly communicated rank falsehoods concerning the nature of the Soul. The Purusha, the Portion of God present in the individual (though it usually remains behind a thick, subtle veil), is experienced by the Yogin to be Immortal, Indestructible, Unblemishable. This strikes as an obvious reality, even when using ordinary mental faculties, because if the Soul is a Portion of God, it must automatically be everlasting. This profound Truth of existence, experienced by the Yogin and recorded enduringly in the Hindu scripture, was best articulated by Sri Krishna to Arjuna in Kurukshetra so many years ago, reviving the warrior's inner law and motivating him to return to battle against his adharmic cousins:

The embodied Soul is eternal in existence, indestructible and infinite; only the material body is factually perishable; therefore fight O Arjuna. Anyone who thinks the Soul is the slayer, and anyone who thinks the Soul is slain, both of them are in ignorance – the Soul never slays nor is slain. The Soul never takes birth and never dies at any time, nor does it come into being again when the body is created. The Soul is birthless, eternal, imperishable and timeless and is never destroyed when the body is destroyed. O Arjuna, one who knows the Soul as eternal, unborn, undeteriorating – how does that person cause death to anyone and whom does he slay? Just as a man gives up old, worn out garments and accepts new apparel, in the same way the embodied Soul gives up old and worn out bodies, verily accepting new bodies. Weapons cannot cleave it, nor the fire burn it, nor do the waters drench it, nor the wind dry up the Soul. The Soul is uncleavable, it is incombustible, insoluble and unwitherable. Eternally stable, immobile, all-pervading, unmodifiable and primordial. It is declared that the Soul is imperceptible, the Soul is inconceivable, the Soul is immutable; therefore knowing it as such, thou should not grieve. (Bhagavad Gita 2:18-25)

In Islam however, the Soul is given qualities antithetical to Sri Krishna's Knowledge of It. Of these false attributes, the most astonishing of all is the Soul as a perishable entity - if Allah so permits the death of It:

And a soul will not die but with the permission of Allah (when) the term is fixed, and whoever desires the reward of this world, I shall give him of it, and whoever desires the reward of the hereafter I shall give him of it, and I will reward the grateful. (Quran 3:145)

This is the exact opposite of Yogin Awareness, in whom the Soul is known and experienced to travel from body to body through time, a Portion of the Divine described in the Upanishads as “the Purusha, no bigger than a thumb, is the inner Self, ever seated in the heart of man.” (Svetasvatara Upanishad, Part III) The falsehood of declaring a Soul to potentially die is alone enough to disabuse the notion that a luminous, divine figure was the one guiding Mohammed. For only a being without a Soul itself could be so prone to perpetuating a myth of the Soul perishing, or, as professed in another verse, being destroyed:

And forsake those who take their religion for a pastime and a jest, and whom the life of the

world beguileth. **Remind (mankind) hereby lest a soul be destroyed by what it earneth.** It hath beside Allah no protecting ally nor intercessor, and though it offer every compensation it will not be accepted from it. Those are they who perish by their own deserts. **For them is drink of boiling water and a painful doom, because they disbelieved.** (Quran 6:70)

Disbelief in Allah is not the only way a Soul is destroyed; a failure to follow the Prophet yields a similar fate:

Had it been a near adventure and an easy journey they had followed thee, but the distance seemed too far for them. Yet will they swear by Allah (saying): “If we had been able we would surely have set out with you.” **They destroy their souls**, and Allah knoweth that they verily are liars. (Quran 9:42)

A religion with genuine mystic knowledge would never attribute to an incombustible, insoluble and unwitherable entity the limitations besetting mankind. But as the Asura of Falsehood is a creature of the Vital world, without a Soul or Psychic Being, seeing itself as greater than Brahma, aiming to prevent the transformation of the earthly life to the Divine, mistaking its own separative consciousness for the greatest truth of existence, he naturally projects upon any deity characteristics native to *himself* and the overall *avidya* or Ignorance. Thus the features of the Vital world – of which the Asura belongs – are entirely present in Islam's description of the Soul, something in reality eternal, unborn, undeteriorating, beyond the limitation and death that accompanies all vital sheaths and formations. The Purusha, in contrast to the Asura of Falsehood's lies, is “the Maker of all things, self-luminous and all-pervading, He dwells always in the hearts of men.” (Svetasvatara Upanishad, Part IV) Yet Islam dares to claim that something as fundamentally situated as the Soul can in fact be lost by mortals!

Say: “To whom belongs what is in the heavens and the earth?” Say: “To Allah; He has ordained mercy on Himself; most certainly He will gather you on the resurrection day - there is no doubt about it. **(As for) those who have lost their souls, they will not believe.**” (Quran 6:012)

Numerous are the ways that the Muslim may find his Soul vanishing, especially if we take the ambiguous Islamic explanation that a lack of good deeds is to blame:

Do they wait for aught but its final sequel? On the day when its final sequel comes about, those who neglected it before will say: “Indeed the messengers of our Lord brought the truth; are there for us then any intercessors so that they should intercede on our behalf? Or could we be sent back so that we should do (deeds) other than those which we did?” **Indeed they have lost their souls and that which they forged has gone away from them.** (Quran 7:53)

Forgery in the Quran, in addition to the alteration of scripture, refers to the practice of Polytheism - the “forging” of partners with Allah, as the following passage implies when it describes the inventions that fail the disbelievers:

And who is more unjust than he who forges a lie against Allah? These shall be brought before their Lord, and the witnesses shall say: “These are they who lied against their Lord. Now surely the curse of Allah is on the unjust. Who debar (men) from the way of Allah and would have it crooked, and who are disbelievers in the Hereafter.” Such will not escape in the earth, nor have they any protecting friends beside Allah. For them the torment will be double. They could not bear to hear, and they used not to see. **Such are they who have lost their souls, and that which they used to invent hath failed them.** Assuredly in the Hereafter they will be the greatest losers. (Quran 11:18-22)

A hadith mentioning one of the previous verses describes once more a book of deeds that is recorded throughout the life of an individual:

Narrated Safwan bin Muhriz Almazini:

While I was walking with Ibn Umar holding his hand, a man came in front of us and asked, "What have you heard from Allah's Apostle about An-Najwa?" Ibn Umar said, "I heard Allah's Apostle saying, 'Allah will bring a believer near Him and shelter him with His Screen and ask him: Did you commit such-and-such sins?' He will say: 'Yes, my Lord.' Allah will keep on asking him till he will confess all his sins and will think that he is ruined. Allah will say: 'I did screen your sins in the world and I forgive them for you today', and then he will be given the book of his good deeds. Regarding infidels and hypocrites (their evil acts will be exposed publicly) and the witnesses will say: These are the people who lied against their Lord. Behold! The Curse of Allah is upon the wrongdoers.'" (11.18) (Sahih Bukhari Volume 3, Book 43, Number 621)

In a different Quran passage, a paucity of good deeds is directly linked to a rejection of Allah's communications and the *disappearance* of the Soul:

And as for him whose good deeds are light, these are they who shall have lost their souls, abiding in hell. The fire shall scorch their faces, and they therein shall be in severe affliction. "Were not My communications recited to you? But you used to reject them."

They shall say: "O our Lord! our adversity overcame us and we were an erring people: O our Lord! Take us out of it; then if we return (to evil) surely we shall be unjust." He shall say: "Go away into it and speak not to Me." (Quran 23:103-108)

The fallacies present in these verses describing the loss of Souls are numerous, originating from erroneous fabrications as to what consciously happens after the death of a body. The Purusha, as the Bhagavad Gita illumines, relinquishes bodies like clothing, transmigrating from life to life. There is a small caveat to this basic pattern, for in the Soul's journey, in which its Psychic continues to develop, there are *temporal* periods between the lives that may be marked by a conscious transit (involving the subtle body) to non-material worlds such as Swargaloka (heaven) or Patalas and Narakasyas (underworlds or hell). Beyond the fact that these are not perpetual abodes, in the Sanatana Dharma it is known that the physical body dissolves in the material plane, and does not proceed with the rest of the consciousness into the non-earthly worlds. Thus any subsequent 'punishment' afforded has to be psychological, and nowhere in the Vedas, Upanishads, or Bhagavad Gita, is there a description of an afterlife involving a perpetual hell of physical torture. These works, the Word of Self-Realized individuals, mostly describe a hell upon earth resulting from adharmic and even evil actions. This is best detailed in the Bhagavad Gita, which illuminates upon an "Asuric" type of life materializing out of a particular psychology, that certain men follow:

Afflicted with innumerable fears and anxieties, enveloped in delusions, engrossed in gratification of the senses, **they fall into a hell of their own evil**. They sacrifice and give not out of regard for spiritual injunctions, but from a self-regarding ostentation, from vanity and with a stiff and foolish pride. In the egoism of their strength and power, in the violence of their wrath and arrogance they hate, despise Me, the Soul residing in all bodies. Those envious, cruel, evil, lowest of mankind, I cast down continually into the cycle of birth and death into the wombs of the Asuric. Entering Asuric wombs birth after birth, O Arjuna, such persons never find me, gradually sinking into the most abominable type of existence. There are three gates to hell – lust, anger and greed; therefore they must be renounced by man. A person liberated from these three doors of *tamas*, O Arjuna, performs acts conducive to Self-Realization, gradually attaining the Supreme destination. (Bhagavad Gita 16:16-22)

In this passage of the Gita, it's important to note that the Asuric births are not necessarily implying the person to be a demon incarnate, although this *not* impossible; rather, it is their psychology that the Gita

references, as demonstrated clearly in the description of such a *tamasic* existence. The true Hell is mankind's attachment to fear, anxieties, delusions, sense-based enjoyment, and especially the three gates of lust, anger and greed (the former two, as we shall see, are heavily invoked in Islam); it is an obstinate attachment that accounts for Sri Krishna's comment that "such persons never find me", because they fail to make the *choice to renounce* the primitive psychology. For as humanity is a play of many forces, higher forces are always accessible to counter the lower ones, and even after entering psychologically lower births, the individual still has the *option* of choosing to progress out of his present state: Their failure to find Sri Krishna is simply a decision of their egos to attach to the lower qualities of Prakriti - the contrary renunciation is what allows for segments of humanity to engage in certain activities, such as earning income, without having the psychological reaction of greed, liberating themselves from the traditional tamasic hold and facilitating psychological growth. Also important in the previous passage is the fact that even as Asuric or Asuric-influenced individuals engage in their ignorance, vanity, lust, anger and greed, the Soul continues to reside deep in their heart. Nowhere is there any mention, in the Hindu experience, of any mortal being able to "lose" their Purusha, even if Sri Krishna casts them back into a similar type of birth where the great achievement for that reincarnation will be to make choices favouring either rajasic or sattvic qualities, helping them to accelerate the development of the Psychic.

The Purusha always abides within even the most evil of men, though it may withdraw (without ever leaving) from such a person, deciding to not make any attempts at influencing the individual's present existence. Such a person may have very little development, if any at all, of the Psychic Being distinct from – though an extension of - the Soul, even though the latter is a permanent fixture of earthly existence. The latter will not retreat just because an individual has a peculiar faith not conforming to a monotheistic narrative; instead, qualities similar to cruelty, obstinate narrow-mindedness, incessant hatred, repetitive lying, and sadistic violence are among the many that will cause a Soul to withdraw into a strictly Witness state, if the actions proceed unchecked. Ironically, the Purusha is more likely to withdraw in the individual who properly practices the Islamic religion in which the believer is bombarded from birth with messages promoting incessant fear, delusions, gratification of the senses, aberrant lust, hatred, excessive pride and violence. But even if the Soul withdraws, It can never be lost, as It is Pure Consciousness, meaning that as the Soul is *all* things in the universe, it is simply *impossible* for the Soul to be lost. Man may not be *aware* of his Purusha, but that does not mean It is lost. Indeed just as the Soul is beyond the dualities of man, the pleasure and pain, hot and cold, 'right' and 'wrong', also is the Purusha neither lost nor causing loss. Islam, of course, projects such human dualities upon the Immortal Soul:

And as for him whose measure (of good deeds) is light those are **they who have made their souls suffer loss because they disbelieved in Our communications.** (Quran 7:09)

But the Soul does not "suffer" or lose anything, even in Witness state to an Asuric individual, and certainly not from so-called disbelief, because it is Pure, Eternal, One with All. It is not subject to the *lila* or play of humanity in the terrestrial existence. Even a retreat from the active influence of the individual it embodies is still not a "loss", because the Psychic Being developing can still gain a handful of helpful experiences – through the Soul as a Silent Witness - from even the most Asuric of individuals. Similarly, the mental, vital and physical sheaths the Soul discards at the end of the material life are not at all lost; beneficial gains are still absorbed by the Psychic. The projection of loss onto the Purusha is a sign of the lower vital nature of the Islamic religion, falsely attributing to the Divine a deficiency belonging to itself. Indeed the ability, according to Islamic 'knowledge', of the Soul to die or be destroyed, for man to lose it or for it to suffer loss, is clearly meant to be understood in a tangible and corporeal manner, unambiguously expressed in the following verse:

I swear by the Angels **who violently pull out the souls of the wicked,** And by those who gently

draw out the Souls of the blessed. (Quran 79:01-02)

The context here is that of the individual – who, let us recall, by the time of the afterlife has lost his mental, vital, and physical sheaths – suffering as his Soul is “violently” *pulled* out, like a surgeon removing an organ. The Purusha however, is something intangible, immovable; it is not subject to the laws of the material plane of which pushing and pulling are included. Only a religion entrenched in the lower vital ego assigns to a Portion of God, and the afterlife, laws pertaining to its own realm. At heart, this is the great falsehood of Islam, the projection of the separative egoistic consciousness on every aspect of the universe, including the Purusha. Consequently belief and unbelief, acquisition and loss, pain and pleasure, are all imputed to regions beyond their actual, limited scope. Thus the Soul becomes something that can be “pulled” by an angel, or, as per the following hadith, “captured”!

Narrated Abdullah bin Abi Qatada:

My father said, “One night we were travelling with the Prophet and some people said, ‘We wish that Allah's Apostle would take a rest along with us during the last hours of the night.’ He said, ‘I am afraid that you will sleep and miss the (Fajr) prayer.’ Bilal said, ‘I will make you get up.’ So all slept and Bilal rested his back against his Rahila and he too was overwhelmed (by sleep) and slept. The Prophet got up when the edge of the sun had risen and said, ‘O Bilal! What about your statement?’ He replied, ‘I have never slept such a sleep.’ **The Prophet said, ‘Allah captured your souls when He wished, and released them when He wished.** O Bilal! Get up and pronounce the Adhan for the prayer.’ The Prophet performed ablution and when the sun came up and became bright, he stood up and prayed.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 1, Book 10, Number 569)

The Purusha, however, is not something that is to be captured by a Supreme deity, because it is *impossible to capture something that already belongs to oneself*. Brahma is the Purusha, it is not other than He. There is no difference between the two other than that the latter is the – *unseparated* – Aspect of Brahma that embodies, deep within the heart of man, in the earthly manifestation. It is the ego that experiences itself as the capturer or the captured; the Purusha is neither, as It is beyond the earthly play where dualities occur. Irrespective of all the salutations given to him as a spiritual figure, Mohammed in reality had very little Psychic understanding, and even less intuition or spiritual discrimination. Hence his quick submission to the Asura of Falsehood, his unquestioning acceptance of this ludicrous idea that God is subject to the same vicissitudes of mortals, a most dangerous of premises. For if the Soul and God are subject to the same base laws of man, then the highest ideal of existence inevitably becomes an intensification of the lower vital rather than a transformation of, or a striving to live above, its impure character. The resultant life, now based upon the principles of instinct, hatred and violence, a law to which even the Soul is allegedly subjected, can only lead to the most severe of internal and external ramifications.

* * * *

Submitting to the fundamental requirement of living in fear of Allah, inundated with the ‘Word’ describing the evil of *shirk*, terrified by tales of the severe punishment administered to disbelievers and Polytheists, aware of his god's explicit hatred toward the unbeliever, Mohammed predictably developed a mindset of superiority and separateness to his disbelieving brethren. This was one of the primary objectives the Asura of Falsehood had for his instrument, to convince Mohammed that it was impossible to have an inherent equality between Muslims and non-Muslims, a mindset that inevitably entrenched a rigid psychology of separatism. This absence of samata in Islam is epitomized in the

following Quran verses:

Allah sets forth a parable: (Consider) a slave, the property of another, (who) has no power over anything, and one whom We have granted from Ourselves a goodly sustenance so he spends from it secretly and openly; are the two alike? (All) praise is due to Allah! Nay, most of them do not know. And Allah sets forth a parable of two men; one of them is dumb, not able to do anything, and he is a burden to his master. Wherever he sends him, he brings no good; can he be held equal with him who enjoins what is just, and he (himself) is on the right path? (Quran 16:75-76)

But both men are in fact intrinsically equal, though within the earthly realm one may be superior in a *specific, temporary and manifested* status to another. A religion based on Psychic principles, rather than the primitive law of the lower vital, assuredly proposes ideas of equality in accordance with the knowledge of the Purusha that sits deep in the heart of all humans and thus confirms their *inherent* unity. Islam, on the other hand, was concocted by a hostile vital emanation without a Soul, without samata, falsely believing himself to be superior to Brahma. It is a religion that, in order to crystallize the falsehood of a permanent separation of Muslim from non-Muslim, relays to its followers a lie of unbelievers having Satans for guardians, an accusation helping to establish the ‘other’ as an enemy:

O children of Adam! Let not the Satan cause you to fall into affliction as he expelled your parents from the garden, pulling off from them both their clothing that he might show them their evil inclinations: he surely sees you, he as well as his host, from whence you cannot see them. **Surely We have made the Satans to be the guardians of those who do not believe.** (Quran 7:27)

Knowing this ‘revealed truth’ pertaining to unbelievers, why would a Muslim seek any sort of association with them? The kuffar gods, after all, are of Satan – and so are the infidels themselves. They are the worst of creatures, hated by Allah. They repeat, on a daily basis, the greatest sin of all – *shirk*. Respect or inherent equality are hardly considerations for such a benighted class of creatures; for the non-Muslims are assuredly sub-human, these mortals daring to think in a non-Islamic fashion. Inevitably, given their alleged relationship with Satan, the Quran also ‘reveals’ that the non-believers actively seek to eliminate Allah’s light: “They desire to put out the light of Allah with their mouths, and Allah will not consent save to perfect His light, though the unbelievers are averse.” (Quran 9:32) The unbelievers are also said to plot against “the revelations”, with Allah scheming in response:

And they will say: “If only a portent were sent down upon him from his Lord!” Then say, (O Mohammed): “The Unseen belongeth to Allah. So wait! Lo! I am waiting with you.” And when We cause mankind to taste of mercy after some adversity which had afflicted them, Behold! They have some plot against Our revelations. Say: “Allah is more swift in plotting.” Lo! Our messengers write down that which ye plot. (Quran 10:20-21)

The kuffar of historic times dared to demand that which belonged to Allah’s messengers, a desire that led them to “plot”, for which they were to receive a deserved humiliation:

And thus have We made in every city great ones of its wicked ones, that they should plot therein. They do but plot against themselves, though they perceive not. And when a token cometh unto them, they say: “We will not believe till we are given that which Allah’s messengers are given.” Allah knoweth best with whom to place His message. Humiliation from Allah and heavy punishment will smite the guilty for their scheming. (Quran 6:123-24)

While – and this issue will be addressed in depth later – these verses were evidently communicated in reference to the conflict between disbelievers and believers of Mohammed’s bygone era, it is the very nature of Islam, as the *final* ‘Word’ of Allah, to have such inverted profundities stand the test of time.

Thus the paranoia present in the previous verses can be intimated upon the non-Muslims of today, even among those who are not - unlike in Mohammed's lifetime - officially battling the Muslims, with the actual events of the Prophet's era – as we shall discuss - providing only a minor amount of verification to Gabriel's messages to his instrument. And while it is not entirely clear if the kuffar of Mohammed's life were consistently plotting against Islam, Allah's "light", or the infrarational revelations, what is irrefutable is that the Asura of Falsehood informed Mohammed of the "truth" that Islam will conquer the world:

He it is Who sent His Messenger with guidance and the religion of truth, that He might cause it to prevail over all religions, though the polytheists may be averse. (Quran 9:33)

This prophecy is so crucial to the religion that Gabriel deemed it worthy of an almost verbatim repeat, telling Mohammed in a different occult interaction, "**He it is Who sent His Messenger with the guidance and the true religion that He may make it prevail over all the religions.**" And Allah is enough for a witness." (Quran 48:28) In another chapter of the Quran, we also find this fundamental prediction of Islam prevailing over all the different religions; in this particular surah, the doctrine is preceded by the habitual claim that the unbelievers frequently utter lies against Allah, even as Muslims magnanimously invite them to Islam - such is the evil kuffar desire to destroy the "light" of the 'one true god'!

And when Jesus, son of Mary said: "O Children of Israel! Surely I am the Messenger of Allah to you, verifying that which is before me of the Taurat and giving the good news of a Messenger who will come after me, his name being Ahmad." But when he came to them with clear arguments they said: "This is clear magic." And who is more unjust than he who forges a lie against Allah even as he is being invited to Islam, and Allah does not guide the unjust people. They desire to put out the light of Allah with their mouths but Allah will perfect His light, though the unbelievers may be averse. **He it is Who sent His Messenger with the guidance and the true religion, that He may make it overcome the religions, all of them, though the polytheists may be averse.** (Quran 61:06-09)

The Hadith also record Mohammed as saying that the victory over non-Muslim opponents is unremitting until "Allah's Order", possibly on the Day of Judgement, whereupon the Muslims remain victorious – presumably in the afterlife:

Narrated Muawiya:

Allah's Apostle said, "If Allah wants to do good for somebody, he makes him comprehend the Religion (i.e. Islam), and Allah is the Giver and I am Al-Qasim (i.e. the distributor), and this (Muslim) nation will remain victorious over their opponents, till Allah's Order comes and they will still be victorious." (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 53, Number 346)

Naturally, if Islam is supposed to vanquish the rest of the religions, it must also be the only true religion before Allah. As one would expect, the Quran confirms this 'truth':

Surely the (true) religion with Allah is Islam, and those to whom the Book had been given did not show opposition but after knowledge had come to them, out of envy among themselves. And whoever disbelieves in the communications of Allah then surely Allah is quick in reckoning. (Quran 3:19)

The Asura of Falsehood, having made clear the sin of *shirk* and the 'falsehood' of innumerable gods, without fail declared that if anyone chooses a religion "other than Islam", they will find defeat in the afterlife:

And whoever desires a religion other than Islam, it shall not be accepted from him, and in

the hereafter he shall be one of the losers. (Quran 3:85)

Though Gabriel, as evidenced by the Quran itself, was overall more preoccupied with warning Mohammed about the perils in taking the wrong path to the hellfire, in the latter stages of the Prophet's life, the Asura's attention transitioned to goading Mohammed into an active attempt at bringing to fruition the prophecy of Islam subjugating the world. Such a denouement appeared scarcely credible as Mohammed sat alone in the cave of Hira, that an uncouth Bedouin was to engender a politico-religious movement bringing terror throughout the planet. But Mohammed, when faced with a Titanic figure of the craftiest, most shifting nature, could not help but succumb to fear of a ghastly revenge for failing to fulfil Allah's command. It was this that primarily drove him, a grave apprehension that made him believe in the 'truth' of Islam's hellfire and the desperate need of mankind to avoid their foretold catastrophe - even if it required they acquiesce to violent conquest. And while this fear was the source of his belief, his faith was nevertheless near-resolute, constantly replenished through awe-inspiring occult encounters with the Asura of Falsehood: A strong faith, even in the most irrational, hateful, and wicked of things, remains a potent, nearly incomparable fountainhead of strength for a mortal in any venture he undertakes, irrespective of the opinion of others or the circumstances of the world.

Therefore if Mohammed initially embarked on his mission alone, it was inevitable that he would attract followers, as the sheer intensity of his belief, and the allure of a man so convinced of mankind's future destiny, always prove irresistible to certain individuals who gravitate towards those with a crude vital strength. However, faced with a culture whose religious roots had been laid down in centuries prior, he was never – even with the formidable Asura supporting him – going to be able to convince, with mere words alone, the entire Arab population to give up their heritage and join his monomaniacal faction. Indoctrinated as he was with the presumed Islamic destiny to conquer the world, frustration was the inevitable outcome to the resistance he *initially* met from his compatriots. It was to this that Gabriel countered with some of his most skillful manipulation, the byproduct of both his understanding of mankind's primitive nature and Mohammed's unwavering submission to the Asuric command. The response put forth by the Asura of Falsehood relied heavily on the infrarational revelations of Allah screening the eyes, covering the ears, and closing the hearts of men to the 'truth' of Islam. Thus it was not Mohammed's fault that the unbelievers of his time refused to heed the 'light' of Islam – it was Allah's will, and the Prophet was *not* to force the matter on the unclean, impure, non-Muslims:

And if your Lord had pleased, surely all those who are in the earth would have believed, all of them. **Will you then force men till they become believers?** And it is not for a soul to believe except by Allah's permission; and **He casts uncleanness on those who will not understand.** (Quran 10:99-100)

This verse, and similar communications, were presented to Mohammed to assure him of the greatness of his mission and its destined success, even if all appeared bleak at the time of the infrarational revelation. These messages were crucial in the early stages of Gabriel's engagement with his instrument, because incipient Islam was militarily and politically weak, hence unlikely to sustain a physical confrontation – a quicker way of obtaining conversions - with the “evil” unbelievers. The Asura knew it was unwise for Mohammed to aggravate the Polytheists too much, potentially evoking a violent response when the Muslims were not strong enough to meet it. Thus the Prophet was initially tasked with “warning” the Polytheists of their fate without actively seeking to change their manner of worship. Though restricted to mere exhortations, Mohammed was nonetheless left unimpeded to absorb within his ranks Arabs wishing to join his religion, steadily increasing his numbers to the point where Gabriel felt comfortable enough to suggest war with the disbelievers *if* the latter desired it, otherwise assigning punishment of them to Allah on the Day of Judgement rather than Mohammed's earthly Islamic army:

Or do they say: “A poet, we wait for him the evil accidents of time.” Say: “Wait, for surely I too

with you am of those who wait.” Nay! Do their understandings bid them this? Or are they an inordinate people? Or do they say: “He has forged it.” Nay! They do not believe. Then let them bring an announcement like it if they are truthful. Or did they create the heavens and the earth? Nay! They have no certainty. Or have they the treasures of your Lord with them? Or have they been set in absolute authority? Or have they the means by which they listen? Then let their listener bring a clear authority. Or has He daughters while you have sons? Or do you ask them for a reward, so that they are overburdened by a debt? Or have they the unseen so that they write (it) down? **Or do they desire a war? But those who disbelieve shall be the vanquished ones in war. Or have they a god other than Allah? Exalted is Allah from what they set up (with Him).** And if they should see a portion of the heaven coming down, they would say: “Piled up clouds.” **Leave them then till they meet that Day of theirs wherein they shall be made to swoon (with terror).** The day on which their struggle shall not avail them aught, nor shall they be helped. And surely those who are unjust shall have a punishment besides that (in the world), but most of them do not know. (Quran 52:30-48)

Patiently waiting for his aggregate creation, the Muslims, to gather critical mass, the Lord of Falsehood followed the maxim of truth by repeated assertion, sustaining the hatred in his instrument, reminding him of the supposedly debased nature of the kuffar, of their lies and treachery and mythical gods. When enough followers willing to obey Gabriel's command - funnelled as it was through Mohammed - were corralled, the Asura proceeded to the next tactical stage beyond idle threats: Warfare. This was the final and crucial component to the religion created to fulfil the Asura of Falsehood's ambition of Islam conquering the world and imposing its – *his* - ideological values on mankind. For warnings alone, mere persuasion through fear, are not enough for the master ‘religion’ in its ‘enlightened’ pursuit, its quest to destroy diversity of thought and spiritual practice. Instead, it is *jihad*, the demand of the Muslim to “strive” or “go forth” in physical battle against the despicable disbeliever, conquering them and their religion, that represents the highest endeavour for the pious devotee of Allah. This is the last and final ‘Word’ of his god, that the Muslim, the genuine believer, must fight those who fail to believe in Allah's exclusivity as the ‘one true god’:

O ye who believe! **Fight those of the disbelievers who are near to you, and let them find harshness in you, and know that Allah is with those who keep their duty (unto Him).**
(Quran 9:123)

The believer is only following what Allah specifically, by name, directed Mohammed to do prior to the infidel's destined afterlife fate: “**O Prophet! Strive against the disbelievers and the hypocrites! Be harsh with them.** Their ultimate abode is hell, a hapless journey's end.” (Quran 9:73) Gabriel repeated to him the same directive on a different occasion: “**O Prophet! Strive hard against the unbelievers and the hypocrites,** and be hard against them. And their abode is hell, and evil is the resort.” (Quran 66:09) In another verse Mohammed was commanded to urge the believers on, to fight in Allah's cause against the kuffar, whose response is to be rendered ineffective by Allah:

So fight (O Mohammed) in the way of Allah. Thou art not taxed (with the responsibility for anyone) except thyself - and urge on the believers. Per adventure Allah will restrain the might of those who disbelieve. Allah is stronger in might and stronger in inflicting punishment.
(Quran 4:84)

The call to fight the unbelievers, to wage war against Polytheists like the Hindus, is the inescapable finale to a thought controlling ideology that directs the base emotion of hatred upon those it perceives as the ‘other’, a group it additionally declares guilty of fighting for Satan, surely the most evil of all and someone whose support of the kuffar should quickly ‘inspire’ the believers to wage war against them and their disbelief:

Those who believe fight in the way of Allah, and those who disbelieve fight in the way of the Satan. Fight therefore against the friends of the Satan: surely the strategy of the Satan is weak. (Quran 4:76)

But to persistently attribute to Satan the beliefs and actions of unbelievers is a case of Gabriel – and Muslims - protesting too much, the small man's form of reflection, unable to see the falsehood in his *own* viciousness, hatred and lies, choosing instead to project this upon the mythical 'other'. Indeed the shallowness of the Asuric consciousness is one that easily proceeds from a simple hatred of the non-Muslim's rejection of Islam into killing them specifically because of said opposition to Allah and his Messenger:

When He caused calm to fall on you as a security from Him and sent down upon you water from the cloud that He might thereby purify you, and take away from you the uncleanness of the Satan, and that He might fortify your hearts and steady (your) footsteps thereby. Remember when your Lord revealed to the angels: **"I am with you, therefore make firm those who believe. I will cast terror into the hearts of those who disbelieve. Therefore strike off their heads and strike off every fingertip of them."** That is because they opposed Allah and His messenger. **Whoso opposeth Allah and His messenger, (for him) lo! Allah is severe in punishment.** That (is the award), (it will be said) "so taste it, and (know) that for disbelievers is the torment of the Fire." (Quran 8:11-14)

Explicit here is the rationale for war, that of the 'disbelief' and 'disobedience' held by the 'other'; it is a completely infrarational impetus to kill someone who simply does not hold the same faith, who opposes the *exclusivity* of Allah or the superficial assumption that unity is obtained when mankind thinks the same way and believes in the same name of God. This is an infrarational revelation that can stand on its own without the restraining facts of either Mohammed's time or the era of a particular believer; all that is needed is the opinion that the kuffar are 'disobeying' (by thought and belief!) Allah and the Prophet. Yet even without Asuric verses like the previous ones, or the following, such violence can spontaneously occur when so much hatred is aroused, as the infrarational violence engendered is an avenue of release for the internal tension caused by the vitriol espoused by the Islamic religion. Nevertheless, the Asura of Falsehood left little to chance, unequivocally ordering Muslims to "strive" against those who denied the messengers:

And certainly We have repeated this to them that they may be mindful, but the greater number of men do not consent to aught except denying. And if We had pleased We would certainly have raised a warner in every town. **So do not follow the unbelievers, and strive against them with a great endeavour.** (Quran 25:50-52)

Faced as they – an incipient religious group amidst well-established faiths of the region – were with a sizeable Polytheist contingent opposing them, it was only natural for Mohammed's companions to cower in fear of those whom they were commanded to battle. In response to this, the Asura of Falsehood went further than simply reminding them that a believer is only to fear Allah alone. Additionally, a 'divine revelation' was brought forth declaring a steadfast Muslim army to be assured of conquering an enemy ten times its size:

O Prophet! Exhort the believers to fight. If there be of you twenty steadfast they shall overcome two hundred, and if there be of you a hundred (steadfast) they shall overcome a thousand of those who disbelieve, because they (the disbelievers) are a folk without intelligence. (Quran 8:65)

The importance of such verses – rare positive encouragement rather than the usual intimidation – cannot be overemphasized. After all, if Allah has, in his final set of revelations *ever*, declared as an eternal 'truth' that the pious Muslims are inherently capable of overcoming insurmountable odds, this

verse will then function as a perpetual fount for ensuing Muslim generations to absorb courage from, for their leaders to motivate them with, for them to justify their own barbaric actions. Also, as it is a 'revealed' communication, it becomes *obligatory* for the Muslim to follow, irrespective of the time period he lives in. One hadith in particular illustrates the mandatory – until the Day of Judgement - nature of this particular communication:

Narrated Ibn Abbas:

When the Verse: - “If there are twenty steadfast amongst you, they will overcome two hundred” (8.65) was revealed, **then it became obligatory for the Muslims that one (Muslim) should not flee from ten (non-Muslims)**. Sufyan (the sub- narrator) once said, “Twenty (Muslims) should not flee before two hundred (non Muslims).” Then there was revealed: ‘But now Allah has lightened your (task)...’ (8.66)

So it became obligatory that one-hundred (Muslims) should not flee before two hundred (non-Muslims). (Once Sufyan said extra, “The Verse: ‘Urge the believers to the fight. If there are twenty steadfast amongst you (Muslims)...’ was revealed.”) (Sahih Bukhari Volume 6, Book 60, Number 175)

While the load was infrarationally revealed to have been decreased in verse 8:66 to two-to-one odds, it does not negate the fact that Muslims are *required* to fight when facing ten-to-one odds – only after this initial display of fidelity to Islamic warfare will Allah 'lighten' their task. Different hadith likewise give additional evidence attesting to the paramount importance Allah assigns jihad against the disbeliever. In these authentic hadith, we find many declarations from the Prophet of Islam - the mortal deemed worthy enough to receive the final infrarational revelations of Allah - regarding the importance of jihad against the non-Muslims for their belief-crimes. For instance, in Mohammed's esteemed opinion, only the exclusive belief in Allah and his Messenger should be considered greater than jihad in Islam's inverted hierarchy of “goodness”:

Narrated Abu Huraira:

Allah's Apostle was asked, “What is the best deed?” He replied, “To believe in Allah and His Apostle (Mohammed). The questioner then asked, “What is the next (in goodness)?” He replied, “To participate in Jihad (religious fighting) in Allah's Cause.” The questioner again asked, “What is the next (in goodness)?” He replied, “To perform Hajj (Pilgrim age to Mecca) Mubru, (which is accepted by Allah and is performed with the intention of seeking Allah's pleasure only and not to show off and without committing a sin and in accordance with the traditions of the Prophet).” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 1, Book 2, Number 25)

On another occasion the Prophet, this time interpreting deeds strictly as action rather than belief, replied that jihad is an unequalled deed for the believer:

Narrated Abu Huraira:

A man came to Allah's Apostle and said, “Instruct me as to such a deed as equals Jihad (in reward).” He replied, “I do not find such a deed.” Then he added, “Can you, while the Muslim fighter is in the battle-field, enter your mosque to perform prayers without cease and fast and never break your fast?” The man said, “But who can do that?” Abu Huraira added, “The Mujahid (i.e. Muslim fighter) is rewarded even for the footsteps of his horse while it wanders about (for grazing) tied in a long rope.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 52, Number 44)

The Prophet also noted that the best among the people are those who “strive” in Allah's cause, even if they have to sacrifice their lives:

Narrated Abu Said Al-Khudri:

Somebody asked, "O Allah's Apostle! Who is the best among the people?" Allah's Apostle replied, "A believer who strives his utmost in Allah's Cause with his life and property." They asked, "Who is next?" He replied, "A believer who stays in one of the mountain paths worshipping Allah and leaving the people secure from his mischief." (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 52, Number 45)

Even a singular attempt at fighting in Allah's cause is, for the 'best' of mankind, a mission superior to anything the world has to offer:

Narrated Anas bin Malik:

The Prophet said, "A single endeavour (of fighting) in Allah's Cause in the forenoon or in the afternoon is better than the world and whatever is in it." (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 52, Number 50)

In case of any confusion regarding the constitution of "Allah's Cause", the Prophet of Islam made its nature absolutely clear to his followers:

Narrated Abu Musa:

A man came to the Prophet and asked, "O Allah's Apostle! What kind of fighting is in Allah's cause? (I ask this), for some of us fight because of being enraged and angry and some for the sake of his pride and haughtiness." The Prophet raised his head (as the questioner was standing) and said, "**He who fights so that Allah's Word (Islam) should be superior, then he fights in Allah's cause.**" (Sahih Bukhari Volume 1, Book 3, Number 125)

In a complimentary response to a similar question, the Prophet declared that the best reason for a Muslim to undertake jihad is - rather than potential spoils of war or fame - in order to impose Islam's superiority upon the kuffar:

Narrated Abu Musa:

A man came to the Prophet and asked, "A man fights for war booty; another fights for fame and a third fights for showing off; which of them fights in Allah's Cause?" **The Prophet said, "He who fights that Allah's Word (i.e. Islam) should be superior, fights in Allah's Cause."** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 52, Number 65)

As he had been commanded by Allah to fight the unbelievers, as it had been infrarationally revealed to him that Islam will conquer and subjugate all of the religions, this *had* to become the fundamental reason for Mohammed and his followers to engage in warfare. And because Allah's 'Word' is eternal and not bound by time and place, the scriptural content demanding war against the kuffar remains as the rationale for modern Muslims when faced with an unbelieving enemy that includes *both* civilians and armed soldiers, because the Quran assigns the enemy label to disbelief alone without such distinctions. Additionally, there exists minimal sentiment, in hadith like the above or in most of the Quran verses concerning warfare, for strictly defensive warfare, or the need to maintain an equal space for Islam among the many religions. Even the possibility of defence is only a tactical consideration, a means to an end decreed by the only supreme deity. Indeed such is the emphasis upon achieving global domination in Islam, that those who die in jihad against the non-Muslims are given the special status of martyr, a salutation shared in only four other circumstances:

Narrated Abu Huraira:

Allah's Apostle said, "While a man was going on a way, he saw a thorny branch and removed it from the way and Allah became pleased by his action and forgave him for that." Then the

Prophet said, “Five are martyrs: One who dies of plague, one who dies of an abdominal disease, one who dies of drowning, one who is buried alive (and) dies and one who is killed in Allah's cause.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 1, Book 11, Number 624)

The glory of martyrdom is so unrivalled that Mohammed himself is reported to have desired reincarnation, of all things, upon earth to repeatedly obtain such a death:

Narrated Abu Huraira:

I heard Allah's Apostle saying, “By Him in Whose Hands my life is! Were it not for some men who dislike to be left behind and for whom I do not have means of conveyance, I would not stay away (from any Holy Battle). I would love to be martyred in Allah's Cause and come to life and then get martyred and then come to life and then get martyred and then get resurrected and then get martyred.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 90, Number 332)

For this fanatical devotion to martyrdom he found strong support in the verses infrarationally revealed to him, including one that specifically notes that Allah accepts the wealth and the martyrdom of Muslim jihadis as an *exchange* for their entry into the “Garden” of Islamic paradise:

Lo! Allah hath bought from the believers their lives and their wealth because the Garden will be theirs: **they shall fight in the way of Allah and shall slay and be slain**. It is a promise which is binding on Him in the Torah and the Gospel and the Qur'an. Who fulfilleth His covenant better than Allah? Rejoice then in your bargain that ye have made, for that is the supreme triumph. (Quran 9:111)

This great “bargain” is also referenced in a different communication, one in which the believers are told that the two “good things” are martyrdom in battle or victory while fighting the kuffar for the brute superiority of Islam over the different religions. The verse itself, unlike most of the infrarational Quran verses linking “doom” to a natural disaster caused by Allah, also informs the infidels that the destruction awaiting them might be from the very hands of the Muslims:

Say: Can ye await for us aught save one of two good things (death or victory in Allah's way)? While we await for you that Allah will afflict you with a doom from Him or at our hands. Await then! Lo! We are awaiting with you. (Quran 9:52)

Having heard, from the ‘angel’ Gabriel, these multiple verses extolling fighting against the hated non-Muslims and the greatness of martyrdom if dying for the Asuric cause of Allah, Mohammed could not help but become obsessed with warfare, a fate naturally to be shared by the genuinely Muslim followers of Islam. Indeed such was his preoccupation with warfare against the unbelievers – including the possibility of martyrdom - that he declared himself and other Islamic warriors (mujahideen) to prefer fighting *instead* of the great Paradise considered the ultimate destination for a worthy Muslim:

Narrated Anas bin Malik:

The Prophet said, “Nobody who enters Paradise likes to go back to the world even if he got everything on the earth, except a Mujahid who wishes to return to the world so that he may be martyred ten times because of the dignity he receives (from Allah).”

Narrated Al-Mughira bin Shu'ba: Our Prophet told us about the message of our Lord that “Whoever amongst us is killed will go to Paradise.” Umar asked the Prophet, “Is it not true that our men who are killed will go to Paradise and theirs (i.e. those of the Pagan's) will go to the (Hell) fire?” The Prophet said, “Yes.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 52, Number 72)

This hadith also illustrates another crucial difference between Islam and the Sanatana Dharma, hearkening back to the former's rejection of samata. For the Sanatana Dharma does not declare an

enemy combatant incapable of obtaining Swarga or heaven, or even Self-Realization. This is due to the higher understanding that as all men have within them the Purusha, there is always the *possibility* of each to attain to either the heavenly realms or *moksha*, irrespective of which side they choose in battle. Thus the story of Yuddhisthira, the eldest son of Kunti, finding in heaven his arch-enemy Duryodhana. Brahma, after all, does not take into rigid account the singularity of belief and thought demanded by Islam – more complex is His Will than the distorted Islamic formulation which, rather than the fluid and multi-layered entry to the Swarga (a status nevertheless inferior to Conscious Union with the Supreme) of Hindu mystic experience, is inflexible, manifesting as a near perfect dichotomy between believers in heaven and the kuffar in hell. An exception to this is the aforementioned special status afforded to the mujahideen, who reside in heavenly grades superior to their ordinary Islamic brethren:

Narrated Abu Huraira:

The Prophet said, “Whoever believes in Allah and His Apostle, offer prayer perfectly and fasts the month of Ramadan, will rightfully be granted Paradise by Allah, no matter whether he fights in Allah's Cause or remains in the land where he is born.” The people said, “O Allah's Apostle! Shall we acquaint the people with the good news?” **He said, “Paradise has one-hundred grades which Allah has reserved for the Mujahideen who fight in His Cause, and the distance between each of two grades is like the distance between the Heaven and the Earth. So, when you ask Allah (for something), ask for Al-firdaus which is the best and highest part of Paradise.”** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 52, Number 48)

While there are certainly, as we shall shortly see, caveats – including Quran verses that always supersede authentic hadith - to simply remaining in the land where one is born, we note that this illustrious Paradise, per Mohammed, is infamously found “under the shades of swords.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 52, Number 73) And though the highest regions are reserved specifically for the mujahideen, even those who merely provide non-murderous assistance in Islam's fight for supremacy over the hated kufr religions, will receive a similar reward to the jihadi he helps:

Narrated Zaid bin Khalid:

Allah's Apostle said, “He who prepares a Ghazi going in Allah's Cause is given a reward equal to that of) a Ghazi; and he who looks after properly the dependants of a Ghazi going in Allah's Cause is (given a reward equal to that of) Ghazi.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 52, Number 96)

Similarly, the sheer presence of a Muslim in a battle against a non-Muslim enemy is enough for him to avoid the terrible hellfire:

Narrated Abu Abs: (who is Abdur-Rahman bin Jabir) Allah's Apostle said, “Anyone whose both feet get covered with dust in Allah's Cause will not be touched by the (Hell) fire.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 52, Number 66)

Jihad is so fundamental to Islam that Muslims, according to the Quran, must be ready to immediately respond to the call to war, at the risk of death or injury after actively attempting to fulfil Allah's depraved ambition:

(As for) those who responded (at Ohud) to the call of Allah and the Messenger after the wound had befallen them, those among them who do good (to others) and guard (against evil) shall have a great reward. (Quran 3:172)

The authentic hadith relate the circumstances surrounding Ohud and the previous verse regarding it; for Ohud was a battle after which Mohammed needed immediate reinforcements to chase the Polytheist enemy and prevent them from returning:

Narrated Aisha:

Regarding the Holy Verse: “Those who responded (To the call) of Allah And the Apostle (Muhammad), After being wounded, For those of them Who did good deeds And refrained from wrong, there is a great reward.” (3.172)

She said to Urwa, “O my nephew! Your father, Az-Zubair and Abu Bakr were amongst them (i.e. those who responded to the call of Allah and the Apostle on the day (of the battle of Uhud). When Allah's Apostle suffered what he suffered on the day of Uhud and the pagans left, the Prophet was afraid that they might return. So he said, ‘Who will go on their (i.e. pagans') track?’ He then selected seventy men from amongst them (for this purpose).” (The sub-narrator added, “Abu Bakr and Az-Zubair were amongst them.”) (Sahih Bukhari Volume 5, Book 59, Number 404)

The stipulation of a prompt response to the call of jihad was also ordered by Mohammed on the day of perhaps his greatest triumph:

Narrated Ibn Abbas:

Allah's Apostle said on the day of the conquest of Mecca, “There is no migration now, but there is Jihad (i.e. holy battle) and good intentions. **And when you are called for Jihad, you should come out at once.**” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 53, Number 412)

The conquest of Mecca, the holiest city in Polytheist Arabia, is one of the most famous victories in the ascent of Islam, the proof – if Mohammed needed any – of Islam's irrepressible rise in the Arabian Peninsula, if not the globe. Immediately after this conquest, the Prophet demanded that the brother of one of his followers pledge allegiance to Islam, with belief – presumably of one exclusive deity named Allah – *and* jihad comprising the main components of this obligation:

Narrated Majashi:

I took my brother to the Prophet after the Conquest (of Mecca) and said, “O Allah's Apostle! I have come to you with my brother so that you may take a pledge of allegiance from him for migration.” The Prophet said, “The people of migration (i.e. those who migrated to Medina before the Conquest) enjoyed the privileges of migration (i.e. there is no need for migration anymore).” I said to the Prophet, “For what will you take his pledge of allegiance?” **The Prophet said, “I will take his pledge of allegiance for Islam, Belief, and for Jihad (i.e. fighting in Allah's Cause).”** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 5, Book 59, Number 598)

Undeniable then is the centrality of jihad, the unceasing war against non-Muslims for the sake of proving Islam's superiority through world conquest, so that all of mankind submits to the doctrine of Allah as the only true god, with Mohammed his last Prophet. Indeed, one cannot consider this fundamental Islamic dictate without its partner, because jihad is the principal means by which Islam is to conquer, to impose itself on the world, whereby all mortals, *under duress*, will acknowledge Allah as the sole deity. Such is the emphasis on warfare that we must revisit certain verses that are not as explicit as the previous Asuric revelations and hadith detailing jihad's cardinal position; communications the Muslim can easily interpret as - in lieu of the straightforward descriptions already presented – further justification (if required) for violence against the Infidel. For instance, Allah is infrarationally revealed to severely punish, as a response to the guilty party's rejection of the prophets, the disbelievers *within* the earthly life:

What! Is he whose heart Allah has opened for Islam so that he is in a light from his Lord (like the hard-hearted)? Nay, woe to those whose hearts are hard against the remembrance of Allah; those are in clear error. Allah has revealed the best announcement, a book conformable in its

various parts, repeating, whereat do shudder the skins of those who fear their Lord, then their skins and their hearts become pliant to the remembrance of Allah. This is Allah's guidance, He guides with it whom He pleases; and (as for) him whom Allah makes err, there is no guide for him. Is he then who has to guard himself with his own person against the evil chastisement on the resurrection day? And it will be said to the unjust: "Taste what you earned." Those before them rejected (prophets), therefore there came to them the chastisement from whence they perceived not. **So Allah made them taste the disgrace in this world's life**, and certainly the punishment of the hereafter is greater, but did they know! (Quran 39:22-26)

As detailed earlier, the chastisements meted to the unbelievers are often described in multiple verses as natural calamities, so this Asuric passage can reasonably be interpreted along those lines. Yet even with this information, one could still argue that jihad is but an extension of Allah's punishment, a type of natural disaster inflicted upon the kuffar that is "nearer" to the latter than the hellfire:

Is he then who is a believer like him who is a transgressor? **They are not equal**. As for those who believe and do good, the gardens are their abiding-place, an entertainment for what they did. And as for those who transgress, their abode is the fire. Whenever they desire to go forth from it they shall be brought back into it, and it will be said to them: "Taste the chastisement of the fire which you called a lie." **And most certainly We will make them taste of the nearer chastisement before the greater chastisement that haply they may turn**. And who is more unjust than he who is reminded of the communications of his Lord, then he turns away from them? Surely We will give punishment to the guilty. (Quran 32:18-22)

In a less ambiguous sequence of infrarational revelations (for the previous one can refer to nearer punishments not of a military nature), the non-Muslims in conflict with Mohammed's followers are said to have destroyed their houses with their own *and* the believer's hands. All of this because the kuffar opposed the exclusivity of Allah and his Messenger:

He it is Who caused those who disbelieved of the followers of the Book to go forth from their homes at the first banishment. You did not think that they would go forth, while they were certain that their fortresses would defend them against Allah. **But Allah came to them whence they did not expect, and cast terror into their hearts. They demolished their houses with their own hands and the hands of the believers**. Therefore take a lesson, O you who have eyes! **And had it not been that Allah had decreed for them the exile, He would certainly have punished them in this world**, and in the hereafter they shall have chastisement of the fire. **That is because they acted in opposition to Allah and His Messenger, and whoever acts in opposition to Allah, then surely Allah is severe in retribution**. (Quran 59:02-04)

While Allah is here not directly asking his slaves to strive hard against the unbelievers, he is nevertheless noting the latter's houses to have been destroyed *by* the Muslims, indicative of both his consent to such an attack and a classic example of victim-blaming, whereby heinous actions towards the disbeliever are solely their *own* fault – another Asuric inversion of reality that can be used by the Muslim to rationalize all sorts of depravities (along the same lines, "opposition" can have quite distorted meanings in Islam, including the simple refusal to subjectively accept Allah as the only name of God) against the *untermensch* kuffar. Gabriel also indicates that punishment for disbelief can be undertaken during the earthly life – in this case Allah judged exile to be prudent. And there are indeed plenty of other verses that speak of an earthly chastisement, with the verses in question – like the following - leaving it somewhat unclear if the punishment is supernatural or Allah working through the hands of his Muslim slaves: "(And remember) when Allah said: 'O Jesus! Lo! I am gathering thee and causing thee to ascend unto Me, and am cleansing thee of those who disbelieve and am setting those who follow thee above those who disbelieve until the Day of Resurrection. Then unto Me ye will (all) return, and I shall judge between you as to that wherein ye used to differ. Then as to those who

disbelieve, **I will chastise them with severe chastisement in this world and the hereafter, and they shall have no helpers.**” (Quran 3:55-56) Such passages can be used to provide *supplemental* validation to the verses unambiguously outlining jihad, helping the modern Muslim solidify his desire to further the Islamic ambition through violence. Present as well to affirm his decision are verses that more explicitly associate the punishment dispensed by Allah with the hands of the Muslims, who function as extensions of his chastisement rather than autonomous arbiters of Islamic justice. Indeed in one of these Gabriel infrarationally revealed Allah – and his angels - to have had an active involvement, from well before the time of the Prophet, in the murderous cause of the believers against the non-Muslims:

O you who believe! Be helpers (in the cause) of Allah. As Jesus son of Marium said to (his) disciples: “Who are my helpers in the cause of Allah?” The disciples said: “We are helpers (in the cause) of Allah.” So a party of the children of Israel believed and another party disbelieved, **then We aided those who believed against their enemy**, and they became uppermost. (Quran 61:14)

Similarly, Allah is said to make impotent the nefarious schemes of the unbeliever: “That (is the case); and (know) that Allah (it is) Who maketh weak the plan of disbelievers.” (Quran 8:18) In fact Allah was verily plotting against the unbelievers while at once protecting his final prophet from their desire to kill the terrestrial head of the Islamic religion, the man Allah tasked with destroying all other religions: “And when those who disbelieve plot against thee (O Mohammed) to wound thee fatally, or to kill thee or to drive thee forth, they plot, but Allah (also) plotteth, and Allah is the best of plotters.” (Quran 8:30) The Asura undoubtedly communicated this particular ‘Word’ of Allah to assuage the anxiety of his instrument, filling him with confidence that Allah had ordained the Prophet supernatural security in the midst of war when such designs against the leader of a military are not out of the ordinary. As a further example of this protection, Gabriel informed his instrument that in the thick of battle with the evil disbeliever, Allah had sent forth “hosts” or special emanations to shield the Prophet and his followers, giving them extra strength in their struggle to punish the kuffar for the latter's outrageous belief-crimes:

Allah hath given you victory on many fields and on the day of Hunain, when ye exulted in your multitude. But it availed you naught, and the earth, vast as it is, was straitened for you; then ye turned back in flight. Then Allah sent His peace of reassurance down upon His messenger and upon the believers, **and sent down hosts ye could not see, and punished those who disbelieved. Such is the reward of disbelievers.** (Quran 9:25-26)

Along with embellishing the power of Allah in support of the mujahideen, Gabriel communicated to his instrument that a common practice for a Muslim should include calling upon Allah to make the believers victorious in warfare against the non-Muslims. After all, it is only Allah who is the source of the Islamic victory:

Their cry was only that they said: “Our Lord! Forgive us for our sins and wasted efforts, make our foothold sure, and give us victory over the disbelieving folk.” (Quran 3:147)

The cry is also made in cognizance of Allah standing side to side “with” the believers, as declared by Gabriel in the context of a Muslim army going to battle against the kuffar:

If you demanded a judgement, the judgement has then indeed come to you. And if you desist, it will be better for you. **And if you turn back (to fight), We (too) shall turn back**, and your forces shall avail you nothing, though they may be many, and (know) that **Allah is with the believers.** (Quran 8:19)

While the ‘divine knowledge’ that Allah supports them in battle surely fills the Muslim with confidence, these morale-boosting verses (including the infamous declaration of an assured Islamic success against ten-to-one odds) are sporadic in comparison to the threats made *against* Muslims who

refuse to partake in jihad. Indeed these frequent commandments form a crucial component to both jihad and the very nature of the Islamic religion, representing another application of the Asura of Falsehood's favourite psychological tactic of fear. After all, if Allah commands fighting *and* “rewards” hellfire to those disobeying his infrarational revelations, then it is surely evil to go against the ‘Word’ of Allah by *avoiding* warfare against the non-Muslim:

Have you not seen those to whom it was said: “Withhold your hands, and keep up prayer and pay the poor-rate”? **But when fighting is prescribed for them, lo! a party of them fear men as they ought to have feared Allah, or (even) with a greater fear, and say: “Our Lord! why hast Thou ordained fighting for us? Wherefore didst Thou not grant us a delay to a near end?” Say: “The provision of this world is short, and the hereafter is better for him who guards (against evil); and you shall not be wronged the husk of a date stone. Wherever you are, death will overtake you, though you are in lofty towers.” And if a benefit comes to them, they say: “This is from Allah”; and if a misfortune befalls them, they say: “This is from you.” Say: “All is from Allah.” But what is the matter with these people that they do not make approach to understanding what is told (them)?** (Quran 4:77-78)

Unequivocal here is the perpetual and unmodifiable nature of jihad characterized by the obligatory demand that the believers fight in the cause of Allah, for the inverted truth of subjugating all other religions under the boot of Islam. The threat in this passage is implicit, with the heavenly afterlife an infinitely superior proposition for those not partaking in the “evil” of fleeing from Islam's attempt to impose itself on the unbelievers. But the dangling of the carrot is not enough to convince many “Muslims” of their mandatory obligation, and this betrayal of the basic Muslim duty to participate in jihad was a major problem even during the great Mohammed's time. To counteract it, the Asura of Falsehood repetitively turned to his preferred gambit of using fear; in another infrarational revelation, contained within the following authentic hadith (which provides the background for the specific verse), a severe punishment for deserting the battlefield is hinted at:

Narrated Abdullah bin Kab:

I heard Ka’b bin Malik who was one of the three who were forgiven, saying that he had never remained behind Allah's Apostle in any Ghazwa which he had fought except two Ghazwat Ghazwat-al-Usra (Tabuk) and Ghazwat-Badr. He added, “I decided to tell the truth to Allah's Apostle in the forenoon, and scarcely did he return from a journey he made, except in the forenoon, he would go first to the mosque and offer a two-Rakat prayer. The Prophet forbade others to speak to me or to my two companions, but he did not prohibit speaking to any of those who had remained behind excepting us. So the people avoided speaking to us, and I stayed in that state till I could no longer bear it, and the only thing that worried me was that I might die and the Prophet would not offer the funeral prayer for me, or Allah's Apostle might die and I would be left in that social status among the people that nobody would speak to me or offer the funeral prayer for me. But Allah revealed His Forgiveness for us to the Prophet in the last third of the night while Allah's Apostle was with Um Salama. Um Salama sympathized with me and helped me in my disaster. Allah's Apostle said, ‘O Um Salama! Ka’b has been forgiven!’ She said, ‘Shall I send someone to him to give him the good tidings?’ He said, ‘If you did so, the people would not let you sleep the rest of the night.’ So when the Prophet had offered the Fajr prayer, he announced Allah's Forgiveness for us. His face used to look as bright as a piece of the (full) moon whenever he was pleased. When Allah revealed His Forgiveness for us, we were the three whose case had been deferred while the excuse presented by those who had apologized had been accepted. But when there were mentioned those who had told the Prophet lies and remained behind (the battle of Tabuk) and had given false excuses, they were described with the worse description one may be

described with. Allah said: ‘They will present their excuses to you (Muslims) when you return to them. Say: Present no excuses; we shall not believe you. Allah has already informed us of the true state of matters concerning you. Allah and His Apostle will observe your actions.’ ” (Quran 9:94) (Sahih Bukhari Volume 6, Book 60, Number 199)

While the communication in question (Quran 9:94) does not directly call for the hellfire, it is the understood consequence for a Muslim’s desertion from war duty, and one of the reasons for the Prophet's severe reaction, beyond the disgust he might have felt toward perceived cowards. Indeed the complete abdication of martial duties seen in the Battle of Tabuk is one of the most blatant of offences that the so-called Muslim can commit in attempting to adhere to his religion. For Islam demands of the Muslim a complete internal enthusiasm to involve himself in jihad. If such fervour is not present - as with certain battles during Mohammed's lifetime in which, if his companions did not flee, they nevertheless only half-heartedly engaged the enemy, apprehensive of the unbeliever when only Allah should have been feared -, it is also worthy of a disdain subtly expressed in the following verse:

Even as your Lord caused you to go forth from your house with the truth, **though a party of the believers were surely averse. They disputed with you about the truth after it had become clear, (and they went forth) as if they were being driven to death while they saw (it).** And when Allah promised you one of the two parties that it shall be yours, and you longed that the one not armed should be yours. **And Allah desired to manifest the truth of what was true by His words and to cut off the root of the unbelievers.** That He may manifest the truth of what was true and show the falsehood of what was false, though the guilty disliked. (Quran 8:05-08)

Having been commanded by Allah to strive forth in jihad to uproot the kuffar, Mohammed was faced with an “averse” faction of so-called Muslims who clearly did not believe that the ‘Word’ being received by Mohammed was accurate – or at least not accurate enough for them to enthusiastically risk their lives and wealth for Islam. Yet the previous selection is mild in comparison to others describing such “Muslims”, with another Quran passage laying far more significant scorn upon those unable to live up to the demands of the merciful Allah. These are people who ostensibly submit to the infrarational word, but avoid jihad when asked, and seek to cause mischief if in power:

And those who believe say: “Why has not a chapter been revealed?” **But when a decisive chapter is revealed, and fighting is mentioned therein you see those in whose hearts is a disease look to you with the look of one fainting because of death. Woe to them then!** (They keep affirming) Obedience and a gentle word. But when the affair becomes settled, then if they remain true to Allah it would certainly be better for them. But if you held power, you were sure to make mischief in the land and cut off the ties of kinship! Those it is whom Allah has cursed so He has made them deaf and blinded their eyes. (Quran 47:20-23)

Unfathomable to the real Muslim is this accursed disobedience, because the believers are specifically told, **“And if those who disbelieve fight with you, they would certainly turn (their) backs,** then they would not find any protector or a helper.” (Quran 48:22) Yet even with this ‘knowledge’ of an assured Islamic victory, some of the followers of Mohammed's era inclined to turn their own backs from Allah's command to war, forcing Gabriel to explicitly declare that such a course of action only yields Allah's perpetual wrath upon the guilty party:

O ye who believe! When ye meet those who disbelieve in battle, turn not your backs to them. **Whoso on that day turneth his back to them, unless manoeuvring for battle or intent to join a company, he truly hath incurred wrath from Allah, and his habitation will be hell,** a hapless journey's end. (Quran 8:15-16)

Thus those Muslims who decide *against* fighting in the war for Islam's supremacy over the different

religions, over other forms of thought and belief, will find themselves suffering the same afterlife penalty as the hated kuffar: the terrible hellfire. The message of the Quran is unambiguous in this regard, and as the punishment for fleeing battle – Allah's wrath - is the same as for disbelief, this verse alone signals the obligation of warfare as ultimately equal to the avoidance of *shirk*, at least with regards to the negative consequences. Of course, as the Day of Judgement lies in the distant horizon, men often tend to fear the present rather than a deity's potential rage, and even during the time of Allah's final prophet, countless warnings were ignored and the most clever of excuses were thought of to avoid the call to jihad:

Of them is he who saith: "Grant me leave (to stay at home) and tempt me not." Surely it is into temptation that they (thus) have fallen. Lo! Hell verily is all around the disbelievers. (Quran 9:49)

According to commentary on the Quran, the temptation referred to in this verse is that of the women of Roman (Byzantine) enemies the Prophet sought to engage in battle. The argument made by the so-called believers was that the possibility of succumbing to lust meant they should refrain from battle to avoid sinning¹. But in Islam, as Gabriel's infrarationally revealed response exhibits, abstaining from battle - and using such prevarications to do so - is a far greater sin than lust. Indeed as we shall see, sexual relations – including rape - with enemy females is hardly an unforgivable offence, and was something unworthy of mention in the Prophet's description of the seven destructive sins identified by Islam. Fleeing from battle, however, features prominently in the hadith outlining that particular tradition of Mohammed:

Narrated Abu Huraira:

The Prophet said, "Avoid the seven great destructive sins." The people enquired, "O Allah's Apostle! What are they?" He said, "To join others in worship along with Allah, to practice sorcery, to kill the life which Allah has forbidden except for a just cause, (according to Islamic law), to eat up Riba (usury), to eat up an orphan's wealth, **to give back to the enemy and fleeing from the battlefield at the time of fighting**, and to accuse, chaste women, who never even think of anything touching chastity and are good believers." (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 51, Number 28)

The verse previously mentioned (9:49) is also immediately preceded by a Quran passage that additionally details the type of "believer" who would refrain from battle, those who would dare ask leave from the mandated jihad. In it we find a reiteration of the aforementioned postulation by Gabriel that the "Muslims" who refuse to fight would have caused rebellion and disorder to Mohammed's nascent Islamic army. In this case, the Asura of Falsehood's supposition had an element of reality to it beyond his frequent need to maintain the confidence – or at least the obedience – of his instrument while Islam was engaged in traditional warfare with the disbeliever. For the type of "Muslim" who tries to avoid battle is one who is, if brought along against his will, potentially capable of infecting the rest of the ranks with his disinclination to actually follow the religious obligations of Islam:

Those who believe in Allah and the Last Day ask no leave of thee lest they should strive with their wealth and their lives. Allah is Aware of those who keep their duty (unto Him). They alone ask leave of thee who believe not in Allah and the Last Day, and whose hearts feel doubt, so in their doubt they waver. **And if they had wished to go forth they would assuredly have made ready some equipment, but Allah was averse to their being sent forth and held them back and it was said (unto them): "Sit ye with the sedentary."** Had they gone forth among you they had added to you naught save trouble and had hurried to and fro among you, seeking to cause sedition among you; and among you there are some who would have listened to them. Allah is Aware of evil-doers. Aforetime they sought to cause

sedition and raised difficulties for thee till the Truth came and the decree of Allah was made manifest, though they were loth. (Quran 9:44-48)

As also seen in this selection, the “evil-doers” who refuse to partake in jihad against the non-Muslims are confirmed as themselves disbelieving in Allah, as apostates, because they have abandoned the primary cause of Islam. Of course, Islam is not alone in a *general* denigration of those deserting the battlefield. In the Sanatana Dharma, the fate of warriors abandoning their comrades in war was starkly presented – in a negative fashion - by Lord Krishna to Arjuna:

O Arjuna, happy are the Kshatriyas who achieve a battle of this kind presented in its own accord; such a battle is a wide open path to the heavenly realms. However if you do not engage in this Dharmayuddh, then you have abandoned your svadharma and your reputation, and you will incur sinful reaction. All people will speak of your infamy for all time, and for respected persons infamy is worse than death. The mighty chariot warriors will consider that you retired from the battlefield out of fear and for those whom you have been held in great esteem you will fall into disgrace. Your enemies will speak many malicious and insulting words discrediting your prowess. Alas what could be more painful than that? Either being slain you shall reach the heavenly realm, or by gaining victory you will enjoy earth, therefore O Son of Kunti, confident of success rise up and fight! (Bhagavad Gita 2:32-37)

While the Sanatana Dharma's account of fleeing from battle certainly prescribes ignominy on the person engaging in such an act, it does not go to the extent of Islam by decrying it as an *eternal* sin that inevitably entails the *unceasing* punishment of hellfire. Rather, the punishment here is primarily psychological, and *proportional* – disgrace, infamy, humiliation upon Earth, a fall from a previously elevated worldly status, having to be ruled by a potentially barbarous or Asuric enemy (a much more realistic *and* appropriate karma than a perpetual afterlife hellfire). Another fundamental difference between the two religion's conception of war is that in Hinduism, Arjuna fought a Dharmayuddh, which is a far different proposition to the jihad of Islam. The former seeks to fight an enemy promoting the practice of adharma, the antithesis of the free flowing internal law that is the eternal foundation of India. Among proponents of adharma we find those who seek to impose themselves upon others, who desire to subjugate according to principles such as base materialism or greed or lust or a rigid conception of how mankind is to think and act. These are the parties to be fought – indeed a Dharmayuddh is an appropriate response to jihad, because the latter seeks to violently impose a monolithic, inflexible, hateful, crude dogma upon those it comes across.

Jihad also differs from Dharmayuddh in the former's incessant demand for warfare, a product of its need to subjugate the earth: War is central to Islam, with only the negation of *shirk* barely surpassing it in importance. In the Sanatana Dharma it is the inner discovery of one's law, with the possibility of Realization of one's Soul or Self, that constitutes the core from which all other truths emerge. While Hinduism does grant the use of warfare, as evident in Sri Krishna's discussion with Arjuna, fighting is to be done in proportion to both the amount of adharma present, and the desire of adharmic individuals to physically trample upon others. Accordingly, a Dharmayuddh is used sparingly in direct relation to the actual necessity of going to war in order to strengthen the dharma. It is also only to be undertaken by those fit for it, those with a peculiar and inherent law of being suitable to warfare. Thus all of society, able-bodied or not, is not asked to participate in battle unless the adharmic enemy is so large that the situation has reached that rare extreme; Islam, clearly reflecting its adharmic nature, ordains that all of Allah's devotees, irrespective of their natural function in the world, always participate in some manner of the war effort – *or else*:

O you who believe! What is the matter with you that when it is said to you, Go forth in Allah's way, you should incline heavily to earth? Are you contented with this world's life instead of the hereafter? But the provision of this world's life compared with the hereafter

is but little. If you do not go forth, He will chastise you with a painful chastisement and bring in your place a people other than you, and you will do Him no harm. And Allah has power over all things. If you will not aid him, Allah certainly aided him when those who disbelieved expelled him, he being the second of the two, when they were both in the cave, when he said to his companion: "Grieve not, surely Allah is with us." So Allah sent down His tranquillity upon him and strengthened him with hosts which you did not see, and made lowest the word of those who disbelieved; and the word of Allah, that is the highest; and Allah is Mighty, Wise. **Go forth light and heavy, and strive hard in Allah's way with your property and your persons; this is better for you, if you know.** Had it been a near advantage and a short journey, they would certainly have followed you, but the tedious journey was too long for them. And they swear by Allah: "If we had been able, we would certainly have gone forth with you;" **they cause their own souls to perish**, and Allah knows that they are most surely. (Quran 9:38-42)

This Quran passage highlights again the spectre of eternal hellfire – and even the death of their Soul! - for the believer clinging to comfort rather than risking his life in jihad. The Muslim is warned that the superior option for him is to go forth "light and heavy", symbolic language for prosperity or poverty, well-armed or lightly-equipped, favourable or difficult circumstances, young or old, and other such disparate conditions². Different verses also explicitly warn the Muslim that his family, tribe, wealth and property are all absolutely no excuse for failing to strive in Allah's way, the warfare against the evil kuffar. The punishment for this failure, explicit in the previous passage, is in the following only obliquely mentioned:

Say: If your fathers, and your sons, and your brethren, and your wives, and your tribe, and the wealth ye have acquired, and merchandise for which ye fear that there will no sale, and dwellings ye desire **are dearer to you than Allah and His messenger and striving in His way: then wait till Allah bringeth His command to pass.** Allah guideth not wrongdoing folk. (Quran 9:24)

This command against "wrongdoing" most certainly involves the ultimate destiny of these deserters - the renegades from Islam's 'Word' - of the hellfire. While there are many more facets to Islamic apostasy that we will eventually discuss, it was inevitable that a refusal to engage in warfare against unbelievers would assume such a sustained criticism within the scripture, because the Asura understands that the only means by which he can get his religion of falsehood to conquer the world is through violence, as humanity, befitting its Supreme Creator, is inherently inclined to diversity in thought and belief. Accordingly, multiple verses are devoted to denigrating those who refuse to partake in jihad, including the following selection that castigates these turncoats as "useless", sitting still and constantly trying to avoid the mandated warfare:

Those who were left behind rejoiced at sitting still behind the messenger of Allah, and were averse to striving with their wealth and their lives in Allah's way. And they said: "Go not forth in the heat!" Say: **"The fire of hell is more intense of heat, if they but understood."** Then let them laugh a little: they will weep much, as the reward of what they used to earn. **If Allah bring thee back (from the campaign) unto a party of them and they ask of thee leave to go out (to fight), then say unto them: "Ye shall never more go out with me nor fight with me against a foe. Ye were content with sitting still the first time. So sit still, with the useless."** (Quran 9:81-83)

These "Muslims" fail to recognize that the consequence of their inaction is at the very least an unceasing burning in the hellfire, with their turning away from the scripture, their lack of understanding of it, associated by Gabriel – in the following infrarational revelatory passage – with Allah's will. The selection also hints that the believers of Mohammed's time were only occasionally asked or "tested"

with the call to jihad - the verses mentioning the tests as occurring “once or twice” a year:

And whenever a surah is revealed there are some of them who say: “Which one of you hath thus increased in faith?” As for those who believe, it hath increased them in faith and they rejoice (therefore). **But as for those in whose hearts is a disease, it only addeth wickedness to their wickedness, and they die while they are disbelievers. See they not that they are tested once or twice in every year?** Still they turn not in repentance, neither pay they heed. And whenever a surah is revealed, they look one at another (as who should say): “Doth anybody see you?” Then they turn away. **Allah turneth away their hearts because they are a folk who understand not.** (Quran 9:124-127)

While this passage can certainly be interpreted to include other forms of apostasy besides the apostasy of insubordination, the location of the verses in chapter nine, chronologically considered the final of the Quran's surahs, indicates that the infrarational revelations arrived in response to the turning away of “believers” from the commandment to wage war with non-Muslims. Thus, the inferred tests or battles that might occur periodically within the year were seen to be avoided by some individuals who called themselves “Muslim”, who preferred to instead sit at home, enjoying their wealth and asking the Prophet for “leave” from warfare obligations even after infrarational revelations were sent specifically demanding them to fight the kuffar:

And when a surah is revealed (which saith): Believe in Allah and strive along with His messenger, the men of wealth among them still ask leave of thee and say: “Suffer us to be with those who sit (at home).” They preferred to be with those who remained behind, and a seal is set on their hearts so they do not understand. But the messenger and those who believe with him strive with their wealth and their lives. Such are they for whom are the good things. Such are they who are the successful. Allah hath made ready for them Gardens underneath which rivers flow, wherein they will abide. That is the supreme triumph. And those among the wandering Arabs who had an excuse came in order that permission might be granted them. **And those who lied to Allah and His messenger sat at home. A painful doom will fall on those of them who disbelieve.** (Quran 9:86-90)

The “painful doom” mentioned in this selection, unlike in some of the other verses concerning the non-participation of so-called Muslims in the prescribed warfare against the infidels, leaves the time of the ordained punishment undetermined, potentially hinting at earthly reprisals for such insubordination, which is a crime against the Islamic religion. But before we discuss that aspect of Islam's response to such religious misconduct, we must continue examining the tendency of so-called Muslims in Mohammed's time to prefer inactivity to jihad, with all of the passages – because of Islam's claim to be the final message for mankind – remaining applicable in modern times, the verses representing the summit of religious thought. After all, how can a genuine Muslim, irrespective of circumstance, refuse the gift of subjugating warfare, the essence of Islam, of ‘true religion’? Yet in Mohammed's time and afterwards, to add insult to injury, the so-called Muslims guilty of evading and lying their way out of jihad would in turn seek praise for their alleged involvement in the battles they declined to participate in, taking pride in the victories of Islam for which they refused to risk their own lives! The extent of this practice in Mohammed's lifetime prompted Gabriel to issue an infrarationally revealed warning – this one with violent undertones - to the liars claiming themselves as mujahideen: **“Do not think those who rejoice for what they have done and love that they should be praised for what they have not done - so do by no means think them to be safe from the chastisement, and they shall have a painful chastisement.”** (Quran 3:188) The hadith complementarily make clear that the praise referred to in this verse is only for those undertaking a *ghazwa* (battle):

Narrated Abu Said Al-Khudri:

During the lifetime of Allah's Apostle, some men among the hypocrites used to remain behind him (i.e. did not accompany him) when he went out for a Ghazwa and they would be pleased to stay at home behind Allah's Apostle. When Allah's Apostle returned (from the battle) they would put forward (false) excuses and take oaths, wishing to be praised for what they had not done. So there was revealed: "Think not that those who rejoice in what they have done, and love to be praised for what they have not done..." (3.188) (Sahih Bukhari Volume 6, Book 60, Number 90)

The real Muslims are the most pious of men, the ones violently forcing Islam upon the wretched infidels, or at least killing them for their rejection of Islam. Equality, or its derivative of brotherhood, does not find a place in Islam even betwixt the faithful, as the fighting class has been forever enshrined as the most superior. This is contrary to the ancient Vedic system of Varna, degraded in recent millennia to hereditary caste, which held that even if society consists of classes - by internal nature or law rather than familial tradition - of Brahmanas (knowledge-seekers), Kshatriyas (nobility, warriors), Vaishyas (merchants, wealth-generators), Shudras (workers), at heart – where deep within the Purusha resides - each individual is one with another, and any possible *perceived* outward superiority is transient, confined to the terrestrial manifestation. In Islam however, the earthly prestige extends into the afterlife, persisting for eternity. The elevation of the jihad-partaking Muslim over his less pious brethren is also a portent for a Muslim desiring to avoid battle, a circumstance that Islam *does* allow for, but only in special considerations, as the following selection - one confirming the jihadi Muslims to be of a higher "rank" than the sedentary "Muslim" who sits at home - details:

Those of the believers who sit still, other than those who have a (disabling) hurt, are not on an equality with those who strive in the way of Allah with their wealth and lives. Allah hath conferred on those who strive with their wealth and lives a rank above the sedentary. Unto each Allah hath promised good, but He hath bestowed on those who strive a great reward above the sedentary; Degrees of rank from Him, and forgiveness and mercy. Allah is ever Forgiving, Merciful. (Quran 4:95-96)

The Hadith provide additional support for this caveat to participating in warfare, with one tradition mentioning the physical blindness of Ibn Um-Maktum as precipitating the above infrarational revelations, rare verses providing apparent mercy to the inactive – or at least the disabled sedentary:

Narrated Al-Bara:

When the Divine Inspiration: "Those of the believers who sit (at home)", was revealed the Prophet sent for Zaid (bin Thabit) who came with a shoulder-blade and wrote on it. Ibn Um-Maktum complained about his blindness and on that the following revelation came: "Not equal are those believers who sit (at home) except those who are disabled (by injury, or are blind or lame etc.) and those who strive hard and fight in the Way of Allah with their wealth and lives." (4.95) (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 52, Number 84)

While this does inadvertently provide a modicum of mercy (but only to the Muslims instead of the targeted non-Muslims), in the consciousness of the merciless by nature Asura of Falsehood, it remains more of a tactical consideration, because if the ability of the disabled in warfare is certainly at times suspect, with the modern introduction of suicide bombing – unavailable to Mohammed and his companions – increasing segments of the disabled Muslim population are now actually usable to the cause of Islam. Nevertheless, some of them will yet remain excused from jihad, an arrangement that Islam allows for in one other circumstance, with the difference that the latter scenario – detailed in the following verse - is only a temporary exception whereas physical disability is often life-long:

And the believers should not all go out to fight. Of every troop of them, a party only should go forth, that they (who are left behind) may gain sound knowledge in religion, and

that they may warn their folk when they return to them, so that they may beware. (Quran 9:122)

As the verse makes clear, a segment of the Muslim population who are fit for war, should remain behind from jihad to study the Quran, from which the Asura's inverted "sound knowledge" revives. This of course, is simply another tactical arrangement, based on easily understood military principles whereby the entire army should rarely be going out to fight all at once, especially in the case of Islam in which warfare is predominantly offensive. This verse does not sanction an avoidance of jihad, but simply offers a reminder that the believers should adopt appropriate timing and numbers (both in advanced positions and in depth) while adhering to Islam's obligatory warfare against the non-Muslims. Indeed the call of the Asura of Falsehood to have some Muslims remain in reserve *for the purpose* of increasing their Islamic "knowledge", was designed by him to help further indoctrinate the believers with his depraved religion, one that certainly restricts excuses from participating in war to only the two circumstances mentioned. For example, in the following passage, we find Gabriel discounting additional activities as unequal to either belief in Allah or jihad undertaken for the conquest of Islam's enemies – meaning that they cannot be used for excuses to avoid jihad:

Count ye the slaking of a pilgrim's thirst and tendance of the Inviolable Place of Worship as (equal to the worth of) him who believeth in Allah and the Last Day, and striveth in the way of Allah? They are not equal in the sight of Allah. Allah guideth not wrongdoing folk. Those who believe, and have left their homes and striven with their wealth and their lives in Allah's way are of much greater worth in Allah's sight. These are they who are triumphant. (Quran 9:19-20)

As one can easily conclude, belief alone is not enough, as jihad, the striving in the way of Allah, is also mandatory; similarly, assistance to pilgrims and maintaining mosques are insufficient as religious activities for the believer if they fail to meet the obligation to attack and massacre non-Muslims. Another activity mentioned, the spending of wealth in the cause of Allah, has already been shown to be secondary in nature to waging war, as multiple selections describe it as something to be done in *addition* to warfare. Nevertheless, certain infrarational revelations were sent emphasizing the obligation of spending money for the cause, as the Asura of Falsehood understands that currency is crucial to both the prosecution of war and his calls for Muslims to emigrate. Consequently, Gabriel put forth a mandated requirement that a Muslim contribute money to the Islamic cause, with the finances, while used at times for the poor and needy, also infrarationally revealed to be an *imposition* specifically required for the war effort:

The alms are only for the poor and the needy, and those who collect them, and those whose hearts are to be reconciled, and to free the captives and the debtors, **and for the cause of Allah**, and (for) the wayfarer; **a duty imposed by Allah**. Allah is Knower, Wise. (Quran 9:60)

Islamic alms or charity, otherwise known as the *zakat*, thus assumes an additional burden of a war tax on the *faithful*, another religious obligation for them to adhere to at the risk of the hellfire. And if in Mohammed's time the wealthy were ordered to directly hand their income over to Mohammed along with providing his army material objects that could assist in jihad, in modern times jihad is often funded – albeit indirectly – through Islamic charitable organizations well-versed in channelling money to the appropriately violent parties. And rightfully so, because Allah, in his final set of dictates to mankind, commanded his followers to spend in the cause of bringing Islam to all corners of the planet:

Spend your wealth for the cause of Allah, and be not cast by your own hands to ruin; and do good. Lo! Allah loveth the beneficent. (Quran 2:195)

Any doubt that this infrarational revelation concerns jihad is mitigated by a hadith, narrated by Abu Wail, stating, "Hudhaifa said, 'The Verse: - And spend (of your wealth) in the Cause of Allah and do not throw yourselves in destruction, (2.195) was revealed concerning spending in Allah's Cause (i.e.

Jihad).’ ” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 6, Book 60, Number 41) Previously cited scripture subsequently helps us to understand different, though less explicit, verses on Islamic expenditure - in the following, those bestowing their money in Allah's “way” – as pertaining to jihad funding:

And if you fear treachery on the part of a people, then throw back to them on terms of equality; surely Allah does not love the treacherous. And let not those who disbelieve think that they shall come in first, surely they will not escape. And prepare against them what force you can and horses tied at the frontier, to frighten thereby the enemy of Allah and your enemy and others besides them, whom you do not know - (but) Allah knows them. **And whatever thing you will spend in Allah's way, it will be paid back to you fully and you shall not be dealt with unjustly.** And if they incline to peace, then incline to it and trust in Allah; surely He is the Hearing, the Knowing. (Quran 8:58-61)

This bargain of wealth in exchange for being “paid back” is as we recall linked with *also* risking one's life in return for the reward of Paradise. Of course, spending for the cause of Allah might certainly be interpreted as yielding earthly rewards as a direct result of warfare, but we will examine this aspect of Islam later. For now, we return our attention to the demand of Allah that his obedient slaves spend their money for Islam's sake, in the name of the Islamic zakat or charity. If they instead refuse, then like all other abstentions from the Islamic dictates, Gabriel has ordained that they will receive the painful fire in hell, literally fuelled by the contents of their own currency:

O you who believe! Most surely many of the doctors of law and the monks eat away the property of men falsely, and turn (them) from Allah's way. **And (as for) those who hoard up gold and silver and do not spend it in Allah's way,** announce to them a painful chastisement, **On the day when it shall be heated in the fire of hell, then their foreheads and their sides and their backs shall be branded with it.** This is what you hoarded up for yourselves, therefore taste what you hoarded. (Quran 9:34-35)

This zakat, as we already know, is to be used by the Islamic leaders for numerous purposes beyond aiding the poor. That the ostensibly altruistic nature of charity can be so horrendously usurped by the Asura should come as no surprise, because the Asura of Falsehood traditionally twists the seemingly high-minded pursuits of mankind for his own purpose – in this case charity is an additional feature captured by Gabriel through Islam, with religion itself obviously the first hostage. After all, philanthropy does provide rudimentary benefits to mankind, including its basic survival. Such results do make charity a potentially noble endeavour, but like all activities of man, it is not immune to the ensnarements of ego – the psychological avenue by which the Asura can usurp the function of charity. Indeed, the altruist is often afflicted with the most insidious form of narcissism, attaching greatness to himself for an activity best done with a selfless psychology. Along with this humble approach, the dispersion of charity should be specifically designed to develop the strengths and skills of the receiving party so that charity and a dependence on others might become quickly unnecessary.

Not only are these standard psychological drawbacks present in the Islamic zakat, coexisting alongside is the sinister use of such money – or financial imbalances between the believer and non-Muslim - to obtain non-violent yet coercive conversions, a practice that while not explicitly ordained (in detail) by Gabriel, is yet an inevitable result when we shortly review one of the fundamental tenets of the Islamic religion. But before we detail the brutal economic pressure Islam imposes upon the non-Muslim, we must further analyse how the mandatory Islamic zakat, both an inescapable charitable contribution and a war tax upon the *Muslim*, represents another mechanism by which the Asura of Falsehood exerts control through fear. For the previous scriptural selections are far from the only ones prophesying the errant Muslims to have an infinite punishment if they fail to relieve themselves of their income; in the following, such “hoarders”, who by their stinginess fail to appropriately submit to the scripture, will eventually find their material objects tied to their necks while the hellfire scorches them for their

‘crime’ against Islam:

And let not those who hoard up that which Allah hath bestowed upon them of His bounty think that it is better for them. Nay, it is worse for them. **That which they hoard will be their collar on the Day of Resurrection.** Allah's is the heritage of the heavens and the earth, and Allah is Informed of what ye do. (Quran 3:180)

Additionally, in comments made to his followers, the Prophet warned that one's wealth will appear to the hoarder, the one who refuses to part with the obligatory zakat, in hell through the form of a poisonous snake, further tormenting him:

Narrated Abu Huraira:

Allah's Apostle said, “Whoever is made wealthy by Allah and does not pay the Zakat of his wealth, then on the Day of Resurrection his wealth will be made like a bald-headed poisonous male snake with two black spots over the eyes. The snake will encircle his neck and bite his cheeks and say, ‘I am your wealth, I am your treasure.’” Then the Prophet recited the holy verses: ‘Let not those who withhold...’ (to the end of the verse). (Quran 3.180). (Sahih Bukhari Volume 2, Book 24, Number 486)

Similarly, another hadith records the Prophet as having said, “Do not withhold your money, (for if you did so) Allah would with-hold His blessings from you.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 2, Book 24, Number 513) He also relayed to his followers that “Some people spend Allah's Wealth (i.e. Muslim's wealth) in an unjust manner; such people will be put in the (Hell) Fire on the Day of Resurrection.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 53, Number 347) The importance of fulfilling the compulsory zakat was especially underlined by his comment, “Save yourself from Hell-fire even by giving half a date-fruit in charity.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 2, Book 24, Number 498) As for those who taunted the Prophet and his followers, who mock the modern believer because of the latter's charitable ventures, Allah will have his vengeance upon them for their insults:

They who taunt those of the faithful who give their alms freely, and those who give to the extent of their earnings and scoff at them, Allah will pay them back their scoffing, and they shall have a painful chastisement. (Quran 9:79)

This threatened punishment, however, only serves to remind us of the profound lack of proportion within Islam, an imbalance specifically linked to its creation by the Asura of Falsehood. For though criticism of materialism and hoarding and selfishness is certainly valid, especially as they pull the consciousness of mortals toward outward objects rather than subjective laws and experiences, it is also true that each has an undeniable purpose at a certain stage of development. Greed – which, as we shall see, is not unfamiliar to Islam – is practically a vital impulse, one driving man to action, which at least results in experiences for the Psychic. Hoarding is a necessary instinct in times of scarcity, in which it is of benefit to survival – and while it is less of a requirement in modern times, it would certainly have been needed for the Arabs during the time of a Prophet who desired to inflict famines. And materialism is a form of enjoyment, albeit superficial, that man must experience on his journey through multiple lives, helping him to realize its temporal nature and inspiring him to seek the highest Ananda that material pleasures can only imitate.

But Gabriel did not make his case against hoarding and greed to direct humanity toward something higher; rather, it was a means to extract their money for jihad and to keep them in check through fear. Thus instead of the higher psychological reasons for charity, a base motive, an overt coercion is implanted upon the believer to part with his earnings. This was done by the threat of the incommensurate chastisement of hell for matters whose negative consequences are better suited – and in reality actually manifest – upon earth. Especially in the case of greed and materialism, the positive

outcomes – the procurement of money and goods, status and power – are often quickly attainable, with the unfavourable sequelae – the despair at not obtaining the desired object, the evident loss of subjective qualities due to the obsession with money or goods, or perhaps a feeling that something is missing in the midst of ambitions fulfilled – necessary for the Psychic Being to absorb as experiences in its evolution. Avoiding both specifically because of the threat of hellfire does nothing to further this growth, as man's attention shifts to his fear rather than addressing the psychological nature of greed and materialism, the result of which would lead him towards a calm detachment based on the knowledge of their phenomenal nature and the Soul's immortal status.

Thus the failure of one to donate some of his earnings to charity should not lead to the eternal damnation deemed appropriate by the Asura of Falsehood. For greed and hoarding and materialism are all elements of the *avidya*, of the ignorant consciousness of the world; what they are not, however, is falsehood, because they do not necessarily assume that the separative consciousness is *all* that there is, and in fact can coexist with higher elements. They only become falsehood when their importance is extremely exaggerated, as the Asura did by making the *avidya* of greed and hoarding worthy of a disproportionate punishment, and by making charity mandatory when it should be undertaken out of an inherent understanding of its worth rather than the Islamic coercion based on the fear of hellfire. It is also better dispensed for the purpose of uplifting segments of the population rather than as a war tax that makes them more likely to experience violence specifically due to differences in thought and belief. In Islam however, the payment of the zakat is funnelled towards jihad and conquest, and is demanded from anyone capable of paying it, with one Quran passage – whose final verse, 9:94, has already been shown to direct a severe displeasure at the “Muslim” avoiding jihad - assigning the impoverished a reprieve from the war tax along with the disabled a relief from the obligation of jihad:

Not unto the weak nor unto the sick nor unto those who can find naught to spend is any fault (to be imputed though they stay at home) if they are true to Allah and His messenger. Not unto the good is there any road (of blame). Allah is Forgiving, Merciful. Nor in those who when they came to you that you might carry them, you said, **“I cannot find that on which to carry you”**; **they went back while their eyes overflowed with tears on account of grief for not finding that which they should spend. The way (to blame) is only against those who ask permission of you though they are rich**; they have chosen to be with those who remained behind, and Allah has set a seal upon their hearts so they do not know. They will make excuses to you (Muslims) when ye return unto them. Say: “Make no excuses, for we shall not believe you. Allah hath told us tidings of you. Allah and His messenger will see your conduct, and then ye will be brought back unto Him Who knoweth the unseen as well as the seen, and He will tell you what ye used to do. (Quran 9:91-94)

Disgust is also reserved for those who *begrudgingly* pay the mandated war tax, as the verses immediately following the previous ones – which additionally assign jihad-avoiders the reward of hellfire - indicate:

They will swear to you by Allah when you return to them so that you may let them be. So let them be, surely they are unclean and their abode is hell, a recompense for what they earned. They will swear to you that you may be pleased with them, but if you are pleased with them, yet surely Allah is not pleased with the transgressing people. The dwellers of the desert are very hard in unbelief and hypocrisy, and more disposed not to know the limits of what Allah has revealed to His Messenger; and Allah is Knowing, Wise. **And of the dwellers of the desert are those who take what they spend to be a fine**, and they wait (the befalling of) calamities to you; on them (will be) the evil calamity; and Allah is Hearing, Knowing. (Quran 9:95-98)

Indeed such was the lack of enthusiasm faced by the Prophet for Islam's mandated war tax, an apathy specifically related to its coercive nature, that on one occasion Gabriel spitefully communicated that the

“unwilling” spenders were actually disbelievers whose money should *not* be accepted:

Say: “Spend willingly or unwillingly, it shall not be accepted from you; surely you are a transgressing people.” And nothing hinders their spendings being accepted from them, except that they disbelieve in Allah and in His Messenger and they do not come to prayer but while they are sluggish, and they do not spend but while they are unwilling. Let not then their property and their children excite your admiration; Allah only wishes to chastise them with these in this world's life and (that) their souls may depart while they are unbelievers. And they swear by Allah that they are in truth of you, when they are not of you, but they are folk who are afraid. If they could find a refuge or cave or a place to enter into, they would certainly have turned thereto, running away in all haste. And of them there are those who blame you with respect to the alms; so if they are given from it they are pleased, and if they are not given from it, lo! they are full of rage. (Quran 9:53-58)

While the previous two passages certainly confirm that those “Muslims” who indifferently provide the zakat are in fact disbelievers, it nevertheless remains impossible to ascertain the real motives of Muslims funding a *ghazwa* when we consider the looming punishment for those failing to provide funds. For as the Muslim knows he must finance jihad or face an eternal hellfire, it becomes difficult to measure the spontaneity of the action, and the Muslim might put on a performance of enthusiasm when secretly harbouring resentment. In some regards this arrangement strikes one as characteristic to Mafia organizations, to which protection money must be given at the risk of physical consequences – indeed as we shall see, there is certainly more to the Islamic punishment for disobedience than the terrible hellfire. Knowing this, and subsequently forced to relinquish money they may well have used elsewhere, naturally the desert inhabitants and other Arabs of the Prophet's time felt ambivalent toward paying zakat. Perhaps they did not even believe in the goals of jihad, whether due to an internal sense of the inherent equality of belief and thought, or because of a gravitation to the practices of their Polytheistic ancestors. Or maybe they did not possess the fervour towards vital domination that their co-religionists did. Irrespective of the rationale, it was unlikely for them to openly express their discontent, having seen the potential response, knowing the derision and threats awaiting them. And for modern Muslims, the Hadith provide an explicit justification for *earthly* warfare against “Muslims” refusing to pay the zakat:

Narrated Abu Huraira:

When Allah's Messenger died and Abu Bakr became the caliph some Arabs renegaded (reverted to disbelief). Abu Bakr decided to declare war against them. Umar said to Abu Bakr, “How can you fight with these people although Allah's Messenger said, ‘I have been ordered (by Allah) to fight the people till they say: 'None has the right to be worshipped but Allah', and whoever said it then he will save his life and property from me except on trespassing the law (rights and conditions for which he will be punished justly), and his accounts will be with Allah.’ ” **Abu Bakr said, “By Allah! I will fight those who differentiate between the prayer and the Zakat as Zakat is the compulsory right to be taken from the property (according to Allah's orders). By Allah! If they refuse to pay me even a she-kid which they used to pay at the time of Allah's Messenger, I would fight with them for withholding it.” Then Umar said, “By Allah, it was nothing, but Allah opened Abu Bakr's chest towards the decision (to fight) and I came to know that his decision was right.”** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 2, Book 24, Hadith 483)

As one can undoubtedly conclude, a Muslim who withholds the obligatory war tax is someone who is not only destined for hell, but can also be physically fought due to his reversion into disbelief – an apostasy arising out of a solitary decision. Yet as we will emphatically observe, apostasy in Islam can occur in a myriad of other circumstances based upon choices – whether of thought or action – that

violate rigid Islamic commandments. And if the provision of funding the war effort, as in the choice of the *name* of God to worship, was not, and is not, a question of choice in the Asura of Falsehood's religion, like any other Islamic tenet involving the threat of punishment, a reward – selectively mentioned – is to be granted to those committed to the practice. With regards to this particular obligation, those funding jihad against the kuffar by way of the mandated Islamic charitable contribution have a special heavenly gate reserved for their entrance:

Narrated Abu Huraira:

Allah's Apostle said, "Whoever gives two kinds (of things or property) in charity for Allah's Cause, will be called from the gates of Paradise and will be addressed, 'O slaves of Allah! Here is prosperity.' So, whoever was amongst the people who used to offer their prayers, will be called from the gate of the prayer; and whoever was amongst the people who used to participate in Jihad, will be called from the gate of Jihad; and whoever was amongst those who used to observe fasts, will be called from the gate of Ar-Raiyan; whoever was amongst those who used to give in charity, will be called from the gate of charity." Abu Bakr said, "Let my parents be sacrificed for you, O Allah's Apostle! No distress or need will befall him who will be called from those gates. Will there be any one who will be called from all these gates?" The Prophet replied, "Yes, and I hope you will be one of them." (Sahih Bukhari Volume 3, Book 31, Number 121)

With the carrot dangling in partnership to the incessant threat of punishment for failing to comply to the war tax, Gabriel has both another means to keep his Muslim slaves in their place, and the pathway to continuously replenish Islam's war chest. Thus the call for jihad financing by way of the zakat means that charity becomes integral to the ultimate Islamic ambition, becomes inexorably linked with warfare - for all wars require a treasury, even if the money is sourced through alms. Indeed the 'legalized' – through the Asuric scripture – skimming of funds from "charity" is helpful in modern times for Islamic jihadi organizations to re-establish themselves as charities even if they are initially banned due to their terrorist activities, because Islamic charities are mandated by their own scripture to partake in jihad funding. But such "charity" – coerced with the threats of terrible chastisements – is not the only means by which an Islamic army obtains income, as their supreme 'deity', unsurprisingly, also infrarationally revealed that the wealth of the non-Muslim populace is a justified source of revenue, assuming the elements are not in place to obtain their outright conversion. Therefore - and we find in the following verse the perfect integration of the mandated jihad against the kuffar with the desire to steal their wealth, along with a succinct explanation of the minimal number of choices granted to the non-Muslim - if the infidel does not wish, at swordpoint, to profess that Allah is the only god, then they must pay a tax as a sign of their subjugation to Islam, the 'greatest' religion with the 'greater' god:

Fight those who do not believe in Allah, nor in the latter day, nor do they prohibit what Allah and His Messenger have prohibited, nor follow the religion of truth, out of those who have been given the Book, until they pay the tax in acknowledgement of superiority and they are in a state of subjection. (Quran 9:29)

We find in this verse not only the intimation – one that will be confirmed by additional scripture – of a triple choice to the non-Muslim of either conversion to Islam, subjugation by way of taxation for their disbelief, or death, but also the means by which Islam feeds itself at the expense of the disbelievers, a category that includes those whose money Islam previously rejected due to an unenthusiastic belief or apathy. Islam still takes the latter's wealth, this time by way of *jizya*, the tax whereby they acknowledge the inferiority of their disbelief or apostasy. The verse also conceivably allows leeway for ensuing – to Mohammed - generations of Muslim rulers from the burden of killing *every* non-Muslim, even though it only mentions the people of the book, which of course does not include Polytheists like the Hindus. This *jizya* of the Quran was arguably only meant for the Abrahamic faiths, but as it does not

specifically deny the tax upon Polytheists, and as the sheer number of Polytheists – when facing an Islamic army - prevent them from being immediately converted or entirely slaughtered, and because an authentic hadith presented below records a near contemporaneous – to the Prophet – Islamic general demanding the *jizya* from the Polytheist Khosrau, modern Islamic leaders are certainly justified in following suit:

Narrated Jubair bin Haiya:

Umar sent the Muslims to the great countries to fight the pagans. When Al-Hurmuzan embraced Islam, Umar said to him. “I would like to consult you regarding these countries which I intend to invade.” Al-Hurmuzan said, “Yes, **the example of these countries and their inhabitants who are the enemies of the Muslims**, is like a bird with a head, two wings and two legs; If one of its wings got broken, it would get up over its two legs, with one wing and the head; and if the other wing got broken, it would get up with two legs and a head, but if its head got destroyed, then the two legs, two wings and the head would become useless. The head stands for Khosrau, and one wing stands for Caesar and the other wing stands for Faris. So, order the Muslims to go towards Khosrau.” So, Umar sent us (to Khosrau) appointing An-Numan bin Muqrin as our commander. When we reached the land of the enemy, the representative of Khosrau came out with forty-thousand warriors, and an interpreter got up saying, “Let one of you talk to me!” Al-Mughira replied, “Ask whatever you wish.” The other asked, “Who are you?” Al-Mughira replied, “We are some people from the Arabs; we led a hard, miserable, disastrous life: we used to suck the hides and the date stones from hunger; we used to wear clothes made up of fur of camels and hair of goats, and to worship trees and stones. While we were in this state, the Lord of the Heavens and the Earths, Elevated is His Remembrance and Majestic is His Highness, sent to us from among ourselves a Prophet whose father and mother are known to us. **Our Prophet, the Messenger of our Lord, has ordered us to fight you till you worship Allah Alone or give Jizya (i.e. tribute); and our Prophet has informed us that our Lord says: “Whoever amongst us is killed (i.e. martyred), shall go to Paradise to lead such a luxurious life as he has never seen, and whoever amongst us remain alive, shall become your master.”** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 53, Number 386)

A different hadith has Umar, a companion of the Prophet and - following Mohammed's death - an Islamic Caliph or Leader, encouraging his successor not to excessively tax non-Muslims. No specific mention of Christians or Jews is present in this particular hadith, which captures perfectly the dark art of *jizya*, for when a potentially dangerous unbelieving population is over-taxed, not only is the revenue source drained, the people simultaneously become inclined to revolt:

Narrated Amr bin Maimun:

Umar (after he was stabbed), instructed (his would-be-successor) saying, “I urge him (i.e. the new Caliph) to take care of those non-Muslims who are under the protection of Allah and His Apostle in that he should observe the convention agreed upon with them, and fight on their behalf (to secure their safety) and he should not over-tax them beyond their capability.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 52, Number 287)

While Umar's instructions appear to sound benevolent as far as ensuring the safety of the non-Muslims, it is a false form of munificence, because the non-Muslims are living under the rule of an Asuric religion that despises their faith, that demands that their religion be subjugated and bow before Islam - and their security is in actuality only designed to maintain them as a source of taxation for the ruling Muslims. If the *dhimmi*s – kuffar subjugated by the Muslims – refuse to pay, it is only because their hearts have been made “daring” (as per the following hadith) or rebellious by Allah, a state of affairs that must subsequently require a return to jihad against them:

Narrated Sa'id: Abu Huraira once said (to the people), "What will your state be when you can get no Dinar or Dirhan (i.e. taxes from the Dhimmis)?" On that someone asked him, "What makes you know that this state will take place, O Abu Huraira?" He said, "By Him in Whose Hands Abu Huraira's life is, I know it through the statement of the true and truly inspired one (i.e. the Prophet)." The people asked, "What does the Statement say?" He replied, "Allah and His Apostle's asylum granted to Dhimmis, (i.e. non-Muslims living in a Muslim territory) will be outraged, and so Allah will make the hearts of these Dhimmis so daring that they will refuse to pay the Jizya they will be supposed to pay." (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 53, Number 404)

If the modern Muslim desires concrete examples of *jizya* during the reign of Allah's Apostle, he can look to the hadith documenting the King of Aila's submission to Mohammed:

Narrated Abu Humaid As-Sa'idi:

We took part in the holy battle of Tabuk in the company of the Prophet and when we arrived at the Wadi-al-Qura, there was a woman in her garden. The Prophet asked his companions to estimate the amount of the fruits in the garden, and Allah's Apostle estimated it at ten Awsuq. The Prophet said to that lady, "Check what your garden will yield." When we reached Tabuk, the Prophet said, "There will be a strong wind to-night and so no one should stand and whoever has a camel, should fasten it." So we fastened our camels. A strong wind blew at night and a man stood up and he was blown away to a mountain called Taiy, The King of Aila sent a white mule and a sheet for wearing to the Prophet as a present, and wrote to the Prophet that his people would stay in their place (and will pay Jizya taxation.) (Sahih Bukhari Volume 2, Book 24, Number 559)

The Prophet is also recorded as having allowed, in the aftermath of Khaibar's conquest, its Jews to remain in their lands instead of expelling them - but only under the conditions he offered, involving half of the fruit of their labour going to the Muslims as *jizya*:

Narrated Ibn Umar:

Umar bin Al-Khattab expelled all the Jews and Christians from the land of Hijaz. Allah's Apostle after conquering Khaibar, thought of expelling the Jews from the land which, after he conquered it belonged to Allah, Allah's Apostle and the Muslims. But the Jews requested Allah's Apostle to leave them there on the condition that they would do the labour and get half of the fruits (the land would yield). Allah's Apostle said, "We shall keep you on these terms as long as we wish." Thus they stayed till the time of Umar's Caliphate when he expelled them to Taima and Ariha. (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 53, Number 380)

The *jizya*, obtained after the conquest of non-Islamic people, represents a long-term source of compulsory tribute enriching the Muslim with little by way of productive work expended (other than, of course, the work involved in warfare, periodic massacres, savage intimidation and collecting the tax), while at the same time weakening the non-Muslim by reducing his power, demoralizing him in the process due to the latter's subjugated state – all of this increasing the potential that the kafir might convert to free himself from the financial bondage alone. But before this process can begin, the Islamic army must first conquer the enemy; only after such victories arrive the spoils, often immediately upon triumph. Crucially, unlike other armies who have claimed their rewards throughout the history of time, in Islam, thanks to the machinations of the Asura of Falsehood, the practice of obtaining *all* types of war booty is *codified*, ordained as the final word of 'God', as a divine or righteous *action*, literally the *promise* of Allah if they attack the unbelievers:

Certainly Allah was well pleased with the believers when they swore allegiance to you under

the tree, and He knew what was in their hearts, so **He sent down tranquillity on them and rewarded them with a near victory, And much booty that they will capture.** Allah is ever Mighty, Wise. **Allah promiseth you much booty that ye will capture,** and hath given you this in advance, and hath withheld men's hands from you, that it may be a token for the believers, and that He may guide you on a right path. (Quran 48:18-20)

Of course, as the verses of surah forty-eight immediately preceding the above passage remind us, Islamic rewards or carrots are always contrasted with some type of punishment. And as the promise of war spoils obviously involves the actual participation in jihad, the Asura of Falsehood made sure to emphasize that only through fighting the disbelievers will the Muslims actually obtain this “reward”, and that a failure to wage war leads to a grave chastisement:

Those who are left behind will say when you set forth for the war booty, “Allow us (that) we may follow you.” They desire to change the decree of Allah. Say: “By no means shall you follow us; thus did Allah say before.” But they will say: “Nay! You are jealous of us.” Nay! They do not understand but a little. Say to those of the dwellers of the desert who were left behind: **“You shall soon be invited (to fight) against a people possessing mighty prowess, you will fight against them until they submit. And if you obey, Allah will grant you a good reward, and if you turn back as you turned back before, He will punish you with a painful punishment.”** There is no harm in the blind, nor is there any harm in the lame, nor is there any harm in the sick (if they do not go forth). And whoever obeys Allah and His Messenger, He will cause him to enter gardens beneath which rivers flow, **and whoever turns back, He will punish him with a painful punishment.** (Quran 48:15-17)

If the actual Muslim – the able-bodied one who violently attacks non-Muslims - dies in Allah's cause, he obtains the reserved heavenly gates for the jihadi. Yet if he survives victorious, he returns home (or stays in place) with the war booty, the material possessions and wealth of the enemy.

Narrated Abu Huraira:

I heard Allah's Apostle saying, “The example of a Mujahid in Allah's Cause - and Allah knows better who really strives in His Cause - is like a person who fasts and prays continuously. Allah guarantees that He will admit the Mujahid in His Cause into Paradise if he is killed, otherwise He will return him to his home safely with rewards and war booty.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 52, Number 46)

Superficially similar is this to the message of the Bhagavad Gita, in which man is told that participating in a Dharmayuddh results in either earthly rewards (crucially without, as we will shortly review, the perverse and sadistic elements of the war booty found in Islam) or ascent to heaven. In Islam however, the heavenly reward is *only* obtainable for Muslims, whereas Hinduism notes that both sides in a battle can potentially access the heavenly realms for their respective efforts. While the Mohammedan creed is defined by its cult of separation from the ‘unbelievers’, even among the vaunted believers does equality remain an illusive ideal, the spoils of war acutely highlighting this paradox, as Allah ordained the war booty as belonging to Himself and His Messenger:

They ask thee (O Mohammed) of the spoils of war. Say: “The spoils of war belong to Allah and the messenger, so keep your duty to Allah, and adjust the matter of your difference, and obey Allah and His messenger, if ye are (true) believers.” (Quran 08:01)

Of course, the reason the Asura of Falsehood set this forth as an infrarationally revealed ‘truth’ was for the practical matter of Mohammed needing to have direct access to enemy riches, in order to aggregate the wealth and subsequent military power of the nascent Muslim army. Thus in another communication Gabriel - though this time allowing the believer to keep the majority of his individual war booty –

demanding that one-fifth of it go to Mohammed:

And know that whatever ye take as spoils of war, lo! a fifth thereof is for Allah, and for the messenger and for the kinsman (who hath need) and orphans and the needy and the wayfarer, if ye believe in Allah and that which We revealed unto Our slave on the Day of Discrimination, the day when the two armies met. And Allah is Able to do all things. (Quran 8:41)

Though the verse declares the money as going to Allah, naturally there must exist an earthly figure or leader ready to use the money for “Allah's Cause” – at the time of the inspirational revelations, that was Mohammed. One hadith describes a relevant example of how Mohammed used this currency – on this occasion, the wealth was *not* obtained from a military expedition – for the cause of Allah:

Narrated Umar:

The properties of Bam An-Nadir were among the booty that Allah gave to His Apostle - such Booty were not obtained by any expedition on the part of Muslims, neither with cavalry, nor with camelry. So those properties were for Allah's Apostle only, and he used to provide thereof the yearly expenditure for his wives, **and dedicate the rest of its revenues for purchasing arms and horses as war material to be used in Allah's Cause.** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 6, Book 60, Number 407)

The war booty was supposed to be given only to those taking part in battle, but as Mohammed was the Prophet and Treasurer of Islam, he deemed fit on occasion to give a portion to those of *his* choice, in the process abandoning both his religion's deceptive message of equality and the demand that all able-bodied males fight against the disbelievers:

Narrated Ibn Umar:

Uthman did not join the Badr battle because he was married to one of the daughters of Allah's Apostle and she was ill. So, the Prophet said to him. “You will get a reward and a share (from the war booty) similar to the reward and the share of one who has taken part in the Badr battle.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 53, Number 359)

Such is the importance of increasing the war treasury that Mohammed included the relinquishment of one-fifth of the spoils in the same breath as Ramadan fasting and the zakat as examples of good deeds to perform for the purpose of entering Paradise:

Narrated Ibn Abbas:

When the delegation of Abdul Qais came to the Prophet, he said, “Welcome, O the delegation who have come! Neither you will have disgrace, nor you will regret.” They said, “O Allah's Apostle! We are a group from the tribe of Ar-Rabia, and between you and us there is the tribe of Mudar and we cannot come to you except in the sacred months. **So please order us to do something good (religious deeds) so that we may enter Paradise by doing that,** and also that we may order our people who are behind us (whom we have left behind at home) to follow it.” He said, “Four and four: offer prayers perfectly, pay the Zakat, (obligatory charity), fast the month of Ramadan, **and give one-fifth of the war booty (in Allah's cause),** and do not drink in (containers called) Ad-Duba, Al-Hantam, An-Naqir and Al-Muzaffat.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 8, Book 73, Number 195)

The concentration on the spoils of war evident in these hadith is a subtle yet profound difference between the Sanatana Dharma and the Asura of Falsehood's concoction. As the predominant Hindu focus is on spiritual emancipation rather than the subjugation of the ‘other’ who does not truly exist, warfare is infused with the qualities of higher aspirations and ideals, with even killing done from the vantage of the Soul as “neither slayer nor slain”. Thus earthly rewards become trivial to the upholding

of Dharma, and as the purpose of battle is to strengthen the *universal* internal law rather than for subjugation, spoils of war are taken with honour and restraint. But as Islam is preoccupied with lower vital desires and ambitions, including a need to humiliate the untermensch ‘disbeliever’, the taking of battle rewards is done in an unseemly fashion, without psychological limit. This is hinted at in a series of verses excoriating the non-Muslims as followers of “falsehood” (the Asura's inversion of the term), and urging Muslims to cut off their heads in battle or take them prisoner for ransom:

(As for) those who disbelieve and turn (men) away from Allah's way, He shall render their works ineffective. And (as for) those who believe and do good, and believe in what has been revealed to Mohammed, and it is the very truth from their Lord, He will remove their evil from them and improve their condition. That is because those who disbelieve follow falsehood, and because those who believe follow the truth from their Lord. Thus Allah coineth their similitudes for mankind. **So when you meet in battle those who disbelieve, then smite the necks until when you have overcome them, then make (them) prisoners, and afterwards either set them free as a favour or let them ransom (themselves) until the war terminates.** That (shall be so); and if Allah had pleased He would certainly have exacted what is due from them, but that He may try some of you by means of others; and (as for) those who are slain in the way of Allah, He will by no means allow their deeds to perish. He will guide them and improve their condition. And cause them to enter the garden which He has made known to them. O you who believe! If you help (the cause of) Allah, He will help you and make firm your feet. And (as for) those who disbelieve, for them is destruction and He has made their deeds ineffective. That is because they hated what Allah revealed, so He rendered their deeds null. Have they not then journeyed in the land and seen how was the end of those before them: Allah brought down destruction upon them, and the unbelievers shall have the like of it. That is because Allah is the Protector of those who believe, and because the unbelievers shall have no protector for them. Surely Allah will make those who believe and do good enter gardens beneath which rivers flow; and those who disbelieve enjoy themselves (in the world) and eat as the beasts eat, and the fire is their abode. And how many a town which was far more powerful than the town of yours (O Mohammed) which has driven you out: We destroyed them so there was no helper for them. (Quran 47:01-13)

While the taking of prisoners in battle is a common historic practice, we must keep in mind that Gabriel at no point restricted violence against unbelievers to the battlefield *alone*, and as the ambition of Islam is to conquer the entire world, as all kuffar are wicked and evil, it is not just the necks of their massed soldiers that need to be sliced. But even if the enemy is allowed to live as a prisoner, the believer remains entitled to the former's land and property:

And Allah turned back the unbelievers in their rage. They did not obtain any advantage, and Allah sufficed the believers in fighting, and Allah is Strong, Mighty. And He drove down those of the followers of the Book who backed them from their fortresses and He cast awe into their hearts. **Some you killed and you took captive another part. And He made you heirs to their land and their dwellings and their property, and (to) a land which you have not yet trodden,** and Allah has power over all things. (Quran 33:25-27)

Ordained as these verses are, as the final ‘Word’ of Allah, the ‘eternal truth’, they assuredly must be applicable in all times, even after the death of Mohammed. Thus if the communications were presented in relation to the specific opponents of the Prophet, nevertheless are the themes of destruction, of murder, of obtaining a war booty complete with captives and property, all eternal for subsequent generations of Muslims in their struggle against unbelievers. That is, until the ambition is complete and Muslims rule the world (a possibility that, as will be seen in the scriptural content itself, will *never* materialize). This is the difference between the infrarationally revealed and the rational, with the latter

seeking to contextualize things to a time and place, the former using time and place as mere vessels for universal themes – of a *primitive* psychological quality - it seeks to promote in all ensuing times. In the case of Islam, the theme of slavery is not restricted to merely the warring kuffar soldiers - their women and children are also to be made slaves, a decision Mohammed described as a judgement worthy of Allah:

Narrated Abu Sa'id Al-Khudri:

When the tribe of Bani Quraiza was ready to accept Sad's judgement, Allah's Apostle sent for Sad who was near to him. Sad came, riding a donkey and when he came near, Allah's Apostle said (to the Ansar), "Stand up for your leader." Then Sad came and sat beside Allah's Apostle who said to him, "These people are ready to accept your judgement" **Sad said, "I give the judgement that their warriors should be killed and their children and women should be taken as prisoners." The Prophet then remarked, "O Sad! You have judged amongst them with (or similar to) the judgement of the King Allah."** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 52, Number 280)

This pattern of killing the warrior males – those of a fighting age – and taking captive their women and children remains a practice of Islamic armies, with the captured women – as will be made abundantly evident – subject to more than just household chores. This is the 'divine' right of the believer, founded upon both the Asura of Falsehood's infrarational revelations and Mohammed's recorded statements. Similarly is it the eternal 'truth' of Allah for the Muslim to forcibly convert the unbeliever, a tenet seemingly in contrast to previous verses – and other ones that we will discuss later in this chapter - decrying any measures in that direction. Yet in the Quran do we find numerous verses confirming the 'legality' of the Muslim to forcibly convert non-Muslims to Islam, including the following that notes the submission before Allah and Islam as something that occurs "willingly or unwillingly":

Seek they other than the religion of Allah, when unto Him submitteth whosoever is in the heavens and the earth, willingly or unwillingly, and unto Him they will be returned. (Quran 3:83)

Before we review additional communications authorizing the path of forced conversion, we must address their incongruity to the verses advocating against the practice. In doing so, we must first remember that consistency is only observed in the Islamic religion when pertaining to compartmentalizing the 'other', an approach founded upon the related psychological attributes of hatred and permanent separation. As the forcible conversion of non-Muslims is only a *manifestation* of a certain mindset, rather than the actual subjective impetus for the action, it depends on outward factors, whereas hatred and division are always present internally as the seed. Thus for much of Mohammed's time as the leader of Islam, the necessary *external* factor - overwhelming military force – was absent to obtain immediate mass numbers through forced conversion, even if the spiteful psychology was already in place. But when the Prophet found himself militarily capable of defeating any Arab opponent, Gabriel knew the hour had arrived to communicate to his vessel the 'Word' or 'law' of forced conversion. He would not have expected his instrument to be confused with this apparently conflicting dictate, because he had already infrarationally revealed the 'knowledge' that any message of Allah seemingly in contradiction to a previous one, is merely the introduction of something better, a more important dictate:

None of Our revelations do we abrogate or cause to be forgotten, but we bring something better or similar: Knowest thou not that Allah is Able to do all things? (Quran 2:106)

While it is quite reasonable to presume that revelations made in different times and places may stand in opposition to those of previous eras, for Islam this presents a bit of a problem if we consider the religion's premise that what is contained in the Quran is the final and absolute 'Word' of Allah. Thus, if

within the Quran are verses that contradict previous infrarational revelations, where Allah has deemed one communication to, in practice, supersede another, then why not continue this process posthumous to Mohammed? After all, if there was a need for Allah to change the nature of his communications during the brief lifetime of his final prophet, if he could not reveal a consistent and thorough message in one fell swoop, then he should have for his disposal the entirety of time to bring forth the truth by different means and forms, in variable times and circumstances. Something so profound as the Divine Word should not be fraught with glaring inconsistencies between communications made within such a short time period, to the same vessel. But as Islam is the message of the Asura, the manifestation of such discrepancies becomes clear, because the Lord of Falsehood lives for the promotion of his interests and power, with the latter increasing through military force - the projection of which depends on fluctuating conditions, necessitating decidedly different infrarational revelations *for different levels of military power*. To help calm the anxiety of his vessel over this potentially troubling aspect to the communications, to keep Mohammed obedient, Gabriel needed to put forth the message of Allah's omniscience regarding the replacement of prior communications. Comprehending this, the Prophet was then to ignore calls by others that the incongruous nature of the Quran was a sign of its forgery:

And when We put a revelation in place of another revelation – and Allah knoweth best what He reveals – they say: “You are only a forger.” Nay, most of them do not know. (Quran 16:101)

By describing the contrary verses as simply a superior *supplement* of one verse over another (2:106), without the lesser verse *entirely* negated or discarded, the Asura crafted a mechanism by which ensuing generations of Muslims can profit from *both* of the antipodal verses. For as Islam is a revealed religion, its verses not restricted to the era of the infrarational revelation (though the circumstances surrounding the message help acquaint the believer of its meaning), all generations of Muslims can attach use of each communication to their own particular context, perhaps using the documented response of the Prophet to his peculiar political climate as a guideline. The Muslim can choose one of the opposing verses depending on the advantage or disadvantage, the interest or deterrent, to using the particular communication. Thus when the Muslims are politically and militarily weak, the verses calling for them to leave the unbelievers alone are followed. But when they acquire enough strength or strategic openings, verses glorifying the punishment of infidels who deny the superiority of Islam are granted their rightful and elevated status. This type of progression is exemplified in the following passage of the Quran surah “Victory”, in which Allah is shown to have “held back” the believers from attacking the disbelievers even after a Meccan victory, only to later manifest his wrath through the hands of the Muslims upon the kuffar:

And He it is Who held back their hands from you and your hands from them in the valley of Mecca after He had given you victory over them; and Allah is Seeing what you do. It is they who disbelieved and turned you away from the Sacred Mosque and (turned off) the offering withheld from arriving at its destined place. And were it not for the believing men and the believing women, whom, not having known, you might have trodden down, and thus something hateful might have afflicted you on their account without knowledge - so that Allah may cause to enter into His mercy whomsoever He pleases. Had they been widely separated one from another, We would surely have punished those who disbelieved from among them with a painful punishment. **When those who disbelieved harboured in their hearts (feelings of) disdain, the disdain of (the days of) ignorance**, but Allah sent down His tranquillity on His Messenger and on the believers, and made them keep the word of guarding (against evil), and they were entitled to it and worthy of it. And Allah is Cognizant of all things. (Quran 48:25-26)

As there were Muslims among the enemy, it was not the right time to continue attacking – similar restraint can also be understood as applicable to times when military strength is insufficient to defeat the kuffar. The anticipated improvement in murderous capacity – and implementation - is seen in an

authentic hadith that helps us to understand further the context of 48:25-26. In it, we find the disdain of the unbelievers as resulting from their refusal to acknowledge Allah in treaty or to accept Mohammed as the Prophet of Allah – only to later yield concessions to the Muslims after the Muslims overpowered and began slaughtering them:

Abu Jandal bin Suhail got himself released from them (i.e. infidels) and joined Abu Basir. So, whenever a man from Quraish embraced Islam he would follow Abu Basir till they formed a strong group. **By Allah, whenever they heard about a caravan of Quraish heading towards Sham, they stopped it and attacked and killed them (i.e. infidels) and took their properties.** The people of Quraish sent a message to the Prophet requesting him for the Sake of Allah and Kith and kin to send for (i.e. Abu Basir and his companions) promising that whoever (amongst them) came to the Prophet would be secure. So the Prophet sent for them (i.e. Abu Basir's companions) and Allah revealed the following Divine Verses:

“And it is He Who Has withheld their hands from you and your hands From them in the midst of Mecca, After He made you the victorious over them. ...the unbelievers had pride and haughtiness, in their hearts...the pride and haughtiness of the time of ignorance.” (48.24-26) **And their pride and haughtiness was that they did not confess (write in the treaty) that he (i.e. Mohammed) was the Prophet of Allah and refused to write: “In the Name of Allah, the most Beneficent, the Most Merciful,”** and prevented the Mushriks from visiting the Ka’ba. (Sahih Bukhari Volume 3, Book 50, Number 891)

Though yet to be directly linked to the demand of conversion, prominent here is the wanton violence upon disbelievers, something unfathomable to the Prophet in the early years of Islam, when the Asura of Falsehood preached conversion and violence as unnecessary – even if people did not “confess” that Mohammed was the Prophet of Allah - because Allah was to deliver the punishment in the afterlife. But such external non-violence was by tactical design, dictated by conditions. With a burgeoning Muslim army arrives first the confidence – as seen in the following example - to send letters to powerful enemies warning them of the great sin of refusing to accept Islam, an important distinction over early exhortations by the Asura of Falsehood to leave the Polytheists to Allah – now the Muslim can elicit the earthly fear of death from powerful unbelieving leaders rather simply threatening ordinary civilians with a dreadful afterlife:

Narrated Abdullah bin Abbas:

Heraclius then asked for the letter addressed by Allah's Apostle which was delivered by Dihya to the Governor of Busra, who forwarded it to Heraclius to read. The contents of the letter were as follows: “In the name of Allah the Beneficent, the Merciful (This letter is) from Mohammed the slave of Allah and His Apostle to Heraclius the ruler of Byzantine. Peace be upon him, who follows the right path. **Furthermore I invite you to Islam, and if you become a Muslim you will be safe,** and Allah will double your reward, and if you reject this invitation of Islam you will be committing a sin by misguiding your Arisiyin (peasants). (And I recite to you Allah's Statement:)

“O people of the scripture! Come to a word common to you and us that we worship none but Allah and that we associate nothing in worship with Him, and that none of us shall take others as Lords beside Allah. Then, if they turn away, say: Bear witness that we are Muslims (those who have surrendered to Allah).” (3:64). (Sahih Bukhari Volume 1, Book 1, Number 6)

While this particular letter was possibly just Mohammed warning the Byzantine ruler to protect himself from an afterlife punishment for his “sin”, it nevertheless may well have been sent after the Prophet had achieved some amount of military success (thus implying a terrestrial threat), which subsequently helps us to observe the pattern, whereby warnings of the afterlife transition into warnings of military

punishment (to facilitate conversions), to then using actual battle to obtain the conversions by swordpoint. Progressing closer to the 'legalization' of military force for conversions described in previously mentioned verses, we find the emergence of the Asura's use of famine, an infrarationally revealed earthly punishment for disbelief, to obtain conversions:

There is no god but He. He gives life and causes death, your Lord and the Lord of your fathers of yore. Nay, they play in doubt. Therefore keep waiting for the day when the heaven shall bring an evident smoke That shall overtake men; this is a painful punishment. They will say: "Our Lord! Remove from us the punishment, surely we are believers." How shall they be reminded, when there came to them a Messenger making clear (the truth), Yet they turned their backs on him and said: "One taught (by others), a madman." **Surely We will remove the punishment a little, (but) you will surely return (to evil).** On the Day when We will seize (them) with the most violent seizing. Surely We will inflict retribution. And certainly We tried before them the people of Pharaoh, and there came to them a noble messenger, Saying: "Deliver to me the servants of Allah, surely I am a faithful messenger to you. And that do not exalt yourselves against Allah, surely I will bring to you a clear authority. And surely I take refuge with my Lord and your Lord that you should stone me to death. And if you do not believe in me, then leave me alone." Then he called upon his Lord: "These are a guilty people." (The Lord replied) "So go forth with My servants by night; surely you will be pursued, and leave the sea intervening. Surely they are a host that shall be drowned." (Quran 44:08-24)

The punishment in question was – as recorded in a previously cited hadith – famine, with the passage confirming the principle of abrogation, for previously Mohammed was told to leave the disbelievers to their faith instead of seeking their conversions, whereas this infrarational revelation granted his request of conversion through famine. Gabriel however, did acknowledge in the verses that the method would prove ineffective, with a different hadith describing the circumstances and also confirming the result:

Narrated Abdullah (bin Masud):

When the Prophet realized that the Quraish had delayed in embracing Islam, he said, "O Allah! Protect me against their evil by afflicting them with seven (years of famine) like the seven years of (Prophet) Joseph." So they were struck with a year of famine that destroyed everything till they had to eat bones, and till a man would look towards the sky and see something like smoke between him and it. Allah said:

"Then watch you (O Mohammed) for the day when the sky will produce a kind of smoke plainly visible." (44.10) And Allah further said: "Verily! We shall withdraw the punishment a little, Verily you will return (to disbelief)." (44.15) (Will Allah relieve them from torture on the Day of Resurrection?) (The punishment of) the smoke had passed and Al-Baltsha (the destruction of the pagans in the Badr battle) had passed too. (Sahih Bukhari Volume 6, Book 60, Number 215)

An additional hadith is more explicit in confirming that when the famine was relieved, there was a return to unbelief – hardly a genuine acknowledgement of Islam's superiority.

Narrated Masruq:

One day I went to Ibn Masud who said, "**When Quraish delayed in embracing Islam,** the Prophet invoked Allah to curse them, so they were afflicted with a (famine) year because of which many of them died and they ate the carcasses and Abu Sufyan came to the Prophet and said, 'O Mohammed! You came to order people to keep good relation with kith and kin and your nation is being destroyed, so invoke Allah I?' So the Prophet recited the Holy verses of Sirat-Ad-Dukhan: 'Then watch you For the day that The sky will Bring forth a kind Of smoke

Plainly visible.’ (44.10) **When the famine was taken off, the people renegade once again as nonbelievers.** The statement of Allah, (in Sura Ad-Dukhan) refers to that: ‘On the day when We shall seize You with a mighty grasp.’ (44.16) And that was what happened on the day of the battle of Badr.” Asbath added on the authority of Mansur, “Allah's Apostle prayed for them and it rained heavily for seven days. So the people complained of the excessive rain. The Prophet said, ‘O Allah! (Let it rain) around us and not on us.’ So the clouds dispersed over his head and it rained over the surroundings.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 2, Book 17, Number 133)

Clearly, this hadith describe an ‘enlightenment’ of Mohammed concerning the ineffectiveness of using famine to obtain conversions, as the kuffar will outwardly profess belief for the purpose of sheer survival, reverting to type when subsistence is guaranteed. The Asura of Falsehood likely accepted the failure of famine for conversion, as it is counter-productive to his ambition, because a starving populace, preoccupied with obtaining food, is not a great source of robust mujahideen ready to fight to impose Islam over the kuffar through genocide, to create chaos in the world. If coercion was going to be the tactic by which the Asura instructed Mohammed to gather conversions, it would have to be done by military force seizing the initial declarations of Allah's exclusive status, with this coerced acceptance to be followed by an indoctrinated fidelity among their descendants, helping to secure the numbers of the original mass conversion. In other words, the initial fear of death by military force was to be replaced by the scripturally established terror of suffering an eternal hellfire for disbelief, as the primary means of keeping the followers faithful.

But that – and the pattern is repeated against the unbelievers to this day - can only occur through a gradual transition assisted by the abrogation of the early scripture related to the Prophet's military strength. The Muslims will initially adhere to the decrees of absolutely no conversion of unbelievers, proceeding to threatening them with – as a means to entice conversions - the hellfire for continued disbelief, then moving onto heinous violence against the disbelievers without explicitly demanding their conversion (yet with the implied message that only their conversion will halt the murders), to the call for natural calamities – through which the disbeliever might convert to relieve his suffering - upon those refusing to submit to Islam, at last reaching the inevitable conclusion found in the Asura of Falsehood's infrarational revelations ordering the believer to fight, take captive, and slay the disbeliever – unless the latter converts. If the kafir chooses the the path of converting under extreme duress, he becomes a brother in “faith” and is to be left alone – assuming he pays the zakat or war tax (“poor-due”) and maintains fidelity to the exclusivity of Allah (“establish worship”):

Freedom from obligation (is proclaimed) from Allah and His messenger toward those of the idolaters with whom ye made a treaty. Travel freely in the land four months, and know that ye cannot escape Allah and that Allah will confound the disbelievers (in His Guidance). And a proclamation from Allah and His messenger to all men on the day of the Greater Pilgrimage that Allah is free from obligation to the idolaters, and (so is) His messenger. So, if ye repent, it will be better for you; but if ye are averse, then know that ye cannot escape Allah. Give tidings (O Mohammed) of a painful doom to those who disbelieve, Excepting those of the idolaters with whom ye (Muslims) have a treaty, and who have since abated nothing of your right nor have supported anyone against you. (As for these), fulfil their treaty to them till their term. Lo! Allah loveth those who keep their duty (unto Him). **Then, when the sacred months have passed, slay the idolaters wherever ye find them, and take them (captive), and besiege them, and prepare for them each ambush. But if they repent and establish worship and pay the poor-due, then leave their way free.** Lo! Allah is Forgiving, Merciful. And if anyone of the idolaters seeketh thy protection (O Mohammed), then protect him so that he may hear the Word of Allah, and afterwards convey him to his place of safety. That is because they are a folk who know not. How can there be an agreement for the idolaters with Allah and with His Messenger except

those with whom you made an agreement at the Sacred Mosque? So as long as they are true to you, be true to them. Surely Allah loves those who are careful (of their duty). How (can it be)! While if they prevail against you, they would not pay regard in your case to ties of relationship, nor those of covenant. They please you with their mouths while their hearts do not consent; and most of them are transgressors. They have taken a small price for the communications of Allah, so they turn away from His way - surely evil is it that they do. They do not pay regard to ties of relationship nor those of covenant in the case of a believer, and these are they who go beyond the limits. **But if they repent and keep up prayer and pay the poor-rate, they are your brethren in faith,** and We make the communications clear for a people who know. (Quran 09:01-11)

Conspicuous to the previous passage – which is from the ninth surah, chronologically the final chapter of the Quran and thus confirming that the progressive timeline (and subsequently which verses are considered superior) culminates in the sanctioned call to convert at gunpoint, a decree that because of its timing abrogates the previously “tolerant” (as we will analyse, they are not genuinely tolerant) verses - is the expedient nature of treaties to the Islamic mentality. In Islam, treaties are designed to offer a strategic gain to the believer, perhaps giving an Islamic army a period for respite and reinforcement prior to another attack on the hated kuffar who – as the believer hopes – has been made complacent by a time of apparent peace. A true peace, however, is impossible for a Muslim army confronted with an unbelieving enemy, because Islam does not believe in an inherent equality with the demarcated ‘other’, and instead declares them deserving of being imposed upon by a marauding Muslim horde. And when the Islamic army is ready to proceed with an attack, the non-Muslim is faced with only the choices of death, *jizya*, or compulsory conversion.

If the previous passage in question was communicated to Mohammed in the context of the Polytheist enemies he was facing at the time, for Islamic armies in ensuing eras and vastly different nations, the call to attack and forcibly convert unbelievers has for its context *only* the sheer existence of infidels needing to be presented with the triple choice. Because as long as there exist kuffar, they will either need to be killed, forced to pay a tax acknowledging Islam's superiority, or converted. The particulars of Islam's enemies are irrelevant, with the exception of their disbelief: For as Allah communicated, in his ‘last Word’ to mankind, the deserved recompense of an unbelieving enemy, they must unceasingly meet their earthly fate until the Day of Judgement. Indeed the nature of an infrarationally revealed religion means that the previous passage along with other communications describing the nefarious nature of unbelievers (verses fostering a paranoid mindset) predispose the Muslim to look for any excuse – real or imagined – to attack. But such attacks could only commence *after* Gabriel's sent an Asuric commandment demanding that his instrument strike the Polytheist enemy and extract their unwilling conversion under duress.

The pivotal infrarational revelations demanding unwilling conversions, by their late chronological arrival, confirm the anti-conversion verses as both lesser in importance and earlier in timeline, with an increase in military might leading to the revelatory supersession - abrogating the inaugural infrarational verses. However, the multiple Asuric verses telling Mohammed to leave the kuffar to Allah and his alleged hellfire, while later abrogated, are nevertheless *not* simultaneously *negated*, and remain of use to the infamous Islamic strategy of *taqiya* (or dissimulation), to be discussed in detail later, by which the believer seeks to reassure his non-Muslim counterpart that Islam holds nothing but goodwill to other faiths, that it assuredly abhors the very concept of forced conversions or murdering disbelievers! A detailed study of the Quran and Hadith expose otherwise, and in the matter of forced conversions, the authentic hadith especially offer additional incontrovertible evidence confirming the status of compulsory conversions as a historically approved practice for Islamic armies, beginning with the Prophet's:

Narrated Ibn Umar:

Allah's Apostle said: **“I have been ordered (by Allah) to fight against the people until they testify that none has the right to be worshipped but Allah and that Mohammed is Allah's Apostle, and offer the prayers perfectly and give the obligatory charity, so if they perform a that, then they save their lives and property from me except for Islamic laws and then their reckoning (accounts) will be done by Allah.”** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 1, Book 2, Number 24)

Naturally, a conversion obtained after vanquishing the enemy in battle is one secured under duress, with the non-Muslim viewing it as a way to avoid death, to “save their lives and property” from Islamic terror. Another authentic hadith relates the same command given to Mohammed, the narrator adding his comment that only Muslim lives and property are sacred:

Narrated Anas bin Malik:

Allah's Apostle said, “I have been ordered to fight the people till they say: ‘None has the right to be worshipped but Allah.’ And if they say so, pray like our prayers, face our Qibla and slaughter as we slaughter, then their blood and property will be sacred to us and we will not interfere with them except legally and their reckoning will be with Allah.” Narrated Maimun ibn Siyah that he asked Anas bin Malik, “O Abu Hamza! What makes the life and property of a person sacred?” He replied, “Whoever says, ‘None has the right to be worshipped but Allah’, faces our Qibla during the prayers, prays like us and eats our slaughtered animal, then he is a Muslim, and has got the same rights and obligations as other Muslims have.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 1, Book 8, Number 387)

In the Sahih Muslim collection of hadith, considered the second most important after Sahih Bukhari, Mohammed is recorded specifically detailing the triple choice to an unbelieving enemy – convert, pay *jizya*, or be fought and hopefully slaughtered. In addition to informing them of their only recourse, Mohammed in this tradition declared that those who convert will then have the choice to either immediately fight with the Muslims and receive war booty, emigrate with other Muslims and acquire spoils of war, or live like Bedouins without any possibility of receiving spoils:

It has been reported from Sulaiman b. Buraid through his father that when the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) appointed anyone as leader of an army or detachment he would especially exhort him to fear Allah and to be good to the Muslims who were with him. He would say: **“Fight in the name of Allah and in the way of Allah. Fight against those who disbelieve in Allah. Make a holy war, do not embezzle the spoils; do not break your pledge; and do not mutilate (the dead) bodies; do not kill the children. When you meet your enemies who are polytheists, invite them to three courses of action.** If they respond to any one of these, you also accept it and withhold yourself from doing them any harm. **Invite them to (accept) Islam; if they respond to you, accept it from them and desist from fighting against them. Then invite them to migrate from their lands to the land of Muhajirs and inform them that, if they do so, they shall have all the privileges and obligations of the Muhajirs. If they refuse to migrate, tell them that they will have the status of Bedouin Muslims and will be subjected to the Commands of Allah like other Muslims, but they will not get any share from the spoils of war or Fai except when they actually fight with the Muslims (against the disbelievers). If they refuse to accept Islam, demand from them the Jizya. If they agree to pay, accept it from them and hold off your hands. If they refuse to pay the tax, seek Allah's help and fight them.”** (Sahih Muslim Book 019, Number 4294)

Though in this hadith he advises against killing Polytheist children, in different records, as we shall see, Mohammed consents to their killing. But before we present those traditions of Mohammed, we must

continue our review of how the Asura of Falsehood's instrument, the indiscriminating infrarational mystic, helped further strengthen the Islamic doctrine of war against the non-Muslim by his own actions. Commanded by Gabriel – the alleged conduit to Allah – to outline the limited triple choice to the kuffar, having actually fulfilled this dictate against his Polytheist enemies, Mohammed would also quickly consent to his son-in-law Ali's wish, prior to the Battle of Khaibar, to fight the Polytheist enemy until they became Muslims:

Narrated Sahl bin Sad:

That he heard the Prophet on the day (of the battle) of Khaibar saying, "I will give the flag to a person at whose hands Allah will grant victory." So, the companions of the Prophet got up, wishing eagerly to see to whom the flag will be given, and everyone of them wished to be given the flag. But the Prophet asked for Ali. Someone informed him that he was suffering from eye-trouble. So, he ordered them to bring Ali in front of him. Then the Prophet spat in his eyes and his eyes were cured immediately as if he had never any eye-trouble. **Ali said, "We will fight with them (i.e. infidels) till they become like us (i.e. Muslims)." The Prophet said, "Be patient, till you face them and invite them to Islam and inform them of what Allah has enjoined upon them. By Allah! If a single person embraces Islam at your hands (i.e. through you), that will be better for you than the red camels."** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 52, Number 192)

Under no illusions regarding Islam's primary objective in warfare – securing forced conversions to help hasten the scriptural message that Islam will conquer the world –, Mohammed blessed the news he received from a companion named Jarir. This news involved the latter burning down a house of "idols" and afterwards forcing a Polytheist to destroy the "idols" of his practice while at the same time testifying that only Allah deserved to be worshipped – the kafir in question faced the threat of having his neck chopped off if he refused to comply. All of this done after Mohammed had commanded Jarir to "relieve" the Prophet of the particular house:

Narrated Qais:

Jarir said, "**Allah's Apostle said to me, 'Won't you relieve me from Dhul-Khalasa?'**" I replied, 'Yes, (I will relieve you).' So I proceeded along with one-hundred and fifty cavalry from Ahmas tribe who were skillful in riding horses. I used not to sit firm over horses, so I informed the Prophet of that, and he stroked my chest with his hand till I saw the marks of his hand over my chest and he said, 'O Allah! Make him firm and one who guides others and is guided (on the right path).' Since then I have never fallen from a horse. Dhul-Khulasa was a house in Yemen belonging to the tribe of Khatham and Bajaila, and in it there were idols which were worshipped, and it was called Al-Ka'ba." Jarir went there, burnt it with fire and dismantled it. When Jarir reached Yemen, there was a man who used to foretell and give good omens by casting arrows of divination. Someone said to him, "The messenger of Allah's Apostle is present here and if he should get hold of you, he would chop off your neck." One day while he was using them (i.e. arrows of divination), Jarir stopped there and said to him, "**Break them (i.e. the arrows) and testify that None has the right to be worshipped except Allah, or else I will chop off your neck."** So the man broke those arrows and testified that none has the right to be worshipped except Allah. Then Jarir sent a man called Abu Artata from the tribe of Ahmas to the Prophet to convey the good news (of destroying Dhu-l-Khalasa). So when the messenger reached the Prophet, he said, "**O Allah's Apostle! By Him Who sent you with the Truth, I did not leave it till it was like a scabby camel."** Then the Prophet **blessed the horses of Ahmas and their men five times.** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 5, Book 59, Number 643)

In another hadith, Tufail Bin Amr, a companion of the Prophet, preferred the third choice – death – be applied for those refusing to convert – in this case the Daus tribe:

Narrated Abu Huraira:

Tufail bin Amr came to the Prophet and said, “The Daus (nation) have perished as they disobeyed and **refused to accept Islam**. So invoke Allah against them.” But the Prophet said, “O Allah! Give guidance to the Daus (tribe) and bring them (to Islam)!” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 5, Book 59, Number 675)

The ‘truth’ of Islam is so profound that surely it must be offered to unbelievers at gunpoint, killing those refusing to meekly submit to the ‘profundity’ of its message. Of course, as it is difficult and tiresome to constantly massacre swaths of people, Mohammed preferred conversion, hence his above prayer to Allah, even if he was aware that the infrarational orders required him to fight and kill the enemy if they refused to convert or pay the *jizya*. These particular type of conversions – arising out of a religion that barbarously deems differing thought and belief to be crimes - are by their very nature antithetical to the Sanatana Dharma, the inherent natural law of being that is not restricted to a particular nation, race, religious or spiritual text. For as svadharma is a progressive development with a foundation of internal growth and nature, the forcible imposition of an external way of thinking and acting, for the mere reason of difference in opinion and beliefs - as in the case of conversion to Islam in which death or subjugation are the only alternatives -, offers no benefit to the inherent law, because it only yields outward conformity rather than the individuality – toward the Individual – that Dharma is to facilitate. It also reduces religion and spirituality to the level of barter – the conversions often helping to secure physical safety, as seen with the tribe of Bani Quraiza:

Narrated Ibn Umar:

Bani An-Nadir and Bani Quraiza fought (against the Prophet violating their peace treaty), so the Prophet exiled Bani An-Nadir and allowed Bani Quraiza to remain at their places (in Medina) taking nothing from them till they fought against the Prophet again). **He then killed their men and distributed their women, children and property among the Muslims, but some of them came to the Prophet and he granted them safety, and they embraced Islam**. He exiled all the Jews from Medina. They were the Jews of Bani Qainuqa, the tribe of Abdullah bin Salam and the Jews of Bani Haritha and all the other Jews of Medina. (Sahih Bukhari Volume 5, Book 59, Number 362)

Having seen their brethren killed, their families placed in slavery, their property stolen, the remaining non-Muslims of the tribe felt the need to convert to secure their own safety and perhaps retrieve their wives and property back – a ransom for their allegiance to Islam. In another example of this blackmail, the Hawazin tribe, but only after embracing Islam, were allowed to have their captives returned to them – though Mohammed refused to give them back their properties:

Narrated Marwan bin Al-Hakam and Al-Miswar bin Makhrama:

When the delegates of the tribe of Hawazin, after embracing Islam, came to Allah's Apostle, he got up. They appealed to him to return their properties and their captives. Allah's Apostle said to them, “The most beloved statement to me is the true one. So, you have the option of restoring your properties or your captives, for I have delayed distributing them.” The narrator added, **Allah's Apostle had been waiting for them for more than ten days on his return from Taif. When they realized that Allah's Apostle would return to them only one of two things, they said, “We choose our captives.”** So, Allah's Apostle got up in the gathering of the Muslims, praised Allah as He deserved, and said, “Then after! These brethren of yours have come to you with repentance and I see it proper to return their

captives to them. So, whoever amongst you likes to do that as a favour, then he can do it, and whoever of you wants to stick to his share till we pay him from the very first booty which Allah will give us then he can do so.” The people replied, “We agree to give up our shares willingly as a favour for Allah's Apostle.” Then Allah's Apostle said, “We don't know who amongst you has agreed and who hasn't. Go back and your chiefs may tell us your opinion.” So, all of them returned and their chiefs discussed the matter with them and then they (i.e. their chiefs) came to Allah's Apostle to tell him that they (i.e. the people) had given up their shares gladly and willingly. (Sahih Bukhari Volume 3, Book 38, Number 503)

This again is a forced conversion resulting from the feared likelihood of physical and sexual – as will be documented – enslavement of the captives, along with their potential murder, rather than a measured decision based upon a recognition of Islam's profundity – unless we consider the brutal use of the sword as enlightenment. Instead of masses of men becoming psychologically illuminated by the final ‘Word’ of Allah, it was the dark imposition of crude force that brought the Asura's religion to prominence. Though this particular stratagem has with it the potential for a protracted and bloody struggle, violence directed by the Asura of Falsehood can also have a certain order and tactical astuteness. Such was the case during Mohammed's time when – as narrated by Aisha – *selective* murders were seen as pivotal to obtaining conversions:

Narrated Aisha:

The day of Bu'ath was a day (i.e. battle) which Allah caused to take place just before the mission of His Apostle so that when Allah's Apostle came to Medina, **they (the tribes) had divided (into hostile groups) and their nobles had been killed; and all that facilitated their conversion to Islam.** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 5, Book 58, Number 267)

Notable here along with an instinctive understanding of the benefit to divide and rule, is the use of targeted assassinations to demoralize the enemy, removing their aristocratic elements and potentially decimating the opposition's intellectual, financial and inspirational support. Having destroyed the previous underpinnings of the disbelieving faith and tribe, the resulting void had to be filled. And while one might expect, due to its claim of supremacy, that Islam – a set of dictates on how to think and act – *alone* is enough to fill this partially psychological vacuum, we have the example of Mohammed to show that from the religion's onset, the Asura of Falsehood had no hesitation in using material possessions – bribes - to maintain the obedience of his newly acquired slaves:

Narrated Anas bin Malik:

When Allah favoured His Apostle with the properties of Hawazin tribe as Fai (booty), he started giving to some Quraish men even up to one-hundred camels each, **whereupon some Ansari men said about Allah's Apostle, “May Allah forgive His Apostle! He is giving to (men of) Quraish and leaves us, in spite of the fact that our swords are still dropping blood (of the infidels).”** When Allah's Apostle was informed of what they had said, he called the Ansar and gathered them in a leather tent and did not call anybody else along, with them. When they gathered, Allah's Apostle came to them and said, “What is the statement which, I have been informed, and that which you have said?” The learned ones among them replied, “O Allah's Apostle! The wise ones amongst us did not say anything, but the youngsters amongst us said, ‘May Allah forgive His Apostle; he gives the Quraish and leaves the Ansar, in spite of the fact that our swords are still dribbling (wet) with the blood of the infidels.’ ” **Allah's Apostle replied, “I give to such people as are still close to the period of Infidelity** (i.e. they have recently embraced Islam and Faith is still weak in their hearts). Won't you be pleased to see people go with fortune, while you return with Allah's Apostle to your houses? By Allah, what you will return with, is better than what they are returning with.” The Ansar replied, “Yes, O

Allah's Apostle, we are satisfied.” Then the Prophet said to them. “You will find after me, others being preferred to you. Then be patient till you meet Allah and meet His Apostle at Al-Kauthar (i.e. a fount in Paradise).” (Anas added:) But we did not remain patient. (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 53, Number 375)

But surely the ultimate creation of Allah, Islam, should be immune from the indignity of “infidelity”? We are, after all, describing a faith perfected by Allah, whose last ‘Word’ was apparently so sagacious that all divine communication has ceased since then. Yet neither its propagation throughout the land, nor Mohammed's warning of hellfire, or even the very utterings of the conquered infidels that Allah is the only god and Mohammed his final prophet, were enough to assure genuine allegiance during the time of *the Prophet*. Thus material objects were required in his era, and currently, to secure the “faith” - bribery in place of a substantial internal transformation to Islam. But genuine conversions can only arise when founded on the principles of one's dharma or possibly a specific need of the Psychic Being; Islam, however, proceeds strictly through the approach of the lower vital – raw force and compulsion; material rewards and bribery; ransom and blackmail; terror and relief. And even when Islam obtains conversions not marked by fear or compulsion, it is often – as in the following example during Mohammed's time – based on other considerations native to the superficial vital:

Narrated Amr bin Salama:

We were at a place which was a thoroughfare for the people, and the caravans used to pass by us and we would ask them, “What is wrong with the people? What is wrong with the people?” “Who is that man?” They would say, “That man claims that Allah has sent him (as an Apostle), that he has been divinely inspired, that Allah has revealed to him such-and-such.” I used to memorize that (Divine) Talk, and feel as if it was inculcated in my chest (i.e. Mind). **And the Arabs (other than Quraish) delayed their conversion to Islam till the Conquest (of Mecca). They used to say, “Leave him (i.e. Mohammed) and his people Quraish: if he overpowers them then he is a true Prophet.” So, when Mecca was conquered, then every tribe rushed to embrace Islam, and my father hurried to embrace Islam before (the other members of) my tribe.** When my father returned (from the Prophet) to his tribe, he said, “By Allah, I have come to you from the Prophet for sure!” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 5, Book 59, Number 595)

Yet is this a primitive rationale for conversion, and simultaneously an ignorant perception of God's signs, all based upon the tendency of the lower vital to associated power with physical strength, to reflexively assume earthly military might as a divine affirmation, in similar vein to supposing the earthquake or flood to be a sign of God's displeasure. But Brahma has allowed for a play of a variety of forces in his creation, including – in the realm of war – practical matters such as military equipment and strategy. These will have their say along with forces beyond the scope of ordinary human limits, including non-divine entities such as the Asuras or Rakshasas, but also ordinary life-forces and, of course, the soldier's call to the Supreme Consciousness in the midst of battle. To ascertain the nature of these powers requires a penetrating glance at the psychological qualities of the superior army in question, which in the case of Islam - with its obsession with division, lack of inherent equality, hatred, rigidity, and its quick resort to violence, to name a few of the religion's deplorable characteristics – exposes a dark, shadowy and evil force supporting.

But if a person or a group erroneously presumes strength alone as proof of God, as many Arabs clearly did during the time of Mohammed, then the elements are present for the emergence of a figure such as the Prophet *and* the group's quick acquiescence to his rule – the subtle lure of base Asuric temptations and especially raw power overwhelming any Psychic counter. The Asura, after all, can only function effectively if men – especially when controlling the group – allow him, their permission to his ideology providing a foundation for the emergence of a prominent individual centre like Mohammed or Hitler

that is subservient to Asuric principles and capable of promptly rousing the infected desires of the mass to fruition, organizing the herd to secretly work to prolong the the Lord of Falsehood's rule. But these individuals need more than just assent from the group, because though they are powerful, they obviously cannot prosecute a war by themselves. This is why the Asura of Falsehood, while occultly *possessing* the individual, also makes sure to invade the group consciousness with certain falsehoods the mass generally agrees upon, helping to then establish a psychologically captured flock that the possessed individual can use – by way of obtaining soldiers - for the Asura's loathsome ambitions.

Prakriti's development of human centres is thus usurped by the Asura of Falsehood for the purpose of obtaining an instrument or medium who will then reflect the group-consciousness' (simultaneously manipulated by him) primitive ambition to obtain the fruits potentially accompanying the Asuric march. And as raw vital power is the basis of such a drive, higher vital ideals including honour, universal love, ethics, fraternity, equality and restraint either lose the sway they once held or become inverted by Asuric falsehood to mean something else. In Islam, this is exemplified by the Prophet's conflicting stance on the killing of Polytheist women and children, two parties who were considered forbidden – as military targets - to the classical warrior code predating Islam's ascent. Raised as Mohammed was in that culture, his first instinct – seen in the following, and previously in a Sahih Muslim hadith we presented - appeared to be a reflexive opposition to such slaughter:

Narrated Abdullah:

During some of the Ghazawat of the Prophet a woman was found killed. Allah's Apostle disapproved the killing of women and children. (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 52, Number 257)

Ibn Amar, a companion of Mohammed, narrated a stronger account in a different hadith, stating, “During some of the Ghazawat of Allah's Apostle a woman was found killed, so Allah's Apostle forbade the killing of women and children.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 52, Number 258) Unfortunately, fragile is this sense of compassion and pity for those unable to fight, after one has unconditionally submitted to the guidance of the merciless Asura of Falsehood, when one believes him to either be God or to be the conduit for the ‘divine word’. And if the submission is complete, as with the Prophet, a lack of direct infrarational revelations is not always needed for the instrument to question previously held *personal* principles, because a continued contact with the Asura erodes any earlier Psychic or higher counters to the Lord of Falsehood's depravity. It is a process seen in the authentic hadith regarding the killing of kuffar women and children, in which an initially lofty position began to deteriorate:

Narrated Al-Miswar bin Makhrama and Marwan bin Al-Hakam:

(one of them said more than his friend): The Prophet set out in the company of more than one-thousand of his companions in the year of Al-Hudaibiya, and when he reached Dhul-Hulaifa, he garlanded his Hadi (i.e. sacrificing animal), assumed the state of Ihram for Umra from that place and sent a spy of his from Khuzia (tribe). The Prophet proceeded on till he reached (a village called) Ghadir-al-Ashtat. There his spy came and said, “The Quraish (infidels) have collected a great number of people against you, and they have collected against you the Ethiopians, and they will fight with you, and will stop you from entering the Ka’ba and prevent you.” **The Prophet said, “O people! Give me your opinion. Do you recommend that I should destroy the families and offspring of those who want to stop us from the Ka’ba? If they should come to us (for peace) then Allah will destroy a spy from the pagans, or otherwise we will leave them in a miserable state.”** On that Abu Bakr said, “O Allah Apostle! You have come with the intention of visiting this House (i.e. Ka’ba) and you do not want to kill or fight anybody. So proceed to it, and whoever should stop us from it, we will fight him.” On that the

Prophet said, "Proceed on, in the Name of Allah!" (Sahih Bukhari Volume 5, Book 59, Number 495)

The fact Mohammed *asked* for an opinion on murdering families shows that the Asura of Falsehood had not provided an infrarational revelation specifically approving *or* rejecting the genocide of Polytheist women and children. Though Gabriel did, as noted, command him to slay the Pagans, the verse in question does not highlight whether that also includes non-combatant Polytheists. But surely it should, was the likely thought process of the previously restrained (at least as far as killing women and children) Mohammed, because the ancient warrior code was one constructed by unbelievers before the advent of Islam's 'truth' – the same kuffar liars who sought to violate the 'purity' of Allah by assigning him partners, an unscrupulous party with designs against Allah and Muslims, ignorant of their own abominable status as fuel for the hellfire. Why should Polytheist women and children be spared when they represent the future of such despicable spawn? Their lives and customs – in the following, nighttime raids are sanctioned, breaking the ancestral custom – are to be eradicated, stamped upon by the 'light' and 'truth' of Islam, whether or not that means the slaying of non-Muslim women and children:

Narrated As-Sab bin Jaththama:

The Prophet passed by me at a place called Al-Abwa or Waddan, and was asked whether it was permissible **to attack the pagan warriors at night with the probability of exposing their women and children to danger. The Prophet replied, "They (i.e. women and children) are from them (i.e. Pagans)." (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 52, Number 256)**

Appalling as his callousness sounds, the primitive nature of Islamic warfare – antithetical to the Vedic arrangement of terrestrial warfare, which was strictly for the Kshatriya or Warrior Varna – nevertheless has a cold, pragmatic design behind it. After all, the ancient warrior's decorum grew out of a Polytheistic culture in which the winning party, while certainly desiring material rewards and territorial gains, did not seek to forcefully impose its own thoughts and practices upon the losers. The Asura of Falsehood, on the other hand, tasked Mohammed and ensuing Muslims with a more difficult burden than simply winning a battle – they are to convert the world, with *jizya* and other spoils only a means to that end, though of course they can be enjoyed for awhile. While Mohammed did not have the power or time to fulfil Gabriel's message of world conquest, he knew well enough that this ambition could only begin with a fully Islamic Arabia, an initial step that he, as recorded in the following hadith, outlined to his followers - who by then knew that the killing of Polytheist women and children was sanctioned by his tradition – with his last gasp of air:

Narrated Said bin Jubair:

Ibn Abbas said, "Thursday! What (great thing) took place on Thursday!" Then he started weeping till his tears wetted the gravels of the ground. Then he said, "On Thursday the illness of Allah's Apostle was aggravated and he said, 'Fetch me writing materials so that I may have something written to you after which you will never go astray.' The people (present there) differed in this matter and people should not differ before a prophet. They said, 'Allah's Apostle is seriously sick.' The Prophet said, 'Let me alone, as the state in which I am now, is better than what you are calling me for.' The Prophet on his death-bed, gave three orders saying, '**Expel the pagans from the Arabian Peninsula**, respect and give gifts to the foreign delegates as you have seen me dealing with them.' I forgot the third (order)" (Yaqub bin Muhammad said, "I asked Al-Mughira bin Abdur-Rahman about the Arabian Peninsula and he said, 'It comprises Mecca, Medina, Al-Yama-ma and Yemen.' " Yaqub added, "And Al-Arj, the beginning of Tihama.") (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 52, Number 288)

The expulsion or conversion – or death if they resisted such measures - of the Arabian Polytheists from

the peninsula was not specifically commanded by Allah. Nor was it required, because Gabriel had already communicated enough to Mohammed, delivered enough fear and a firm sense of separateness, imparted tremendous hatred and dehumanization of the other, declared Islam's sovereignty over all, commanded the Prophet in a general fashion to kill Polytheists, and prophesied Islam's conquest of the world, that the details of such deaths or expulsions were sure to blossom, without instruction, in the mind of his simpleton slave. And for the modern Muslims – who understand the infrarational word of Islam's goal to take over the planet, who believe that the killing and subjugation of unbelievers is sanctioned to be a worthy religious endeavour, who take Mohammed's example for guidance - the Asura's message lives on. For though the Muslims are far removed from the time of the Prophet, they have with them the teachings of the Quran and Hadith to activate the primitive motives from which the Asura of Falsehood can use them for his ambitions. The scripture and the Prophet's history give all the required justification for today's Muslim to slaughter and – as we shall see - rape the defenceless, just because of the non-Muslim's particular form of worship.

While someone born into a modern Muslim family will in the vast majority not actively participate in jihad, there remains for him the fundamental mistake of presuming the Quran to be the actual word of God, an association that lets Islam persist as a possible avenue for Asuric contact. For it is in the Quran and the example of Mohammed where we find the seed of evil, the justification – either for oneself or one's co-religionists – for all sorts of depraved and barbaric thinking and action, all in the name of 'God'. And if one questions the 'Word' he is reading, he may still find it difficult to overcome the weight of the group-consciousness supporting Islam along with the fear conditioned into him – both by the Quran and his community – that disobeying Islam's edicts leads to hellfire. Conversely, for the Muslim simple enough to accept the Quran as the final 'truth', and courageous enough to engage in jihad, support will always be present from a community conditioned to separateness and hatred. The latter may not participate in the violence but their silent assent will infuse the atmosphere. Any Psychic check on the pervading environment is likely to face difficulty when the group ego is so firmly attached to a feeling of superiority and separateness from the 'other'. And as the influence of the Quran and authentic hadith – both appealing to the base individual and group ego - begins to dominate over natural Psychic tendencies, the characteristics of the latter recede, only to remain in certain individuals with the strength to ignore the pressure of the group, choosing not to take the latter's Islamic ideals to heart.

But for such individuals to transform from within the fate of a nation or group genuinely wishing to follow Islam's principles, requires a strength rarely seen in the history of time. For unlike his other attempts at capturing the consciousness of a certain group or nation, such as Nazi Germany, in the ongoing case of Islam, the Asura of Falsehood cleverly chose to attach his commands to a transcendental 'God', increasing the possibility of spreading Islam beyond a particular group restricted by skin tone, geography, language or tribe. By corrupting the reality of the Divine Word with Man's lowest attributes instead of providing something higher for him to aspire toward, the Asura succeeded both in making resistance to his message more difficult, and making his slaves quicker to rise in defence of 'God' from the enemy's insults or thought-crimes or mere presence. The association of the 'Divine Word' with separation, hatred, violence and fear is not the only debasement of higher Psychic aspirations and mystic realities found in Asuric Islam: for although its infrarational word holds heaven to be the ultimate state attainable to the believer, by constructing Islam as a religion that *has* to convert the world, Gabriel hinted at a utopian *terrestrial* conclusion prior to the Muslim – hopefully – arriving in Paradise on the Day of Judgement.

After all, if Islam is the finalized religion to dominate over all, it must naturally be the greatest, and if that is so, then all of earth's defects will presumably be cured by its conquest of the planet. Thus the terror and subjugation are for *good*, and mankind must think and act the same way, as Allah apparently

intended. This is the Muslim way to a global peace so desired by the Islamic thinker, a peace ironically obtained through rampaging jihad. Yet as Islam in its very nature is a thought and action *imposing* faith, the very fact that it seeks the whole world to be Muslim means peace is an impossibility even if Islam were to become the world's only religion, because global unity can only emerge from a truly subjective transformation of the individual and group, through a natural development of the internal nature rather than a desperate attempt at rigidly conforming to Islamic doctrine. Thus all of the destruction and the usurpation of Psychic values by falsely associating them with boorish impulses only perpetuates discord and barbarism – just as the Asura of Falsehood wants, because that prevents the flowering of the Divine Consciousness upon earth. The strife only worsens as Islam spreads throughout the world, because as we shall see, a completely Islamic planet leads to precisely the opposite of that imagined by the majority of Muslims – intellectual or otherwise – who only partially understand their religion; for instead of a universal peace, interminable bloodshed is all that Islam's triumph will guarantee.

* * * *

If the dominant urge behind jihad is for the sake of world conquest and helotry of the infidel, there exists another alleged justification to wage war against the unbeliever: overcoming persecution. The argument put forth is that as the unbeliever is prone to torment the faithful, as he sins and plots against Allah and his followers, the believer is compelled to strive against such an enemy. In defence of this supposition, the Muslim turns first to his venerable Quran, discovering apparently divine documentation of kuffar aggression toward the pious ones. In it, we find Gabriel informing his Prophet that those disbelievers will find themselves in hell for their ‘persecution’: “Surely (as for) those who persecute the believing men and the believing women, then do not repent, they shall have the chastisement of hell, and they shall have the chastisement of burning.” (Quran 85:10) While there is no order in this verse to fight the disbelievers due to the ‘persecution’, it was only because of the Muslim army's lack of power at the time. The Asura of Falsehood, intelligent as he is, adjudged it an inappropriate time to confront the non-Muslims, choosing instead to assure his instrument of their afterlife doom. However, as soon as Gabriel felt certain of Mohammed's strength, he demanded a more aggressive response to “being oppressed”, initially calling on the believers to defend themselves:

And whoever defends himself after his being oppressed, these it is against whom there is no way (to blame). The way (to blame) is only against those who oppress men **and revolt in the earth unjustly** - these shall have a painful punishment. (Quran 42:41-42)

As we observe, the two verses link oppression with those who “revolt” in the earth, a curious association when we consider that rebellion in Islam simply means practising *shirk* and refusing to submit to Islam. Verses like these *somewhat* mitigate the Islamic contention of persecution at the hands of the Polytheists, reminding us that with all things related to the Asura of Falsehood, there will be a distortion of meaning. And though we will shortly find *real* examples of persecution documented in the Hadith, the Quran itself is less conclusive, and connects the persecution with other *relatively* lighter elements, including the expulsion of the believers, which in turn became a justification for them to wage war against the Polytheists:

Permission (to fight) is given to those upon whom war is made because they are oppressed, and most surely Allah is well able to assist them. **Those who have been expelled from their homes without a just cause except that they say: “Our Lord is Allah.”** (Quran 22:39)

This of course, represents a typical Asuric distortion, because the Islamic religion is full of instigation, continuously provoking those who disbelieve, and is of course not satisfied with only saying “Our Lord

is Allah” – it adds that the gods and religion of others are false and must be destroyed. And while “expulsion” might not have been a “just” reaction for *some* of the preaching Mohammed was doing, if the Polytheists were to have interpreted some of his threats as imminent to the earth (recall that many of the early verses threatening the disbelievers leave the time of punishment ambiguous), soon to arrive at the hands of the Prophet and his followers, then expulsion becomes arguably an *inadequate* response, especially if the Arab Polytheists were aware of Mohammed's unwavering intention to subjugate them. Nevertheless, the Asura of Falsehood surely understood that his constant goading of his instrument-slave, in turn leading Mohammed to incessantly threaten the Polytheists, would provoke enough of a response to let him infrarationally reveal a ‘persecution’ more severe than simply their Polytheism, with the Asura then free to communicate multiple verses calling upon the believers to flee their homes and wage jihad in response, with a “good provision” for those slain in battle:

Those who fled their homes for the cause of Allah and then were slain or died, Allah verily will provide for them a good provision. Lo! Allah, He verily is Best of all who make provision.
(Quran 22:58)

While there was certainly an element of forced expulsion, another passage in the Quran indicates that this may not have been as severe as the other verses indicate, because it offers the impression of a *voluntary* decision – at least at the time of the particular infrarational revelation. The passage shows that some of the believers did *not* leave their homes with the rest of the Muslims, indicating that their lives were not at threat even if the Polytheists at the time may have shown displeasure to the believers – dislike is not the same thing as persecution, irrespective of Islam's Asuric distortion. The passage once more highlights the use of expulsion – in this case better understood as emigration, whether under the terms of a treaty or not – as a motivation to rouse the believers to jihad:

Lo! those who believed and left their homes and strove with their wealth and their lives for the cause of Allah, and those who took them in and helped them: these are protecting friends one of another. **And those who believed but did not leave their homes, ye have no duty to protect them till they leave their homes**; but if they seek help from you in the matter of religion then it is your duty to help (them) except against a folk between whom and you there is a treaty. Allah is Seer of what ye do. And those who disbelieve are protectors one of another - If ye do not so, there will be confusion in the land, and great corruption. **Those who believed and left their homes and strove for the cause of Allah**, and those who took them in and helped them - these are the believers in truth. For them is pardon, and bountiful provision. And those who afterwards believed and left their homes and strove along with you, they are of you; and those who are akin are nearer one to another in the ordinance of Allah. Lo! Allah is Knower of all things. (Quran 8:72-75)

While the directive to leave certainly brought hardship upon the early Muslims, given the location of this infrarational passage in the surah entitled “Spoils of War”, a chapter compiled after the Battle of Badr between the Arab Polytheists and the Muslims, we also know its circumstances to be absolutely related to the war that Islam instigated. Indeed when we consider the demands of Mohammed and Islam - namely the destruction of the Polytheist's ancient beliefs and persons, the call for their conversion and rape (to be discussed later), the declaration that they belonged in hell and related insults -, we begin to understand what impelled the Arab Pagans to expel Mohammed and his companions even prior to actual war! As Islam brainwashes its followers into believing their religion to be the only truth, justifiably imposing itself – and with violence - upon others, with a birthright to conquer the world, it becomes exceedingly difficult for Muslims to have rational insight into why unbelievers might either not want them around, or react to the provocations and violence by driving them from their midst. Thus the sense of ‘persecution’ from such a bigoted group must always be scrutinized, because their thinking is distorted by Asuric falsehood, which tells them that they are part of a ‘revealed’ and

‘chosen’ party, with their ‘disbelieving’ opponents a group eternally declared to be deaf and dumb, evil, liars, and friends of Satan – there is no reason then, to try and understand the perspective of the ‘other’. The explanations of the ‘other’ cannot be trusted, because as everything they do has already been deemed to be in opposition to Allah rather than in self-defence, their actions – including verbal comments *and their sheer existence as non-Muslims* - can only be ‘persecutory’ in nature.

Having written that, we nevertheless find in the Islamic records genuine examples – rather than the relatively softer expulsion of a faction that overtly declared itself to be an enemy of the host group - of persecution suffered by Mohammed's companions. For if the Pagans initially banished the Prophet and his followers, they did not follow this with proactive measures designed to contain the growth of the Asuric religion. Eventually the time arrived where Mohammed's numbers were such that war began, and the Polytheist Arabs naturally became nervous, having observed him succeed in battles, having heard the boast of the great Asuric instrument that Islam was to overtake their ‘false’ religion, that they were worthy of hatred and genocide and rape and hellfire. In response to the growing Islamic menace that was being confirmed by military success, the Polytheists – as documented in authentic hadith - resorted to instinctive tendencies such as desiring to murder those who converted to the Islamic religion:

Narrated Abdullah bin Umar:

While Umar was at home in a state of fear, there came Al-As bin Wail As-Sahmi Abu Amr, wearing an embroidered cloak and a shirt having silk hems. He was from the tribe of Bani Sahn who were our allies during the pre-Islamic period of ignorance. **Al-As said to Umar, “What is wrong with you?” He said, “Your people claim that they would kill me if I become a Muslim.” Al-As said, “Nobody will harm you after I have given protection to you.” So Al-As went out and met the people streaming in the whole valley. He said, “Where are you going?” They said, “We want Ibn Al-Khattab who has embraced Islam.” Al-As said, “There is no way for anybody to touch him.” So the people retreated.** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 5, Book 58, Number 204)

While the impetus to kill battle-aged males converting to Islam had a strong element of *military* justification for the Arab Polytheists, cognizant as they were of the religion's ambitions *against them*, their response to Mohammedan instigation nevertheless contained a spiteful element, hinted at in the case of Said bin Zaid bin Amr bin Nufail:

Narrated Qais:

I heard Said bin Zaid bin Amr bin Nufail saying in the mosque of Al-Kufa, **“By Allah, I have seen myself tied and forced by Umar to leave Islam before Umar himself embraced Islam.** And if the mountain of Uhud could move from its place for the evil which you people have done to Uthman, then it would have the right to move from its place.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 5, Book 58, Number 202)

If the evident use of forcible conversions is not enough to indicate the extent of the Polytheist response to Islam's assault upon them, the following account of Abu Jandal's treatment hints at a possible pre-medieval tendency of the Arabs to inflict tribulations upon those with whom they were locked in warfare:

Then Suhail said, “We also stipulate that you should return to us whoever comes to you from us, even if he embraced your religion.” The Muslims said, “Glorified be Allah! How will such a person be returned to the pagans after he has become a Muslim?” **While they were in this state Abu-Jandal bin Suhail bin Amr came from the valley of Mecca staggering with his fetters and fell down amongst the Muslims.** Suhail said, “O Mohammed! This is the very first term

with which we make peace with you, i.e. you shall return Abu Jandal to me.” The Prophet said, “The peace treaty has not been written yet.” Suhail said, “I will never allow you to keep him.” The Prophet said, “Yes, do.” He said, “I won't do.” Mikraz said, “We allow you (to keep him).” Abu Jandal said, “O Muslims! Will I be returned to the pagans though I have come as a Muslim? Don't you see how much I have suffered?” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 3, Book 50, Number 891)

Clearly, the early Muslims did occasionally suffer at the hands of their Arab compatriots, with their physical well-being and life in peril due to their belief in Allah as the only deity for mankind *and* their applied desire to *impose* this belief upon the ‘unbeliever’ through warfare. Yet when we consider Islam's claim to be the sole truth for mankind, the greatest of all religions, worthy of subjugating the world, we naturally would expect such a faith to transcend the barbarity of persecution. What we find instead is a creed that has done the opposite, keeping elements – including forced conversions - of the Arab tribal culture, and expanding on it, adding the financial hardship of *jizya* within earth along with the promise of perpetual torment in hell for the evil kafir. Rather than transcending such depravity with the ideals of samata and peace, Islam crucially, under the adept guidance of the Asura of Falsehood, took the martial penchant of a certain corner of the world and codified it, establishing a ‘divine law’ for mankind that was absolute, unchanging. Thus the ancient axiom of the persecuted becoming the persecutor, administering worse pain on their victims than previously experienced by themselves, is established in Islam as a religious directive. Instead of transforming one of the rudimentary cycles of the world into something luminous, Islam, befitting its Asuric inspiration, only wishes to end the “persecution” dispensed *toward* Muslims, explicitly declaring in its holy book that once this ceases, “religion” should then *only* be for Allah – with such a denouement involving the implementation of persecution, conversion, *jizya* or death, all delivered by Muslims upon their non-Muslim counterparts:

Fight in the way of Allah against those who fight against you, **but begin not hostilities**. Lo! Allah loveth not aggressors. **And slay them wherever ye find them, and drive them out of the places whence they drove you out, for persecution is worse than slaughter**. And fight not with them at the Inviolable Place of Worship until they first attack you there, but if they attack you (there) then slay them. Such is the reward of disbelievers. But if they desist, then lo! Allah is Forgiving, Merciful. **And fight them until persecution is no more, and religion is for Allah**. But if they desist, then let there be no hostility except against wrong-doers. (Quran 2:190-93)

Notable to this selection is the direct association of persecution with expulsion, which Gabriel deemed “worse than slaughter”. Of course, the type of ‘divine’ justice Islam administers to disbelievers, including rape, murder, loot and slavery, pales in comparison to expulsion. And Gabriel's instruction in the passage to avoid beginning hostilities was not the result of higher principles such as a quest for inherent equality with their infidel counterparts, but instead a strategic consideration related to the Prophet's army either being too weak to initiate the fighting at the time of the infrarational revelation, or the Asura deeming an attack tactically unwise at the moment. At any rate, even if this were the sole Islamic verses or hadith stipulating violence toward the non-Muslim (we already know this to not be the case), it would nevertheless fail to halt the waves of unprovoked – at least according to a normal understanding of provocation - aggression by the Muslim. This is because verses declaring the kuffar to be ‘persecutors’ of the faithful are unnecessary to foster the paranoia and malevolence inspiring attacks on unbelievers, when the religion already has multiple infrarational revelations declaring the unbeliever evil and a friend of Satan, labelling him a plotter against Muslims *and* Allah, and attesting to the hatred that Allah feels for his creation. We also know the religion to prophesy itself as world-conqueror, a goal for which unprovoked or excessive aggression is inevitable, with the following Quran verses again directing a fight against “persecution” not solely to end it, but also to make *religion* strictly for Allah

alone!

Say to those who disbelieve, if they desist, that which is past shall be forgiven to them. And if they return, then what happened to the ancients has already passed. **And fight them until persecution is no more, and religion is all for Allah.** But if they cease, then lo! Allah is Seer of what they do. (Quran 8:38-39)

Islam was not fighting “persecution” to give itself breathing room among other faiths in the region; it wanted - and continues to desire - to supplant all others and subjugate them – a clear indicator of the diluted nature of the persecution experienced by the religion's adherents. A hadith providing context to the above verses supports the simple interpretation that fighting against persecution was meant to make faith exclusively for Allah, intriguingly explaining that the “persecution” or affliction referred to in the verse is simply the worship of other gods besides Allah - although in fairness, it also describes genuine examples of suffering experienced by the early Muslims:

Narrated Ibn Umar:

That a man came to him (while two groups of Muslims were fighting) and said, “O Abu Abdur Rahman! Don't you hear what Allah has mentioned in His Book: ‘And if two groups of believers fight against each other...’ (49.9) So what prevents you from fighting as Allah has mentioned in His Book?”

Ibn Umar said, “O son of my brother! I would rather be blamed for not fighting because of this Verse than to be blamed because of another Verse where Allah says:

“And whoever kills a believer intentionally...” (4.93) Then that man said, “Allah says: ‘**And fight them until there is no more afflictions (worshipping other besides Allah) and the religion (i.e. worship) will be all for Allah (Alone).**’ ” (8.39) Ibn Umar said, “**We did this during the lifetime of Allah's Apostle when the number of Muslims was small, and a man was put to trial because of his religion, the pagans would either kill or chain him; but when the Muslims increased (and Islam spread), there was no persecution.**” When that man saw that Ibn Umar did not agree to his proposal, he said, “What is your opinion regarding Ali and Uthman?” Ibn Umar said, “What is my opinion regarding Ali and Uthman? As for Uthman, Allah forgave him and you disliked to forgive him, and Ali is the cousin and son-in-law of Allah's Apostle.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 6, Book 60, Number 173)

While the examples provided in this hadith certainly indicate some amount of genuine persecution, it is important to note that as the Islamic religion demanded its imposition upon the Arab way of life and initiated a *war* with the Polytheists to consciously destroy the latter, the religion opened itself up the prospect of an instinctive Arab reaction whereby the early Muslims were put on trial for their beliefs, because Islam is a ‘faith’ that is unabashedly political and *militaristic*, that desires to dominate others, that seeks to attack and murder – it was thus well within the realm of possibilities that a response to it would include some form of violence. Indeed, though the Muslims of Mohammed's era were subject to chains and possible death while *at war*, the naked ambition of their religion, plain for all to see in verses and hadith of this nature, points to the Asura of Falsehood's – and ensuing Islamic rulers – use of both real and imagined persecution as a springboard to further Islam's ugly objective, rather than declaring it to be something contrary to luminous religious thought or higher values. In reality, Islam has done nothing to supersede the mentality of the Arabs – whether Polytheist, Christian or Jew – of Mohammed's lifetime, a culture with elements of viciousness and the usurpation of one god or tribe or belief over another, a land where the defects of the ego were confused with lofty religio-spiritual matters.

Instead, the Asura of Falsehood established, through his clever manipulation of the difficulties

Mohammed faced from the Arab Polytheists in his ascent to military supremacy in the peninsula, a persecution complex that served to spur his instrument on. For if there were indeed times when Mohammed's followers were subject to tribulations, the feeling of persecution arose primarily after the expulsion from their homes (the Asuric communications predominantly relate persecution to emigration – at times voluntary, at times not – rather than the killings and fetters documented by the hadith), itself a result of Islam's provocation. Also, describing an optional need to flee from one's dwelling as “persecution” is open to debate, because persecution is more often associated with torture or forced conversions or rapes or famine, where death or severe suffering are expected. Being exiled is indeed a form of hardship, but it should not always be associated with persecution, a word that strikes of extreme conditions and pain beyond migration. The extent of Mohammed's – and his followers – “persecution” is exaggerated, a mixture of real examples of torture combined with misinterpretations and distortions. And even if the overestimated account of suffering were true, Islam remains *in agreement* that vicious and sadistic methods of punishment are native to religious thinking and action, *but only if* Muslims or Allah are the ones dispensing the tribulations – whether in the earth or in hell. In utter contrast to this nefarious creed, nowhere in the luminous *scripture* of the Sanatana Dharma (specifically the Vedas or Upanishads or Bhagavad Gita) do we find a doctrine of torture – whether by a ‘chosen’ group of mortals or by a God gleefully administering it in hell – of anyone, let alone ‘unbelievers’ who cannot exist in the reality of life put forth by Hinduism.

Though there were real incidents of cruciation brought about by the Polytheists, Gabriel was always going to look for any means to construct a persecution complex, as we can tell by his magnification of Mohammed's eviction. The Asura, let us recall, desires to keep man in a state of permanent conflict as an easy way to obstruct him from the secret Divine Truth of human existence. Thus his need to first create a faction of mortals to be defined as the ‘other’, and then label them as ‘persecutors’ of the exalted or chosen party. For when an individual or group believes itself subject to the threat of torture or violence from the ‘other’, they are likely to respond to the ‘persecution’ disproportionately, greatly in excess of whatever real damage previously inflicted upon them. Such an exaggerated response is more likely to occur from a group, like the Muslims, for whom the ‘persecution’ is – though possibly based on real examples of torment - fathomed to be more severe than it actually is, because in cases in which suffering is truly horrendous, often the victims simply never recover the strength to become the persecutor; or, having been beaten down so comprehensively, they identify with their tormentors, even if they do not convert. Mohammed and his companions, while experiencing some hardship and real afflictions, did not suffer to the extent that their strength was drained, and with the Asura goading his instrument, the persecution complex became one of the pillars of a sadistic, sickening mentality towards an illusionary ‘other’ in a world founded upon the integral unity of Brahma.

All that this complex does is to perpetuate the paranoia, hatred and fear of the crude lower ego, bringing about the cyclical violence that sustains the Asura's rule, even if the warfare also destroys the ‘chosen’ party upon earth. For the Asura of Falsehood has never had - nor will he ever have – genuine concern for “prophets” or “Muslims”, or the creed of “Islam”, all of which – the individual, doctrine, and group – are tools among many held by him throughout the aeons of time, all serving only a utilitarian purpose. Correspondingly Gabriel, in modern times, uses the persecution complex to either produce imagined threats or magnify the response to real provocations. His ability to sustain a heightened feeling of suffering among Muslims is fundamentally related to his assertion that Islam is the final ‘Word’ of Allah, that all before it and all after it are incomparable. As Islam is an infrarationally revealed faith, as the verses contained in the Quran are to be the highest foundation of the planet, naturally they assume an eternal character, a crystallization of time that becomes the ‘truth’ for eternity. Consequently, though the relatively few acts of torture committed by the Polytheists were in relation to a mixture of provocation by their contemporary Muslim opponents, a barbaric instinctive tendency of the Arabs of the time, and due to the sheer fact they were engaged in warfare with an

enemy openly stating its desire to destroy their way of life, context is superseded by the Asuric doctrine of Islam's finality. The description of kuffar in the Quran (and to an extent the hadith) must then be of a permanent quality, their psychology fixed both prior to the Prophet and after his death.

As the infidel is typical, infrarationally revealed to be a plotter, sinner, evil-doer, persecutor of Muslims, then irrespective of what the Muslim sees with his eyes or feels with his heart, and regardless of the quality of the interactions with his unbelieving counterpart, the kafir has never had, and never will have, noble intentions towards the faithful. As the truth of any harmonious exchange is rejected – without acknowledging the particulars of the Muslim's time and place - by their infrarational Islam, for the believers having to juggle the declarations of Allah with a feeling of unity with 'disbelievers' that is Psychic in nature, there can only emerge within an internal discord, even if it is subconscious. Such strife, whether experienced consciously or not, can tear apart the central consciousness that organizes an individual's mentality and vital movements: the pious eventually have to decide between the competing narratives. If the Muslim genuinely believes in the 'Word' of Allah, that it overrides both context and his own feeling, then he must take the account of infidel treachery as enduring. And if he cannot at first find the lies and plotting defining the kuffar, he is sure to find them soon enough, for as paranoia is ingrained in Islam, the Muslim's fable of persecution will assimilate all sorts of delusions, because the state of being persecuted is fundamental to the Islam narrative, and whatever feeble support can be found for it will be used unthinkingly.

This is the nature of a *infrarationally* revealed religion: As the 'truth' is already preconceived, the believer has to change his natural mental and emotional patterns to artificially fit the criteria of the fixed postulation of 'truth' - in this case the Quran. And as the unbelievers continue to remain upon earth, the persecution complex must persist, because the Quran has revealed them to be tormentors of Muslims. It is this sheer fact of the infidel's existence that will drive the pious ones to seek as much scriptural evidence as possible 'proving' the former's sinister designs and justifying the continuation of jihad between the Dar-ul-Islam (House of Islam) and the Dar-ul-Harb (House of War) containing the tormenting party. When the believer reads the Quran, for instance, he finds evidence that the disbeliever is *currently* at "war" with Muslims:

Lo! the number of the months with Allah is twelve months by Allah's ordinance in the day that He created the heavens and the earth. Four of them are sacred: that is the right religion. So wrong not yourselves in them. **And wage war on all of the idolaters as they are waging war on all of you.** And know that Allah is with those who keep their duty (unto Him). (Quran 9:36)

Obviously, this communication was directed to Mohammed during a time when the "idolaters" were genuinely battling his clan. Yet because Islam is infrarationally revealed to be the final doctrine for mankind, the modern Muslim can interpret this verse as belonging to a boundless state of affairs - for why would Allah 'reveal' it as final, only for it not to be taken as a truth superseding all context and time? And while we know that most of the Asura's messages were specific to a time and place, to the genuine Muslim, the Quran is a living document of both the past and future, and when he reads verses like this, he is automatically inclined to look for any *current* signs that the kafir is waging war against him. This only leads to increasing paranoia, made worse when – as often is the case – the reality is that there is *no* war being waged by the infidel. As the Quran must be a truth greater than his own intellect or senses, minor acts are subsequently taken as signs of a "war" that may lead to the Muslim's own death or conversion, because Allah's 'Word' declares this to be the non-Muslim's unceasing objective:

For surely if they prevail against you they would stone you to death or force you back to their religion, and then you will never succeed. (Quran 18:20)

A verse like this can only foster paranoia in the modern believer, as it is not merely directed toward Mohammed's earthly enemies, but instead targets all non-Muslims after his death. Accordingly, the

Muslim must guard against the purported actions or inclinations of his sworn enemy. The persecution is presented in the above verse as a possibility, and as such, it is an excellent one to use in modern times with the intent to rouse the believers, forcing them to confront the kuffar they are eternally at war with. Because if they do not, the infidels are sure to kill or convert them, and likely in a cruel manner. From the resulting paranoia and anxiety, all sorts of violence can be redirected outward upon the unsuspecting disbeliever. These communications only strengthen the persecution complex, impelling the Muslim to remain hyperaware of the continued kuffar threat. His reward will be conquest over his enemy, and the chance to punish the 'evil ones', because only the believer is allowed to inflict torture and suffering: it is his God-given 'right', after all! And if verses like the previous one refer to threats against common Muslims, when the pious ones read or listen to the Quran, they find numerous instances in which the evil enemy has gone beyond assailing the ordinary believer, daring to violate the holiest of Islamic men, the prophets:

They will not harm you but a slight hurt. If they fight you, they shall turn their backs to you (to flee), and they shall not be helped. Abasement has been imposed on them wherever they are found, except under a covenant with Allah and a covenant with men, and they have become deserving of wrath from Allah, and humiliation is made to cleave to them. **This is because they disbelieved in the verses of Allah and slew the prophets unjustly.** This is because they disobeyed and exceeded the limits. (Quran 3:11-112)

If we consider that the people referred to here were the 'People of the Book', one can scarcely imagine how much worse Allah's wrath is for Polytheists daring to kill the prophets, or those parties that dared to try and assassinate Mohammed, the "Seal" of Prophets. For though he eventually succumbed to natural causes, he nevertheless was on the receiving end of assassination attempts from his enemies, including a poisoned sheep from the Jews of Khaibar:

Narrated Abu Huraira:

When Khaibar was conquered, Allah's Apostle was presented with a poisoned (roasted) sheep. Allah's Apostle said, "Collect for me all the Jews present in this area." (When they were gathered) Allah's Apostle said to them, "I am going to ask you about something; will you tell me the truth?" They replied, "Yes, O Abal-Qasim!" Allah's Apostle said to them, "Who is your father?" They said, "Our father is so-and-so." Allah's Apostle said, "You have told a lie, for your father is so-and-so," They said, "No doubt, you have said the truth and done the correct thing." He again said to them, "If I ask you about something; will you tell me the truth?" They replied, "Yes, O Abal-Qasim! And if we should tell a lie you will know it as you have known it regarding our father," Allah's Apostle then asked, "Who are the people of the (Hell) Fire?" They replied, "We will remain in the (Hell) Fire for a while and then you (Muslims) will replace us in it." Allah's Apostle said to them. "You will abide in it with ignominy. By Allah, we shall never replace you in it at all." Then he asked them again, "If I ask you something, will you tell me the truth?" They replied, "Yes." He asked, "Have you put the poison in this roasted sheep?" They replied, "Yes." He asked, "What made you do that?" They replied, "We intended to learn if you were a liar in which case we would be relieved from you, and if you were a prophet then it would not harm you." (Sahih Bukhari Volume 7, Book 71, Number 669)

Though this poisoning can be spun into a lesson on the nonpareil of Mohammed, it nevertheless also represents a clear example of the Jews attempting to kill Mohammed, having refused to believe his verbal declarations of prophethood. They were not the only party to make such an effort; a Polytheist is recorded as having made an attempt to strangle the Prophet:

Narrated Urwa bin Az-Zubair:

I asked Abdullah bin Amr, "What was the worst thing the pagans did to Allah's Apostle?" He

said, “I saw Uqba bin Abi Mu’ait coming to the Prophet while he was praying. Uqba put his sheet round the Prophet's neck and squeezed it very severely. Abu Bakr came and pulled Uqba away from the Prophet and said, ‘Do you intend to kill a man just because he says: My Lord is Allah, and he has brought forth to you the Evident Signs from your Lord?’ ” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 5, Book 57, Number 27)

While it is indeed possible that this attack occurred prior to Mohammed's consolidation of military power, it seems more plausible that it occurred after it became apparent that the two parties were at war, making the act an ordinary aspect of battle – that of killing the enemy's leader. And even if we accept Abu Bakr's presumption that the foiled assassination was a result of the Polytheist's dislike of Mohammed declaring his Lord to be Allah, what Abu Bakr has left unsaid here is the accompanying assertion that all other god's are false, likely a heinous insult to Mohammed's similarly egoistic Arab Polytheist contemporaries. As Mohammed was a product of his culture, the Arab Polytheist instinctively understood – even if Gabriel had yet to communicate the ‘Word’ of Islam subjugating all the other religions – that the Prophet was unlikely to rest with simply declaring them as denizens of the hellfire due to their belief in false gods. Rather, as the Arab Polytheists tended to implant their particular form of worship or deity upon the enemy (evident in the previously noted exaltation of Hubal during the Battle of Badr), the assassin understood the inevitable outcome of Mohammed's separative doctrine, and reflexively sought to kill him.

These seventh century actions, done in circumstances of considerable debate, degraded to a worse level by Islam through its codification of a spiteful and vengeance-driven culture, can subsequently be branded as ‘persecution’ endemic to the Infidel. Thus a modern Imam can easily, when attempting to instigate his flock, identify these hadith and discuss the infrarationally revealed, sempiternally ‘evil’ nature of the Jew and Polytheist, the ones who dared to try and kill the greatest of all mankind, Mohammed: Why would they not then be considered able persecutors of ordinary modern Muslims? The hadith documentation that such actions occurred – especially in the case of the Jews – during war, and the fact of Mohammed hardly sustaining incessant attacks during his period of military weakness, can be conveniently ignored by a modern Imam seeking to uphold the religion's Asuric agenda. In their perpetuation of the false doctrine of hatred and paranoia leading to violence – justified as ‘self-defence’ – against the infidel, the persecution complex finds supplemental support in hadith more open to interpretation than the assassination ones. In the following, the account of Abu Dhur's beating at Polytheist hands is put forth:

Narrated Ibn Abbas:

...Abu Dhur agreed and followed Ali till he entered the place of the Prophet and Abu Dhur entered with him. He then listened to the speech of the Prophet and embraced Islam on that very spot. The Prophet said to him, “Go back to your people and inform them (of this religion) till you receive my (further) orders.” Abu Dhur said, “By Him in Whose Hands my life is! I will proclaim my conversion to Islam publicly amongst them (i.e. Infidels).” He went out till he reached the Mosque and announced as loudly as possible, “I testify that None has the right to be worshipped but Allah and that Muhammad is the Apostle of Allah.” The people then got up and beat him till they knocked him down. Al-Abbas came and threw himself over him (to protect him) saying, “Woe to you! Don't you know that he is from Ghifar and there is the route (road) to your merchants towards Sham (i.e. through the place where this tribe dwells)?” Thus he saved him from them. Abu Dhar did the same on the next day and the people beat him again and Al-Abbas drew himself over him (to save him as before). (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 56, Number 724 & 725)

While he was indeed beaten for declaring himself a Muslim, notice in the mandatory Islamic assertion loudly and provocatively declared by Abu Dhur in a Polytheist gathering, that no other gods have the

right to be worshipped, a quite insulting thing to say while in the company of people who disagreed. Unsurprisingly, the Polytheists reacted impulsively, as mortals are occasionally liable to do when unreasonably aggravated. Nevertheless, they showed restraint after Al-Abbas jumped upon Abu Dhur – hardly is this the stuff of sadistic persecution, considering the backdrop of war between the two parties (one shudders to think what would happen to a Hindu that went into a mosque and declared something similar about Allah). Yet one can envision this particular hadith being twisted into an example of ‘persecution’ to suit the needs of a modern Imam if warfare or rioting is required against the unclean disbelievers. Similarly, mere “hostility” from a non-Muslim is enough to instigate war at behest of Allah himself, with Abu Huraira narrating that “Allah's Apostle said, ‘**Allah said, I will declare war against him who shows hostility to a pious worshipper of Mine.**’ ” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 8, Book 76, Hadith 509)

The definition of hostility, of course, remains open to a staggering amount of possibilities: A glance representing intent to kill a believer, a misheard statement a slur against the Prophet or Allah, or of course, a casual statement that numerous Gods or names of God exist. Thus the Islamic religion only requires a slight, an infinitesimal pin prick announcing themselves as the ‘persecuted’ party, vindicating their fury upon the infidel who refuses to identify with Allah's ‘Word’. But beyond this need to fix the kuffar to a ‘Divine’ standard, or even their *actual* suffering at the enemy's hands, there exists a sheer subjective need for the Muslim to feel persecuted, to experience the self-righteous anger emerging from a *belief* that one's people are afflicted. The rage that manifests provides them with a sense of being alive, a purpose to their life, and crucially, a justification for all sorts of barbarities. The savage nature of what this entails to their enemy is irrelevant due to both theological dictates sanctioning the perverse actions, and a primitive need of the lower ego for crude vengeance; the latter, though at times a response to real provocation, is what is manipulated by the Asura of Falsehood through his reminders of ‘persecutions’ past and current - it is partner to his infrarationally revealed verses in sustaining the complex.

Nowhere was this pattern, of a subjective impression of being persecuted eventually leading into violence against the supposed tormentors, as prominent in recent times than in Nazi Germany under the reign of Adolf Hitler. As we have already reviewed, well before he was to declare himself Fuhrer, he lived modestly as a young man in Vienna, the centre of the Hapsburg Empire. Here, as we also mentioned, he felt his German brethren to be under assault from a myriad of actors beyond just the despicable Jews. And when he returned to Germany following his military service in World War I, he set about – during his imprisonment - describing the machinations of these groups, and how they plotted the downfall of the German war effort, which was not a real defeat but a betrayal. In one example within *Mein Kampf*, he wrote that a general strike in munition factories was “organized” as a means to prevent German victory:

At that moment when victory seemed ready to alight on the German standards, a conspiracy was arranged for the purpose of striking at the heart of the German spring offensive with one blow from the rear and thus making victory impossible. A general strike in the munition factories was organized. (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 158)

His paranoia, as we also know, was not restricted to vaguely defined conspirators – for the liberal Press and Marxists were both operating as soldiers in a grand Jewish conspiracy to enslave the Germans:

The function of the so-called liberal Press was to dig the grave for the German people and Reich. No mention need be made of the lying Marxist Press. To them the spreading of falsehood is as much a vital necessity as the mouse is to a cat. Their sole task is to break the national backbone of the people, thus preparing the nation to become the slaves of international finance and its masters, the Jews. (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, pp. 192-93)

The status of a slave is one easily associated with suffering and torture, with the conquered party experiencing all sorts of humiliation and depravities. By claiming the Germans as subject to an intricate conspiracy designed to enslave them, there could only emerge a grievous sense of injustice, a need to fight back against these alleged persecutors. And the object for this response was *pre-determined* to be the Jew, the clever genius slowly diluting the purity of the German race before he subjugated them:

Never in this world can the Jew become master of any people except a bastardized people. That is why the Jew systematically endeavours to lower the racial quality of a people by permanently adulterating the blood of the individuals who make up that people. (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 255)

The irrational fear of being exterminated by the ‘other’, of having one's identity crumble through a complicated process by a hidden hand who one has little power to control, can only give rise to rage and a desire to strike, because the only other presumed option in such purported circumstances is death. The inevitable violence is supported by a perverse form of moral righteousness founded upon a projection - rather than facts - that the ‘other’ is set to torment one's group. This subjective feeling creates a siege mentality very effective in war, especially in times – such as Mohammed's – when an army is at a disadvantage in numbers. But the projection itself only portends to some form of destruction, though not necessarily restricted to the ‘other’ who constitutes the object of irrational claims. For if one continues to concentrate on hatred, paranoia and violence, if these comprise the internal thought waves and vital vibrations, eventually there will be a physical manifestation that will engulf oneself: this is how powerful one's psychology and beliefs are, with terrestrial events preceded by an internal buildup often lengthy in duration.

In the examples of Hitler and Mohammed, the subjective hatred, the projections masking their inferiority and an intrinsic and barbarous thirst for blood, manifested in the physical world according to plan, initially at least. But as they were in occult reality unleashing the Asuric beast upon the manifestation, the ending was not what they had in mind, with Hitler killing himself, with Mohammed knowing Arabia had yet to be fully conquered. Similarly, the current generation of faithful, notably in “Pakistan” (as we will detail in the next chapter), are encountering the unseemly situation of, after unleashing the genie of violence upon the kuffar, having their fellow believers targeting *them*. Far from the glory of world conquest they fantasize about, is the reality of internecine strife among Muslims. But one only needs to examine the Quran to find validation for such conflict, with the crucial caveat that when a Muslim attacks another Muslim, it is only because the latter has fallen to the status of a non-Muslim due to their betrayal of Allah's dictates including, as we already know, the mandatory fighting against ‘persecution’, the jihad against the kuffar:

Warfare is ordained for you, though you dislike it. But it may happen that ye hate a thing which is good for you, and it may happen that ye love a thing which is bad for you. Allah knoweth, ye know not. They ask you concerning the sacred month about fighting in it. Say: “Fighting in it is a grave matter, and hindering (men) from Allah's way and denying Him, and (hindering men from) the Sacred Mosque and turning its people out of it, are still graver with Allah.” And **persecution** is graver than slaughter, **and they will not cease fighting with you until they turn you back from your religion, if they can. And whoever of you turns back from his religion, then he dies while an unbeliever** - these it is whose works shall go for nothing in this world and the hereafter, and they are the inmates of the fire - therein they shall abide. (Quran 2:216-17)

Fighting here is, once again, directly connected to religion (Islam) itself, and the passage furthermore illustrates that in order for modern Muslims to feel properly ‘religious’, a sense of persecution – in this passage related to a non-violent, refused entry into the sacred mosque, a practice that as we shall see, Islam has appropriated and directed towards non-Muslims - and of the danger faced by Islam, must

both be evoked. And as these delusional beliefs consequently incite warfare, a jihad that is mandatory even *absent* of either consideration, then battle assuredly must be undertaken against the non-Muslim. Accordingly, if Islam is at war with the kuffar in various regions of the world such as Chechnya or Kashmir or even Lahore, if these are the borders where Muslims in Dar-ul-Islam are being ‘persecuted’ by infidels, then it supposes that Muslims in these parts, and even their brethren across the world, should have for their sole focus the cause of jihad in those locations, preferably undertaken via actual battle, or at the very least through financial support. Unless, of course, the so-called Muslim wishes to die “while an unbeliever”.

As Islam has not yet conquered the world, it is inevitable that meeting points will emerge where the majority Islamic communities, provinces or nations, must – per their religious scripture - engage non-Muslims in war. It is here especially where slights or misheard words become grievous insults to Mohammed, where minor scuffles represent a diabolical conspiracy to destroy Islam, where the persecution complex revives itself. Because without the latter, warfare is harder to execute, as the complex makes it easier to motivate masses believing themselves under duress. Thus the refrain of Islam being in danger will always exist as long as there remain infidels who are, by Allah's ‘Word’, unendingly plotting the subjugation or death of the pious ones. And as Islam mandates that the faithful are perennially persecuted, the Muslim is left in the ironic state in which they become instigators of cruel violence while falsely believing themselves to be the aggrieved party. And if the kuffar fights back, the Muslim's bizarre sense of moral indignation escalates, for how dare the unbelievers not accept that Islam is the only religion? How dare they battle against the faithful seeking to bring them ‘true’ faith through warfare and intimidation?

It is the ultimate degradation of religion, which Islam equates to a match of football, a mere extension of crude tribal warfare, with “winners” and “losers” in earth and in heaven – the lower vital externalization of a domain that should be subjective. According to this barbarism, if someone is conquered, the conqueror must have the superior and truest religion, irrespective of each religion's comparative psychological precepts. By turning a vital formula of *avidya* into the hallmark of their religion, the Asura added more falsehood to his concoction by inflating a characteristic of the lower vital ego to an extreme in which it masquerades as an allegedly sublime spiritual truth. Thus it comes as little surprise that, for believers refusing to fight against perceived persecution, or those simply refusing the call to war against the kuffar, Islam has earmarked apostasy – another means for the wrath and retribution of the lower vital to be given undue ‘religious’ significance by the Asura of Falsehood. For if one does not follow the infrarational word of Islam, whatever their explanation, they must be a traitor, not worthy of the honorific of Muslim, cast off into the status of Infidel.

As we shall see, it is a branding that occurs in a myriad of circumstances, beyond a simple decision to abstain from jihad.

* * * *

When asked to explain away the hatred originating from the Quran and Hadith, to account for the violence directed toward unbelievers and their faith, the response of Muslim intellectuals – the people most likely to engage in such debate – has two components specifically related to Islamic scripture. The first thrust is to ignore or deny the countless passages promoting malevolence and killings of the non-Muslim, focusing instead on the smattering of infrarational revelations that can justify somewhat tranquil relations between the two parties. But as even a cursory glance at the Quran and authentic hadith exposes Islam's incipient lust for blood to be far more important than its rare calls for cordiality,

the Muslim intellectual then has to take a different angle to convince both the unbelievers and the faithful that hatred and slaughter of kuffar are not the core of Islam. To do so, he often adopts the seemingly reasonable stance that if the Islamic scripture certainly has for its record spite and violence towards the kuffar, this is a historical matter not related to modern events and current relations between the two groups, and should not be considered when discussing Islam or belief and disbelief, as it belongs to ancient times.

While this is a rational and thoughtful argument put forth, what the intellectual forgets (or conveniently chooses to ignore - a strong possibility that we will discuss later) is the crucial element of Islam's status as a revealed religion, whose verses are the final 'Word' of Allah, functioning as the supreme guidance for mankind above all other competitors for his mind and heart. Indeed the fact – easily acknowledged by the intellectual - alone of Allah deeming Islam to be his ultimate and determining 'Word', with Mohammed his *last* messenger (Quran 33:40), should be enough to appreciate the cardinal nature of the religion's hateful and violent verses. But if this is not enough to convince, the Quran contains within it literal dictates from "Allah" demanding that Muslims follow his orders verbatim, warning them of the danger in not doing so. One clear example infrarationally reveals – similar to verses detailing historic cases of doomed towns rejecting the earlier prophets – how the earlier people of Arabia betrayed their "covenant" with Allah in multiple ways *including*, most importantly, altering and "neglecting" his infrarational revelations:

And certainly Allah made a covenant with the children of Israel, and We raised up among them twelve chieftains; and Allah said: "Surely I am with you; if you keep up prayer and pay the poor-rate and believe in My messengers and assist them and offer to Allah a goodly gift, I will most certainly cover your evil deeds, and I will most certainly cause you to enter into gardens beneath which rivers flow; but whoever disbelieves from among you after that, he indeed shall lose the right way." But on account of their breaking their covenant We cursed them and made their hearts hard. **They altered the words from their places and they neglected a portion of what they were reminded of.** And you shall always discover treachery in them excepting a few of them, so pardon them and turn away. Surely Allah loves those who do good (to others). **And with those who say, "We are Christians," We made a covenant, but they neglected a portion of what they were reminded of,** therefore We excited among them enmity and hatred to the day of resurrection; and Allah will inform them of what they did. (Quran 5:12-14)

Unlike the Christian Bible, which has had numerous editions and modifications, the Quran cannot be edited, and none of its communications are to be "neglected", or else the believer faces a catastrophic finale. Thus if a Muslim ruler seeks to *only* highlight the rare tolerant verses, creating an abridged version of the Quran (albeit paper thin after the removal of intolerant scripture), he is committing a grave sin, one at the very least punishable with the horrendous fire. The Asura of Falsehood was sure to impart this 'truth' upon Mohammed, for he knows very well the tendency of mankind to lose concentration on a task, to try and change, ignore or even forget – for better or worse – orders he is not partial towards. To prevent this, Gabriel later infrarationally revealed a different destiny for the alterers and neglecters, one far worse than the pardon and enmity mentioned in the previous passage. He returned, as one should by now expect, to his favoured tactic of threatening the Muslim with hellfire, as Gabriel understands that this is his best tactic to get the faithful to obey all – even the most savage and ludicrous - of his commands, with the irresistible outcome of hatred, suffering and violence for believer and kuffar alike. And just as the actual Muslim is not permitted to revise or overlook his scripture, so is he not allowed to distinguish between the messengers, or even between Allah and his Prophets – or else he becomes a non-Muslim receiving a "disgraceful chastisement":

Surely those who disbelieve in Allah and His messengers and (those who) desire to make a distinction between Allah and His messengers and say, "We believe in some and disbelieve

in others,” and desire to take a course between (this and) that. These it is that are truly unbelievers, and We have prepared for the unbelievers a disgraceful chastisement. (Quran 4:150-51)

While this initially refers to the unauthorized choosing between prophets, or a separation of them from Allah, it can easily be interpreted to include a “course” between different verses, the choice of following some infrarational revelations and rejecting others based upon one's inner law or even superficial preferences. This element of free will, ingrained in the Sanatana Dharma, is naturally targeted by an Asura of Falsehood needing to obstruct or destroy the potential of man to move along lines closer to his Soul, because that is precisely what Gabriel does not want to happen, as an increase to Consciousness in the Multiplicity will end his rule. While the Purusha is infinitely superior to the Asura and the other hostile vital entities that seek to obscure it, the strength of the Soul is not easy for Man to nourish in a world of entrapments including fear, the Asura's great tool of enslavement. It is this defect of humanity that allowed the Lord of Falsehood to fashion Islam into an ‘all or nothing’ religion, utilizing mankind's fear of becoming sectioned from the group – apostasy in Islam - and suffering in connection to that.

Though we are aware that the Hadith record Mohammed's declaration that a belief in the exclusivity of Allah is *alone* enough to warrant heaven and an escape from the eternal torture, the Quran itself does *not* have a corresponding verse. And as we know that the Quran supersedes the Hadith, the believer must always be careful to take into account the entirety of the Quran's dictates. Thus, if a believer believes in Allah's exclusivity yet decides that other verses or tenets are not for him, he instantly becomes an unbeliever who yet thinks of himself as a “Muslim”. As the truth of what this entails dawns upon us, we come to realize that the type of Muslim derided as an “extremist”, the one's most likely to engage in terrorism or support it, are in fact appropriately described as literalists, buttressed in their position by multiple revelatory passages including the previous two. Indeed it is the literal, rigid, ‘all or nothing’ interpretation of Islam that is the correct one; everything in the Quran must be followed as commanded, believed as ordered. Thus a “Muslim” cannot accept that a Polytheist's faith is a true path to God, yet simultaneously believe himself a good “Muslim” simply because he is praying towards Mecca five times a day and believes in Allah. Neither can the Muslim, when offering his prayers, do so for the sake of appearance, because the Asura revealed such a man to be “swaying between this and that” - an Infidel:

Lo! The hypocrites seek to beguile Allah, but it is He Who beguileth them. When they stand up to worship they perform it languidly and to be seen of men, and are mindful of Allah but little. Swaying between this (and that), (belonging) neither to these nor to those. He whom Allah causeth to go astray, thou (O Mohammed) wilt not find a way for him. (Quran 4:142-43)

When faced with the possibility that his worship might be considered fraudulent or ‘hypocritical’, that his demeanour is just a performance for others, the believer's anxiety only heightens, fearful as he is of the dreaded label of kafir. In response, he is forced to become excessively fervent, perhaps literally frothing at the mouth, to counter any charges of infidelity to Allah. Because if he does not show an overwrought, histrionic religiosity, he might end up in the pits of hell, or perhaps at the end of an actual Muslim's knife or bombing. Indeed, if one believer might worry of being perceived as languid, another may be both confident in his own faith *and* believe it his duty to guard his religion's ‘honour’, searching for so-called believers who are only pretending. In creating this category of apostates, Gabriel conceived of another method of fostering paranoia, this time against persons nominally thought to belong to the chosen religion. A visit to the mosque for daily prayers can subsequently take the guise of an investigation, rather than a quest for higher or inner experiences, as the pious ones begin to wonder if the fellow next to them is genuinely a Muslim, or in reality a fake who secretly despises

Allah. And if said person were to miss part of the demanded daily routine of worship or not show enough enthusiasm in prayer, a pious believer's suspicion is sure to amplify, leading him to conclude that the individual in question might be, if not an outright unbeliever, one seeking a “middle course”, something the believer is taught to *also* equate with a denial of Allah's signs, as treason and infidelity:

And when a wave like mountains covers them they call upon Allah, being sincere to Him in obedience, but when He brings them safe to the land, **some of them follow the middle course**; and none denies Our signs but every perfidious, ungrateful one. (Quran 31:32)

A middle course, naturally, can entail the practice of choosing between Islamic verses or practices, following a plastic, individualized religious life rather than becoming one of the violent automatons Gabriel needs to perpetuate his rule. A path in-between can be dangerous (though at times, as we shall see, the Asura uses it to his advantage) to the Asura of Falsehood's intent, dissipating the military effectiveness of Islam that is best served by an unthinking obedience. Consequently, the “Muslim” who dares to introduce flexibility into his religious practice, who looks for *options* in religious matters, is - in Islam's perverse interpretation of reality - disobeying his Lord, on an erroneous path:

It is not fitting for a Believer, man or woman, when a matter has been decided by Allah and His Messenger to have any option about their decision: if any one disobeys Allah and His Messenger, he is indeed on a clearly wrong Path. (Quran 33:36)

Explicit again is the fact that there is almost entirely no choice in Islam, unless a verse grants one on a *specific* matter. A Muslim must follow all of the infrarational revelations transmitted to Mohammed, whether or not they suit the believer's inherent tendencies. He does not have the option to follow some and disregard others, because there is no freedom of thought or belief in Islam. Without this, it becomes apparent that Islam is against true individuality, a natural liberty founded upon an internal exploration and experimentation with thinking and worship. The Asura does not want individuals, because true uniqueness is paradoxically supported by the Soul – which the Lord of Falsehood recoils from - in man that he shares equally with all of creation. And while it seems peculiar, as described in the previous verses, for the Asura to reveal that all earthly affairs are to be ultimately determined by *both* Allah and his Messenger, through this inclusion of Mohammed, Gabriel has cleverly arranged another mechanism for controlling the masses. Part of his purpose in elevating Mohammed to a God-like status (discussed in depth later) was to – in conjunction with the verse describing the Prophet as the most exemplary of mortals – add power to Mohammed's own messages to his companions, the Hadith traditions. As he knew his instrument to be the most servile of men to the Asuric doctrine, both the Quran and any tradition from Mohammed's life beyond his transmission of the infrarational revelations, become very useful in moulding the minds and actions of men for the Asura's agenda. And if a Muslim does not entirely follow, or inadvertently goes against, Gabriel's false account of the world described by that scripture, he stands guilty of lying against Allah:

And, for what your tongues describe, do not utter the lie, (saying) **“This is lawful and this is unlawful”, in order to forge a lie against Allah**; surely those who forge the lie against Allah shall not prosper. A little enjoyment and they shall have a painful punishment. (Quran 16:116-117)

Thus if a “Muslim” follows the light from his Soul, believing that others have the right to worship a God of multiple names as they see fit, that non-Muslims should not be hated or killed because of their belief, that unbelievers are not perpetually plotting against the pious ones - if the “Muslim” follows all or part of this *and* claims it to be integral to Islam, he is in actuality a liar, alleging illegal things as “lawful” and deserving the severe chastisement Islam specializes in. This latter fate, as one would naturally expect, is of one the reasons why Mohammed told his followers to reject new things or innovations, *bidah*, not matching the core hatred and violence of Islam:

Narrated Aisha:

Allah's Apostle said, **"If somebody innovates something which is not in harmony with the principles of our religion, that thing is rejected."** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 3, Book 49, Number 86)

Mohammed also related to his companions a prophecy in which he, when trying to hand water to fellow Muslims from a river in Paradise, found them pulled away from him, with Allah informing him that these men were washed away due to their sin of adding new ideas or practices to Islam:

Narrated Abdullah:

The Prophet said, "I am your predecessor at the Lake-Fount (Kauthar) and some men amongst you will be brought to me, and when I will try to hand them some water, they will be pulled away from me by force whereupon I will say, 'O Lord, my companions!' Then the Almighty will say, **'You do not know what they did after you left, they introduced new things into the religion after you.'**" (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 88, Number 173)

In another hadith describing the same prophecy of Kauthar, Mohammed is recorded as reacting in disgust to the Apostate innovators daring to alter the 'Word' or core practices of Islam:

Narrated Sahl bin Sa'd:

I heard the Prophet saying, "I am your predecessor at the Lake-Fount (Kauthar), and whoever will come to it, will drink from it, and whoever will drink from it, will never become thirsty after that. There will come to me some people whom I know and they know me, and then a barrier will be set up between me and them." Abu Sa'id Al-Khudri added that the Prophet further said: "I will say those people are from me. It will be said, 'You do not know what changes and new things they did after you.' **Then I will say, 'Far removed (from mercy), far removed (from mercy), those who changed (the religion) after me!'**" (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 88, Number 174)

These hadith confirm the literalist interpretation of Islam as the only version authorized, further verification that – per Islam - the pinnacle of human knowledge is to have occurred in a brief period of time, that modern ideas of progress are false because mankind was simply waiting for one man to present a series of 'divine' dictates that cannot be expanded upon from their own limited form. Gabriel, by his infrarational revelations, encapsulated a certain part of Arabian history and his own instrument's verbal communications for future generations. Muslims are ordered not to search for truth, knowledge, practices or a conception of life beyond the restricted arc of the Quran and possibly the authentic hadith that they falsely believe to be the entire 'truth'. If they do actually search into the confusion, or rationale, behind certain Islamic commandments, the pious ones are told that their inquiries will lead them astray, down into disbelief:

O ye who believe! Ask not of things which, if they were made unto you, would trouble you. But if ye ask of them when the Qur'an is being revealed, they will be made known unto you. Allah pardoneth this, for Allah is Forgiving, Clement. **A folk before you asked (for such disclosures) and then disbelieved therein.** (Quran 5:101-102)

Inadvertently, the secret insecurity of Islam is presented here, as the simple questioning of tenets can become a quick path to disbelief – a rather strong gauge of the religion's fragility and susceptibility. Such disbelief, as we know, leads directly into the scalding flame, a dreaded residence for 'illegal' thought or faith. The perverseness of the Asura of Falsehood and his religious construct is such that Islam takes inquisitiveness as a sign of an unbeliever, a search for knowledge as a sin against God. Though the hadith below, one providing some context to the above passage, does not detail any

penetrative questions asked of Islam's *core* tenets, it does confirm the passage as a clear description of inquisitiveness leading to disbelief:

Narrated Anas:

The people started asking the Prophet too many questions importunately. So one day he ascended the pulpit and said, "You will not ask me any question but I will explain it to you." I looked right and left, and behold, every man was covering his head with his garment and weeping. Then got up a man who, whenever quarrelling with somebody, used to be accused of not being the son of his father. He said, "O Allah's Apostle! Who is my father?" The Prophet replied, "Your father is Hudhaifa." Then Umar got up and said, "We accept Allah as our Lord, Islam as our religion and Muhammad as our Apostle and we seek refuge with Allah from the evil of afflictions." The Prophet said, "I have never seen the good and bad like on this day. No doubt, Paradise and Hell was displayed in front of me till I saw them in front of that wall," Qatada said: "This Hadith used to be mentioned as an explanation of this Verse: 'O you who believe! Ask not questions about things which, if made plain to you, may cause you trouble.' " (5.101) (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 88, Number 211)

The refusal to allow inquiry, to restrict faith and God (!) to a select few ordainments made to a solitary Prophet in Arabia, is additional proof that Islam is not a religion preoccupied with its follower's internal growth, which by definition requires subjective trial and error pertaining to thoughts and beliefs and actions. The pursuit of knowledge, the exploration of different forms of worship, the exchange of cultural values and spiritual practices, even the fluctuation between belief and disbelief, are all part of the Psychic Being's growth; to restrict one's life to remotely obeying commandments that often are contrary to one's inner lines is the antithesis of *svadharma*. Islam, however, does not care about the individual's internal growth; in fact, the Asura of Falsehood actively seeks to douse the transformative fire of the Soul, the Psychic spark that the Vedic God Agni represents, because as it is the Psychic that will drive a Muslim to think beyond the ordinary grooves of what he has been taught in his mosques and madrassas (Islamic seminaries), Gabriel seeks to suppress its development with warnings of an apocalyptic fate.

Otherwise, the Muslim might 'fall' into disbelief, no longer under the hypnotic command of a hateful entity who cares not for mankind and prefers they wither in hatred, pain and suffering. And though the Asura has, by fixing man upon the lowest of his potentialities, created an effective destructive force against humanity's attempt to bring the Soul into the manifestation, it is precisely because of the rejection of ideas or beliefs not reconciled to Islam's limited arc, that Gabriel's faith is doomed in its quest to dominate the entire planet. For flexibility, change and transformation are principles of *Prakriti* designed specifically to make humanity stronger, wiser, more joyful, and finally, powerful. These are the characteristics close to the Divine in the mortal, and a religion that prevents him from a many-sided development not only obstructs him from realizing his Soul, but is itself destined to atrophy and die, irrespective of how many billions of people follow it. As a Muslim by definition cannot hold a sceptical stance on his religion, one that demands evidence of Allah beyond the infrarational scripture or its repetition by an Imam, their psychological and spiritual development is stunted by the most severe of enemies, whose instrument informed the faithful that Allah *hates* the inquisitiveness of his own creation!

Narrated Ash-shabi:

The clerk of Al-Mughira bin Shuba narrated, "Muawiya wrote to Al-Mughira bin Shuba: Write to me something which you have heard from the Prophet." So Al-Mughira wrote: I heard the Prophet saying, "**Allah has hated for you three things:**

1. Vain talks, (useless talk) that you talk too much or about others.

2. Wasting of wealth (by extravagance)

3. And asking too many questions (in disputed religious matters) or asking others for something (except in great need).” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 2, Book 24, Number 555)

Present once more is the attribution of hatred as a characteristic of God, the claim that an Immortal Creator is prone to the barbaric emotions of mankind. The ‘God’ fashioned by Gabriel is, befitting the Asura's own personality, against wisdom and love, demanding that everyone think and act in the same way. And for those whose thought and actions could not be controlled, Mohammed – misinformed as he was by the Lord of Falsehood – warned of ruinous future:

Narrated Abu Huraira:

The Prophet said, “Leave me as I leave you for **the people who were before you were ruined because of their questions and their differences over their prophets**. So, if I forbid you to do something, then keep away from it. **And if I order you to do something, then do of it as much as you can.**” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 92, Number 391)

The sphere of religion is consequently invaded by the principles of a military regime, in which soldiers must unthinkingly follow the dictates of their superiors. Mohammed rotely submitted before the Asura, and his supporters obey both he and the Lord of Falsehood they take to be a divine emissary. In doing so, not only are Muslims to heed, without argument or choice, the infrarationally revealed verses (and even Mohammed's authentic hadith declarations), they must also make sure to never divide themselves into sects, because this might represent the first act of betrayal, the possibility of new thought patterns or experimentation with religious practice, a loosening of their psychological bondage from falsehood. If they do so, they will be repeating the same mistake of the early Arab dwellers, who fell into division even after repeated prophets had come forth with the ‘one true religion’:

He has made plain to you of the religion what He enjoined upon Noah and that which We have revealed to you and that which We enjoined upon Abraham and Moses and Jesus that keep to obedience **and be not divided therein**. Hard to the unbelievers is that which you call them. Allah chooses for Himself whom He pleases, and guides to Himself him who turns (to Him), frequently. (Quran 42:13)

The believers are in some verses told to not be concerned with those who previously divided the religion, because the latter's fate will be determined by Allah, an ominous destiny indeed: “Surely they who divided their religion into parts and became sects, you have no concern with them. Their affair is only with Allah, then He will inform them of what they did.” (Quran 6:159) Historically, the most obvious examples of divisions into sects involve the Jews and Christians, the parties who were first exposed to the ‘truth’ presented to them by prophets prior to Mohammed. Though Islam certainly distinguishes itself from Christianity in that regard and by other doctrinal differences, Gabriel nevertheless explicitly declared Muslims to be far closer in affinity to Christians than Polytheists such as the Hindu:

Certainly you will find the most violent of people in enmity for those who believe (to be) the Jews and those who are polytheists, and **you will certainly find the nearest in friendship to those who believe (to be) those who say, “We are Christians.”** This is because there are priests and monks among them and because they do not behave proudly. (Quran 5:82)

Such is the affinity – in the following verse Jews are included with the Christians – between Muslims and those of the “Book” that the Asura revealed to Mohammed that Jews, Sabians (contemporary converts to Islam) and Christians need not “fear”: “Surely those who believe and those who are Jews and the Sabians and the Christians - whoever believes in Allah and the last day and does good - they shall have no fear nor shall they grieve.” (Quran 5:69) The respect afforded by Islam to Christianity

especially, is because the two have numerous similarities, beginning with the central characteristic that only the 'true' believers are saved from the hellfire and ascend to heaven after dying. Like Judaism, the two practice exclusivity, setting strict definitions as to who is a believer, simultaneously assigning the unbelievers a low status in life along with their dreadful fate in the afterlife. Unlike Judaism, the two are aggressive, proselytizing religions, using similar conversion tactics in varying degrees, with Islam quicker to resort to violence (though Christians have historically done likewise, and continue to do so in a relatively smaller frequency and intensity). In the two religions there is a room for the concept of intercession in which the prophets – to use Islam's description of both Jesus and Mohammed – can directly petition God to save an individual from the hellfire. They both also – with Christianity again not as intensely as Islam – place strong emphasis on one particular book of scripture and certain important global centres of worship.

Little surprise then, that Muslims and Christians often find common ground against the heathenous Hindu, consciously or subconsciously allying in anti-Hindu positions, as both view the Hindu as the ultimate infidel, because his belief that God can actually manifest His Consciousness into the Multiplicity of the human *adhar* is the pinnacle of Polytheism. In India, this mutually shared antipathy might manifest as Quran-justified Muslim violence towards Hindus being obfuscated by Christian intellectuals, the latter conditioned to assume the Muslim delusion of Hindu 'persecution', as a similar persecution complex – again, a subconscious creation to rationalize aggression against the Polytheists, because it is a greater motivator in inciting the believer to commit violence than the simple scriptural commandments to obtain conversions – also exists in their religion. Both religions have designs on the Hindu, mired in their ignorant belief that world conquest or conversion by an organized religion is the pinnacle of spirituality, with the large global population of Hinduism representing an identified target for their predatory actions.

Though they share these aims and tactics, they nevertheless must fundamentally differ, even if they are, per Islam, both people of the book. The most crucial divergence lies in the aforementioned focus of Gabriel in maintaining strict adherence to *every single verse*, without alteration or the permission of interpretations that introduce heretical strains of thought into the 'one true religion'. Thus the Quran is unedited from its original version, whereas the Bible has had numerous revisions in Christian history, including modifications that occurred prior to the time of Mohammed – something the Asura of Falsehood was surely aware of, because he would not have admonished the practice otherwise. It is this flexibility that has provided openings for Psychic qualities to permeate the atmosphere of Christian nations, at the very least tempering the severity of opposition to non-Christian belief or thought, unlike Islam's harsh and uncompromising stance towards such diversity. While this is the most important distinction between the two - as Christians in the end only need to follow a couple of the main tenets to launch into heaven, while Muslims must be vigilant, at the threat of hellfire, against disobeying any of the thousands of Asuric revelations -, there exist other fundamental fissures marking the Christians as lower in class to the pious Muslims. For instance, from the perspective of their particular representations of God, Islam declares its opposition - through the mouth of Jesus himself - to the famous Christian trinity:

And when Allah saith: "O Jesus, son of Mary! Didst thou say unto mankind, 'Take me and my mother for two gods beside Allah?' " **He saith: "Be glorified! It was not mine to utter that to which I had no right. If I used to say it, then Thou knewest it.** Thou knowest what is in my mind, and I know not what is in Thy Mind. Lo! Thou, only Thou, art the Knower of Things Hidden? I spake unto them only that which Thou commandedst me, (saying): 'Worship Allah, my Lord and your Lord.' I was a witness of them while I dwelt among them, and when Thou tookest me Thou wast the Watcher over them. Thou art Witness over all things." (Quran 5:116-17)

While Christians might disagree that their worship of the Holy Trinity is tantamount to Polytheism, irrespective of the debate, Islam clearly assumes this practice to be similar to the worship of multiple gods, and rejects it as both *shirk* and a schism from the 'true religion' in which Jesus is one of many mortal prophets prior to Mohammed, rather than the sole Son of God to be worshipped along with God. It was due to such departures from the 'true religion' that Gabriel warned his instrument, "Surely this Islam is your religion, one religion (only), and I am your Lord, therefore serve Me. And they broke their religion (into sects) between them - to Us shall all come back." (Quran 21:92-93) While the communications regarding the deconstruction of Islam into sects mostly refer to the history of other monotheistic religions, different breaks from literalist Islam (its authentic form) were possibly present during Mohammed's time as well:

And surely this, your religion, is one religion, and I am your Lord, therefore be careful of your duty to Me. But they cut off their religion among themselves into sects, each rejoicing in that which is with them. Therefore leave them in their overwhelming ignorance till a time. (Quran 23:52-54)

If there were indeed diversions from the "one" faith during Mohammed's time, then Muslims must be on guard for such schisms within their own lifetime. And though the original departures from the real religion were likely Christianity and Judaism, because of Quran's literalist quality and fixed eternal status, there always existed the possibility of further transgressions from its original form, as a faction of Islam with even a slight deviation, when practised by multitudes of followers in contrast to the rest following the mainstream form, becomes by definition a sect. In post-Mohammed Islam, the greatest of all schisms emerged only a short time after his death, with a distinct group, the Shi'ites, essentially cutting themselves off from the rest of Muslims. If the precise reason for the creation of Shia Islam is debated, with some parties attributing uniquely political causes, others declaring it to be a religious matter, the distinctions between orthodox Sunni and Shia Islam are insurmountable. The more well-known – to passive Sunni and non-Muslim observers – of the idiosyncrasies of Shi'ism relate to its political bifurcation. Here, the Shi'ites contend that Mohammed's son-in-law Ali, married to his daughter Fatima, should have succeeded Mohammed as Caliph (Ruler) of the Islamic *ummah* (nation), one of only two communities or nations (unbelievers are the other one) that Islam recognizes to exist on the planet. Instead, it was Abu Bakr, Mohammed's trusted companion and Father-in-law to his child bride Aisha, who became the next Islamic sovereign, *receiving* Ali's oath of allegiance:

Narrated Aisha:

Fatima the daughter of the Prophet sent someone to Abu Bakr (when he was a caliph), asking for her inheritance of what Allah's Messenger had left of the property bestowed on him by Allah from the Fai (i.e. booty gained without fighting) in Medina, and Fadak, and what remained of the Khumus of the Khaibar booty. On that, Abu Bakr said, "Allah's Messenger said, 'Our property is not inherited. Whatever we leave, is Sadaqa, but the family of (the Prophet) Mohammed can eat of this property.' By Allah, I will not make any change in the state of the Sadaqa of Allah's Messenger and will leave it as it was during the lifetime of Allah's Messenger, and will dispose of it as Allah's Messenger used to do." So Abu Bakr refused to give anything of that to Fatima. So she became angry with Abu Bakr and kept away from him, and did not talk to him till she died. She remained alive for six months after the death of the Prophet. When she died, her husband Ali, buried her at night without informing Abu Bakr and he said the funeral prayer by himself. When Fatima was alive, the people used to respect Ali much, but after her death, Ali noticed a change in the people's attitude towards him. **So Ali sought reconciliation with Abu Bakr and gave him an oath of allegiance.** Ali had not given the oath of allegiance during those months (i.e. the period between the Prophet's death and Fatima's death). Ali sent someone to Abu Bakr saying, "Come to us, but let nobody come with you," as he disliked that

Umar should come, Umar said (to Abu Bakr), "No, by Allah, you shall not enter upon them alone." Abu Bakr said, "What do you think they will do to me? By Allah, I will go to them." So Abu Bakr entered upon them, and then Ali uttered Tashah-hud and said (to Abu Bakr), "We know well your superiority and what Allah has given you, and we are not jealous of the good what Allah has bestowed upon you, but you did not consult us in the question of the rule and we thought that we have got a right in it because of our near relationship to Allah's Messenger." Thereupon Abu Bakr's eyes flowed with tears. And when Abu Bakr spoke, he said, "By Him in Whose Hand my soul is to keep good relations with the relatives of Allah's Messenger is dearer to me than to keep good relations with my own relatives. But as for the trouble which arose between me and you about his property, I will do my best to spend it according to what is good, and will not leave any rule or regulation which I saw Allah's Messenger following, in disposing of it, but I will follow." On that Ali said to Abu Bakr, "I promise to give you the oath of allegiance in this after noon." So when Abu Bakr had offered the Zuhr prayer, he ascended the pulpit and uttered the Tashah-hud and then mentioned the story of Ali and his failure to give the oath of allegiance, and excused him, accepting what excuses he had offered; Then Ali (got up) and praying (to Allah) for forgiveness, he uttered Tashah-hud, praised Abu Bakr's right, and said, that he had not done what he had done because of jealousy of Abu Bakr or as a protest of that Allah had favoured him with. Ali added, "But we used to consider that we too had some right in this affair (of rulership) and that he (i.e. Abu Bakr) did not consult us in this matter, and therefore caused us to feel sorry." On that all the Muslims became happy and said, "You have done the right thing." The Muslims then became friendly with Ali as he returned to what the people had done (i.e. giving the oath of allegiance to Abu Bakr). (**Sahih Bukhari** Volume 5, Book 59, Hadith 546)

While this hadith, though acknowledging Ali's grievances, unquestionably supports Abu Bakr as Mohammed's heir, Shi'ites often claim the hadith in question to be fabricated or unreliable. In disputing the hadith however, especially Sahih Bukhari - a thoroughly comprehensive work judged by the majority of Islamic scholars to be undeniably authentic-, the Shia tread dangerously close to the line of apostasy. But if Shi'ite arguments regarding the political fissure have some amount of justification, since Mohammed himself did not officially name a successor, certain Shia have – at least historically if not as much in recent times - challenged a tenet at Islam's core - that of the Quran being the unalterable compilation of Allah's chosen 'Word'. These Shia have outrageously contended that the Quran is incomplete, with numerous verses withheld from its original composition³ specifically to negate any claim of Ali or his descendants to the position of Caliph. It is certainly an emotive issue, because as we have seen, alteration of the scripture is absolutely forbidden in Islam, and to accuse the early companions, those closest to Mohammed, of this crime, is tantamount to desecrating the Prophet himself by association!

Yet if the Shia have historically been unable to accept the demotion of Ali, this pales in comparison to their inability to reconcile Islam's strict message of one god and one last human prophet - the narrative of Islam which presumably defines Mohammed as mortal, without the powers of either the angels or Allah. Though this is the superficial understanding of Islam's assertion, we shall later observe the Quran and Hadith to promote a decided magnification of Mohammed's status by a subtle process mostly unconscious to the pious ones ironically rallying around the Islamic call to reject worship of humans as divine. It is a command, so obviously crucial to the religion, that Shi'ite Islam consciously fails at obeying, as we immediately find in its distortion of the *shahada*, the testimony required of all Muslims, where one declares, "There is no God but Allah, and Mohammed is his Messenger." To this the Shia daringly innovate, "and Ali is (Mohammed's) caretaker." By doing so, they are - fortunately – still only violating the authentic hadith from which the testimony derives. Though not insulting the sanctity of the Quran in this instance, they come close by putting another individual next to both Allah

and Mohammed, when only the “Seal” of the prophets alone is worthy of such proximity. But this oath, a pillar of Shi’ism, offers a clue into the most severe aspect of their break from actual Islam, the unquestionable heresy that Shi’ism promotes: For the placement of Ali at the end of the orthodox *shahada* is only the first example of their misplaced and excessive valuation of Muslim leaders who emerged after the time of the Prophet.

This apostasy is best understood when we realize that the predominant sub-group of Shi’ite Islam, the Twelvers, practice a religion in which there is always an Imam of the age who, crucially, is *divinely* guided. These twelve Imams, beginning with Ali, are not just political rulers - they shepherd the religious life of their followers as well. Though not usually attributed the gift of receiving revelations, these Imams are believed to be elevated above the ordinary mortal and are infallible, having an unnaturally close relationship with Allah that they in turn use to instruct their flock. The Imams are thought to have knowledge of the future and of all revealed books, and can choose when they die (Muhammad ibn Yaqub Al-Kulaini, *Al-Kaafi*). These are attributes that were never ascribed to Mohammed, even if he was given the power of after-life intercession – the Prophet is explicitly stated to have been human numerous times in the Quran, without any ability to choose his time of death. Indeed, so were the prophets before Mohammed identified as mortal, without such supernatural powers characteristic to the twelve Shia Imams, including the extraordinary power of the twelfth Imam, *al-Mahdi*, who was born centuries ago but has since disappeared in occult worlds, awaiting his return.

But declaring humans to have such supernatural or divine capabilities is, after all, a Polytheistic tradition. The culmination of this, in the Sanatana Dharma, is the liberation into Self-Realization by which the individual dissolves his egoistic identity and Unites with the truest Self above or Soul within. Islam maintains a rigid separation between man and God; there cannot exist Divine emanations, Avatars or Realizations upon earth – that is Polytheism because it leads to worship of different manifestations and names of God rather than Islam's idea of a strictly transcendent and separate Allah. In Paradise, we recall, Muslims only experience the pleasures of life, rather than a true Union with their Creator, as the highest possibility of consciousness. Muslims have no choice – although, for certain males, the Islamic Paradise is a favourable end – in their ideas on the afterlife, or in their thoughts and beliefs within the life. Diversity can only lead to disobedience against the Asura who secretly is their king, precipitating transgressions that might lead Muslims to practices closer to svadharma and the quest for one's Soul. Or, if not towards a Polytheistic, integral faith that sees all of creation as in secret reality one with Brahma, a deviation from Islam may direct the so-called Muslim towards Judaism or Christianity, as occurred in the generations before Mohammed. These were the people of the book who betrayed the sacred covenant:

And when Allah made a covenant with those who were given the Book: You shall certainly make it known to men and you shall not hide it; but they cast it behind their backs and took a small price for it; so evil is that which they buy. (Quran 3:187)

They were also – the following verse is directed towards the Jews who only *partially* believed in the finalized scripture of Allah – guilty of killing the prophets even as they professed belief in what said messengers were relating to them:

And when it is said to them, “Believe in what Allah has revealed”, they say: “We believe in that which was revealed to us;” and they deny what is sent down after that, while it is the truth verifying that which they have. Say: “Why then did you kill Allah's Prophets before if you were indeed believers?” (Quran 2:91)

The community which contained the Arab Jews, for the most part, followed the earlier Prophets including Moses – yet some of them, as we know, dismissed the glorious message of one of Allah's most important humans: “And when Moses said to his people: ‘O my people! Why do you give me

trouble? And you know indeed that I am Allah's messenger to you.' But when they turned aside, Allah made their hearts turn aside, and Allah does not guide the transgressing people." (Quran 61:05) This dreadful violation can possibly be interpreted as one kind of apostasy, in which the believer's heart and mind 'turn' from the 'truth' presented to them by Allah's messengers. Another form of heresy is the type in which one only professes belief, having never really had faith to begin with. A humiliation in earth and terror in death is the appropriate 'divine' response for these apostates, who also "alter the words from their places":

O Messenger! Let not those grieve you who strive together in hastening to unbelief, from among those who say with their mouths **"We believe," but their hearts do not believe**, and from among those who are Jews. They are listeners for the sake of a lie, listeners for another people who have not come to you. **They alter the words from their places**, saying: "If you are given this, take it, and if you are not given this, be cautious." And as for him whose temptation Allah desires, you cannot control anything for him with Allah. **Those are they for whom Allah does not desire that He should purify their hearts, they shall have disgrace in this world, and they shall have a grievous chastisement in the hereafter.** They are listeners of a lie, devourers of what is forbidden. Therefore if they come to you, judge between them or turn aside from them, and if you turn aside from them, they shall not harm you in any way; and if you judge, judge between them with equity. Surely Allah loves those who judge equitably. (Quran 5:41-42)

As we have evidently seen, there exist multiple avenues for apostasy within Islam, including a belief in only certain scriptural injunctions, alterations of the very infrarational word within the Quran, following some prophets but not others, outwardly professing faith but having never subjectively believed in Allah, and of course, a more simple apostasy of overtly disbelieving after having once had faith. The latter two forms most obviously fit the traditional definition, and in Islam relate to an absence of belief in Allah specifically (because all different names of God, let us recall, are false). The other forms are often considered heretical, but in Islam heresy is the same as apostasy, because as the scripture assigns small departures from the strict commandments as the equivalent of *complete* apostasy, there are no subtleties in the manner, and the English definitions (blasphemy, apostasy, heresy, etc.) coalesce under the assumed hellfire – and worse, as we shall review. Nevertheless, if Islam does not endorse distinctions, the individuals in question certainly will have different subjective perceptions of themselves, with the classically defined apostates understanding that Islam assigns them the same fate as the rest of mankind who are not on the 'correct' side of Islam's primitive division of humanity.

But for the other types of apostates - the heretics who fail to realize that their particular deviations from orthodox Islam place them into the realm of outright apostasy rather than simple unorthodoxy (as if such a schism would ever be accepted by Islam!) –, that knowledge is decidedly lacking. Ironically, these subgroups often concurrently direct scorn upon others, like the Hindus, whom they consider to be unbelievers; only later do they, to their great surprise, find themselves the target of Muslims greater in piety, the 'real' believers. It is in this precarious position that the Shia are confined, faithful to much of Islam but - due to their questioning of the Quran's construction, and their addition of new *religious* material to a 'divinely' perfected treatise – nevertheless assigned the position of disbelief, because Islam is an 'all or nothing' religion that does not take into account the nuances that should naturally apply to religious worship. It is for this that a previously mentioned hadith, and the one below, note apostasy to include the introduction of fresh ideas into the religion, a 'crime' of which the Shia are undeniably guilty:

Narrated Abdullah:

The best talk (speech) is Allah's Book (Quran), and the best way is the way of Muhammad, and

the worst matters are the heresies (those new things which are introduced into the religion); and whatever you have been promised will surely come to pass, and you cannot escape (it). (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 92, Number 382)

The insertion of different spiritual-religious ideas (for the Shi'ite are hardly the first to believe in 'divine' emanations or other occult realities) into Islam is not the only way for "new" things to try and enter its pristine enclosure, as differing thought does not have to invade with a fixed religious doctrine or with the seeming authority of a 'prophet' – it can be spontaneous, through an inquisitive process characteristic of the inner mind, whose qualities are rejected by a rigid, infrarationally defined faith that limits thought to the external mind that repeats indoctrinated thought patterns. Having briefly discussed Islam's negation of this innate inquiry, we return to the topic again when we consider its status as another type of Islamic heresy or "hypocrisy", best delineated in multiple verses rebuking the practice of disputation or arguing over the infrarationally revealed scripture. It is a debate - over the veracity of Gabriel's communications - that inevitably continues to this day, because the Asura of Falsehood's imposition cannot change the features of the inner mind, which will resist the unthinking obedience demanded by Islam.

In Islam, the term disputer is assigned to multiple persons besides the inquisitive Muslim, beginning with the most obvious – those who argue their god to be real and Allah false or inferior: "And they say: 'Are our gods better, or is he?' They do not set it forth to you save by way of disputation; nay, they are a contentious people." (Quran 43:58) Again we see how the Arab culture, where a presumably illimitable god was "better" than other versions of Himself, was the perfect breeding ground for the Asura's message of division, the antithesis of the Veda in which the Gods are not deemed "better" than one another, as each one contains the rest within themselves - all of them in reality an indestructible Power or Personality of One Supreme Brahma. The Arab Polytheism may have allowed for different forms of worship without declaring others to be recipients of hell as a result of their variance, but it was infiltrated by too much egoism, and it is a very easy path from one 'god' being superior to another, to the belief that *only* one name of god should exist. As for those who dispute the latter belief, or the hour of judgement, their doom is accelerated:

Those who do not believe in it would hasten it on, **and those who believe are in fear from it,** and they know that it is the truth. **Now most surely those who dispute obstinately concerning the hour are in a great error.** (Quran 42:18)

The disputers of Gabriel's message of falsehood include more than those who unabashedly reject the Islamic doctrine. For instance, when Allah informs mankind, "those who dispute about Our communications may know, there is no place of refuge for them", (Quran 42:35) it does not imply a simple disbelief in Allah or his exclusivity – it may instead be a case of a disagreement with certain scriptural commands. Yet the very fact that Islam is an infrarationally revealed religion, with its 'Word' supplanting all other factors, means the debater - most often considering himself to be a good Muslim – will find that even the use of fine rational or ethereal arguments will yield him no success in changing the general intellectual climate. For as the 'Word' was only delivered to a select few mortals in the annals of time, the disputer ultimately cannot meet Allah's communicated demand that he support his argument with scripture of his *own*:

And among mankind is he who disputeth concerning Allah without knowledge or guidance or a scripture giving light, Turning away in pride to beguile (men) from the way of Allah. For him in this world is ignominy, and on the Day of Resurrection We make him taste the doom of burning. (Quran 22:08-09)

But it is a falsehood, this supposition that arguments can only be made if one is armed with a competing scripture - even if we ignore for a moment Islam's claim that *only* one scripture can provide

all of the “light”. To begin, it is not enough to assert a scripture as ‘divine’, like Islam does; what must be examined is the psychological quality of the text in question to determine if what is contained within is of a higher nature, guiding man to the summits rather than magnifying his brute aspects. And even the most luminous of scriptures need not be the only paradigm for mankind, as the Divine Truth is something beyond the time and space that a particular work, irrespective of its luminosity, emerges from. The Truth of God is far beyond words verbally passed down through generations, or letters inscribed on a paper - indeed in Bharat there are countless accounts of Self-Realization occurring in illiterate devotees such as Sri Ramakrishna. Yet if the Realization of one's inherent Unity with God is a great event, it nevertheless need not be the criteria required to grant one the ‘right’ of disputation. Each mortal, in his arguments, opinions or beliefs, contains within some morsel of truth, more than enough to justify a debate over the existence of God and His qualities. It is a disputation designed – secretly to some – to assist man in proceeding to profounder truths, helping him to reject falsehoods purported to be divine, to recognize ignorance, to fortify his inherent law, all leading him closer to his Purusha. Thus, a lack of knowledge or access to a particular scripture in no way means that an individual does not have some truth to his thoughts and arguments, or deserves to be barred from scrutinizing a purported ‘Divine Word’.

The Quran, at any rate, fails to meet basic elements of an actual Divine Word. For one, the Asura lied and told Mohammed that Allah had declared him a “Seal”, as if there were no further work for God to complete in a world where suffering and discord were prominent even in the Arabia of Mohammed's time. In doing so, the Lord of Falsehood also restricted Allah, allegedly an eternal being, from returning to the scene of his great creation and guiding it further. And disputation is one of the processes by which such evolution goes forth; in one prominent facet of this ultimate transformation, Brahma continues to use *vibhutis* who, by the sheer power of their intellectual argument or vital force or creativity, break down formations that are outdated or erroneous. But these elements, especially the searing light of the intellect, are in fact adversarial and dangerous to a rigid religion crystallized in time; understanding this, the Asura sought to prevent Mohammed from listening to arguments against the infrarational communications, warning him that “devils” guide the disputers, and that listening to them only leads to idolatry:

And eat not of that whereon Allah's name hath not been mentioned, for lo! it is abomination.
Lo! **The devils do inspire their minions to dispute with you.** But if ye obey them, ye will be in truth idolaters. (Quran 6:121)

Entering the ranks of the idolaters, as we know, is to join the losing party of disputers in the game of life, a fate Mohammed desired to avoid once he knew of its grievous nature, such was his fear of the consequences – as outlined in the following - resulting from disputing the Quran:

And certainly We lodged the children of Israel in a beautiful abode and We provided them with good things; but they differed not until the knowledge had come to them. Surely your Lord will judge between them on the resurrection day concerning that in which they disagreed. But if you are in doubt as to what We have revealed to you, ask those who read the Book before you. Certainly the truth has come to you from your Lord, **therefore you should not be of the disputers. And you should not be of those who reject the communications of Allah, (for) then you should be one of the losers.** Surely those against whom the word of your Lord has proved true will not believe, Though every sign should come to them, until they witness the painful chastisement. (Quran 10:93-97)

This passage is excellent in showing how Islam briefly recognizes the distinction between disputers – including those expressing *doubt* - and rejecters, yet consigns all of them – and other types of apostates – to the hellfire, for they are all losers in the spiteful ‘divine’ trial that man is supposedly undergoing. Irrespective of their particular subcategory - including those “Muslims” who dispute with, doubt,

modify, make additions to, only partially follow, or outright reject (after having once believed) Allah's 'Word' – they are all apostates and deserve perennial anguish. As this potential fate can be easily deconstructed through incisive intellectual analysis (which only requires arguments from the rational mind), when the Asura of Falsehood's maxim of truth by repeated assertion fails, his primary recourse is to counter intellectual arguments by promoting the lower *vital* – rather than intellectual or rational – fear that apostasy leads to the hellfire, an example of which is clearly seen in the previous passage. And along with the apprehension of being branded a heretic or a disputer, is the previously mentioned epithet of “hypocrite” or *munaḥfiq*, a term in the Quran sometimes used to describe those only partially following the religion, choosing some verses to believe in while dismissing others. But more often than not, the hypocrites are in reference to “Muslims” who *outwardly* profess faith yet in reality are lying, having secretly “turned away” from the Islamic religion they professed fidelity toward. It is a “disease” that they have contracted, these sickly individuals:

Verily We have sent down revelations and explained them. Allah guideth whom He will unto a straight path. **And they say: “We believe in Allah and the messenger, and we obey”; then after that a faction of them turn away. Such are not believers.** And when they appeal unto Allah and His messenger to judge between them, Lo! A faction of them are averse! But if right had been with them they would have come unto him willingly. Is there in their hearts a disease, or have they doubts, or fear they lest Allah and His messenger should wrong them in judgement? Nay, but such are the unjust. (Quran 24:46-50)

The hypocrites pretending to believe are under the grasp of Satan - this must be the explanation for their refusal to heed the word of Allah and his prophets, and their transgression back to Polytheism:

Hast thou not seen those who **pretend that they believe** in that which is revealed unto thee and that which was revealed before thee, how they would go for judgement (in their disputes) to false deities when they have been ordered to abjure them? Satan would mislead them far astray. And when it is said to them: “Come to what Allah has revealed and to the Messenger”, you will see the hypocrites turning away from you with (utter) aversion. (Quran 4:60-61)

But those refusing to accept Allah's exclusivity can have no real effect on the ‘one true god’, as Gabriel assured Mohammed during the early phase of his rise to power, when many were ignoring the commands of Islam – often manifesting in desertion from Islam's nascent jihad, a frequent reason why most modern “Muslims” can also be accused of turning back from Islam. There are, however, other examples of turning back, as the following passage implies: “So that you may not grieve for what has escaped you, nor be exultant at what He has given you. And Allah does not love any arrogant boaster, Those who are niggardly and enjoin niggardliness on men. **And whoever turns back**, still Allah is He Who is the Self-sufficient, the Praised.” (Quran 57:23-24) Likewise, the Asura of Falsehood told Mohammed to preserve faith that Allah always knows which men secretly abandon the ‘true’ religion of Islam: “Therefore turn aside from him who turns his back upon Our reminder and does not desire anything but this world's life. That is their sum of their knowledge. Surely your Lord knows best him **who goes astray** from His path and He knows best him who follows the right direction.” (Quran 53:29-30)

If the deceit of so-called Muslims was too clever for the Prophet to perceive, he was again to take comfort in the fact that Allah is never fooled: “And most certainly Allah will know those who believe and most certainly He will know the hypocrites.” (Quran 29:11) The resolute faith of Mohammed in an all-seeing and supportive Allah was crucial to sustaining the Asura of Falsehood's agenda, because a mortal with such belief – even if his ideology is that of a depraved falsehood - is likely to never abandon any overarching ambition, which in Mohammed's case was an Islamic expansion complicated by so many of his early companions either deserting him or only half-heartedly believing in the Islamic religion. But the Prophet was also, lest he himself dared to give up, bombarded with the message of

fear, with terrifying threats - of an eternal doom in hell if he sided with the hypocrites or let their heresy influence or weaken him - accompanying a simultaneous call to worship the Lord of Retribution. After all, those dying as unbelievers, after having departed the religion, are not to receive forgiveness from Allah:

Surely those who disbelieve and turn away from Allah's way and oppose the Messenger **after that guidance has become clear to them** cannot harm Allah in any way, and He will make null their deeds. O you who believe! Obey Allah and obey the Messenger, and do not make your deeds of no effect. **Surely those who disbelieve and turn away from Allah's way, then they die while they are unbelievers, Allah will by no means forgive them.** (Quran 47:32-34)

Those rash enough to part with Allah's mercy, his protection of them from the hellfire, are sure to suffer “injury” to their Soul, an Immortal Portion of God that Islam fantasizes to be under the same rules as the mental, vital and physical sheaths:

Surely those who swear allegiance to you do but swear allegiance to Allah; the hand of Allah is above their hands. **Therefore whoever breaks (his faith), he breaks it only to the injury of his own soul**, and whoever fulfils what he has covenanted with Allah, He will grant him a mighty reward. (Quran 48:10)

While the previous two selections - the latter notably located in the surah “Victory” – might be considered specific to the refusal of Muslim's to participate in obligatory jihad, not only does our review now make clear that *disobeying one tenet means disobeying them all*, these particular verses can also be construed as the turning back from other mandated precepts of Islam. It is a terrible decision to fall into disbelief, because it results in a fate that Allah the Almighty is immune from, for he is the one delivering the punishment:

And let not those grieve you **who fall into unbelief hastily**, surely they can do no harm to Allah at all. Allah intends that He should not give them any portion in the hereafter, and **they shall have a grievous chastisement. Surely those who have bought unbelief at the price of faith shall do no harm at all to Allah, and they shall have a painful chastisement.** And let not those who disbelieve think that Our granting them respite is better for their souls. **We grant them respite only that they may add to their sins, and they shall have a disgraceful chastisement.** (Quran 3:176-78)

This selection again emphasizes the continued need for the Asura of Falsehood to reassure Mohammed, to help him conclude the military defections and other insubordination to be the result of foolish mortals remaining ignorant of the ‘Divine’ wrath for “unbelief”, and that any “respite” from Allah is simply him letting their heresy fester so that their punishment can be more severe. Without these frequent reminders, the Asura's instrument was sure to lose his confidence when faced with a lack of progress in sustaining converts, making him less likely to deliver a message he had completely internalized – that of ‘guarding’ against heretical thoughts and actions including a departure from exclusively worshipping Allah:

That you shall not serve (any) but Allah. Surely I am a warner for you from Him and a giver of good news, And you that ask forgiveness of your Lord, then turn to Him. He will provide you with a goodly provision to an appointed term and bestow His grace on every one endowed with grace, **and if you turn back, then surely I fear for you the chastisement of a great day.** (Quran 11:02-03)

Regarding the companions of Mohammed who left Islam even after hearing the infrarational revelations directly from his mortal lips, Gabriel was quick to assure the Prophet that these incidents of turning back in no way reduced his importance; the Asura would also warn others that disbelieving –

after specifically bearing witness to the truth in front of Allah's Apostle – was a quick path to doom if they failed to repent:

How shall Allah guide a people who disbelieved after their believing and (after) they had borne witness that the Messenger was true and clear arguments had come to them, and Allah does not guide the unjust people. (As for) these, their reward is that upon them is the curse of Allah and the angels and of men, all together. They will abide therein. Their doom will not be lightened, neither will they be reprieved - Except those who repent after that and amend, then surely Allah is Forgiving, Merciful. **Surely, those who disbelieve after their believing, then increase in unbelief, their repentance shall not be accepted, and these are they that go astray.** Surely, those who disbelieve and die while they are unbelievers, the earth full of gold shall not be accepted from one of them, though he should offer to ransom himself with it, these it is who shall have a painful chastisement, and they shall have no helpers. (Quran 3:86-91)

Though Mohammed relayed countless warnings to his companions similar to this, originating both from direct Asuric messages and his own – albeit heavily brainwashed - mind, the Prophet was later to tell his companions that among *them* were those who nevertheless were to leave the religion after his death, only to find themselves guilty on Judgement Day:

Narrated Ibn Abbas:

The Prophet said, “You will be gathered (on the Day of Judgement), bare-footed, naked and not circumcised.” He then recited: ‘As We began the first creation, We, shall repeat it: A Promise We have undertaken: Truly we shall do it.’ (21.104) He added, “The first to be dressed on the Day of Resurrection, will be Abraham, and some of my companions will be taken towards the left side (i.e. to the (Hell) Fire), **and I will say: ‘My companions! My companions!’ It will be said: ‘They renegade from Islam after you left them.’** Then I will say as the Pious slave of Allah (i.e. Jesus) said. ‘And I was a witness Over them while I dwelt amongst them. When You took me up You were the Watcher over them, And You are a witness to all things. If You punish them. They are Your slaves And if You forgive them, Verily you, only You are the All-Mighty, the All-Wise.’ ”(5.117-118) (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 55, Number 568)

These men were warned, by the Seal of the Prophets no less, of the consequences for falling, after their initial fidelity to Islam, into disbelief - the sign of which, on the Day, is the blackening of one's face:

On the day when (some) faces shall turn white and (some) faces shall turn black: then as to those whose faces turn black, it will be said: **“Did you disbelieve after your believing? Taste therefore the chastisement because you disbelieved.”** And as to those whose faces turn white, they shall be in Allah's mercy; in it they shall abide. (Quran 3:106-107)

Fitting is this description of the ultimate destiny offered by Islam, because this religion only imagines a linear world of black and white, the vast majority of its infrarational revelations attempting to define existence into permanently separate groups of ‘pure’ Muslims and hated non-Muslims, with any attempts at union between the two or any signs of rejecting the ‘true’ faith met with unimaginable pain. Thus even a shred of doubt on the believer's part will lead to a darkened face - such uncertainty enough to meet the criteria of heresy for which only the unceasing fire is justified:

On the Day when the hypocritical men and the hypocritical women will say to those who believe: “Wait for us, that we may have light from your light,” it shall be said: “Turn back and seek a light.” Then separation would be brought about between them, with a wall having a door in it. (As for) the inside of it, there shall be mercy in it, and (as for) the outside of it, before it there shall be punishment. They will cry out to them: “Were we not with you?” They shall say:

“Yea! But you caused yourselves to fall into temptation, and you waited and **doubted**, and vain desires deceived you till the threatened punishment of Allah came, while the archdeceiver deceived you about Allah. So today ransom shall not be accepted from you nor from those who disbelieved. **Your abode is the fire, it is your friend and evil is your refuge.**” (Quran 57:13-15)

If there remained any question that the status of the hypocrite – the one who outwardly appears to be a Muslim yet deviates from Islam through multiple avenues including, as the previous passage notes, doubt and “vain desires” - is in some way better than the ordinary Polytheist, Gabriel utterly removed it, declaring them, in the same breath, to be punished by Allah just as the idolaters are: “Lo! We offered the trust unto the heavens and the earth and the hills, but they shrank from bearing it and were afraid of it. And man assumed it. Lo! He hath proved a tyrant and a fool. **So Allah punisheth hypocritical men and hypocritical women, and idolatrous men and idolatrous women.** But Allah pardoneth believing men and believing women, and Allah is ever Forgiving, Merciful.” (Quran 33:72-73) In a different communication, the Asura of Falsehood similarly informs us that *both* the hypocrites and Polytheists are cursed by Allah and reside in the perpetual fire for their ‘illegal’ and “evil” *thoughts* “about Allah”, which certainly includes thought-crimes that multiple names of God are valid:

And (that) He may punish the hypocritical men and the hypocritical women, and the polytheistic men and the polytheistic women, the entertainers of evil thoughts about Allah. On them is the evil turn, and Allah is wroth with them and has cursed them and prepared hell for them, and evil is the resort. (Quran 48:06)

Islam is a binary creed, and any deviation from the norm leads to the hellfire; apostates, hypocrites, blasphemers, pretenders and liars are all equal to the Polytheist. There is no mercy for those willing to follow only a portion of the Quran, who heed certain prophets but not all, who doubt segments of the scripture, who practice select tenets but decline others. In the latter case, Gabriel included those who lie about helping their brethren if they are forced to flee from their homes, those who likewise prevaricate an intention to assist in battle:

Have you not seen those who have become hypocrites? They say to those of their brethren who disbelieve from among the followers of the Book: “If you are driven forth, we shall certainly go forth with you, and we will never obey any one concerning you, and if you are fought against, we will certainly help you.” And Allah bears witness that they are most surely liars. Certainly if these are driven forth, they will not go forth with them, and if they are fought against, they will not help them, and even if they help-them, they will certainly turn (their) backs, then they shall not be helped. You are certainly greater in being feared in their hearts than Allah; that is because they are a people who do not understand. They will not fight against you in a body save in fortified towns or from behind walls. Their fighting between them is severe, you may think them as one body, and their hearts are disunited. That is because they are a people who have no sense. Like those before them shortly, they taste the evil result of their affair, and they shall have a painful punishment. (And the Hypocrites) are the like the Satan when he says to man, “Disbelieve.” But when man disbelieves, he says: “I am surely clear of you. Surely I fear Allah, the Lord of the worlds.” Therefore the end of both of them is that they are both in the fire to abide therein, and that is the reward of the unjust. (Quran 59:11-17)

Not only do the hypocrites lose Satan for a trusted companion in the afterlife, they must also reckon with a doom, this time in the world, that is appropriate for those initially submitting to Allah yet subsequently falling prey to the former's lure:

They swear by Allah that they said nothing (wrong), **yet they did say the word of disbelief, and did disbelieve after their Surrender (to Allah).** And they purposed that which they could

not attain; and they sought revenge only that Allah by His messenger should enrich them of His bounty. **If they repent it will be better for them; and if they turn away, Allah will afflict them with a painful doom in the world and the Hereafter, and they have no protecting friend nor helper in the earth.** (Quran 9:74)

Like many Asuric revelations, this can be interpreted as justifying earthly punishment *and* as a another warning of the afterlife terror. In the former, the painful chastisement announced to the *munafiq* can assume the nature of many things, from earthquakes to floods, from famines to the gleaming sword of a 'real' Muslim. Whatever it may be, they are assured of receiving it:

O you who believe! believe in Allah and His Messenger and the Book which He has revealed to His Messenger and the Book which He revealed before. And whoever disbelieves in Allah and His angels and His messengers and the last day, he indeed strays off into a remote error. **Surely (as for) those who believe then disbelieve, again believe and again disbelieve, then increase in disbelief, Allah will not forgive them nor guide them in the (right) path. Announce to the hypocrites that they shall have a painful chastisement.** (Quran 4:136-138)

So strong was Gabriel's distaste for hypocrites that he, functioning as a 'god' albeit in the guise of an angel, informed Mohammed that any prayers of his seeking forgiveness for the hypocrite was destined to fail: "Ask forgiveness for them (O Mohammed), or ask not forgiveness for them. **Though thou ask forgiveness for them seventy times Allah will not forgive them. That is because they disbelieved in Allah and His messenger, and Allah guideth not wrongdoing folk.**" (Quran 9:80) Mohammed, presented with this rare communication granting him a choice to pray for Abdullah bin Ubai (the chief of the hypocrites), inclined to the remaining Psychic element in him, deviating slightly from the Asuric hardness demanded by the Lord of Falsehood. It was a flickering from the Soul in Mohammed that made him desire to conduct this prayer, the Portion of God which the Asura does not have and cannot fathom. But as the Purusha is antithetical to his creed of Falsehood, Gabriel could not allow Mohammed to persist with such behaviour and bend to the Psychic influence, possibly neutralizing the potency of an ideology and army he was trying to create. He thus instructed Mohammed to never again make such a prayer for the hypocrites, telling him, "And never (O Mohammed) pray for one of them who dieth, nor stand by his grave. Lo! They disbelieved in Allah and His messenger, and they died while they were evil-doers." (Quran 9:84)

It was a similar, and likewise successful, attempt on the part of the Asura of Falsehood to extinguish the last embers of Mohammed's Psychic (indeed we know chapter nine to be chronologically final to the scripture), one that we also saw in our previous examination of the hadith concerning Quran verse 9:113, though the latter referred to the outright Polytheists instead of the hypocrites who had left the Islamic religion. Nevertheless, Gabriel's command was the same, and the verse in question (9:113) was followed by another that informed Mohammed that he could not use the example of Abraham to support his prayer, because the latter's request for Allah's forgiveness of his own Polytheist father was in fact eventually withdrawn by the early prophet on his own volition:

It is not for the Prophet, and those who believe, to pray for the forgiveness of idolaters even though they may be near of kin (to them) after it hath become clear that they are people of hell-fire. **The prayer of Abraham for the forgiveness of his father was only because of a promise he had promised him, but when it had become clear unto him that he (his father) was an enemy to Allah he (Abraham) disowned him.** Lo! Abraham was soft of heart, long-suffering. (Quran 9:113-114)

Returning to the two verses directed at the *munafiq* Abdullah bin Ubai, we find testimony of the Asura's quick obliteration of Mohammed's Psychic spark in an authentic hadith contextualizing the infrarational revelations:

Narrated Ibn Umar:

When Abdullah bin Ubai (the chief of hypocrites) died, his son came to the Prophet and said, "O Allah's Apostle! Please give me your shirt to shroud him in it, offer his funeral prayer and ask for Allah's forgiveness for him." So Allah's Apostle gave his shirt to him and said, "Inform me (When the funeral is ready) so that I may offer the funeral prayer." **So, he informed him and when the Prophet intended to offer the funeral prayer, Umar took hold of his hand and said, "Has Allah not forbidden you to offer the funeral prayer for the hypocrites?" The Prophet said, "I have been given the choice for Allah says: '(It does not avail) Whether you (O Mohammed) ask forgiveness for them (hypocrites), or do not ask for forgiveness for them. Even though you ask for their forgiveness seventy times, Allah will not forgive them.'** (9.80) **So the Prophet offered the funeral prayer and on that the revelation came: "And never (O Mohammed) pray (funeral prayer) for any of them (i.e. hypocrites) that dies."** (9.84) (Sahih Bukhari Volume 2, Book 23, Number 359)

But the orders to not pray for hypocrites and other kuffar are far from the only means by which the Asura of Falsehood seeks to divorce personal relations between the Muslims and non-Muslims, having already established a philosophical schism by promoting the exclusivity of Allah. For though Gabriel constantly informed his instrument that Muslims are not to worship the Gods or Goddesses whom Polytheists believe exist, he felt the need to proceed further and partition his prophets from that particular group, telling Mohammed, "Surely Abraham was an exemplar, obedient to Allah, upright, and he was not of the polytheists." (Quran 16:120) The Asura would repeat this point during multiple occult meetings, on one occasion communicating, "Then We revealed to you: Follow the faith of Abraham, the upright one, and he was not of the polytheists." (Quran 16:123) Additionally he revealed, "Allah speaketh truth. So follow the religion of Abraham, the upright. He was not of the idolaters." (Quran 3:95) While those three verses are primarily meant to reiterate the demand of "Allah" to abstain from *shirk*, the language used is more ambiguous than previously cited verses castigating those praying to other gods, for to "not be" of a group can mean more than simply refusing to follow their religious beliefs.

After all, it is conceivable that a Muslim can disagree with the beliefs of a kafir yet exist amicably within the same community, though he might still share the same distrust – internally - of them that Allah does. But the Asura of Falsehood does not desire a state of affairs in which affinity might develop between his chosen slaves and the designated 'other', as growing rapport reduces the possibility of the war and chaos that he loves. To try and minimize any permanent possibility of peace, Gabriel initially used the example of a prior messengers like Abraham, as believers naturally model the actions of men considered to be great by their religion. Transitioning beyond this simple reproach, calls to reject coexistence with unbelievers were then combined with commandments implicitly warning of the risk of such cooperation. For instance, Mohammed was told, "O Prophet! Be careful of (your duty to) Allah and do not comply with (the wishes of) the unbelievers and the hypocrites; surely Allah is Knowing, Wise." (Quran 33:01) This was deemed important enough to repeat, along with a comment on the "annoying" nature of the guilty party:

O Prophet! Surely We have sent you as a witness, and as a bearer of good news and as a warner, And as one inviting to Allah by His permission, and as a light-giving torch. And give to the believers the good news that they shall have a great grace from Allah. And be not **compliant** to the unbelievers and the hypocrites, and leave unregarded their annoying talk, and rely on Allah; and Allah is sufficient as a Protector. (Quran 33:45-48)

In the warped Islamic mindset, to be compliant to an unbeliever is analogous to licking their boots, becoming their slaves, and worshipping their Gods. But to be compliant towards another does not always need to have such severe connotations: for instance, in a familial structure, one member may

undertake actions on behalf of the others that appear to outsiders as supplicant or almost humiliating. Nevertheless, these actions are taken for the overall good of the family, even if it involves hardship, with beneficial results eventually arriving to the one who undertook the initial work. And because the development of that nuclear family and its extended version provided a foundation by which individuals could aggregate their mental, emotional and physical abilities, Prakriti has secured it as the initial avenue for the majority of an individual's growth, because it offers the best means for a secure base upon which this progression can take place. Islam, however, does not care for this evolution of man, and in seeking to vanquish diversity of belief and thought as expressed through a myriad of religions, has for one of its tactics the destruction of the family, a dissolution fomented through commands that Muslims refrain from friendship with their unbelieving relatives, including fathers and brothers:

O ye who believe! **Choose not your fathers nor your brethren for friends if they take pleasure in disbelief rather than faith.** Whoso of you taketh them for friends, such are wrong-doers. (Quran 9:23)

While familial cordiality is not the same as true friendship (as they are different forms of human relations), the intent of Gabriel's message is clear – that of abandoning the normal human attachment (healthy and necessary at a certain stage of the ordinary ego, and indeed spiritual, development) between relatives. And, most importantly, all because they do not share exactly the same beliefs, rather than a case of one relative grievously wronging the other. Similarly to the call of callously detaching from one's unbelieving father or brother, the Muslim is also not to take any kafir as a “guardian”, a term that can be interpreted as also relating to a parental figure in one's life who might not be a blood relative:

O you who believe! Do not take for guardians those who take your religion for a mockery and a joke, from among those who were given the Book before you, and the unbelievers. And be careful of (your duty to) Allah if you are believers. (Quran 5:57)

To further divorce the believer from his family, even the money and land of a kafir relative (and vice versa) is deemed unacceptable, with the Hadith recording the Prophet saying, “A Muslim cannot be the heir of a disbeliever, nor can a disbeliever be the heir of a Muslim.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 8, Book 80, Number 756) The separation is thus complete even after death, with no prayers allowed for the afterlife well-being of kuffar relatives, no legal ties between their wealth and that of the faithful. It is the pattern of a cult, blocking a Muslim from interventions of reality or infusions of different ideas that arrive from others with a varying perspective; the believer is instead restricted to an enclave of like-minded individuals, all taught from one primary religious text, from one ‘law’, one externalized way of thinking, acting and living. All are subservient to the Asura of Falsehood and other crude vital forces unleashed – due to their submission to the tenets and thought patterns of Islam – upon the material plane. The cultish mentality is succinctly described in Gabriel's infrarational revelation to Mohammed that compassion is strictly reserved for fellow Muslims - a brazen falsehood, because all humans have a Soul from whom compassion and pity originates and extends outward toward the rest of creation:

Mohammed is the Messenger of Allah, **and those with him are firm of heart against the unbelievers, compassionate among themselves.** You will see them bowing down, prostrating themselves, seeking grace from Allah and pleasure. Their marks are in their faces because of the effect of prostration. That is their description in the Taurat and their description in the Injeel; like as seed-produce that puts forth its sprout, then strengthens it, so it becomes stout and stands firmly on its stem, delighting the sowers that He may enrage the unbelievers on account of them. Allah has promised those among them who believe and do good, forgiveness and a great reward. (Quran 48:29)

To show benevolence toward a select group alone is not enough for a religion to genuinely be considered universal, because God exists in varying degrees in all of His creation – to deny otherwise is to attribute the limitations of mortals upon a limitless Purusha, an Unrestrictable Brahma. It is through this fundamental falsehood that Islam goes about seeking to destroy the family, as it confuses exclusive belief as a criteria – the *only* criteria - for compassion, without considering psychology or bloodlines or nurturing or the Psychic. Gabriel's purpose in breaking the family differs from the relatively recent Indian phenomenon of spiritual seekers entirely abandoning their human relations in the hope of attaining to a Divine Consciousness. The latter set of mortals, though retreating from the earthly life, sometimes without any contact with their relatives and friends, do not make this transition in the spirit of malevolent separation the Asura demands of Muslims, because they understand that the family members they are leaving all have the Purusha secretly residing within. The departure of the spiritual seeker is not out of spite; rather, it is to try and reduce the ordinary attachment of ego that the family structure subsists upon, with the intention of *moksha* or liberation from the regular patterns - God subsequently descending in Consciousness into the adhar. In Islam however, the ordinary family attachment is simply replaced by the cult of Islam - a monstrous egoism.

Similar to the family's reduction by the fanatical embrace of the Shadow, is Islam's more corrosive and sinister negation of the most sublime of ordinary human relations – friendship. For the family, though usually an effective initial platform for human evolution, is beset with certain problems that make it of a lower spiritual quality than friendship. At its worst, a family can be riddled with abuse, and – due to the historic value placed on family – can entrap one in a vicious cycle of both suffering and inflicting pain upon others: A key component in these latter extreme cases, when compared to friendship, are the scant options available for family members subject to such humiliations, for one does not choose the family of birth, whereas one has more control over the development of friendship. And even the ordinary or superior forms of family relations still fall short of true friendship, at least strictly in terms of spiritual growth, because even the most superior of families will still have - in the interactions between members – more attachment, both emotionally and to the traditional family roles, than friendship. The latter, after all, is without the obligation and conformity expected of familial bonds; self-sacrifice among friends is often done without any desire for a return favour, whereas such actions in the family are frequently made because one is forced or expected to. While there is a certain level of attachment between friends (it remains a human relationship), it is more sattvic and freer of ego than other forms of relations, and thus offers a channel for the expression of the Soul's qualities between individuals. As it is sattvic *but* human, the attachment present is yet looser to the point where it becomes, to an extent, an example of the type of detachment one needs in a sadhana or spiritual discipline, in which a disengagement from the subtle bonds of the world are needed to release the individual consciousness into the Supreme Reality.

But this liberation from the varying degrees of psychological bondage into the Soul or Self is not the same as the rupture Islam commands of its followers. For the detachment of Asura's religion that deems the break from family and friends justified simply due to a different belief in the name of God, is a *tamasic* one defined by its cruel, evil and egoistically divisive nature. It is the egoistic aspect to Islam's separation that differs from the *moksha* of Hinduism, for though a sadhana requires man to free himself from one's attachment (the psychological detachment is more important than the physical), crucially, this separation is simply an *intermediate* step into a complete Unity with *all* of creation through the common Purusha that is in reality the *only* Existence. The schism fundamental to Islam, on the other hand, only leads to a permanent separation of the ordinary *human* consciousness, a fissure claimed to continue unendingly after death. Indeed the ripping apart of the natural familial bonds and Psychic unity of friendship proceeds as 'Divine' decree in Asuric Islam, the very 'Word' of an allegedly benevolent creator, with Allah specifically demanding Muslims to reject friendship with those not of the Islamic religion:

O you who believe! **Do not take for intimate friends from among others than your own people.** They do not fall short of inflicting loss upon you, they love what distresses you. Vehement hatred has already appeared from out of their mouths, and what their breasts conceal is greater still. Indeed, We have made the communications clear to you, if you will understand. (Quran 3:118)

As friendship is the most Psychic of ordinary human relations, with the least amount of ego involved, where all of the qualities innate to the Soul – including samata, fidelity, sincerity, selflessness, humility and generosity – are expressed, it is only the Asura of Falsehood who would tear at such a unity, absurdly justifying the rupture on a lack of belief in an exclusive god. Belief in that ‘one true god’ and his infrarationally revealed scripture supersede all other considerations, including the most harmonious of relations that might occur between Infidel and Muslim. For the ‘Word’ of Allah relates that those receiving his hatred - a group which the kuffar *always* fall within – are not to receive the friendship of the pious ones:

O you who believe! Do not make friends with a people with whom Allah is wroth; indeed they despair of the hereafter as the unbelievers despair of those in tombs. (Quran 60:13)

Such verses, especially when inculcated by believers at an early age, conditions them to view the non-Muslims as enemies, to avoid contact with them even if a natural affinity exists. And if the previous two verses are not specific enough, Gabriel also identifies the Jews and Christians – who as we know, are in some Asuric revelations afforded a respect never granted to Polytheists - as unworthy of companionship:

O you who believe! **Do not take the Jews and the Christians for friends.** They are friends of each other, and **whoever amongst you takes them for a friend, then surely he is one of them;** surely Allah does not guide the unjust people. (Quran 5:51)

Thus if one becomes friends with the Jew or Christian, he transforms into a Jew or a Christian, worthy of hellfire. And if this is the disgrace awaiting friendship with the people of the book, imagine the anger of Allah if a Muslim genuinely befriends a Hindu! The cult of Islam isolates its worshippers from others, assisting the Asura in hardening the Muslim mentality to the point where all sorts of violence is possible against groups with whom they have lost sense of the inner unity that exists between all of the Divine creation. It is a psychological stance that while important in all eras for the Asura of Falsehood's ongoing ambition, was acutely needed during the Prophet's time, when the ties between friends and family remained strong, a reflection of Islam's infancy. Thus Gabriel repeatedly warned his instrument and early followers of the danger of amicably living with the kuffar, because the Asura was concerned that contact might weaken the effectiveness of his message - harmonious relations with the designated ‘other’ blunting the destructive nature of his force. But the situation of Mohammed's life was also much more delicate than modern times due to that same minuscule quantity of Muslims, and the Lord of Falsehood knew that if pushed his medium and followers too much, if he made them break from their family and friends too quickly, he faced the real possibility of a backlash. Cognizant of this, Gabriel at one point communicated to Mohammed that it was perhaps feasible to become friends with the previously assigned enemy, as long as they were not making war against Muslims or driving them from their homes:

It may be that Allah will ordain love between you and those of them with whom ye are at enmity. Allah is Mighty, and Allah is Forgiving, Merciful. Allah forbiddeth you not those who warred not against you on account of religion and drove you not out from your homes, that ye should show them kindness and deal justly with them. Lo! Allah loveth the just dealers. Allah forbiddeth you only those who warred against you on account of religion and have driven you out from your homes and helped to drive you out, that ye make friends of them. Whosoever

maketh friends of them - (All) such are wrong-doers. (Quran 60:07-09)

Clearly, this passage *by itself* can be used by Muslims to justify cordial relations, or even genuine friendships, with the dreaded infidels. It could very well be used by some as a negation of the multiple verses – some yet to be presented – ordering the pious to abandon ties with the kuffar. But the problem with this potential solution is the caveat of peaceful intentions from the unbeliever, something we fail to find in any other infrarational revelation dealing with them. For the persecution complex created by the Quran can only lead one to believe that the unbelievers are at some stage of war with the chosen Muslims, that they have all sorts of nefarious designs on the obedient slaves of Allah. From this complex and the sheer number of verses rejecting friendship with unbelievers, it is more appropriate to conclude that the Infidel must never be genuinely befriended, for there exists no time when he is not plotting against Allah and Muslims. And though the segment in the previous selection dealing with believer's being driven out of their homes was in the context of Mohammed's companions fleeing from Mecca, as Islam is a revealed religion, that historic specifier to the verse is discarded, and the criteria for friendship rests upon whether or not the unbelievers are currently at war with the Asuric cult of Islam (the answer is that of course the non-Muslims are plotting war against the pious!).

There is, however, one other rationale for using the previous passage, with Islamic leaders tactically applying it in certain situations in order to mask their real ambitions from *both* the kuffar and certain believers. It was for such tactical purposes as well that Gabriel made the rare amicable declaration presented above, when normally – as in the following passage - he persisted with his demand that Muslims never befriend the unbelievers, or for that matter, the hypocrites: **“O ye who believe! Choose not disbelievers for (your) friends in place of believers. Would ye give Allah a clear warrant against you? Lo! The hypocrites (will be) in the lowest depth of the Fire, and thou wilt find no helper for them, Save those who repent and amend and hold fast to Allah and make their religion pure for Allah (only).** Those are with the believers. And Allah will bestow on the believers an immense reward.” (Quran 4:144-46) Similar to befriending the Jew or Christian, those sitting with hypocrites and unbelievers as they engage in mockery (according to the ultra-sensitive Islamic definition of the word) of Allah's infrarational revelations, are “like” them the inhabitants of hell:

Those who chose disbelievers for their friends instead of believers! Do they look for power at their hands? Lo! All power appertaineth to Allah. He hath already revealed unto you in the Scripture that, when ye hear the revelations of Allah rejected and derided, (ye) sit not with them (who disbelieve and mock) until they engage in some other conversation. Lo! **In that case (if ye stayed) ye would be like unto them.** Lo! Allah will gather hypocrites and disbelievers, all together, into hell. Those who wait upon occasion in regard to you and, if a victory cometh unto you from Allah, say: “Are we not with you?” And if the disbelievers meet with a success say: “Had we not the mastery of you, and did we not protect you from the believers?” - Allah will judge between you at the Day of Resurrection, and Allah will not give the disbelievers any way (of success) against the believers. (Quran 4:139-141)

Although this passage provides a loophole whereby a believer could argue that his unbelieving friends do not “mock” the Asuric revelations, further communications firmly close that door, declaring those befriending the infidel to *never* have been genuine believers in Allah – in other words, *munaḥiqun*. For otherwise they would not have made such a reprobate error, an evil act attributed to their Soul – just another in the litany of falsehoods promoted as ‘truth’ by Islam:

You will see many of them befriending those who disbelieve. Certainly evil is that which their souls have sent before for them, that Allah became displeased with them and in chastisement shall they abide. **And had they believed in Allah and the prophet and what was revealed to him, they would not have taken them for friends! But most of them are transgressors.** (Quran 5:80-81)

Friendship, one of the greatest developments of Prakriti, a channel by which the Psychic can grow and overtake the base egoistic tendencies of man, is thus ordained to be an eternal sin, unless restricted to fellow Muslim automatons. By narrowing the catalogue of possible friends, the Asura potentiates the power of his own creation, blocking off the introduction of diverse ideas – for thoughts usually precede actions and no influential movement can survive without a consistent and fortifying mental framework – and accentuating his own restricted discourse. The Muslim, ‘knowing’ the world and ‘truth’ of life to be a struggle or jihad between ascendant Islam and the non-Muslim, must identify himself first and foremost by his status as *separate* from, and fighting against, the unbeliever. For to be a Muslim is inexorably linked to jihad against the scorned kafir – the pious cannot have a personal identity without an enemy, oddly enough for a religion claiming to be the *only* truthful account of things. Thus those born to families under the stranglehold of Islam cannot have for themselves a true svadharma – they become part of the Asura's flock, shaped only by the Quran verses and authentic hadith narratives. The Muslim must identify with Islam first rather than any other definition of self, whether that be spiritual, psychological, occupational or even material. Otherwise the Muslim might find himself befriending those whom his ‘God’ debases himself to hate - and in making that friendship violating a very important commandment, one so crucial to be worthy of special emphasis in the The Disputer surah, a chapter entirely dedicated to defining the *munafiq* relationship with disbelief and Satan, one also underlying the winners and losers in Islam's binary account of existence:

Have you not seen those who befriend a people with whom Allah is wroth? They are neither of you nor of them, and they swear falsely while they know. Allah has prepared for them a severe punishment: surely what they do is evil. **They make their oaths to serve as a cover so they turn away from Allah's way, therefore they shall have an abasing chastisement.** Neither their wealth nor their children shall avail them aught against Allah; they are the inmates of the fire, therein they shall abide. On the day that Allah will raise them up all, then they will swear to Him as they swear to you, and they think that they have something (to stand upon). Now surely they are the liars! The Satan has gained the mastery over them, so he has made them forget the remembrance of Allah. They are the Satan's party - now surely the Satan's party are the losers! **Surely (as for) those who are in opposition to Allah and His Messenger, they shall be among the most abased. Allah has written down: “I will most certainly prevail, I and My messengers.”** Surely Allah is Strong, Mighty. **You shall not find a people who believe in Allah and the latter day befriending those who act in opposition to Allah and His Messenger, even though they were their (own) fathers, or their sons, or their brothers, or their kinsfolk;** these are they into whose hearts He has impressed faith, and whom He has strengthened with an inspiration from Him. And He will cause them to enter gardens beneath which rivers flow, abiding therein; Allah is well-pleased with them and they are well-pleased with Him - these are Allah's party. Now surely the party of Allah are the successful ones. (Quran 58:14–22)

The Disputer surah alone is almost enough to entirely define the Islamic religion, as it separates those in “opposition” to Allah *and* Mohammed as belonging to Satan's party, the destined losers - for only Allah and his Messengers are to prevail in the world and in the afterlife; as it identifies the hypocrites who cover their disbelief with oaths of piety; as it notes Allah's wrath toward hypocrites and unbelievers, the inmates of hell; as it makes clear that a ‘good’ Muslim does not befriend hypocrites or unbelievers among even his relatives and friends; and finally, as the reward for practising actual Islam includes the brilliant landscape of Paradise, home of the victorious religion. While this passage does not articulate the call for conversion of, and violence towards, non-Muslims, the foundation is provided for the intensification of a hatred that begets genocide when Islamic leaders decide it is time to follow the verses calling for violence. For the Muslims are, as the Disputer surah emphasizes, obsessed with winning above all other considerations – a characteristic common to the Asura's invasion of the general

atmosphere, if not his occult command. Additionally, if the kafir is part of Satan's party, and if Satan is the evil one, why would a Muslim *not* have – irrespective of Allah's *specific* ordainments – a desire to kill the infidel when the murder will potentially lead to Islam's victory? The only legitimate reason for the believer to refrain from warfare is if he does not yet possess the means or cover to murder - he must then at least remain separate, per the dictate of 'Allah'. After all, if a Muslim helps an unbeliever or hypocrite, the latter are sure to "turn" him aside from the infrarational revelations:

And you did not expect that the Book would be inspired to you, but it is a mercy from your Lord, **therefore be not a helper of the unbelievers. And let them not turn you aside from the communications of Allah after they have been revealed to you, and call (men) to your Lord and be not of the polytheists.** And call not with Allah any other god; there is no god but He, every thing is perishable but He. His is the judgement, and to Him you shall be brought back. (Quran 28:86-88)

Communications like this easily introduce paranoia during all time periods, because the Quran is not specific to the unbelievers of Mohammed's era, and the Muslim must be on guard that any interchange of kindness, whether toward infidels or from them, is the first step on a path to hell. The kuffar, after all, not only have evil plans for the pure believer – they are also the enemies of Allah and must not be taken for friends:

O you who believe! **Do not take My enemy and your enemy for friends.** Would you offer them love while they deny what has come to you of the truth, driving out the Messenger and yourselves because you believe in Allah, your Lord? If you go forth struggling hard in My path and seeking My pleasure, would you manifest love to them? And I know what you conceal and what you manifest, and whoever of you does this, he indeed has gone astray from the straight path. **If they find you, they will be your enemies, and will stretch forth towards you their hands and their tongues with evil, and they ardently desire that you may disbelieve. Your relationship would not profit you, nor your children on the day of resurrection. He will decide between you, and Allah sees what you do.** Indeed, there is for you a good example in Abraham and those with him when they said to their people, "Surely we are clear of you and of what you serve besides Allah. We declare ourselves to be clear of you, and enmity and hatred have appeared between us and you forever, until you believe in Allah alone", **but not in what Abraham said to his father:** "I would certainly ask forgiveness for you, and I do not control for you aught from Allah." (They prayed): "Our Lord! on Thee do we rely, and to Thee do we turn, and to Thee is the eventual coming. Our Lord! Do not make us a trial for those who disbelieve, and forgive us, our Lord! Surely Thou art the Mighty, the Wise." (Quran 60:01-05)

Such is the harshness of Gabriel's law against contact with unbelievers, that the previous passage was not even connected – as acknowledged by Mohammed in the following hadith – to ordinary friendship; rather, it was an opposition towards an attempt of one of the Prophet's companions to protect his relatives living in kuffar territory. While Mohammed did not doubt Hatib, the companion in question, he was nevertheless to receive – just as he did with prayers for his own non-Muslim relatives – the previous Asuric revelations contradicting his mortal opinion:

Narrated Ali:

Allah's Apostle sent me along with AzZubair and Al-Miqdad and said, "Proceed till you reach a place called Raudat-Khakh where there is a lady travelling in a howda on a camel. She has a letter. Take the letter from her." So we set out, and our horses ran at full pace till we reached Raudat Khakh, and behold, we saw the lady and said (to her), "Take out the letter!" She said, "I have no letter with me." We said, "Either you take out the letter or we will strip you of your clothes." So she took the letter out of her hair braid. We brought the letter to the Prophet and

behold, it was addressed by Hatib bin Abi Balta'a to some pagans at Mecca, informing them of some of the affairs of the Prophet. The Prophet said, "What is this, O Hatib?" Hatib replied, "Do not be hasty with me, O Allah's Apostle! I am an Ansari man and do not belong to them (Quraish infidels) while the emigrants who were with you had their relatives who used to protect their families and properties at Mecca. So, to compensate for not having blood relation with them, **I intended to do them some favour so that they might protect my relatives (at Mecca), and I did not do this out of disbelief or an inclination to desert my religion.**" The Prophet then said (to his companions), "**He (Hatib) has told you the truth.**" Umar said, "**O Allah's Apostle! Allow me to chop his head off?**" The Apostle said, "He is one of those who witnessed (fought in) the Battle of Badr, and what do you know, perhaps Allah looked upon the people of Badr (Badr warriors) and said, 'Do what you want as I have forgiven you.' " (Amr, a sub-narrator, said: This Verse was revealed about him (Hatib): 'O you who believe! Take not My enemies and your enemies as friends or protectors.' (60.1) (Sahih Bukhari Volume 6, Book 60, Number 412)

In this case there existed an understandable rationale for Mohammed and the early Muslims – note Umar's desire to behead Hatib - to oppose such interaction with their contemporary Polytheists, because Mohammed and his companions were *at war* with the kuffar. But as Gabriel designed his infrarationally revealed religion to be the 'Word' for eternity, ordinary circumstances of warfare become distorted into falsehood by way of their perpetual codification, leading to an Asuric inversion of the classification of a "state of war" – in Islam, war is permanent, even if the religion allows, as we will discuss, for tactical truces with the non-Muslims. As the Quran verses are for eternity, ensuing generations must often exaggerate insignificant differences or peculiarities to in turn legitimize cessation of all contact from the unbeliever, all of whom are military enemies. To do this requires the baseline paranoia nurtured by the Quran, from which statements or actions by Polytheists are misinterpreted as signs of warfare or persecution. Similarly, those who 'dispute' the knowledge presented to Mohammed, whether or not they declare themselves Muslims, are in actuality the followers of Satan, who leads disputers and those *befriending* disputers into the burning flame:

Among mankind is he who **disputeth** concerning Allah without knowledge, and followeth each rebellious devil; **For him it is decreed that whoso taketh him for friend, he verily will mislead him and will guide him to the punishment of the Flame.** (Quran 22:03-04)

Those who dispute and claim to be Muslim, let us recall, belong to the subset of fire-dwellers known as hypocrites, which includes both pretenders and those who initially believe then disbelieve. But identifying a hypocrite is not an easy task for the Muslim, because Islam's determination of hypocrisy ultimately rests in the thoughts of a pretender. Due to this, Gabriel at times reminded his Prophet – similar to the previous communication - that even if the believers are unable to detect the *munafiqun*, Allah will assuredly delineate the imposters from the pious, the fuel of the fire from the enjoyers of heaven. However, as the believer is 'divinely' roused to jihad, he is also obligated by Islamic law to both identify and murderously take into account the activities of hypocrites defined as enemies of Islam and Muslims. As such, he has for instruction the Quran – whose verses on hypocrites have already been presented – and the authentic hadith. In the latter, he finds Mohammed providing in one instance a four-fold criteria to help unmask the hypocrites:

Narrated Abdullah bin Amr:

The Prophet said, "Whoever has (the following) four characters will be a hypocrite, and whoever has one of the following four characteristics will have one characteristic of hypocrisy until he gives it up. These are: (1) Whenever he talks, he tells a lie; (2) whenever he makes a promise, he breaks it; (3) whenever he makes a covenant he proves treacherous; (4) and whenever he quarrels, he behaves impudently in an evil insulting manner." (Sahih Bukhari

But this definition presents numerous problems, because one can lie about ordinary human matters and break everyday promises, yet still remain exclusively devoted to Allah and the Prophet – and thus should not have to be categorized as someone potentially close to the hellfire. While the breaking of covenants, if it refers to distinct Islamic tenets, appears to represent a solid basis for hypocrisy, establishing an “evil insulting manner” is fraught with varying subjective definitions. And it is precisely the subjectivity or individuality of worship that emerges again to shine its light upon the falsehood of the very attempt to take minor external words or circumstances as a sign of heresy from the belief in an exclusionary God, the latter principle itself the nadir of falsehood. These sort of guidelines allow for a dangerous escalation of casual misinterpretations and superficial dislikes between people to turn into a ‘crime’ against Allah, especially when we consider that the first three are quite similar, since telling a lie is often associated with breaking promises or covenants. And for the final criteria, all the “hypocrite” needs is a tempestuous personality to reach the objective standard for hypocrisy.

From the perspective of the actual Muslim however, hadith like the previous one at least help to provide him with rules to identify and expose the hated pretender, to win him ‘spiritual’ points with Allah for assisting the ‘one true god’ in the great jihad. As most mortals are born with a capacity to recognize irregularities or deviations that can be interpreted as lying, and even broken promises or “evil insulting” mannerisms, a Muslim coming across this and similar authentic hadith and Quran verses will use them to develop confidence in his sleuthing ability to discover pretenders and disputers within his community. But if he reads further, this self-assurance is sure to falter, because both the Quran and numerous hadith – including the below – unmistakably detail that the despised hypocrite can secretly remain as such, even while undertaking the most superior of religious actions:

Narrated Abu Said Al-Khudri:

While the Prophet was distributing (war booty etc.) one day, Dhul Khawaisira, a man from the tribe of Bani Tamim, said, “O Allah's Apostle! Act justly.” The Prophets said, “Woe to you! Who else would act justly if I did not act justly?” Umar said (to the Prophet), “Allow me to chop his neck off.” **The Prophet said, “No, for he has companions (who are apparently so pious that) if anyone of (you compares his prayer with) their prayer, he will consider his prayer inferior to theirs, and similarly his fasting inferior to theirs, but they will desert Islam (go out of religion) as an arrow goes through the victim's body (games etc.) in which case if its Nasl is examined nothing will be seen thereon, and if its Nady is examined, nothing will be seen thereon, and if its Qudhath is examined, nothing will be seen thereon, for the arrow has gone out too fast even for the excretions and blood to smear over it.** Such people will come out at the time of difference among the (Muslim) people and the sign by which they will be recognized, will be a man whose one of the two hands will look like the breast of a woman or a lump of flesh moving loosely.” Abu Said added, “I testify that I heard that from the Prophet and also testify that I was with Ali when Ali fought against those people. The man described by the Prophet was searched for among the killed, and was found, and he was exactly as the Prophet had described him.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 8, Book 73, Number 184)

If Mohammed acknowledges here the prevailing Islamic concept that certain believers are more pious to other Muslims, he also irreversibly enshrines the uncertainty of knowing which Muslim, including those appearing to be the most pious, might secretly be a hypocrite. Though some Muslims may take comfort in the ‘knowledge’ that at least Allah is forever cognizant of who the pretenders are, they unfortunately are also tasked with remaining on guard *and waging war* against such individuals, at the risk of hellfire if turning back from that religious obligation. For though Islam orders Muslims to abide

separately from the hypocrites, it also frustratingly notes the latter to include those who seem to be great believers, who offer no clue of their secret disbelief. Whereas it is relatively easy to observe a lying and insulting “Muslim” and then deduce him – based upon the previously cited tradition of the Prophet - to be a heretic, it is nearly impossible to discover an apostate, an enemy who must be targeted just like other kuffar, behind the guise of an outwardly fastidious devotee strictly adhering to Islam's rituals and orders.

But as the Muslim knows such “believers” exist in the ranks, he cannot fully trust even his own “Muslim” friends, for they might very well be renegade from Islam. If a ‘real’ believer cannot be completely sure of the faith of his own co-religionists, he must also exist in a chronic state of paranoia toward his *own* community or nation, one often completely “Muslim” by census. He can never have a total mental peace when with Muslim friends, because Allah has both infrarationally revealed the fact of apostates (including the most outwardly pious types) within the Muslim community, and the need to *at least* avoid said persons – with the threat of hellfire if the believer has inadvertently become friends with them. As peace is precisely the opposite of what the Asura wants, by cleverly using an undeniable fact of life – that of the ever-present uncertainty when considering the internal thoughts of another – he keeps his flock mentally unbalanced: from this derangement, chaos and anarchy naturally spring forth, a state of existence so dearly cherished by an entity devoid of Truth. For though the ‘real’ Muslim knows he will never be able to discover *all* of the apostates in his community, Allah has provided him certain tantalizing, *concrete*, details indicating some of their identities – something more definitive than lying, which remains open to interpretation. The first of these signs, as we know, is the non-participation of able-bodied males in obligatory jihad; similarly do we know that refusing to spend in Allah's cause leads to apostasy, with multiple verses confirming this Islamic fact besides those already documented:

When the hypocrites come to you, they say: “We bear witness that you are most surely Allah's Messenger.” **And Allah knows that you are most surely His Messenger, and Allah bears witness that the hypocrites are surely liars. They make their faith a pretext so that they may turn (men) from the way of Allah.** Verily evil is that which they are wont to do. **That is because they believe, then disbelieve, so a seal is set upon their hearts so that they do not understand.** And when you see them, their persons will please you, and If they speak, you will listen to their speech. (They are) as if they were big pieces of wood clad with garments. They think every cry to be against them. **They are the enemy, therefore beware of them.** May Allah destroy them! How they are deluded! And when it is said to them, “Come, the Messenger of Allah will ask forgiveness for you”, they turn back their heads and you may see them turning away, full of pride. It is alike to them whether you beg forgiveness for them or do not beg forgiveness for them. Allah will never forgive them; surely Allah does not guide the transgressing people. **They it is who say, “Do not spend upon those who are with the Messenger of Allah until they break up.”** And to Allah are the treasures of the heavens and the earth, but the hypocrites do not understand. They say: “If we return to Medina, the mighty will surely drive out the meaner therefrom.” But to Allah belongs the might and to His Messenger and to the believers, but the hypocrites do not know. (Quran 63:01-08)

Just as Gabriel understands that warfare is the best way for his infrarational religion to conquer the world, spreading falsehood and death and suffering in the process, he likewise understands that money is the left hand to jihad, for no battle can be fought without a treasury. If money is nearly as important to jihad as able-bodied mujahideen, and if the Asura of Falsehood revealed it as such to mankind, then those refusing to spend on jihad are – as documented in additional verses like the following - by definition hypocrites or apostates, having turned back from a sacred command of Allah:

The hypocrites fear lest a surah should be sent down to them telling them plainly of what

is in their hearts. Say: "Go on mocking, surely Allah will bring forth what you fear." And if thou ask them (O Mohammed) they will say: "We did but talk and jest." Say: **"Was it at Allah and His revelations and His messenger that ye did scoff?" Make no excuse. Ye have disbelieved after your belief.** If We forgive a party of you, a party of you We shall punish because they have been guilty. The hypocrites, both men and women, proceed one from another. They enjoin the wrong, and they forbid the right, and **they withhold their hands (from spending for the cause of Allah).** They forget Allah, so He hath forgotten them. **Lo! the hypocrites, they are the transgressors. Allah promiseth the hypocrites, both men and women, and the disbelievers fire of hell for their abode. It will suffice them. Allah curseth them, and theirs is lasting torment.** (Quran 9:64-68)

Verses like these continue to make it easy for modern day Islamic leaders to obtain funds for jihad, especially from those who are unable to fight. After all, a refusal to do so leads to the maligned label of *munafiq*, whom Allah will certainly curse in hell. But no war can occur, no world conquest of all the religions, without soldiers ready to kill and be killed in the name of Islam and the Quran, the holiest of all books that establishes the obligation of jihad. It is through that obedience to the 'Holy Book', the infrarational 'Word' of Allah, that a covenant has been established between Allah and Muslims, with the latter practising fidelity to the 'Word' and the Messenger, helping to further their Prophet's cause, which is the same as Allah's cause. To do otherwise is to "turn back", transgressing into apostasy:

And when Allah made a covenant through the prophets: "Certainly what I have given you of Book and wisdom - then a messenger comes to you verifying that which is with you, **you must believe in him, and you must aid him.**" Allah said: "Do you affirm and accept My compact in this (matter)?" They said, "We do affirm." He said: "Then bear witness, and I (too) am of the bearers of witness with you." **Whoever therefore turns back after this, these it is that are the transgressors.** (Quran 3:81-82)

As jihad is part of this great covenant, as attacks on Polytheists are 'divinely' ordained for eternity, a rejection by a so-called believer of his duty to engage in jihad marks him clearly as an apostate. For he has "turned back" from what he previously promised Allah, a phrase that – if reading strictly the previous passage – if conceivably interpreted in numerous fashions, is quite often in the Quran a direct reference to, as we know, some type of non-participation in battle. While we have already seen plenty of examples of a simple failure to enter the battleground, different verses describe hypocrites who actually flee the scene of war:

O you who believe! Call to mind the favour of Allah to you when there came down upon you hosts, so We sent against them a strong wind and hosts, that you saw not, and Allah is Seeing what you do. When they came upon you from above you and from below you, and when the eyes turned dull, and the hearts rose up to the throats, and you began to think diverse thoughts of Allah. There the believers were tried and they were shaken with severe shaking. **And when the hypocrites and those in whose hearts was a disease began to say: "Allah and His messenger promised us naught but delusion."** And when a party of them said: **"O people of Yasrib! There is no place to stand for you (here), therefore go back."** And a party of them asked permission of the Prophet, saying, **"Surely our houses are exposed," and they were not exposed. They only desired to fly away. If the enemy had entered from all sides and they had been exhorted to treachery, they would have committed it, and would have hesitated thereupon but little. And certainly they had made a covenant with Allah before, that they would not turn (their) backs; and Allah's covenant shall be inquired of.** Say: **"Flight shall not do you any good if you fly from death or slaughter, and in that case you will not be allowed to enjoy yourselves but a little."** Say: **"Who is he who can preserve you from Allah if He intendeth harm for you, or intendeth mercy for you."** They will not find

that they have any friend or helper other than Allah. Allah knows indeed those among you who hinder others and those who say to their brethren, “Come to us,” **and they come not to the fight but a little.** Being niggardly with respect to you, **but when fear comes, you will see them looking to you, their eyes rolling like one swooning because of death.** But when the fear is gone they smite you with sharp tongues, being niggardly of the good things. **These have not believed,** therefore Allah has made their doing naught, and this is easy to Allah. They think the allies are not gone, and if the allies should come (again) they would fain be in the deserts with the desert Arabs asking for news about you, **and if they were among you they would not fight save a little.** Certainly you have in the Messenger of Allah an excellent exemplar for him who hopes in Allah and the latter day and remembers Allah much. And when the believers saw the allies, they said: “This is what Allah and His Messenger promised us, and Allah and His Messenger spoke the truth.” And it only increased them in faith and submission. **Of the believers are men who are true to the covenant which they made with Allah:** so of them is he who accomplished his vow, and of them is he who yet waits, and they have not changed in the least; **That Allah may reward the truthful for their truth, and punish the hypocrites if He please or turn to them (mercifully);** surely Allah is Forgiving, Merciful. (Quran 33:09–24)

To further appreciate the context of these infrarational revelations, we turn to the Hadith, where we find that the verses were communicated after the Battle of Uhud, one in which many of Mohammed's “Muslim” companions fled from their Asuric duty:

Narrated Anas:

My uncle Anas bin An-Nadr was absent from the Battle of Badr. He said, “O Allah's Apostle! I was absent from the first battle you fought against the pagans. (By Allah) if Allah gives me a chance to fight the pagans, no doubt, Allah will see how (bravely) I will fight.” **On the day of Uhud when the Muslims turned their backs and fled, he said, “O Allah! I apologize to You for what these (i.e. his companions) have done, and I denounce what these (i.e. the pagans) have done.”** Then he advanced and Sad bin Muadh met him. He said “O Sad bin Muadh! By the Lord of An-Nadr, Paradise! I am smelling its aroma coming from before (the mountain of) Uhud.” Later on Sad said, “O Allah's Apostle! I cannot achieve or do what he (i.e. Anas bin An-Nadr) did. We found more than eighty wounds by swords and arrows on his body. We found him dead and his body was mutilated so badly that none except his sister could recognize him by his fingers.” We used to think that the following Verse was revealed concerning him and other men of his sort: “Among the believers are men who have been true to their covenant with Allah...” (33.23) (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 52, Number 61)

Those fleeing the Battle of Uhud had, according to Islam, in reality always been hypocrites who quivered when faced with battle, who doubted Allah, who forgot their own promises, who stood in fear of other men rather than Allah – war only served to unmask their real nature to everyone. They had forgotten – because as hypocrites they had never truly believed – that an inescapable component of their covenant with Allah was to potentially die in jihad. The scripture, as expected, describe this aspect as a Muslim's *obligation* to Allah:

Narrated Zaid bin Thabit:

When we wrote the Holy Quran, I missed one of the Verses of Surat-al-Ahzab which I used to hear Allah's Apostle reciting. Then we searched for it and found it with Khuzaima bin Thabit Al-Ansari. The Verse was:

“Among the Believers are men Who have been true to Their Covenant with Allah, Of them, some have fulfilled Their obligations to Allah (**i.e. they have been Killed in Allah's Cause**), And some of them are (still) waiting.” (33.23) So we wrote this in its place in the Quran. (Sahih

Jihad against the infidel is compulsory in Islam's twisted formulation of religion, and to abdicate from a command of Allah is to sin against him, a fall into disbelief. But this is not the idea of religion which one intuitively associates with a call to something higher or more universal; Islam is instead the glorification of one's lower impulses, of living a life in fear of punishment for thought or belief crimes. Neither is a refusal to fight in battle – in Islam mostly for the sake of imposing the ‘true’ religion upon others – a sign of a lack of religion, for the Kshatriya life is not the inner law of most individuals, and the best type of war for the Kshatriya is a Dharmayuddh or fight against adharm, not one in which an adharmic and false ideology (Islam) is to be forced upon others. Yet as we have already seen numerous examples of Islam's demonic temperament, it should come as no surprise for us to learn of the Asura's most ruthless directive towards those refusing their jihad obligation, itself – when attacking rather than as part of the rare defensive battle – a clearly adharmic command for non-Kshatriyas. Through this murderous mandate against apostates, we patently observe the brutal nature of both the Lord of Falsehood and his creation of Islam:

What is the matter with you, then, that you have become two parties about the hypocrites, while Allah has made them return (to unbelief) for what they have earned? Do you wish to guide him whom Allah has caused to err? And whomsoever Allah causes to err, you shall by no means find a way for him. They desire that you should disbelieve as they have disbelieved, so that you might be (all) alike; therefore take not from among them friends until they flee (their homes) in Allah's way. **But if they turn back, then seize them and kill them wherever you find them, and take not from among them a friend or a helper.** Except those who reach a people between whom and you there is an alliance, or who come to you, their hearts shrinking from fighting you or fighting their own people; and if Allah had pleased, He would have given them power over you, so that they should have certainly fought you; therefore if they withdraw from you and do not fight you and offer you peace, then Allah has not given you a way against them. **You will find others who desire that they should be safe from you and secure from their own people; as often as they are sent back to the mischief they get thrown into it headlong; therefore if they do not withdraw from you, and (do not) offer you peace and restrain their hands, then seize them and kill them wherever you find them; and against these We have given you a clear authority.** (Quran 4:88-91)

As the authentic hadith confirm, the apostates in question were the ones who “turned back” from the Battle of Uhud, only later returning to the Prophet. But as they had already sinned against Allah by renouncing their faith (via fleeing battle), they were at once traitors *and* apostates, and Gabriel duly informed his instrument of their deserved punishment:

Narrated Zaid bin Thabit:

When the Prophet set out for (the battle of) Uhud, some of those who had gone out with him, returned. The companions of the Prophet were divided into two groups. One group said, “We will fight them (i.e. the enemy),” and the other group said, “We will not fight them.” So there came the Divine Revelation: ‘(O Muslims!) Then what is the matter within you that you are divided into two parties about the hypocrites? Allah has cast them back (to disbelief) Because of what they have earned.’ (4.88) On that, the Prophet said, “That is Taiba (i.e. the city of Medina) which clears one from one's sins as the fire expels the impurities of silver.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 5, Book 59, Number 380)

Returning to the Quran passage in question, one again marvels at the naked sadism inherent to Islam's characterization of God, who is said to consciously “cause” a person to revert into disbelief, fully knowing that he must then torture the individual eternally in the hellfire. But there at least exists a

crude logic to the killing of “Muslims” who flee from battle (and subsequently refuse to leave their homes to wage jihad), arising from both the mandated obedience to all verses and the Asura of Falsehood's ultimate objective for the religion: global conquest. The former implants upon the believers a cult mentality, in which belief is strengthened by co-religionists and the total number of followers – the psychology of the herd – rather than a subjective *bhakti*: thus the Muslim, when learning of a defector from the cult, reflexively – even before consulting the scripture – reacts with rage and violence towards such a ‘crime’, as his religious ‘education’ (truth by repeated assertion) has left him unable to explain the possibility of diverse thoughts and beliefs, or of one believing a certain thing at one stage in life, only to later *change one's mind*. Unable to mentally conceptualize such fluidity, anger is the only outlet for the pious ones who believe such acts to be crimes against Allah.

Regarding Islam's global ambition, the killing of turncoats and absconders finds a slightly more reasonable foundation, but only from the *military* perspective, in which an army must be resolute and single-minded in battle. Those fleeing from battle have the potential to irreversibly damage the cause, and the killing of such individuals is a mechanism to ensure that such treachery is not repeated. The problem of course, is that the Asura has typically exaggerated the military treason of Mohammed's companions into a *religious* falsehood, into a *sin* against God or Allah, having previously made the adharmic demand that all Muslims – bar an insignificant minority – instigate jihad. This means that unlike most modern armies where joining is volitional, all able-bodied Muslims are mandated by their ‘God’ to fight. Thus an inherent apathy towards war, or simple cowardice, become the precipitants of a *disproportionate*, final, eternal punishment *by Allah* – so simple is the Islamic religion, where declining the infrarationally revealed command of jihad marks one as an apostate, to be killed for heresy in earth and burned for eternity in hell.

Notable as well in the previous communication from Surah An-Nisa is the command to *refrain* from killing absconders who are being protected by people allied with the Muslim army: this represents another example of the Asura of Falsehood's practical intelligence, of his understanding that there are times for the believers to fight and murder, and times for circumspection. While these are situations in which the violent rage towards apostates must be curtailed, Islam does indeed provide – when such practical considerations are not needed – further ‘divine’ sanction, beyond the great sin of refusing to participate in jihad, for the killing of apostates and other non-Muslims. In one infrarational revelation potentially used for such a purpose, the believers are told to fight those who break their oaths with Muslims:

And if they break their oaths after their agreement and (openly) revile your religion, then fight the leaders of unbelief - surely their oaths are nothing - so that they may desist. What! Will you not fight a people who broke their oaths and aimed at the expulsion of the Messenger, and they attacked you first. Do you fear them? But Allah is most deserving that you should fear Him, if you are believers. Fight them, Allah will punish them by your hands and bring them to disgrace, and assist you against them and heal the hearts of a believing people. (Quran 9:12-14)

Though this passage is in relation to the unbelievers rather than apostates, the wording is such that it can also be used as a rationale to fight apostates as well. The wording, as with anything created by the Asura of Falsehood, can also lead to distorted conceptions of an ‘attack’, which might include verbal ‘assaults’ on Allah's exclusivity – for though Mohammed's circumstances were of genuine war, the application of the scripture is for perpetuity, and subsequently, ‘war’ *must* be perceived in some fashion. In a more specific directive to undertake jihad, the most pious of Muslims are ordered to fight certain believers who “act wrongfully” towards other Muslims, until the latter return to the fold - the use of force and murder justified by the need to prevent the creation of sects or schisms that could divert the internal strength of the religion by creating ideological ‘enemies’ within:

And if two parties of the believers quarrel, make peace between them. But if one of them acts

wrongfully towards the other, fight that which acts wrongfully **until it returns to Allah's command**. Then if it returns, make peace between them with justice and act equitably; surely Allah loves those who act equitably. (Quran 49:9)

An authentic hadith regarding this verse uses the dreaded term of transgression, one associated with violating the sacred tenets of the religion, including the “affliction” of worshipping other Gods along with Allah:

During the affliction of Ibn Az-Zubair, two men came to Ibn Umar and said, “The people are lost, and you are the son of Umar, and the companion of the Prophet, so what forbids you from coming out?” He said, “What forbids me is that Allah has prohibited the shedding of my brother's blood.” **They both said, “Didn't Allah say, ‘And fight then until there is no more affliction?’ ” He said, “We fought until there was no more affliction and the worship is for Allah Alone while you want to fight until there is affliction and until the worship become for other than Allah.”**

Narrated Nafi (through another group of sub-narrators): A man came to Ibn Umar and said, “O Abu Abdur Rahman! What made you perform Hajj in one year and Umra in another year and leave the Jihad for Allah's Cause though you know how much Allah recommends it?” Ibn Umar replied, “O son of my brother! Islam is founded on five principles, i.e. believe in Allah and His Apostle, the five compulsory prayers, the fasting of the month of Ramadan, the payment of Zakat, and the Hajj to the House (of Allah).” **The man said, “O Abu Abdur Rahman! Won't you listen to why Allah has mentioned in His Book: ‘If two groups of believers fight each other, then make peace between them, but if one of them transgresses beyond bounds against the other, then you all fight against the one that transgresses.’ ” (49.9) and: ‘And fight them till there is no more affliction (i.e. no more worshipping of others along with Allah).’ ”**(Sahih Bukhari Volume 6, Book 60, Number 40)

But wrongful actions or afflictions or transgressions towards fellow Muslims include things like belief or thought crimes, which of course are *not* actions, but are deemed as such because of the Asura of Falsehood's inversion of wisdom. Thus a hypocrite does not need to simply refrain from battle to be fought and killed – his acquiescence to beliefs in multiple names of God is enough reason for a Muslim to wage jihad against him due to that transgression, even if such a person also believes in the existence of Allah. While absconding from war and Polytheism appear to be – according to the crude weltanschauung of Islam - *theologically* understandable reasons to kill a hypocrite, because the religion is by definition restricted, narrow and extreme, it nevertheless finds additional seemingly minor justifications for murdering hypocrites and other non-Muslims. One infrarationally revealed example relates to the slanderous comments directed towards the Muslims of Medina:

And those who speak evil things of the believing men and the believing women undeservedly, they are guilty indeed of a false accusation and a manifest sin. O Prophet! Say to your wives and your daughters and the women of the believers that they let down upon them their over-garments. This will be more proper, that they may be known, and thus they will not be annoyed; and Allah is Forgiving, Merciful. If the hypocrites and those in whose hearts is a disease and the agitators in the city do not desist, We shall most certainly set you over them, then they shall not be your neighbours in it but for a little while. Cursed - wherever they are found they shall be seized and murdered, a (horrible) murdering. (Such has been) the way of Allah with respect to those who have gone before, and you shall not find any change in the way of Allah. (Quran 33:58-62)

While this passage was in response to the allegedly false accusations placed upon the believers – including the brides of Mohammed - by the *munafiqun* and kuffar of the time, the ‘Word’ of Allah is

final and if any modern apostate or non-Muslim dares to spread rumours about the pious ones, let alone defend himself and his beliefs, he is to be found and murdered – for that is the unchangeable way of Allah. This call to murder is just another hallmark of the Asura of Falsehood, because if slander and rumours are insulting and petty, they are not in themselves *divine* justification for slaughter. Indeed, a sattvic approach for a mortal to take when faced with false – but non life-threatening - rumours, is to simply ignore them and let the truth eventually emerge. And while we have already mentioned multiple passages explicitly sanctioning the slaughter of apostates for a range of reasons, including insults and rumour mongering, there are additional communications that can also support the earthly murder of apostates along with their chastisement in hell:

Obedience and a gentle word (was proper), but when the affair becomes settled, then if they remain true to Allah it would certainly be better for them. But if you held command, would you be sure to make mischief in the land and cut off the ties of kinship? Those it is whom Allah has cursed so He has made them deaf and blinded their eyes. Do they not then reflect on the Quran? Nay, on the hearts there are locks. **Surely (as for) those who turn back after that guidance has become manifest to them, the Satan has seduced them, and He gives them respite. That is because they say to those who hate what Allah has revealed: “We will obey you in some of the affairs.”** And Allah knows their secrets. **But how will it be when the angels cause them to die smiting their faces and their backs.** That is because they follow what is displeasing to Allah and are averse to His pleasure, therefore He has made null their deeds. Or do those in whose hearts is a disease think that Allah will not bring to light their spite? (Quran 47:21-29)

Note the crucial component of the passage, that of apostates turning away after the “guidance” has been sent to them, a choice that fails to meet the requirement of Islam and necessitates punishment from the angels. While the angels in the previous passage are possibly smiting the apostates in hell, one can argue that as Allah and his ‘angels’ are indeed the source of the Muslim’s victories in war, an Islamic mob can use the passage as motivation to butcher to death an apostate while knowing the ‘truth’ that the ‘angels’ and Allah, in reality, are causing (by the hands of the believers) the hypocrites (or other unbelievers) to die in such a sadistic fashion. Having these type of ‘angels’ and a ‘God’, Allah, for guidance, it was only natural for Mohammed to proceed in the most brutal fashion towards his former co-religionists. Indeed, he related to his companions the ‘truth’ – as he understood it from his indoctrination – that apostasy was one of only three justifications for killing someone who calls themselves a Muslim:

Narrated Abdullah:

Allah's Apostle said, “The blood of a Muslim who confesses that none has the right to be worshipped but Allah and that I am His Apostle, cannot be shed except in three cases: In Qisas for murder, a married person who commits illegal sexual intercourse and the one who reverts from Islam (apostate) and leaves the Muslims.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 83, Number 17)

In one notably cruel instance, the Prophet viciously punished a set of apostates who, along with reverting to Polytheism, stole some of his camels:

Narrated Anas bin Malik:

Some people from the tribes of Ukl and Uraina came to Allah's Apostle and embraced Islam and said, “O Allah's Apostle! We are owners of livestock and have never been farmers,” and they found the climate of Medina unsuitable for them. So Allah's Apostle ordered that they be given some camels and a shepherd, and ordered them to go out with those camels and drink their milk and urine. So they set out, **but when they reached a place called Al-Harra, they**

reverted to disbelief after their conversion to Islam, killed the shepherd and drove away the camels. When this news reached the Prophet he sent in their pursuit (and they were caught and brought). The Prophet ordered that their eyes be branded with heated iron bars and their hands be cut off, and they were left at Al-Harra till they died in that state. (Sahih Bukhari Volume 7, Book 71, Number 623; also Sahih Bukhari Volume 8, Book 82, Number 797 and Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 83, Number 37)

As the infrarationally revealed (Quran 5:38), ‘divine’ punishment for theft is to simply cut the hand off the thief, it is clear that inhumanely branding the apostates with iron rods and leaving them to die in painful suffering, is an appropriate punishment according to Asuric Islam, because the ‘crime’ of leaving the Islamic religion is greater in severity to theft. Such outright apostasy, and the more insidious pretending by other hypocrites, are a grave matter indeed, to the extent that Mohammed, when referring to the *munaḥiq* offspring of an individual during his time, wished to remain alive long enough to personally massacre the heretic spawn!

Narrated Abu Said:

Ali sent a piece of gold to the Prophet who distributed it among four persons: Al-Aqra bin Habis Al-Hanzali from the tribe of Mujashi, Uyaina bin Badr Al-Fazari, Zaid At-Ta’i who belonged to (the tribe of) Bani Nahban, and Alqama bin Ulatha Al-Amir who belonged to (the tribe of) Bani Kilab. So the Quraish and the Ansar became angry and said, “He (i.e. the Prophet) gives the chief of Najd and does not give us.” The Prophet said, “I give them so as to attract their hearts (to Islam).” Then a man with sunken eyes, prominent checks, a raised forehead, a thick beard and a shaven head, came (in front of the Prophet) and said, “Be afraid of Allah, O Mohammed!” The Prophet said, “Who would obey Allah if I disobeyed Him? (Is it fair that) Allah has trusted all the people of the earth to me while, you do not trust me?” Somebody who, I think was Khalid bin Al-Walid, requested the Prophet to let him chop that man's head off, but he prevented him. **When the man left, the Prophet said, “Among the off-spring of this man will be some who will recite the Qur’an but the Qur’an will not reach beyond their throats (i.e. they will recite like parrots and will not understand it nor act on it), and they will renegade from the religion as an arrow goes through the game's body. They will kill the Muslims but will not disturb the idolaters. If I should live up to their time I will kill them as the people of Ad were killed (i.e. I will kill all of them).”** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 55, Number 558)

Another hadith presents a similar record of this classic tendency of an Asuric instrument quickly resorting to murder, with the minor exception of Mohammed referring to the Thamud nation instead of Ad, along with asserting that it was not his duty – nor that, one can infer, of his followers – to meticulously search for apostates:

Narrated Abu Said Al-Khudri:

Ali bin Abi Talib sent a piece of gold not yet taken out of its ore, in a tanned leather container to Allah's Apostle. Allah's Apostle distributed that amongst four Persons: Uyaina bin Badr, Aqra bin Habis, Zaid Al-Khail and the fourth was either Alqama or Amir bin At Tufail. On that, one of his companions said, “We are more deserving of this (gold) than these (persons).” When that news reached the Prophet, he said, “Don't you trust me though I am the truth worthy man of the One in the Heavens, and I receive the news of Heaven (i.e. Divine Inspiration) both in the morning and in the evening?” There got up a man with sunken eyes, raised cheek bones, raised forehead, a thick beard, a shaven head and a waist sheet that was tucked up and he said, “O Allah's Apostle! Be afraid of Allah.” The Prophet said, “Woe to you! Am I not of all the people of the earth the most entitled to fear Allah?” Then that man went away. Khalid bin Al-Wahd

said, "O Allah's Apostle! Shall I chop his neck off?" The Prophet said, "No, for he may offer prayers." **Khalid said, "Numerous are those who offer prayers and say by their tongues (i.e. mouths) what is not in their hearts."** Allah's Apostle said, **"I have not been ordered (by Allah) to search the hearts of the people or cut open their bellies."** Then the Prophet looked at him (i.e. that man) while the latter was going away and said, "From the offspring of this (man) there will come out (people) who will recite the Qur'an continuously and elegantly but it will not exceed their throats. (They will neither understand it nor act upon it). They would go out of the religion (i.e. Islam) as an arrow goes through a game's body." **I think he also said, "If I should be present at their time I would kill them as the nations and Thamud were killed."** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 5, Book 59, Number 638)

But it is much easier said than done for a believer to avoid searching the hearts of the Muslim nation and exposing its hypocritical individuals, because as we have already documented, there are multiple verses and authentic hadith explicitly warning them of the apostate threat to Islam, asking them to kill such heretics. Even the early infrarational revelations are enough to make a Muslim desire to discover who is a hypocrite, because as the Muslim is commanded to sever friendship with apostates, it behoves him to ascertain which members of his community are pretending to be Muslim, so that he can at least end all interaction with such heretics. And as he knows that jihad is the primary outward objective of his religion, that the killers of apostates and hypocrites are revered as great jihadis who deserve both earthly spoils and the special regions of Paradise, it is in his best 'spiritual' (as perversely defined by Asuric Islam) interest to hunt down the traitors and slay them. It is also something that their Prophet wanted ensuing generations to do, with an afterlife reward for the pious murderers:

Narrated Ali:

I relate the traditions of Allah's Apostle to you for I would rather fall from the sky than attribute something to him falsely. But when I tell you a thing which is between you and me, then no doubt, war is guile. **I heard Allah's Apostle saying, "In the last days of this world there will appear some young foolish people who will use (in their claim) the best speech of all people (i.e. the Qur'an) and they will abandon Islam as an arrow going through the game. Their belief will not go beyond their throats (i.e. they will have practically no belief), so wherever you meet them, kill them, for he who kills them shall get a reward on the Day of Resurrection."** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 56, Number 808)

With explicit instructions from both Allah and the Messenger to kill apostates, why would pious Muslims refrain from doing so, if circumstances permitted? Their justification is 'divine', perpetual are the rewards, and they have for an example the exalted Prophet. And when considering the previous hadith as motivation to heed the call to murder, any generation of Muslims might conclude theirs to be the "last days" of the world, 'inspiring' them to eliminate the pretenders. And if the 'Word' of Allah, the call of the Messenger and his earthly examples of culling apostates are more than enough to murder, there also exist authentic hadith detailing how his companions faithfully followed the message, killing those who departed from the 'true religion' of Islam. One such example relates to Abu Musa, whom the Prophet had sent to administer a province in Yemen:

Narrated Abu Burda:

Allah's Apostle sent Abu Musa and Muadh bin Jabal to Yemen. He sent each of them to administer a province as Yemen consisted of two provinces. The Prophet said (to them), "Facilitate things for the people and do not make things difficult for them (Be kind and lenient (both of you) with the people, and do not be hard on them) and give the people good tidings and do not repulse them. So each of them went to carry on his job. So when any one of them toured his province and happened to come near (the border of the province of) his companion, he

would visit him and greet him. Once Muadh toured that part of his state which was near (the border of the province of) his companion Abu Musa. Muadh came riding his mule till he reached Abu Musa and saw him sitting, and the people had gathered around him. Behold! There was a man tied with his hands behind his neck. Muadh said to Abu Musa, "O Abdullah bin Qais! What is this?" **Abu Musa replied, "This man has reverted to Heathenism after embracing Islam."** Muadh said, **"I will not dismount till he is killed."** Abu Musa replied, **"He has been brought for this purpose, so come down."** Muadh said, **"I will not dismount till he is killed."** So Abu Musa ordered that he be killed, and he was killed. Then Muadh dismounted and said, "O Abdullah (bin Qais)! How do you recite the Qur'an?" Abu Musa said, "I recite the Qur'an regularly at intervals and piecemeal. How do you recite it O Muadh?" Muadh said, "I sleep in the first part of the night and then get up after having slept for the time devoted for my sleep and then recite as much as Allah has written for me. So I seek Allah's Reward for both my sleep as well as my prayer (at night)." (Sahih Bukhari Volume 5, Book 59, Number 630)

While these were men who had to answer to the "exemplar" Messenger during his lifetime, the authentic hadith also present examples in which the murder of apostates was undertaken by Muslim leaders after the death of Allah's Apostle - actions yet justified by the infrarational revelations and the Prophet's declarations on the matter. In one definitive tradition, Ali's burning of a group of apostates was criticized by Ibn Abbas, but not because of the end result; rather, the latter merely preferred a method different to the fire used by Ali, because that punishment should be reserved exclusively for Allah. The actual slaughter of apostates, however, was easily supported by Mohammed's explicit call – itself a result of direct commandments from Gabriel – to kill heretics:

Narrated Ikrima:

Some Zanadiqa (atheists) were brought to Ali and he burnt them. The news of this event, reached Ibn Abbas who said, "If I had been in his place, I would not have burnt them, as Allah's Apostle forbade it, saying, 'Do not punish anybody with Allah's punishment (fire).' **I would have killed them according to the statement of Allah's Apostle, 'Whoever changed his Islamic religion, then kill him.'**" (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 84, Number 57)

Merciless indeed is the quick and savage response of Islam to what it deems treachery - a betrayal of thought and belief from the uniformity demanded by the Asura of Falsehood's inversion of spirituality and knowledge. Allah has supposedly intended for all of mankind to be funnelled into specific mental and vital patterns, even though a cursory examination of Prakriti and her processes vividly displays a world – of which Allah is also the purported creator – full of diversity, experimentation, trial and error. Going against both the Divine Truth and the Law of Nature, the Asura of Falsehood has to try and eradicate the very essence of life and mind - that differentiation of Prakriti in form, vital movements, emotions and mentality. For from this pure Vital and Mind emerges the search for the Supreme Consciousness in a myriad of forms consistent with an infinity of subjective possibilities, leading one onto a unique *path* whose final destination – but only after transcending both dharma and the subliminal veil demarcating the consciousness from the Consciousness – is the Oneness in Multiplicity inherent to all.

But we must again recall that Gabriel – as he was known to Mohammed – does not want humanity to reach that ultimate aspiration, one that begins with the following of the svadharma, the inherent inner law that is *always* at least subtly different in each person. With this law - intrinsic to the born physical, vital and mental sheaths – as a foundation, the central being - aided of course by the Psychic – secretly aspires to consciously exist *as* the Soul beyond thought, emotions and form. It is only from there that one can truly experience Unity with all of existence, let alone the rest of mankind, because the Law of the Soul includes a comprehensive Oneness between the polar aspects of Manifestation and Non-

manifestation, whereas a consciousness rooted to the former can attain only a transient unity at best, especially if it does not seek to follow the sattvic or higher rajasic psychological principles that are closest to the Purusha. Islam, however, does not ascribe unity to the realization of one's Soul; indeed, falsehood is so predominant that the Purusha is incredibly said to have human characteristics, including death! The Asura's religion, concomitant to his opposition to Truth, invariably seeks a 'united' mankind only from the position of imposed thought and emotional content, things that will *never* be the same in all, whereas the Unity of God is one based on a Supreme Consciousness rather than the limited variables of thought and emotion.

In the Asura of Falsehood's concoction, only one name of God is to be worshipped, only one set of 'revelations' are to be followed, only a fixed arrangement of thought and action is to be sought, with any deviation from these commands meeting a swift and final punishment of murder. Everyone must have the same beliefs, live life according to the same external principles (for instance, the number of prayers performed in a day), and wage war against those who are against this artificial unity. But this is the most external of solidarities, a mere superficial concord that is ever-ripe to crumble from within, such is the scope for heresy and so harsh the penalty for it. It is at best a transient unity, quickly shattered into warring parties claiming superior declarations of piety; a house of cards and blood, suffering and pain; a cruel irony behind the death and destruction of *Muslims* now transformed into the hated 'other'.

* * * *

This is all quite the fate for those not conforming to the Asura of Falsehood's inversion of the Supreme Truth, for mortals seeking their own path in the world, those trying to follow a law most natural to them, devotees looking for God according to their unique disposition. For these individuals and the rest of the publicly identified non-Muslims, and perhaps more so for the hypocrites and apostates (including those who call themselves "Muslim"), a dreadful Islamic reckoning awaits. It begins in the earth where they find themselves the object of appalling scorn from both Allah and his unthinking followers: mocked for their belief in different formulations of God; demeaned as firewood in hell; taxed simply because they fail to acknowledge the alleged exclusivity of Allah; subject to violently losing their property to the pious ones; even forced into sexual slavery (as we shall review later). Marked as inferior beings, the Islamic equivalent of the Nazi *untermensch*, they are to be conquered and subjugated, with only Islam emerging supreme; left for them are the options of conversion, death, or life as an unbelieving slave.

Though a perfunctory reading of the Quran and Hadith is enough to ascertain the designs of Islam upon the infidel, the reading of scripture – especially in its entirety – is not something that most are wont to do, as people tend to prefer second hand accounts or the verbal instruction of a cleric. Additionally, those inclined to read scripture often limit it to the faith they are born into, accustomed as they are to their own cultural traditions. Thus – especially in a time of relative tranquillity (for Islam is never really at peace with 'disbelief') – the unbeliever is unlikely to undertake a thorough study of an Islamic religion that denigrates him as subhuman. Fortunate is his unfamiliarity for Muslims, because if the kafir becomes fully cognizant of Islam's opinion of him and its looming violence, his natural psychological response is to become vigilant, preparing himself for an eventual confrontation with an Asuric cult desiring to eclipse all light in the world. This reflexive tendency of a group when faced with the threat of extinction was something Gabriel was fully aware of while communicating to his instrument Mohammed.

For the survival instinct is not restricted to the individual, as Prakriti has allowed for its permeation to the group in the knowledge that Her solitary units require a stable collective to flourish in. Thus the group and nation will also be disposed to fighting off invaders; this is the will to live that, though highly exaggerated by Hitler as the primary truth of Nature, is indeed a real component of Her work in the evolution of consciousness towards God. As the Asura of Falsehood, present at the initial manifestation of consciousness into the multiplicity, understands this rudimentary mechanism, he had to create a means by which this response could either be circumvented or delayed until Muslims obtain the advantage over the non-Muslims. After all, in war or conquest, a guarded enemy, an opponent with knowledge of one's ambitions and strategies, becomes a more difficult enemy to defeat, mentally prepared as they are for one's advances. Nobody naturally wishes to be subjugated, especially when learning of the barbaric use Islam has for its captured subjects: As the kuffar is more likely to prepare for war if he obtains this understanding, it is in the best strategic interest of Islam to prevent him, for as long as possible, from either knowing of Islam's ambitions entirely, or recognizing the full extent of Islam's hatred and barbaric 'justice' for them in both the earth and the afterlife. From this strategic reality, Islam has developed the principle of *taqiya*, or dissimulation, that the Muslim may use in his interactions with the infidel, a stratagem designed to lull the unbeliever into complacency and assist with Islam's objective of world conquest.

The need for such deception was paramount from Islam's beginning, when the Asura of Falsehood's flock, although ruthless at heart, was nevertheless small and fragile. Though the Polytheist Arabs surely had an inkling that Mohammed's new cult was not predisposed towards them, the combination of his followers small numbers and the restraint imposed upon the Prophet by Gabriel, left the kuffar complacent to the threat. The tactical confinement placed upon Allah's Apostle was made by the Asura through numerous commands such as the following, in which he ordered Mohammed to leave the infidels to Allah: "Surely they will make a scheme, And I (too) will make a scheme. So grant the unbelievers a respite: let them alone for awhile." (Quran 86:15-17) As Mohammed at the time of such infrarational revelations did not have the military power necessary to inflict lasting damage upon his foe, it was better, decided Gabriel, to bide their time, waiting for more mujahideen and favourable circumstances. Thus his reassurances to the Prophet that Allah was always plotting against his enemy, even if his Apostle was to refrain from either learning of Allah's plans or making and executing his own independently.

But there was a different, fairly legitimate reason to engage in *taqiya*, one not as concerned with global ramifications. For the fear of persecution, though often exaggerated by the Muslims, was genuinely a part of the Arab reality during and prior to Mohammed's time. Understanding as he did the Arab culture and its history of violence towards those not conforming to the dominant religious power, Gabriel was able to present a conceivable historical example of a previous Muslim hiding his faith from a non-Muslim ruler:

And certainly We sent Moses with Our communications and clear authority, To Pharaoh and Haman and Qaroun, but they said: "A lying magician." So when he brought to them the truth from Us, they said: "Slay the sons of those who believe with him and keep their women alive." And the struggle of the unbelievers will only come to a state of perdition. And Pharaoh said: "Let me alone that I may slay Moses and let him call upon his Lord; surely I fear that he will change your religion or that he will make mischief to appear in the land." And Moses said: "Surely I take refuge with my Lord and your Lord from every proud one who does not believe in the day of reckoning." **And a believing man of Pharaoh's people who hid his faith said:** "What! Will you slay a man because he says, 'My Lord is Allah', and indeed he has brought to you clear arguments from your Lord? And if he be a liar, on him will be his lie, and if he be truthful, there will befall you some of that which he threatens you (with); surely Allah does not

guide him who is extravagant, a liar. O my people! Yours is the kingdom this day, being masters in the land, but who will help us against the punishment of Allah if it come to us?" Pharaoh said: "I do not show you aught but that which I see (myself), and I do not make you follow any but the right way." And he who believed said: "O my people! Surely I fear for you the like of what befell the parties - The like of what befell the people of Noah and Ad and Samood and those after them, and Allah does not desire injustice for (His) servants; And, O my people! I fear for you the day of calling out, The day on which you will turn back retreating; there shall be no saviour for you from Allah, and whomsoever Allah causes to err, there is no guide for him. And certainly Joseph came to you before with clear arguments, but you ever remained in doubt as to what he brought; until when he died, you said, 'Allah will never raise a messenger after him.' Thus does Allah cause him to err who is extravagant, a doubter. Those who dispute concerning the communications of Allah without any authority that He has given them - greatly hated is it by Allah and by those who believe. Thus does Allah set a seal over the heart of every proud, haughty one." And Pharaoh said: "O Haman! Build for me a tower that I may attain the means of access, The means of access to the heavens, then reach the god of Moses, though I verily think him to be a liar." And thus the evil of his deed was made fairseeming to Pharaoh, and he was turned away from the way; and the struggle of Pharaoh was not (to end) in aught but destruction. And he who believed said: "O my people! Follow me, I will guide you to the right course. O my people! This life of the world is only a (passing) enjoyment, and surely the hereafter is the abode to settle. Whoever does an evil, he shall not be recompensed (with aught) but the like of it, and whoever does good, whether male or female, and he is a believer, these shall enter the garden, in which they shall be given sustenance without measure. And, O my people! How is it that I call you to salvation and you call me to the fire? You call on me that I should disbelieve in Allah and associate with Him partners that of which I have no knowledge, and I call you to the Mighty, the most Forgiving. No doubt that what you call me to has no title to be called to in this world, nor in the hereafter, and that our turning back is to Allah, and that the extravagant are the inmates of the fire. So you shall remember what I say to you, and I entrust my affair to Allah, Surely Allah sees the servants." So Allah protected him from the evil (consequences) of what they planned, and the most evil punishment overtook Pharaoh's people - The fire. They shall be brought before it (every) morning and evening and on the day when the hour shall come to pass: "Make Pharaoh's people enter the severest chastisement." And when they shall contend one with another in the fire, then the weak shall say to those who were proud: "Surely we were your followers; will you then avert from us a portion of the fire?" Those who were proud shall say: "Surely we are all in it; surely Allah has judged between the servants." And those who are in the fire shall say to the keepers of hell: "Call upon your Lord that He may lighten to us one day of the punishment." They shall say: "Did not your messengers come to you with clear arguments?" They shall reply: "Yea." They (the keepers) shall say: "Then call, but the call of the unbelievers is only in error." Most surely We help Our messengers, and those who believe, in this world's life and on the day when the witnesses shall stand. The day on which their excuse shall not benefit the unjust, and for them is curse and for them is the evil abode. (Quran 40:23-52)

While it is reasonable to presume that there was indeed persecution by Arab Polytheists towards the defined Muslims of the Quran and Hadith (others may argue, based on history, that the believer above was likelier a Jew than a Muslim, because the Islamic religion did not exist during the time of the Pharaoh), as the ambition to annihilate the 'other' was indeed part of a harsh and egoistic West Asian culture, Islam's own claims of persecution are automatically embellished, with its exaggeration of a partial reality serving a useful purpose. After all, paranoia is the very breath of the religion, fundamental in motivating them to destroy others; this same impetus, of course, is subsequently met

with appropriate kuffar resistance interpreted by the believers as ‘persecution’ – precisely the cyclical pattern Gabriel knows will entrench the persecution complex. And if the example presented above highlights a Muslim “hiding” his faith to protect against a genuine threat of persecution by the Pharaoh, it is nevertheless a verse that can be used to justify dissimulation in modern settings, because any slight or insignificant action by the disbeliever can be concluded to be ‘persecution’.

The Egyptian Pharaoh, accustomed as he was to ignorantly redirecting the worship of God toward his own *ego*, could not – as with Islam - perceive a world in which other types of spiritual or religious devotion could exist. Aggrandized as his ego was, the mere possibility of divergent thought on the matter was enough to kill, and one understands perfectly well why the ‘Muslim’ in the previous passage kept hidden his actual beliefs. Fortunately for the world, the Pharaoh did not have the guiding darkness of an Asura of Falsehood codifying his religious framework for all future generations, and this particular cult of ego worship – a projection of his own limited mortality upon the Divine – died an appropriate death. Islam, itself a different projection – of brute, false, egoistic *ideals* - upon God, stubbornly persists thanks to its codification and dissemination in the form of a “holy book” that cannot be altered. Thus its practice of taqiyah continues on, supported by more than the solitary verse, with different scriptural injunctions – including the following – providing even more flexibility for its modern application:

(As for) those who do not believe in Allah's communications, surely Allah will not guide them, and they shall have a painful punishment. Only they invent falsehood who believe not Allah's revelations, and (only) they are the liars. **He who disbelieves in Allah after his having believed, not he who is compelled while his heart is at rest on account of faith, but he who opens (his) breast to disbelief - on these is the wrath of Allah, and they shall have a grievous chastisement.** This is because they love this world's life more than the hereafter, and because Allah does not guide the unbelieving people. These are they on whose hearts and their hearing and their eyes Allah has set a seal, and these are the heedless ones. No doubt that in the hereafter they will be the losers. (Quran 16:104-109)

As Gabriel used the word “compelled” in this passage, we must presume that its first use is for the Muslim – especially during Mohammed's time – facing either outright persecution or the spectre of it. But again, persecution is a relative concept, and with this particular set of infrarational verses there can exist further justification, beyond frank oppression, to lie about one's belief to the unsuspecting kuffar. For unlike the verse describing the ‘Muslim’ who hid his faith from a Pharaoh inclined to kill him because of the latter's *own* egoistic impulse, a modern Muslim may find it necessary to mask all or some of his beliefs to prevent a *defensive* action from the Infidel, a response to Islam's ambition to subjugate. In this manner, a Muslim might feel “compelled” to voice a belief that all Gods are real while remaining internally at “rest” in his faith that only Allah is real and *akbar* or greater than the nonexistent kuffar gods. By expressing such an un-Islamic belief while simultaneously *not* believing it, the Muslim can promote a dangerous overconfidence in the non-Muslim, who might become ill-prepared to handle Islam's actual intentions.

Thus what in certain historic – and the rare modern - circumstances was a question of acute survival, is in normal environments – for there have only been a few ideologies as Asuric as Islam that would genuinely persecute Muslims without the latter's provocation – an excellent strategy providing Muslims living in Dar-ul-Harb a climate from which they can build up their strength, and especially their sheer numbers - even if they are *themselves* initially unaware (the Imams, to the contrary, are fully aware) of what Islam actually wants them to do to the kuffar. The latter situations abound, and it is only in extraordinary instances that Muslims are currently forced to *completely* deny their faith; nowadays they are merely compelled to deny the antagonism and violence towards unbelievers that is central to Islam, pretending that the Asura's religion is only concerned with harmony between all of mankind. While a

partial denial may technically represent apostasy, Muslims can defend themselves against this most serious of allegations by pointing to their hearts being “at rest” during this particular type of taqiya, which can also be described by the term *tawriya* – to create a false impression, by calculated design.

And if the need to obfuscate in non-persecutory climates currently represents the primary application of Islamic dissimulation, even during the time of the Prophet, the practice of the different components of taqiya, or at very least the *tawriya* of *feigned* divergence from scriptural injunctions – itself allowed by the same infrarational ‘Word’ of Allah -, was present in situations where persecution remained far from the reality. The most infamous example of this, one cited by numerous Islamic leaders – after Mohammed's death - when justifying seemingly unfavourable agreements between Muslims and non-Muslims, was the Treaty of Hudaibiya, signed by Allah's Apostle with the Quraish Polytheists amidst his critical war with them. At the time of the treaty Mohammed was en route to Mecca for the *umra*, a yearly Arab custom of pilgrimage to Mecca. By then the Arab Polytheists understood that Islam's jihad sought to eliminate them rather than just take spoils, and they went to warn him of their intent to fight. Gabriel however, knew the time was not conducive for war, and instructed his instrument to seek a truce with the hated infidels:

The Prophet then rebuked the she-camel and she got up. The Prophet changed his way till he dismounted at the farthest end of Al-Hudaibiya at a pit (i.e. well) containing a little water which the people used in small amounts, and in a short while the people used up all its water and complained to Allah's Apostle of thirst. The Prophet took an arrow out of his arrow-case and ordered them to put the arrow in that pit. By Allah, the water started and continued sprouting out till all the people quenched their thirst and returned with satisfaction. While they were still in that state, Budail bin Warqa-al-Khuzai came with some persons from his tribe Khuza'a and they were the advisers of Allah's Apostle who would keep no secret from him and were from the people of Tihama. **Budail said, “I left Kab bin Luai and Amir bin Luai residing at the profuse water of Al-Hudaibiya and they had milch camels (or their women and children) with them, and will wage war against you, and will prevent you from visiting the Kaba.” Allah's Apostle said, “We have not come to fight anyone, but to perform the Umra. No doubt, the war has weakened Quraish and they have suffered great losses, so if they wish, I will conclude a truce with them, during which they should refrain from interfering between me and the people (i.e. the Arab infidels other than Quraish), and if I have victory over those infidels, Quraish will have the option to embrace Islam as the other people do, if they wish; they will at least get strong enough to fight. But if they do not accept the truce, by Allah in Whose Hands my life is, I will fight with them defending my Cause till I get killed, but (I am sure) Allah will definitely make His Cause victorious.”** Budail said, “I will inform them of what you have said.” So, he set off till he reached Quraish and said, “We have come from that man (i.e. Mohammed) whom we heard saying something which we will disclose to you if you should like.” Some of the fools among Quraish shouted that they were not in need of this information, but the wiser among them said, “Relate what you heard him saying.” Budail said, “I heard him saying so-and-so,” relating what the Prophet had told him. (Sahih Bukhari Volume 3, Book 50, Number 891)

In the same hadith (displayed below) we learn that the treaty terms were unfavourable, indeed humiliating, to the Muslim army, as the Polytheists refused to acknowledge Allah's infrarationally revealed declaration that Mohammed was His Apostle, and only allowed him to perform the *umra* in the subsequent year. The fact of Gabriel allowing such a perceived insult to be meted out shows that, irrespective of Mohammed's posturing – seen above in his seemingly benevolent gesture to let the Quraish regroup -, his own army's strength was not *yet* enough to both defeat the Quraish and consolidate any gains emerging from the victory:

When Suhail bin Amr came, the Prophet said, "Now the matter has become easy." Suhail said to the Prophet, "Please conclude a peace treaty with us." So, the Prophet called the clerk and said to him, "Write: By the Name of Allah, the most Beneficent, the most Merciful." Suhail said, "As for 'Beneficent,' by Allah, I do not know what it means. So write: By Your Name O Allah, as you used to write previously." The Muslims said, "By Allah, we will not write except: By the Name of Allah, the most Beneficent, the most Merciful." The Prophet said, "Write: By Your Name O Allah." Then he dictated, "This is the peace treaty which Muhammad, Allah's Apostle has concluded." **Suhail said, "By Allah, if we knew that you are Allah's Apostle we would not prevent you from visiting the Kaba, and would not fight with you. So, write: 'Muhammad bin Abdullah.'**" The Prophet said, **"By Allah! I am Apostle of Allah even if you people do not believe me. Write: Muhammad bin Abdullah."** (Az-Zuhri said, **"The Prophet accepted all those things, as he had already said that he would accept everything they would demand if it respects the ordinance of Allah, (i.e. by letting him and his companions perform Umra.)"**) The Prophet said to Suhail, "On the condition that you allow us to visit the House (i.e. Ka'ba) so that we may perform Tawaf around it." Suhail said, "By Allah, we will not (allow you this year) so as not to give chance to the Arabs to say that we have yielded to you, but we will allow you next year." So, the Prophet got that written. (Sahih Bukhari Volume 3, Book 50, Number 891)

Later, Gabriel would infrarationally reveal that Suhail's refusal to accept Mohammed as Allah's Apostle was enough justification for the death of the former *and* his followers. But before that communication was sent to him, Mohammed, having already *superficially* disavowed a central Islamic tenet, also acquiesced – as the same hadith documents - to his companions being tortured (with one of the real examples of persecution faced by the early Muslims documented), all in order to uphold the terms of the treaty, confident as he was that Allah was directing him in the correct fashion, aware that this 'humility' was necessary for strategic purposes, for the ambition of Islam:

Then Suhail said, "We also stipulate that you should return to us whoever comes to you from us, even if he embraced your religion." The Muslims said, "Glorified be Allah! How will such a person be returned to the pagans after he has become a Muslim?" While they were in this state Abu-Jandal bin Suhail bin Amr came from the valley of Mecca staggering with his fetters and fell down amongst the Muslims. Suhail said, "O Mohammed! This is the very first term with which we make peace with you, i.e. you shall return Abu Jandal to me." The Prophet said, "The peace treaty has not been written yet." Suhail said, "I will never allow you to keep him." The Prophet said, "Yes, do." He said, "I won't do." Mikraz said, "We allow you (to keep him)." Abu Jandal said, "O Muslims! Will I be returned to the pagans though I have come as a Muslim? Don't you see how much I have suffered?"

Abu Jandal had been tortured severely for the Cause of Allah. Umar bin Al-Khattab said, "I went to the Prophet and said, 'Aren't you truly the Apostle of Allah?' The Prophet said, 'Yes, indeed.' I said, 'Isn't our Cause just and the cause of the enemy unjust?' He said, 'Yes.' I said, 'Then why should we be humble in our religion?' He said, 'I am Allah's Apostle and I do not disobey Him, and He will make me victorious.' I said, 'Didn't you tell us that we would go to the Kaba and perform Tawaf around it?' He said, 'Yes, but did I tell you that we would visit the Kaba this year?' I said, 'No.' He said, 'So you will visit it and perform Tawaf around it?' " Umar further said, "I went to Abu Bakr and said, 'O Abu Bakr! Isn't he truly Allah's Prophet?' He replied, 'Yes.' I said, 'Then why should we be humble in our religion?' He said, 'Indeed, he is Allah's Apostle and he does not disobey his Lord, and He will make him victorious. Adhere to him as, by Allah, he is on the right.' I said, 'Was he not telling us that we would go to the Kaba and perform Tawaf around it?' He said, 'Yes, but did he tell you that you

would go to the Kaba this year?' I said, 'No.' He said, 'You will go to Kaba and perform Tawaf around it.' ” (Az-Zuhri said, “Umar said, ‘I performed many good deeds as expiation for the improper questions I asked them.’ ”) (Sahih Bukhari Volume 3, Book 50, Number 891)

The same hadith additionally relates Mohammed proactively *returning* his Muslim companions to the Polytheists for the sake of the treaty and providing Islam with tactical respite from warfare:

When the writing of the peace treaty was concluded, Allah's Apostle said to his companions, “Get up and slaughter your sacrifices and get your head shaved.”...Umar then divorced two wives of his who were infidels. Later on Muawiya bin Abu Sufyan married one of them, and Safwan bin Umayya married the other. **When the Prophet returned to Medina, Abu Basir, a new Muslim convert from Quraish came to him. The Infidels sent in his pursuit two men who said (to the Prophet), “Abide by the promise you gave us.” So, the Prophet handed him over to them.** They took him out (of the City) till they reached Dhul-Hulaifa where they dismounted to eat some dates they had with them. Abu Basir said to one of them, “By Allah, O so-and-so, I see you have a fine sword.” The other drew it out (of the scabbard) and said, “By Allah, it is very fine and I have tried it many times.” Abu Basir said, “Let me have a look at it.”

When the other gave it to him, he hit him with it till he died, and his companion ran away till he came to Medina and entered the Mosque running. When Allah's Apostle saw him he said, “This man appears to have been frightened.” **When he reached the Prophet he said, “My companion has been murdered and I would have been murdered too.” Abu Basir came and said, “O Allah's Apostle, by Allah, Allah has made you fulfil your obligations by your returning me to them (i.e. the Infidels), but Allah has saved me from them.” The Prophet said, “Woe to his mother! what excellent war kindler he would be, should he only have supporters.” When Abu Basir heard that he understood that the Prophet would return him to them again, so he set off till he reached the seashore.** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 3, Book 50, Number 891)

Faced with such terms, Mohammed's followers were naturally hesitant to fall in line, with even the non-life threatening aspects of the treaty meeting resistance, as recorded in a different hadith:

Narrated Al-Bara bin Azib:

When Allah's Apostle concluded a peace treaty with the people of Hudaibiya, Ali bin Abu Talib wrote the document and he mentioned in it, “Muhammad, Allah's Apostle.” The pagans said, “Don't write: ‘Muhammad, Allah's Apostle’, for if you were an apostle we would not fight with you.” **Allah's Apostle asked Ali to rub it out, but Ali said, “I will not be the person to rub it out.”** Allah's Apostle rubbed it out and made peace with them on the condition that the Prophet and his companions would enter Mecca and stay there for three days, and that they would enter with their weapons in cases. (Sahih Bukhari Volume 3, Book 49, Number 862)

Of course, the most divisive aspect involved Mohammed's concession of physically returning Muslims to the Polytheists, a treaty term that an additional hadith records as decidedly abhorrent to his followers:

Narrated Marwan and al-Miswar bin Makhrama:

(from the companions of Allah's Apostle) When Suhail bin Amr agreed to the Treaty (of Hudaibiya), one of the things he stipulated then, was that the Prophet should return to them (i.e. the pagans) anyone coming to him from their side, even if he was a Muslim; and would not interfere between them and that person. **The Muslims did not like this condition and got disgusted with it.** Suhail did not agree except with that condition. So, the Prophet agreed to that condition and returned Abu Jandal to his father Suhail bin Amr. **Thenceforward the Prophet**

returned everyone in that period (of truce) even if he was a Muslim. (Sahih Bukhari Volume 3, Book 50, Number 874)

Though faced with his companion's clear loathing of the treaty, one containing terms easily justifying a revolt within his ranks, Mohammed was secure in his decision, slave as he was to the Asura of Falsehood, confident that his actions were the work of Allah. After all, there was no reason for him to listen to mere mortals when 'God', by way of Gabriel's occult voice, had explicitly communicated the Treaty of Hudaibiya to be a victory for Muslims:

Surely We have given to you a clear victory, That Allah may forgive your community their past faults and those to follow and complete His favour to you and keep you on a right way, And that Allah might help you with a mighty help. He it is Who sent down tranquillity into the hearts of the believers that they might have more of faith added to their faith - and Allah's are the hosts of the heavens and the earth, and Allah is Knowing, Wise - That He may cause the believing men and the believing women to enter gardens beneath which rivers flow to abide therein and remove from them their evil; and that is a grand achievement with Allah. And (that) He may punish the hypocritical men and the hypocritical women, and the polytheistic men and the polytheistic women, the entertainers of evil thoughts about Allah. On them is the evil turn, and Allah is wroth with them and has cursed them and prepared hell for them, and evil is the resort. (Quran 48:01-06)

The Hadith confirm this verse as communicated in relation to the agreement, with one declaring, “**‘Verily, We have given you (O Mohammed) a manifest victory’ refers to Al-Hudaibiya Peace treaty.**” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 6, Book 60, Number 358) It was Mohammed's direct, occult communication with Gabriel, the Asura of Falsehood claiming to be a conduit for Mohammed's particular deity, that provided his unshakeable belief and ability to accept the inevitable torture of his friends. Thus, when confronted by his companions about the agreement, he was completely secure in his response – irrational though it was – that Allah would not fail him. Indeed as the following hadith shows, the explanation he presented to an arguing Umar included a recital of the Victory revelation – the infrarational word superseding all other arguments, just as it did for Hitler in a different era:

Narrated Abu Wail:

We were in Siffin and Sahl bin Hunaif got up and said, “O people! Blame yourselves! We were with the Prophet on the day of Hudaibiya, and if we had been called to fight, we would have fought.” But Umar bin Al Khatab came and said, “O Allah's Apostle! Aren't we in the right and our opponents in the wrongs?” Allah's Apostle said, “Yes.” Umar said, “Aren't our killed persons in Paradise and theirs in Hell?” He said, “Yes.” **Umar said, “Then why should we accept hard terms in matters concerning our religion? Shall we return before Allah judges between us and them?” Allah's Apostle said, “O Ibn Al-Khattab! I am the Apostle of Allah and Allah will never degrade me.”** Then Umar went to Abu Bakr and told him the same as he had told the Prophet.

On that Abu Bakr said (to Umar), “He is the Apostle of Allah and Allah will never degrade him.” Then Surat-al-Fath (i.e. Victory) was revealed and Allah's Apostle recited it to the end in front of Umar. On that Umar asked, “O Allah's Apostle! Was it (i.e. the Hudaibiya Treaty) a victory?” Allah's Apostle said, “Yes.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 53, Number 406)

Though 'Allah' had confirmed the agreement - irrespective of its unfavourable terms - as victorious, Umar could not help but – try as he might to avoid heretic thoughts – at least briefly question the veracity of Allah's infrarational revelation. After all, the Polytheists seemingly humiliated Mohammed and Allah by denying the 'eternal word' of Mohammed's status as Allah's Apostle. Adding injury to

insult, the Treaty of Hudaibiya left Muslims open to capture and potential torture by the Polytheists, something their Prophet passively accepted without recourse. Why then, Umar may have quietly wondered before admonishing himself to refrain from heresy (another hadith already mentioned documents Umar as volitionally undertaking “many good deeds as expiation” for his ‘sinful’ questioning of Mohammed and Allah), would the great Allah declare such an ignominious outcome, a degradation of his believing slaves to a level below that of the heinous kuffar, to be a triumph of the ‘one true religion’ on earth?

The answer, naturally, lies in the relative weakness of the early Muslims when compared to their Polytheist counterparts. As his slaves were fewer in numbers, Gabriel knew he had to conserve their strength, and thus he needed to make sure they avoided unnecessary battles – and potential deaths – against an enemy which *at the time* had superior capabilities. Though he knew that his psychological hold on Mohammed, and especially his claim of transmission of the ‘Word’ of Allah, was enough to motivate the instrument to fight an enemy of superior numbers (in this case, using the previously mentioned verse foretelling a Muslim victory against an army with a ten-fold or twice the numerical advantage), the Asura of Falsehood was – and is - intelligent enough to know that there are times to fight and times to rest. Nevertheless, in order for him to fully convince Mohammed that retreat was the path to power, an infrarational revelation was needed detailing this apparent humiliation as a “victory”. That the Treaty of Hudaibiya lead to the anguish of many pious ones was irrelevant to the Asura, for he is callously indifferent to the fate of men, even those steadfastly worshipping his falsehood.

Irrespective of the Asura's harshness, because the core of Mohammed's army was to remain with him, there was still plenty of military force available – and strengthened by the truce – for Gabriel to use when he deemed it ready to attack the kuffar, preferably when they were least expecting a battle. Therein lies the function of taqiyah – in this infamous example manifesting as a specific treaty: It is merely a strategic arrangement, not in the least representing a profound transformation of the religion's objectives or doctrine. Treaties declaring “peace”, or other lies made to gain the trust of non-Muslims, are a means to an end, softening them and leaving them unaware of, and thus unprepared for, an upcoming attack potentially to yield considerable gains for the Muslims. In the case of the Treaty of Hudaibiya, a precedent for Islamic warfare was set, with the hadith recording Ali, who at the time faced an insurrection from the hypocrites, basing his actions upon that Treaty as presented in the “light of the Quran.” Though his followers were unhappy he opted for a truce with his opponents, Ali was secure in the example of Hudaibiya, and Allah's ‘Word’ of it representing a “victory”, over the passions of his followers:

Narrated Habib bin Abi Thabit:

I went to Abu Wail to ask him (about those who had rebelled against Ali). On that Abu Wail said, “We were at Siffin (a city on the bank of the Euphrates, the place where the battle took place between Ali and Muawiyah). A man said, ‘Will you be on the side of those who are called to consult Allah's Book (to settle the dispute)?’ Ali said, ‘Yes (I agree that we should settle the matter in the light of the Qur’an).’ **Some people objected to Ali's agreement and wanted to fight.** On that Sahl bin Hunaif said, ‘Blame yourselves! I remember how, on the day of Al-Hudaibiya (i.e. the peace treaty between the Prophet and the Quraish pagans), if we had been allowed to choose fighting, we would have fought (the pagans). At that time Umar came (to the Prophet) and said, ‘Aren't we on the right (path) and they (pagans) in the wrong? Won't our killed persons go to Paradise, and theirs in the Fire?’ The Prophet replied, ‘Yes.’ Umar further said, ‘Then why should we let our religion be degraded and return before Allah has settled the matter between us?’ The Prophet said, ‘O the son of Al-Khattab! No doubt, I am Allah's Apostle and Allah will never neglect me.’ So Umar left the place angrily and he was so impatient that he went to Abu Bakr and said, ‘O Abu Bakr! Aren't we on the right (path) and they (pagans) on the

wrong?’ Abu Bakr said, ‘O the son of Al-Khattab! He is Allah's Apostle, and Allah will never neglect him.’ Then Sura Al-Fath (The Victory) was revealed.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 6, Book 60, Number 367)

The hypocrites – for those rebelling against the genuinely Muslim leader can only be considered as such – were still to be ravaged, though Ali initially decided to offer a transient ‘peace’ between hostilities. Similarly, Polytheists are to be destroyed even if there exist certain time periods of tranquillity between the faithful and the infidel: the coexistence or harmony engendered during such intervals are only external displays, a calculated deceit that – per Mohammed – forms the basis of war:

Narrated Abu Huraira:

The Prophet said, “Khosrau will be ruined, and there will be no Khosrau after him, and Caesar will surely be ruined and there will be no Caesar after him, and you will spend their treasures in Allah's Cause.” **He called, “War is deceit.”** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 52, Number 267)

Such artifice was prominent in his battlefield dealings, and included more than simply the signing of agreements he had no intention of unceasingly upholding. It extended to concealing the movements of his army, a practice that while common – and reasonable, to be fair – in the recent history of warfare, was often not the case in past ages, when armies usually met each other directly on the battlefield, without subterfuge, having announced their intentions beforehand. Mohammed preferred the element of surprise, hiding his plans from Polytheist enemies:

Narrated Ka’b bin Malik:

Whenever Allah's Apostle intended to carry out a Ghazwa, he would use an equivocation to conceal his real destination till it was the Ghazwa of Tabuk which Allah's Apostle carried out in very hot weather. As he was going to face a very long journey through a wasteland and was to meet and attack a large number of enemies. So, he made the situation clear to the Muslims so that they might prepare themselves accordingly and get ready to conquer their enemy. The Prophet informed them of the destination he was heading for (Ka’b bin Malik used to say, “Scarcely did Allah's Apostle set out for a journey on a day other than Thursday.”) (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 52, Number 198)

While deception is common in battle and has its place, this Islamic mentality exists well beyond the clash of swords and rattle of gunfire. Islam's vision of war, as we remember, is not one between two formal armies – it is between the solitary nations of Islam and Infidel, and the Islamic war against the latter continues until the kuffar are either killed, converted or subjugated. There is, after all, no such thing as a civilian among the non-Muslims – we recall Mohammed as saying that even Polytheist women and children are “of them”. As Islam is technically *always* at war with the unbelievers, as their mere disbelief identifies them as a *military* opponent, as the actual Muslim cannot be satisfied until the entire globe bows before Allah, it means that any lying toward unbelievers, and all dissimulating for the sake of the Asura's creed, become part of Islamic *piety*. Because of Islam's ambition, the use of taqiyyah both then and now is rarely for the protection against persecution; indeed, the greatest example of its practice – Hudaibiya – actually *increased* the persecution of Muslims during the Apostle's own lifetime!

Such an outcome should not come as a surprise, because the Asura is more than willing to let expendable humans be tortured if it means an increased likelihood of his creed conquering the earth, enslaving mankind to the falsehood that God must be feared and all must think the same. The fulfilment of this global objective far exceeds the considerations of ordinary Muslims, who should be happy to complete their obligated jihad (even if it involves their capture and torture), because the whole point of the religion, from the individual perspective, is to attain to a Paradise beyond the earthly

existence, with jihad offering the quickest path. But as the Lord of Falsehood has expansionary aims, taqiyah is paramount and should proceed irrespective of individual outcomes, as long as it assists with the strategic outlook. Thus, if dissimulation leads to persecution like it did during the Treaty of Hudaibiya, as long as it serves Islam, Muslims should be glad to suffer. Of course, even after writing that, it still remains rare in our current age for Muslims to experience true, *unprovoked*, genuine persecution (rather than slights or insults) from the unbelievers.

Because of the infrequency of unprovoked ‘persecution’, taqiyah in our times thus primarily functions to hide scriptural *aspects* of Islam from the unbeliever; the modern Muslim does not need to deny his faith, unlike the one example put forth in the Quran relating the time of the Pharaoh. Rather, his course is to obfuscate the tenets of his faith that are unpalatable to the Infidel's formulation of religion. Before we proceed to the numerous methods by which the pious ones dissimulate in this fashion, we must examine again a theme of the Quran indirectly related to taqiyah – that of Allah directly causing the unbelievers to be deaf and dumb to the infrarational word. It is this, along with the understanding that dissimulation is necessary for Islam to eventually reign supreme, that strengthens a Muslim's resolve to lie about his faith. For though verses like the following were infrarationally revealed by the Asura of Falsehood primarily to instill confidence in Mohammed that Islam is the sole ‘truth’, they easily allow for taqiyah by making the Muslims believe the kuffar incapable of recognizing the confabulations of the pious:

And when you recite the Quran, We place between you and those who do not believe in the hereafter a hidden barrier. And We have placed coverings on their hearts and a heaviness in their ears lest they understand it, and when you mention your Lord alone in the Quran they turn their backs in aversion. We know best what they listen to when they listen to you, and when they take counsel secretly, when the unjust say: “You follow only a man deprived of reason.” See what they liken you to! So they have gone astray and cannot find the way. (Quran 17:45-48)

If the infidels are unable to understand the recited Quran verses, they will not only be destined for disbelief and the hellfire, but will also remain ignorant of Islam's nefarious designs – explicitly outlined in Allah's communications - toward them. After all, these are the same infrarational revelations that justify the killing of non-Muslims because of their thought and belief ‘crimes’; schemes against them; denigrates their beliefs; condones their subjugation, rape and taxation; and declares their religion to suffer an eventual conquest. As the infidel apparently cannot fathom the Quran, the Muslim proceeds – assuming it is strategically appropriate - to misinform in a carefree fashion, believing that the enemy does not know any better, because the latter's eyes are blind, his ears are deaf, and his heart is sealed. The pious ones – sanguine in their belief that Allah is protecting them and clouding the awareness of the kuffar – are often brazen in their obfuscations and lies, scarcely concerned that Islam's multiple enemies will discern their machinations, see through the prevarications to the ugly reality of the Asuric faith.

But the outrageous tales that one might expect from a stratagem like taqiyah, underhanded as the technique is, are in fact used infrequently, with the modern methods of taqiyah often originating as a response to the psychological needs of the unbelievers who form the majority group in non-Islamic nations. To understand the current life aspirations of the non-Muslims, we must realize that the majority of the unbelieving world is only a couple of generations removed from both colonialism and wide ranging war; and with Nazism, the cause of the last cataclysm, essentially destroyed, there is no current non-Islamic creed or ideology on the planet with the same toxic mixture of hatred, single-mindedness, intolerance, fanaticism and violence. In contrast to the undiluted Islam that exists in the Quran verses and authentic hadith, the global culture – not mired in world war or the impulse for it - is currently more concerned with the multifaceted growth of the individual, even if the material development is often predominant to this course. The economic and ordinary growth of man, however, is a normal and

necessary part of his life, and is especially important in societies and nations emerging from the suppression of organic economic activity during heinous colonial subjugation.

This material drive – and its balanced practice - is best understood through the Sanatana Dharma's concept of four *purusarthas*, or life purposes, available to mortals. Of the four domains, *dharma* (the inherent and fluid inner law) and *moksha* (liberation from the ego consciousness into the Divine Consciousness) represent the internal and higher spheres of existence the majority of mankind – especially in the case of *moksha* – remain ignorant of. The other two are far more basic, with *kama* accounting for mankind's aesthetic (on a scale of refinement from brute to the ordinary to the sublime) predilections, *artha* the individual's quest for material and financial gains. As these facets are common and understood by all, they are far more easily taken up by the group than dharma and especially moksha (something extremely unlikely to happen as a collective realization). While a national dharma, as opposed to a national moksha, is at least feasible, has happened before, and might well happen again, nations, like individuals, must nevertheless first go through times where kama or artha hold sway.

Unlike this fluid conception, Islam, a religion with fixed restrictions on every component of humanity's existence, inevitably confronts the human tendency for aesthetic exploration and material gains. It is the former, of course, that clashes most with an ideology fashioned for perpetual warfare – military doctrines demanding complete obedience are naturally opposed to the multi-faceted, free flowing expression and enjoyment of beauty in life. And as aestheticism often leads to decadence (whether perceived or real) and 'immorality' (morals are frequently usurped and exaggerated by the Asura of Falsehood to incite mankind to self-righteous violence), a rigid and Asuric cult like Islam will often, when living as minorities in aesthetically-inclined cultures, find justification for separation, hatred and violence towards the 'sinful' majority. It is a rationalization irresistible to the genuine Muslim fully indoctrinated in the Islamic scripture, especially when that same scripture records their Prophet as declaring music, prevalent throughout all cultures (including self-professed Islamic nations), as worthy of Allah's wrath:

Narrated Abu Amir or Abu Malik Al-Ashari:

That he heard the Prophet saying, "From among my followers there will be some people who will consider illegal sexual intercourse, the wearing of silk, the drinking of alcoholic drinks **and the use of musical instruments, as lawful**. And there will be some people who will stay near the side of a mountain and in the evening their shepherd will come to them with their sheep and ask them for something, but they will say to him, 'Return to us tomorrow.' Allah will destroy them during the night and will let the mountain fall on them, and He will transform the rest of them into monkeys and pigs and they will remain so till the Day of Resurrection." (Sahih Bukhari Volume 7, Book 69, Number 494)

While there do not exist categorical infrarational revelations regarding music or non-religious art (the Asura of Falsehood, as we will discuss, had plenty to say about that which he deemed "idols"), because Allah has made Mohammed the "exemplar" for mankind, the believer must, if he wants to be assured of Paradise, heed the Prophet's practice and declarations. A good Muslim must therefore abstain from using musical instruments, painting, or owning pictures:

Narrated Aisha:

The Prophet entered upon me while there was a curtain having pictures (of animals) in the house. His face got red with anger, and then he got hold of the curtain and tore it into pieces. **The Prophet said, "Such people as paint these pictures will receive the severest punishment on the Day of Resurrection."** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 8, Book 73, Number 130)

In another hadith displaying the Apostle of Allah's ignorance of the Soul's true nature, he declares that those making pictures will, on Judgement day, be asked to put a "Soul" into that picture.

Narrated Ibn Abbas:

The Prophet said, "Whoever claims to have seen a dream which he did not see, will be ordered to make a knot between two barley grains which he will not be able to do; and if somebody listens to the talk of some people who do not like him (to listen) or they run away from him, then molten lead will be poured into his ears on the Day of Resurrection; and whoever makes a picture, will be punished on the Day of Resurrection and will be ordered to put a soul in that picture, which he will not be able to do." (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 87, Number 165)

Unbeknownst to the Prophet, the supposed final messenger of God, the Soul – if we take the Soul as Mahapurusha or Brahma – exists within *everything* in the manifestation, even if it is latent in the elements constituting a picture, while active in mortals. Thus Brahma is technically – though non-*dynamic* - within a picture, or even cruder objects like jewellery and the aforementioned silk that Mohammed forbade his followers:

Narrated Al-Bara:

The Prophet ordered us to do seven (things) and forbade us from seven (other things): He ordered us to pay a visit to the sick, to follow funeral possessions, to say: May Allah be merciful to you to a sneezer, - if he says: Praise be to Allah, to accept invitation (invitation to a wedding banquet), to return greetings, to help the oppressed, and to help others to fulfil their oaths (provided it was not sinful). **And he forbade us from seven (things): to wear golden rings or golden bangles, to wear silk (cloth), Dibaj, Sundus and Mayathir.** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 8, Book 73, Number 241)

If in this latter dictate we can hypothesize that part of the Prophet's intention was for believers to enjoy similar items in heaven, he has nevertheless made them indisputably unlawful in earth – thus according to Islam, these items are unworthy of a Muslim's attention. But the principle behind avoidance of silk and gold is based on a misunderstanding of the function of such physical objects. Islam's underlying premise is that these objects represent decadence and squalor, supposed infidel qualities and hence un-Islamic. Yet even if we accept their rudimentary conception that silk and gold are signs of decadence, they remain *objects*, not the comprehensive truth of things. In other words, it is the attachment placed upon the material objects that is paramount, not the inert substance. In that sense, the Islamic reaction to perceived decadence involving the two objects is just as bad as their superficial use, or the excessive importance placed upon them, by mortals who are merely practising a basic *avidya* that can still intellectually appreciate the potential for the higher psychological states including the Supreme Consciousness.

The Islamic exile of music and painting from life meanwhile, represents a worse crime than the restriction of ornaments to Paradise, as not only does this 'law' deny humanity a basic enjoyment – cruel enough in itself -, the Asura in his pretence of divine jurisprudence has blocked a path for God to manifest himself. For though music and painting, or different art-forms, may at times genuinely be decadent or perceived as such by barbarians, they nevertheless are frequently a means for the expression of the inner vital or the vital component of the Psychic (as opposed to the vital desires confused for the Soul by many), the pranamayapurusha. Music and painting produced by individuals of a refined and subtle aesthete is both an expression of the Divine in earth and a means for the continued evolution of Prakriti towards the destined Multiplicity. The two should not be rejected simply because their degraded forms are usually the initial signs of a decadent culture – this is not a problem of painting or music, but the psychology of the individuals within the culture. The banishment of the two blocks beauty and joy within life, and is another example of Islam's adharmic nature, for many are born

with an inner law inclined to such activities, and to force them to conform to a certain way of living can only hamper the growth of the Psychic while at once psychologically oppressing.

It is often the interpreted decadence of a non-Muslim civilizations expression of beauty that, because it presents quickly to the senses of the Muslim (rather than a measured conclusion following a thorough examination of the 'other' and their culture), provides an impetus for a believer to study his own religion, hoping to find something greater. But not everything called religion leads to a superior way of living, and if Islam is taken as a response to cultures currently preoccupied with *kama* and *artha*, the result is a fall rather than any longed-for spiritual rising, because Gabriel's creed unleashes the hostile lower vital forces that Nation-Souls are trying to work through and transform. It is in fact quite reasonable to expect broad-minded cultures to allow a certain amount of experimentation and transition through the material aims in life, because this phase can help form a psychological basis for a national dharma, or at least something approximating it: These are the kuffar lands where acceptance of different beliefs *and paths* are allowed, the nations thought 'immoral' by the self-righteous Muslims.

But the conquest by an Islamic religion that aggrandizes crude vital forces will in actuality only lead to something worse than decadence, as senescent cultures – or those with decaying elements – still contain within them seeds of higher ideals and aspirations and truths that can be used by future generations for the nation's rebirth. Islam, on the other hand, with its pretence of a final and definitive 'Word', does not allow for the natural cycle of nations and civilization of which decadence may precede a *greater* revitalization, where the decay might actually be beneficial to create something superior, because Islam keeps nations rooted to infrarationalism. Whatever is present in the Quran and authentic hadith is ultimate, and as this crystallization of the Asura of Falsehood's inverted 'truth' does not ask for the transformation of the individual except to have them conform to rigid beliefs and thoughts, Islam remains worse than decadence, because it *permanently* entrenches the depraved lower vital forces that were likely partially present prior to an Asuric turn of the culture – the smaller emanations of infrarationality preceding the entrance of the darkest Shadow.

While the advent of Islam in moribund lands certainly results in disastrous consequences for those aspiring to refined culture, however much the believers insist that attempts to convert kuffar cultures represents an appropriate response to supposed lasciviousness, it remains a superficial excuse, as the drive to convert is inevitable when Muslims are indoctrinated with scripture declaring world conquest as truth - with violence, conversion and subjugation condoned in the process. The practice of taqiyah is inherent to the shallow motive – that of Islam representing a superior faith to alleged infidel decadence – put forth for conversion of unbelievers, a mission that ironically requires the use of rational arguments highlighting supposed weaknesses of the 'other', whereas Islam is an infrarationally revealed religion in which one obeys the dictates of an already 'perfected' doctrine - the same principle of logic used *against* non-Muslims is deemed unnecessary to support Islam's supremacy! Similarly, the mere fact that someone does not exclusively believe in Allah or practice Islamic tenets to the letter, are – infrarationally - alone enough to justify his conversion, subjugation or death: It is, after all, Allah's 'Word' that demands this.

Nevertheless, the more intellectually inclined Imam or Muslim, when in foreign lands or bearing the burden of peacefully engaging the kuffar as a religious minority, understands the necessity of shaping his interactions to the non-Muslim's culture and expectations of religious teaching, along with daily habits – a component of taqiyah known as *muruna*, the superficial assimilation whereby certain aspects of Islamic law are temporarily discarded. The leaders instruct their flock (who are often unconscious that it is by calculated design) in this fashion because they understand the need to *reflect* a version of Islam onto their unbelieving counterparts that conform to the latter's narrative of existence and religion. This is the best way for taqiyah to proceed, a fluid method taking into account the robustness of the

Infidel response and the current strength of the pious; some circumstances allow for an aggression truer to Islam, others require a tactical peace and sweet-sounding lies. Though this type of taqiya is best seen in the intellectually advanced or scripturally aware followers of Islam, it is also present in ordinary Muslims with little Islamic instruction, especially if they are a small minority – survival is best accomplished when one is most able to blend into the majority culture. It is easier for these latter Muslims, who openly identify with Islam, to appear assimilated if they remain *unaware* of what their religion actually teaches – dissimulation is most effective when practised unconsciously, as it is much easier to tell a lie when one believes it to be true.

When analysing, on the other hand, the application of taqiya by Muslim intellectuals and Imams in particular, it becomes far less likely to conclude that any aspect of their strategy is unconscious, especially in the latter of the two. As they are more inventive than the Muslim of the street, they often utilize certain infrarational revelations to shape a vision of Islam appealing to the traditional values of the unaware non-Muslim; and by using the Quran to promote kuffar ideals, Muslims are likelier to convince sceptical unbelievers that Islam is free of menacing intentions towards them. One way of doing this is by promoting the fallacy that Islam is open-minded toward other religions – a tolerance, we recall, that is better than rigid exclusivity yet inferior to a genuine acceptance of multiple paths or strivings to a God that can be called by infinite names, or even doubt or disbelief in the very existence of a supreme deity. The dissimulators ignore the unrelenting intolerance and hatred within their scripture, basing their lie of Islamic magnanimity on an extreme minority of Quran verses, including the following:

Say: “O unbelievers! I worship not that which ye worship; Nor worship ye that which I worship. And I shall not worship that which ye worship. Nor will ye worship that which I worship. **Unto you your religion, and unto me my religion.**” (Quran 109:01-06)

To begin, this is decidedly not a message of acceptance, and actually confirms the division of mankind fundamental to Islamic ideology, with Infidels and Muslims existing on different sides of an impenetrable wall. It is in reality a hostile communication even if it does not advocate violence, because it creates the ‘other’ and seeks to dissolve links between both parties. Though we know Gabriel's motive for this infrarational revelation was to prevent Mohammed from going to war against the unbelievers while militarily weak, it is currently used to hide the truth of Islam's desire to subjugate the non-Muslim. The pious ones will use the verse to claim that Islam is tolerant of all faiths and that any crimes against unbelievers committed in its name go against the ethos of the religion. Of course, the ‘tolerance’ presented in the previous passage is not the same as that practised by most countries, especially India where different Gods and Goddesses are worshipped as the same Brahma, where religion is comprehensively inclusive of myriad ideas and beliefs. In different nations as well, the current formulation of tolerance is far closer to a universal acceptance than a tenet of complete separation the above verses promote – the majority of modern non-Muslim nations allow for different faiths and even have multiple centres of varied worship.

It is thus an utter lie to propose the previous surah as equal even to the religious freedom afforded by nations whose citizens practice fraternal Abrahamic faiths, let alone the Vedic truth of multiple paths to Vishnu. While the communication itself plainly contrasts the principles of the Sanatana Dharma, the derived dissimulation also goes against the majority of Quran verses, infrarationally revealed as it was during a time when Mohammed lacked the capacity to destroy enemy religions as he was later commanded to do. However, because this apparent contradiction exists, and is only rectified by understanding the timeline or stages of progressive Muslim military power, a believer voicing the lie of Islamic tolerance can at least feel secure enough that he is using the scripture in a relatively appropriate manner. For the ‘educated’ – in the Quran and Hadith – this involves temporarily ignoring the hundreds of hateful and intolerant verses to read into an implicitly divisive verse the message of harmony and

brotherly love between all faiths! Similarly, when confronting the Infidel charge that Islam allows forceful conversion, the taqiyah artist turns to a different passage that reinforces yet another lie:

O you who believe! spend out of what We have given you before the day comes in which there is no bargaining, neither any friendship nor intercession, and the unbelievers - they are the unjust. Allah is He besides Whom there is no god, the Everliving, the Self-subsisting by Whom all subsist; slumber does not overtake Him nor sleep; whatever is in the heavens and whatever is in the earth is His; who is he that can intercede with Him but by His permission. He knows what is before them and what is behind them, and they cannot comprehend anything out of His knowledge except what He pleases, His knowledge extends over the heavens and the earth, and the preservation of them both tires Him not, and He is the Most High, the Great. **There is no compulsion in religion.** The right direction is henceforth distinct from error. **And he who rejecteth false deities and believeth in Allah hath grasped a firm handhold which will never break.** Allah is Hearer, Knower. Allah is the Protecting Guardian of those who believe. He bringeth them out of darkness into light. **As for those who disbelieve, their patrons are false deities. They bring them out of light into darkness. Such are rightful owners of the Fire. They will abide therein.** (Quran 2:254-7)

While the entire passage is obviously one marked with hatred and intolerance, dismissing as it does the kafir to hell and labelling his Gods as false, it is only the solitary declaration in verse 256, of “no compulsion in religion,” that is mentioned by Muslims applying the passage for dissimulation. The Muslim cleverly ignores the subsequent denigration of non-Muslim beliefs, aware that expressing the whole passage or citing its entirety will at the very least bring into question their claim of tolerance and love. And though this verse specifically rejects compulsion, the knowledgeable Muslim is still, for all practical purposes, lying about forced conversions, because he is certainly aware of later verses and hadith offering bountiful support for coercive methods to obtain conversions. The chronologically ensuing infrarational revelations and hadith are clearly more important, because the ones begrudgingly promoting a bare minimum of inter-faith harmony were – and are – only for strategic purposes; by refusing to acknowledge the former communications in their discussions with unbelievers, the pious are guilty of a tactic known as *kitman* or omission, of *not telling the whole story*, trying to place a shroud over reality by a means subtly different than the outright prevarications expressed in different circumstances. Yet does this particular method, like *muruna* and *tawriya*, fall under the domain of taqiyah, which is simply the lying – in one form or another – about one's Muslim identity, not necessarily regarding one's official status, but more so in the subtleties related to tenets and scripture, since the scripture is fundamentally intertwined with an identification as “Muslim”.

Returning to forced conversions, because non-Muslim cultures view this as a form of violence, the strategically aware believers are quick to deny its scriptural presence, passing off any global examples as the result of “extremist” or “radical” thinking. Similarly, acts of Islamic terrorism, currently a near daily occurrence in multiple locations on the planet, are dissimulated as “extremism” or “freedom fighting”, ignoring clear scriptural justification for its *unprovoked* use. This point is subsequently coupled with the assertion that Islam is a “religion of peace”, or – rare as global knowledge of Islam increases – that Islam itself translates to peace rather than its actual definition of *submission* (to Allah alone). But the former assertion is absolute nonsense, because as we have already seen, Islam exists strictly for war against unbelievers and apostates, and any description of it as peaceful only leads one to recall the Orwellian definition of peace. At best, Islam acquiesces to a strategic break in hostilities allowing it to prepare for a definitive assault on the kuffar; during peacetime however, the Muslim is instructed not to exceed “the limits”, as communicated in the following surah concerning a treaty signed with the unbelievers of Mohammed's time:

O you who believe! Do not violate the signs appointed by Allah nor the sacred month, nor

(interfere with) the offerings, nor the sacrificial animals with garlands, nor those going to the sacred house seeking the grace and pleasure of their Lord. **And when you are free from the obligations of the pilgrimage, then hunt, and let not hatred of a people - because they hindered you from the Sacred Masjid - incite you to exceed the limits**, and help one another in goodness and piety, and do not help one another in sin and aggression; and be careful of (your duty to) Allah. Surely Allah is severe in requiting (evil). (Quran 5:02)

Though these restrictions were placed on the pious in accordance with a treaty signed by Allah's Apostle, modern Muslims can view current limits in a more flexible manner, depending upon the extent of the unbeliever's reaction to their provocations. These limits – whether written in the Quran or understood through daily interaction with non-Muslims – are only for times when Muslims are in a weaker position; it is an armistice rather than a true internal peace (which, we recall, should be the aspiration of religion) based on a *samata* or harmony with those not in accordance with Islamic tenets. The former, on the other hand, is a 'peace' marked by the "hatred of a people" noted in the previous verse - or a suspicion of the unbeliever's motives:

And let not those who disbelieve think that they shall come in first; surely they will not escape. And prepare against them what force you can and horses tied at the frontier, to frighten thereby the enemy of Allah and your enemy and others besides them, whom you do not know (but) Allah knows them. And whatever thing you will spend in Allah's way, it will be paid back to you fully and you shall not be dealt with unjustly. **And if they incline to peace, then incline to it and trust in Allah**; surely He is the Hearing, the Knowing. **And if they intend to deceive you - then surely Allah is sufficient for you**; He it is Who strengthened you with His help and with the believers. (Quran 8:59-62)

The inconsistency here is that the rules of conduct demanded of the hated unbeliever is exactly opposite to the instructions given to the pious; the believer is not at all expected to transcend the psychology alleged to his enemy, leading to a curious mental disconnect in which the non-Muslim is chastised for possibly engaging in the same practices of the 'pure' Muslims. But this is because the Asura does not genuinely care for the higher mental or vital realities of existence, preferring instead to use mankind's natural disapproval of things like dishonesty to his advantage, providing his sheep with the caveat that as long as they believe in Allah alone and base their entire actions, including *taqiya*, upon furthering Islam's ambitions – often, as in the case of captured sexual slaves, coinciding with the believer's savage inclinations -, then they are indeed following a righteous 'divine' path. And as Gabriel comprehends the potential hold of the infrarational over most mortals, he knows that clear intellectual arguments exposing the brazen disjointedness to his communications are easily overcome with simple and repetitive messages evoking primitive emotions such as fear, and thus he did not need to maintain – other than with the principal tenets – a rigorous consistency over the entire breadth of his infrarational revelations to Mohammed, with the obvious exception of using abrogation as the means to account for *scriptural* inconsistency.

Similarly, neither must his most effective modern instrument, the well-versed Imam leading the prayers, maintain a psychologically consistent message, because as they understand the contextual reasons for certain infrarational revelations, they know when to appropriately use them. If, for instance, the Imam's flock does not have the strength in numbers or weaponry to vanquish the kuffar among whom they live, or if the infidels are suspicious of Muslim intentions, the Imam will choose verses or hadith corresponding to what the Prophet experienced under similar circumstances. Thus if Muslims are weak, and the kuffar incline to peace, then so will the pious. But this does not mean they will live as friends or in harmony; rather, hatred and paranoia – and an opportunism looking for moments to strike - will prevail, with the belief that Allah will later grant the faithful enough strength to subjugate or kill their enemy. Yet at the same time, in order to propagate the notion that Islam welcomes 'peace' with

unbelievers, the believer will often - when conversing or debating non-Muslims – astonishingly claim that Islam is against violence or murder, a refrain that we frequently hear nowadays, arriving as rapidly as the medics following another instance of what is known as Islamic terror. Then, just as quickly, the attackers are denounced as “extremists” or even “not Muslims”, because Islam is a “religion of peace”, and would never hurt a “Soul”, including the evil kafir.

To help support this latter component of taqiya, Muslims return to the effective tactic of only partially presenting a verse to presumably naive infidel eyes and ears. Islam, the grand dissimulators will say, demands that its followers not slay a single human life, because the religion – as one might expect from a “religion of peace” - believes that all life is sacred: Noble indeed is this declaration, leading the unbelievers to perhaps take Islam for a progressive, universal faith. But even the very verse identified in support of that questionable assertion - which like two of the Quran selections previously cited, is normally presented *missing* a pivotal component - is one that points to the *opposite* conclusion claimed by the Muslim dissimulator, with the crucially omitted portion that life can be taken if *in the course of justice*. Or rather, the Asura of Falsehood's perversion of it:

Those who are polytheists will say: “If Allah had willed we would not have ascribed partners unto Him nor our fathers, nor would we have forbidden (to ourselves) anything.” Even so did those before them reject until they tasted Our punishment. Say: “Have you any knowledge with you so you should bring it forth to us? You only follow a conjecture and you only tell lies.” Say: “Then Allah's is the conclusive argument; so if He please, He would certainly guide you all.” Say: “Come, bring your witnesses who can bear witness that Allah forbade (all) this.” Then if they bear witness, do not bear witness with them; and follow not the low desires of those who reject Our communications and of those who do not believe in the hereafter and make (others) equal to their Lord. Say: “Come, I will recite unto you that which your Lord hath made a sacred duty for you.” **That ye ascribe no thing as partner unto Him** and that ye do good to parents, and that ye slay not your children because of penury - We provide for you and for them - and that ye draw not nigh to lewd things whether open or concealed. **And that ye slay not the life which Allah hath made sacred, save in the course of justice.** This He hath command you, in order that ye may discern. (Quran 6:148-151)

While we know that the “course” of Islamic “justice” (“save in the course of justice” is always omitted by dissimulators who speak of Islam forbidding the slaughter of “life which Allah hath made sacred”) involves the violent conversions and killings of non-Muslims (especially Polytheists like the Hindus) simply for their beliefs, hence making a mockery – that the caveat *immediately* follows the line used for taqiya only adds to the farce – of a dissimulator's claims, this passage also succeeds in highlighting the recurrent Muslim tenet that believing in multiple Gods leads to an afterlife punishment - for those avoiding the sword or bombing in earth. Though the Muslim dissimulator understands that this verse can be dissected following a proper examination, he also knows the majority to be disinclined toward such endeavours, allowing him to persist with this particular example of taqiya, one for which he has further ammunition. For similar to the previous verse, there exists another commonly used Quran verse - that “whoever slays a soul, it is as though he slew all men” - used as ‘proof’ that Islam is against murdering non-Muslims and apostates committing belief-crimes. And like the previously cited passage, it is a claim of benevolence only made possible through a crucial omission of Allah's words, which on this occasion are sandwiched in the middle:

For this reason did We prescribe to the children of Israel that **whoever slays a soul, unless it be for manslaughter or for mischief in the land, it is as though he slew all men**; and whoever keeps it alive, it is as though he kept alive all men; and certainly Our messengers came to them with clear arguments, but even after that many of them certainly act extravagantly in the land. (Quran 5:32)

The neglected line provides the pivotal exception to a law that, if one were to believe the so-called moderate Muslims, renders any killings of a disbeliever un-Islamic. The key word in the verses is “mischief”, because as we already know, Allah infrarationally revealed the kuffar to be constantly scheming against the pious, disrespecting their tenets, and mocking the Almighty Allah. Ordinarily existing in a paranoid state, when the believer – quickly - remembers the mischief always practised by the Infidel (which Allah has communicated to be the eternal bent of the kafir mind), he feels justified in slaughtering them, forever putting lie to the assertion that Islam is against the slaying of all men. Or, if the believer prefers explicit confirmation, all he has to do is read the two verses *immediately* following 5:32, in which he finds the great Allah commanding Muslims to *murder* the mischief-makers, the ones who “wage war” against Allah and are thus automatically disbelievers:

The punishment of those who wage war against Allah and His messenger and strive to make mischief in the land is only this, that they should be murdered or crucified or their hands and their feet should be cut off on opposite sides or they should be imprisoned; this shall be as a disgrace for them in this world, and in the hereafter they shall have a grievous chastisement, Except those who repent before you have them in your power; so know that Allah is Forgiving, Merciful. (Quran 5:33-34)

As the non-Muslims are perpetually plotting against both Allah and his followers, conceivably – to the warped mentality spawned by the Asura's inversion of wisdom – *always* waging war (making this verse not as defensive as might be interpreted) against the ‘one true religion’, a Muslim has absolute, unequivocal approval to murder the unbelievers, with the sole, real exception arising from a different type of taqiyah – the tactical peace required to allow the believers temporary rest from warfare. If the believer is not concerned about the non-Muslim reaction to such murders, he will gladly kill in the name of his Lord, the Champion of Falsehood. But, comes the next scripturally-based rebuttal of the “moderate Muslim”, Allah has explicitly *forbidden* the killing of innocents, therefore the “terrorists” cannot be real Muslims. While the use of the following verse in support of this particular claim appears to create an emphatic dismissal of kuffar assertions, it is in truth yet another dissimulation involving the favoured method of omission. The verse itself, when viewed entirely, is also ultimately difficult to construe as a broad denouncement of murder, which is the impression one receives when listening to the dissimulating arguments involving the infrarational revelation:

And do not kill any one whom Allah has forbidden, except for a just cause, and whoever is slain unjustly, We have indeed given to his heir authority, so let him not exceed the just limits in slaying; surely he is aided. (Quran 17:33)

For Muslims to claim, using this verse, that Islam forbids all killing, requires them to deliberately ignoring the unambiguously stated *exception* of a “just cause” (which will obviously include apostasy or *shirk*) for murder. It also requires one to disregard the Islamic ‘knowledge’ imparted that there exist upon earth individuals for whom the believers are *not* forbidden from killing, including the outright Apostates and other non-Muslims, *and* those who refuse to follow certain elements of the scripture even if they believe themselves to be “Muslim”. It is the Asuric, Islamic law or justice to kill these individuals, because such slaughter does *not* “exceed the limits” pertaining to murder. Indeed the Muslim only needs to deem his evil actions as meeting the paltry standards worthy of dispensing “justice”, as outlined in the following Quran selection:

And the servants of the Beneficent Allah are they who walk on the earth in humbleness, and when the ignorant address them, they say: “Peace.” And they who pass the night prostrating themselves before their Lord and standing. And they who say: “**O our Lord! Turn away from us the punishment of hell, surely the punishment thereof is a lasting.** Surely it is an evil abode and (evil) place to stay.” And they who when they spend, are neither extravagant nor parsimonious, and (keep) between these the just mean. **And they who do not call upon**

another god with Allah and do not take the life, which Allah has forbidden except in the requirements of justice, and (who) do not commit fornication - and he who does this shall find a requital of sin; The punishment shall be doubled to him on the day of resurrection, and he shall abide therein in abasement, Except him who repents and believes and does a good deed. So these are they of whom Allah changes the evil deeds to good ones; and Allah is Forgiving, Merciful. (Quran 25:63-70)

The actual truth, the one “moderate Muslims” are keen to hide from non-Muslims, is that the only lives deemed sacred, the only individuals whom Muslims should not kill, are fellow believers. The infidels and hypocrites, polytheists and godless, are all *exempt* from safety in earth, guilty as they are of the ‘injustice’ of different thought and belief – they must be struck down righteously by the pious in earth, and then by the ‘merciful’ Allah in hell. The unbelievers are in the Islamic inversion of reality *untermensch*, fuel for the hellfire as Allah declared, unworthy of pity or kindness. Only Muslims are to be protected, and if a believer kills another Muslim intentionally, it is *then* that Allah's supposed universal wrath against life-taking emerges, because *only* this type of murder is unjust:

And whoever kills a believer intentionally, his punishment is hell; he shall abide in it, and Allah will send His wrath on him and curse him and prepare for him a painful chastisement. (Quran 4:93)

Nowhere in the Quran does there exist a communication specifically bringing Allah's rage upon the murderers of apostates or Polytheists; the opposite is true, and it is only by a clever selection of words that a dissimulator can contend otherwise. Like other commands delivered by Gabriel, safeguarding the life of ‘true’ Muslims is obtained through fear of Allah's wrath, which in itself underlines the verse's importance. Additionally, the hadith confirm that the previous verse was not abrogated:

Narrated Said bin Jubair:

The people of Kufa disagreed (disputed) about the above Verse. So I went to Ibn Abbas and asked him about it. He said, “This Verse: ‘And whoever kills a believer intentionally, his recompense is Hell’ was revealed last of all (concerning premeditated murder) and nothing abrogated it.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 6, Book 60, Number 114)

Mohammed is also recorded as saying that an authentic “Muslim is the one who avoids harming Muslims with his tongue or his hands. And a Muhajir (an emigrant) is the one who gives up (abandons) all what Allah has forbidden.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 8, Book 76, Number 491) Never did he voice an Islamic duty to avoid either insulting non-Muslim beliefs or physically harming the kafir – it is only evil to abuse a Muslim, only disbelief when a Muslim is killed, because Muslims belong to humanity whereas non-Muslims are subhuman:

Narrated Abdullah:

Allah's Apostle said, “**Abusing a Muslim is Fusuq (i.e., an evil-doing), and killing him is Kufr (disbelief).**” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 8, Book 73, Number 70)

As infidels are already disbelievers reneging from the ‘true religion’ (Islam) prior to their hypothetical murder by the mujahideen, this statement was in relation to the most pious of Muslims, the ones adhering to every single detail of authentic Islam. The Hadith also provide supplemental evidence that the killing of, or as the following shows, mere intent to murder such pious Muslims, is unjustifiable - with both occurrences punished by hellfire:

Narrated Al-Ahnaf bin Qais:

I went to help that man (i.e., Ali), and on the way I met Abu Bakra who asked me, “Where are you going?” I replied, “I am going to help that man.” He said, “Go back, for I heard Allah's

Apostle saying, 'If two Muslims meet each other with their swords then (both) the killer and the killed one are in the (Hell) Fire.' I said, 'O Allah's Apostle! It is alright for the killer, but what about the killed one?' He said, 'The killed one was eager to kill his opponent.' ” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 83, Number 14)

While the believer may view this as further proof of the great brotherhood to which he belongs, not only is the Islamic unity a false one – dismissing, as it does, vast swaths of humanity to rape, subjugation, murder and hellfire –, Gabriel's intention in promoting a Muslim fraternity was not for the sake of a noble ideal. The Asura of Falsehood does not care for the outcome of harmony and peace that genuine brotherhood might engender, and any prospect of fraternal relations is a guise to get mankind to do his bidding – in this case, waging perpetual war and bringing the falsehood of Islam to the world, an impossibility if Gabriel's minions are constantly at each other's throats. Though the seeds of an internal destruction – paranoia over hypocrites – is prominent in his religion, the Asura nevertheless desires at least a *temporary* solidarity to facilitate conquests against officially non-Muslim nations. If internal chaos emerges after Islam subjugates the planet, it again suits his desire – which he holds superior to his tool of Islam - to prevent the conscious evolution of mankind to God in the Multiplicity. The first step to this disastrous outcome is to separate the “Muslim” from “non-Muslim”, with the authentic hadith important in emphasizing the fundamental superiority of Muslim over non-Muslim life, with one tradition explicitly outlining Islamic jurisprudence that Muslims are *not* to be killed for killing disbelievers, unlike the typical lawful retribution assigned if the victim is one of the pious:

Narrated Abu Juhaifa:

I asked Ali, “Do you have the knowledge of any Divine Inspiration besides what is in Allah's Book?” Ali replied, “No, by Him Who splits the grain of corn and creates the soul. I don't think we have such knowledge, but we have the ability of understanding which Allah may endow a person with, so that he may understand the Qur'an, and we have what is written in this paper as well.” I asked, “What is written in this paper?” He replied, “(The regulations of) blood-money, the freeing of captives, **and the judgement that no Muslim should be killed for killing an infidel.**” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 52, Number 283)

While such hadith are not directly attributed to Allah's Apostle, there are others displaying his fanatical devotion to Gabriel's dictate against killing fellow Muslims, including those who had only belonged to the ‘true’ faith for a handful of seconds:

Narrated Ubaidullah bin Adi bin Al-Khiyar:

That Al-Miqdad bin Amr Al-Kindi, who was an ally of Bani Zuhra and one of those who fought the battle of Badr together with Allah's Apostle told him that he said to Allah's Apostle, **“Suppose I met one of the infidels and we fought, and he struck one of my hands with his sword and cut it off and then took refuge in a tree and said, ‘I surrender to Allah (i.e. I have become a Muslim),’ could I kill him, O Allah's Apostle, after he had said this?”** Allah's Apostle said, **“You should not kill him.”** Al-Miqdad said, “O Allah's Apostle! But he had cut off one of my two hands, and then he had uttered those words?” Allah's Apostle replied, “You should not kill him, for if you kill him, he would be in your position where you had been before killing him, and you would be in his position where he had been before uttering those words.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 5, Book 59, Number 354)

Not only does this hadith present further corroboration that Islam allows forced conversions, it highlights the crucial and incurable flaw in the Islamic version of human unity, with the question of hypocrisy – as defined in the Quran – frequently invading the Muslim's mind, undermining his action. Conceivably, an unbeliever about to be killed can lie and claim adherence to Allah and his Prophet, preventing his own death and increasing the likelihood that his fellow kuffar soldiers will assist him or

potentially kill the jihadi that towers over him yet is unable – by Mohammed's authentic tradition - to deliver the deathblow. It was a dilemma that Mohammed's companions were to actively face, with their instinctive response to kill causing great distress to the Asura of Falsehood's instrument:

Narrated Usama bin Zaid:

Allah's Apostle sent us towards Al-Huruqa, and in the morning we attacked them and defeated them. I and an Ansari man followed a man from among them and when we took him over, he said, “La ilaha illal-Lah.” On hearing that, the Ansari man stopped, but I killed him by stabbing him with my spear. When we returned, the Prophet came to know about that and he said, “**O Usama! Did you kill him after he had said ‘La ilaha ilal-Lah?’**” I said, “**But he said so only to save himself.**” **The Prophet kept on repeating that so often that I wished I had not embraced Islam before that day.** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 5, Book 59, Number 568)

The Prophet had a two-fold reason for demanding restraint when an opponent uttered the sacred words, with the scriptural element pertaining to his companion's (now the killer of a Muslim!) afterlife prospects after violating a Quran verse. Mohammed also had in mind a more practical consideration, knowing as he did that many of his followers remained in the midst of the ‘evil’ Polytheist ranks (recall Quran 48:25-26), practising taqiyah and superficially denying their Muslim identity and beliefs, even to the extent (likely because they had no choice) of taking up arms alongside the kuffar. This was the reality of the situation during his time, as he explained to Al-Miqdad:

Narrated Al-Miqdad bin Amr Al-Kindi:

The Prophet also said to Al-Miqdad, “**If a faithful believer conceals his faith (Islam) from the disbelievers, and then when he declares his Islam, you kill him, (you will be sinful). Remember that you were also concealing your faith (Islam) at Mecca before.**” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 83, Number 5)

This hadith is a fine historical example of taqiyah, with Mohammed's companions hiding their beliefs from the Polytheists in a setting where death was a possibility – albeit an exaggerated one – if Muslim hatred and intolerance toward the Infidels were exposed. Though such concealment was related to the active war between the Arab factions, an attestation of Allah's Apostle can be used in all times, and for a variety of reasons, as long as it serves Islam's primary ambition. While the Prophet's declaration to Al-Miqdad reinforces the sin of killing fellow believers, it completely fails to mitigate Muslim anxiety over the prevalence of hypocrisy, as technically all the kafir has to do, when faced with imminent death, is to say the magical words that there is no god except Allah and Mohammed is his final prophet. Whether they believe it or not remains to be seen, and indeed may never be fully known, even as the more pious of Muslims attempt to eliminate hypocrisy through the punishment of death. Yet even with this powerful tool of ‘divinely’ sanctioned murder, a mere mortal, irrespective of the deity he prays toward, can never be completely sure of what is in another's heart and mind, and as Muslims are bombarded with the message that hypocrites are everywhere, little things become magnified, and even the Prophet's tradition assuring the fidelity of individuals within Polytheist ranks can be questioned, with the pious instead turning to *Allah's* ‘Word’ on the matter:

Lo! **as for those whom the angels take (in death) while they wrong themselves**, (the angels) will ask: “In what were ye engaged?” They will say: “We were oppressed in the land.” (The angels) will say: “Was not Allah's earth spacious that ye could have migrated therein?” As for such, their habitation will be hell, an evil journey's end, **Except the weak from among the men and the children who have not in their power the means nor can they find a way (to escape).** So these, it may be, Allah will pardon them, and Allah is Pardoning, Forgiving. (Quran 4:97-99)

To understand this Asuric revelation, we turn to the hadith, where the particular “wrong” is explained:

Narrated Muhammad bin Abdur-Rahman Abu Al-Aswad: The people of Medina were forced to prepare an army (to fight against the people of Sham during the caliphate of Abdullah bin Az-Zubair at Mecca), and I was enlisted in it; Then I met Ikrima, the freed slave of Ibn Abbas, and informed him (about it), and he forbade me strongly to do so (i.e. to enlist in that army), and then said, **“Ibn Abbas informed me that some Muslim people were with the pagans, increasing the number of the pagans against Allah's Apostle.** An arrow used to be shot which would hit one of them (the Muslims in the company of the pagans) and kill him, or he would be struck and killed (with a sword).” Then Allah revealed: “Verily! as for those whom the angels take (in death) while they are wronging themselves (by staying among the disbelievers)” (4:97) Abu Aswad added, “Except the weak ones among men, women...” (4:98) (Sahih Bukhari Volume 6, Book 60, Number 120)

Reading the above revelatory passage (4:97-99), the corresponding hadith, and the records of Mohammed's desire to protect Muslims fighting alongside the enemy (as long as these believers were able to recite the shahada and subsequently ‘prove’ their faith), we find arguments both supporting *and* opposing perhaps the most dangerous form of taqiya: a Muslim joining an Infidel army. The advantages for the Islamic cause are impressive, with such a person – especially if he were able to work his way into a leadership position – capable of betraying the non-Muslim army or government, informing his pious brethren of their secret plans, identifying weaknesses to exploit, actively undermining – especially at war – kuffar manoeuvres or tactics, and dissimulating the lies of Islamic tolerance and peace to try and promote inertia in non-Muslim society. While the gains to such a placement are undeniable, the risks are numerous, beginning with a Muslim's presence in an Infidel army possibly requiring him to kill his fellow believers – if he refuses, his own life is then in danger at kuffar hands due to his insubordination or treason against *them*.

The requirement to potentially slay his brethren can only, if the individual is well-versed or informed, give serious pause to his decision to follow the order, or even to join an enemy army in the first place. Unlike the companions of Mohammed's time, the modern pious have, in the form of infrarational revelations yet to be – at the time – transmitted to the Prophet, clear communications ordering them to avoid joining a Polytheist army and forbidding them to murder their religious brothers. Thus, it is only sheer ignorance of Islamic scripture – itself a dangerous and potential pathway to apostasy – or a conscious taqiya that can justify joining a Hindu, Christian, Jewish, Atheist, or Secular majority army not fighting for the ambitions of Islam. Though a Muslim can point to the Prophet's examples criticizing the killings of companions in the Polytheist army, Quran verses are superior to the hadith, originating as they do from the omniscient Allah. The believer who fights for the Almighty's eternal enemy, potentially killing fellow Muslims, can only do so by consciously or unwittingly ignoring Quran verses 4:97 and 4:93, the former telling him that he is wronging himself (before Allah) by his mere presence in kuffar ranks, the latter directly informing that those intentionally killing another Muslim will go straight to hell. Fighting for a non-Muslim army is thus a clear example of hypocrisy for those aware of the commandments, a violation of the unchangeable ‘Word’ that *cannot* be selectively followed, precisely what happens when any two verses are simply ignored: a believer can possibly justify taqiya in a government role, but it becomes very difficult to do so in a standing non-Muslim army in which the infrarational revelations are easily violated.

Such a serious transgression can lead to a so-called Muslim's death through the accusation – and conviction - of heresy, and it is a difficult thing – though the Prophet tried – to convince a soldier that an enemy combatant who has just tried to kill him, is in fact his compatriot, all because of a few words the enemy recites. Allah's Apostle may have been the most submissive Asuric instrument to have ever graced the planet, but even his earthly presence was not enough to guarantee the fidelity of individuals

staying with the enemy, as evident by Gabriel's communication criticizing the practice as a crime against oneself, resulting in an afterlife of hellfire. It thus becomes very difficult for the actual Muslim, when he considers the 'holiest' of scripture, to fight for a non-Muslim, fearful as he is of Allah's vengeance. The tactic remains the most difficult of dissimulations, for not only does a Muslim engaging in it require a strong faith that Allah will forgive him for the obvious heresy (if he has to kill a Muslim), he must also possess the personality for an intense, prolonged deception of which only a few natures have the wherewithal.

Just as it is difficult for the scripturally informed Muslim to obediently serve a non-Muslim army, so too is it dangerous for the Infidel to train and include the pious ones within their ranks, keeping in mind the narrative of Islam and the strategy of taqiyyah. Unbelievers should not be surprised – assuming they have read the Islamic scripture – at Muslim betrayal, whether through refusing an order to kill a Muslim enemy of the army, or by transferring sensitive information to jihadis in order to help Islam's ambition. Though the placement of a believer within kuffar ranks is more easily argued as apostasy, there nevertheless exists enough contradicting arguments for the infidels to also remain wary of having Muslims for soldiers, especially the ones well-versed or instructed in Islamic scripture, those likely to understand the finer points pertaining to dissimulation. Yet is this infiltration of a non-Muslim army, dangerous as it is for the security of unbelieving nations, still only one example of how taqiyyah is applied in modern times. More common is the aforementioned practice (for psychological operations) of selectively using either certain Quran verses or parts of the communications, neglecting the rest of the verse or other contradictory communications that abrogate the ones used for dissimulation. This is the well trodden method by which Muslims conceal the violent nature of Islam from the unsuspecting kuffar, only later to spring upon them the brutality of Allah. It was a path adroitly exemplified by the Prophet, who was sensitive to the danger of being known for too much violence, and wished to mask the reality of his intentions:

Narrated Jabir bin Abdullah:

We were in a Ghazwa (Sufyan once said, in an army) and a man from the emigrants kicked an Ansari man (on the buttocks with his foot). The Ansari man said, "O the Ansar! (Help!)" and the emigrant said, "O the emigrants! (Help!)" Allah's Apostle heard that and said, "What is this call for, which is characteristic of the period of ignorance?" They said, "O Allah's Apostle! A man from the emigrants kicked one of the Ansar (on the buttocks with his foot)." Allah's Apostle said, "Leave it (that call) as is a detestable thing." Abdullah bin Ubai heard that and said, "Have the (the emigrants) done so? By Allah, if we return Medina, surely, the more honourable will expel therefrom the meaner." When this statement reached the Prophet, Umar got up and said, "**O Allah's Apostle! Let me chop off the head of this hypocrite (Abdullah bin Ubai)!**" **The Prophet said, "Leave him, lest the people say that Mohammed kills his companions."** **The Ansar were then more in number than the emigrants when the latter came to Medina, but later on the emigrant increased.** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 6, Book 60, Number 428)

As Mohammed desired to bring more people into his fold, he did not wish to earn a reputation for killing his companions, even if it was 'divinely' sanctioned for the 'crime' of hypocrisy. Better that he allow certain things to slide in order to promote a version of Islam more attractive to unbelievers, making them less resistant to conversion or at least allowing the early Muslims to live amongst them. A modern version of this tactic may involve the assertion that Islam allows dissent or debate within its community, though we know it to demand unthinking obedience along with legislating death for heretics. The previous hadith also hints at another aspect of taqiyyah – the influence of demographics. Implied here is the correlation between Mohammed's restraint and the population of the Ansar relative to his followers, the difference explaining his need to withhold violence. Similarly, when Muslims

emigrate to hostile lands – an activity for which they have copious scriptural examples - or are minorities in their homelands, they adhere to the Apostle's precedent, initially *not* applying the violent and harsh verses so that they can present a friendly and assimilated image to their hosts.

But as their population increases relative to the kuffar, less is the Muslim fear of retaliation, and they begin applying the aggressive verses, allowing their simmering paranoia and hatred to transform into action against an unbelieving party purported to actively - or soon to be - plotting against Allah and them. Having previously avoided attention by staying peaceful, the believers become – especially when they account for around ten percent of the population – increasingly lawless (at least according to kuffar laws), for though not yet capable of engaging in a victorious jihad, they feel confident enough to satisfy their bloodlust without fear of significant reprisal to their community, secure in their demographic strength and knowing that other believers will come forth with the lie – to pacify the kuffar - that such actions “do not represent true Islam”. At these percentages jihad consists of terrorist actions, rioting and street-level intimidation or thuggery; they do not yet possess the numbers, especially within the government, legislature, armed forces or police, to impose upon the infidel Sharia law and all of its depravity or inverted ‘truth’.

The tactic of selective quotation and outrageous claims of Islamic tolerance are not only necessary to mollify the angry unbeliever in the event of terrorism or rioting, but can also function on their own for expansionary purposes, facilitating genuine – though minimal in quantity - conversions from those taking Mohammedanism to represent the exact opposite of what it actually says. Though the types of taqiyyah previously mentioned might obtain a certain amount of converts, it is only in Sufism – markedly heretical, as we shall extensively document in the next chapter - where we find an example of a dissimulation yielding a relatively large number of converts, rather than taqiyyah's typical defensive function of preventing a decisive kuffar reaction to the inevitable religious violence accompanying the demographic march of Islam. And though this jihad of reproduction (and emigration) is not in the slightest specified by the Quran or authentic hadith, it represents an ironic example of logic and mathematics being applied by an infrarational ideology in support of its primitive designs, because it is quite obvious that in battle – and Islam is technically always at war – those with numerical superiority tend to emerge victorious. Thus if Islam wishes to defeat its enemy, it must be patient until the time and numerical strength favours them; taqiyyah aids in both stopping the flock (through Imams emphasizing the facade of inter-religious harmony) from initiating violence when weak, and deceiving the non-Muslims that any Muslim violence is antithetical to ‘true’ Islam. The art of dissimulation is to lull the kuffar to sleep until the Muslims have enough strength in numbers to either forcefully convert or subjugate (through *jizya* and other spoils) the enemies of Allah.

And if any doubts were to remain regarding the validity of taqiyyah, the believer needs only turn to an authentic hadith in which Mohammed, the exemplar for mankind, is recorded dutifully obeying Allah's instructions to abstain from fighting – even when faced with insults from the Polytheists - until it was specifically ordained:

Narrated Usama bin Zaid:

Allah's Apostle rode a donkey, equipped with a thick cloth-covering made in Fadak and was riding behind him. He was going to pay visit to Sad bin Ubada in Banu Al-Harith bin Al-Khazraj; and this incident happened before the battle of Badr. The Prophet passed by a gathering in which Abdullah bin Ubai bin Salul was present, and that was before Abdullah bin Ubai embraced Islam. Behold in that gathering there were people of different religions: there were Muslims, pagans, idol-worshippers and Jews, and in that gathering Abdullah bin Rawaha was also present. When a cloud of dust raised by the donkey reached that gathering, Abdullah bin Ubai covered his nose with his garment and then said, “Do not cover us with dust.” **Then Allah's Apostle greeted them and stopped and dismounted and invited them to Allah (i.e.**

to embrace Islam) and recited to them the Holy Qur'an. On that, Abdullah bin Ubai bin Salu'il said, "O man! There is nothing better than that what you say. If it is the truth, then do not trouble us with it in our gatherings. Return to your mount (or residence) and if somebody comes to you, relate (your tales) to him." On that Abdullah bin Rawaha said, "Yes, O Allah's Apostle! Bring it (i.e. what you want to say) to us in our gathering, for we love that."

So the Muslims, the pagans and the Jews started abusing one another till they were on the point of fighting with one another. The Prophet kept on quietening them till they became quiet, whereupon the Prophet rode his animal (mount) and proceeded till he entered upon Sad bin Ubada. The Prophet said to Sad, "Did you not hear what Abu Hub-b said?" He meant Abdullah bin Ubai. "He said so-and-so." On that Sad bin Ubada said, "O Allah's Apostle! Excuse and forgive him, for by Him Who revealed the Book to you, Allah brought the Truth which was sent to you at the time when the people of this town (i.e. Medina) had decided unanimously to crown him and tie a turban on his head (electing him as chief). But when Allah opposed that (decision) through the Truth which Allah gave to you, he (i.e. Abdullah bin Ubai) was grieved with jealousy and that caused him to do what you have seen." **So Allah's Apostle excused him, for the Prophet and his companions used to forgive the pagans and the people of Scripture as Allah had ordered them, and they used to put up with their mischief with patience.** Allah said: "And you shall certainly hear much that will grieve you from those who received the Scripture before you and from the pagans..." (3.186) And Allah also said: "Many of the people of the Scripture wish if they could turn you away as disbelievers after you have believed, from selfish envy..." (2.109)

So the Prophet used to stick to the principle of forgiveness for them as long as Allah ordered him to do so till Allah permitted fighting them. So when Allah's Apostle fought the battle of Badr and Allah killed the nobles of Quraish infidels through him, Ibn Ubai bin Salul and the pagans and idolaters who were with him, said, "This matter (i.e. Islam) has appeared (i.e. became victorious)." So they gave the pledge of allegiance (for embracing Islam) to Allah's Apostle and became Muslims. (Sahih Bukhari Volume 6, Book 60, Number 89)

Crucial to our analysis of this hadith is the term "mischief", a 'crime' which the above record, in connecting mischievousness to a mere dismissal of the Prophet's message, helps to emphatically confirm the previous Quran verses authorizing the murder of the "mischief" makers as absolute justification for the killing of non-Muslims who, instead of persecuting Muslims, are simply disagreeing with their scriptural allegations. A different hadith of the above incident also accounts for Mohammed's discipline in waiting for the right time to murder, his absorption of any offensive comments that "annoyed" the Muslims – note again the lack of genuine persecution, verifying once more that the *primary* motivation for Islamic warfare is simply to trample upon other faiths - until the time Allah permitted a righteous jihad for their 'crime' of making irritating *statements* against Islam:

"...So when Allah had prevented that with the Truth He had given you, he was choked by that, and that caused him to behave in such an impolite manner which you had noticed." So Allah's Apostle excused him. **(It was the custom of) Allah's Apostle and his companions to excuse the pagans and the people of the scripture (Christians and Jews) as Allah ordered them, and they used to be patient when annoyed (by them).** Allah said: "You shall certainly hear much that will grieve you from those who received the Scripture before you...and from the pagans." (3.186)

He also said: "Many of the people of the scripture wish that if they could turn you away as disbelievers after you have believed..." (2.109) **So Allah's Apostle used to apply what Allah had ordered him by excusing them till he was allowed to fight against them.** When Allah's

Apostle had fought the battle of Badr and Allah killed whomever He killed among the chiefs of the infidels and the nobles of Quraish, and Allah's Apostle and his companions had returned with victory and booty, bringing with them some of the chiefs of the infidels and the nobles of the Quraish as captives. Abdullah bin Ubai bin Salul and the pagan idolaters who were with him, said, "This matter (Islam) has now brought out its face (triumphed), so give Allah's Apostle the pledge of allegiance (for embracing Islam)." Then they became Muslims. (Sahih Bukhari Volume 8, Book 73, Number 226)

More than anything else, including his inherent personal beliefs, Mohammed was attached to whatever the "angel" Gabriel, a resplendent mask over a vast darkness, told him. Submissive fidelity - to the infrarational word - was the Prophet's greatest attribute which, if it had been placed in the hands of an actual Guru, would have led him to true spiritual enlightenment. Unfortunately, it was the Lord of Falsehood who grabbed hold of him, knowing that such complete obedience by nature can trump the mind's analytical or burgeoning Psychic functions, enabling one to believe and follow contradictory commands. Otherwise, confusion results when faced with a religion telling one to both fight and maintain peace with the enemy – only the selective use of scripture (and understanding of the rationale for applying it in that manner) demanded of Mohammed and all Muslims can resolve the paradox. Thus there are no Quran verses that truly cancel a different one, as all infrarational revelations are both the immortal 'Word' of Allah and eternally applicable, *depending upon the circumstances*. This is why Muslims – and especially the Imams who command them in religion – can declare Islam to be a religion of peace and tolerance without the slightest trace of irony, because they understand that at the time of their statement, Islam exists in a tactical armistice, with mandated warfare to occur at a later point in time. Taqiyah is psychologically harmonious for Muslims cognizant of Islam's ambition to take over the world, aware of their own current limitations and those of Mohammed when he made 'peace' with his enemies. For these Muslims, outward kindness and declarations of a universal appreciation of all faiths are done to conceal their secret Asuric intentions to destroy non-Muslim creeds and impose Sharia law upon all.

But cordiality alone is not enough for the Muslim applying the modern rendition of taqiyah in a world of increasing education for the non-Muslim masses, a planet where ancient texts are far more accessible than in the past. For the similarly educated Muslim, when engaging his counterpart - the latter likely aware of the ubiquitous Islamic terrorism and perhaps vaguely familiar with Islam's violent texts -, more ingenuity is now required to keep the majority unbeliever accepting the lie that the Asura of Falsehood's religion values harmony and diversity of thought and belief. To do this, the brighter and more proactive Muslims will go beyond the previously highlighted practice of carefully selecting lines of a verse to support illegitimate claims of a benign version of Islam. Taking the next step, these particular individuals will use a variety of distractions or red herrings to equate Islam's negatives with either the religion or national history of the Infidel he is debating. For instance, when others note the pervasive violence against unbelievers, Muslims will bring up the Christian Crusades, or perhaps infamous genocides such as the Holocaust or Stalin's purges, to counter any criticisms or inquiries of Islam, attempting to shame the unbeliever and silence any further discussion on Islam's glaring falsehood. Doing this also, albeit in a negative fashion, attempts to equate Islam's theology on par with any other religion, its history as nothing unusual in thousands of years of global warfare. Like all good distractions, this tactic of Muslim dissimulators at times contains a significant amount of truth, because all of the violence and hatred expressed by Islam can be found throughout history in different nations or religions, including mass killings of a group designated as the 'other'.

However, the one fundamental difference, the reason why Islam deserves such intense scrutiny, the crucial distinction between Islam's perpetrated horrors and those of even its closest relative Christianity, is the emphasis of the Quran that all verses must be followed unaltered, unabridged, without change or

a selective following of infrarational revelations suiting the believer's personality. It is this that explains both Islam's impressive strength and its inevitable death – a rigidity allowing for substantial growth until the pressure of constant change breaks its obstinate formation. It also marks the failure of the dissimulators argument, for though the Christians savagely pillaged the heathens and the British Empire starved crores of Indians to death, or – using a less violent example often cited by Muslims – Hindu society formulated a discriminatory caste system, none of these cases were marked by a supporting ideology that actively prevented an *evolution* of action or thinking. In the case of Christianity, the Bible has been altered on multiple occasions and fortunately does not contain within it the severe reprimands *against such modifications*; thus the Renaissance and other transformative movements were able to proceed without the *prolonged* ferociousness – one based upon clear theological justification – characteristic of Islam's targeting of heretics, and global Christianity has tamed itself to a certain degree, generally using less violence and more sophisticated – and disingenuous - methods to obtain conversions. Likewise the caste system, itself with scarce theological foundation (at least in the primary Hindu scripture), also continues to progressively weaken, though work remains to be done. At any rate, the caste system *remains* present in both Muslim and Christian societies of the subcontinent, itself a refutation of Muslim criticism based on *religious* arguments, let alone the fact of its inappropriate use when confronted with complaints of Islamic violence against *non-Muslims* (the caste system representing a problem within a religious group rather than an *inter-religious* one).

Another diversion commonly used by Muslim intellectuals is to place blame for terrorist actions solely upon either the individual or geopolitical nation committing the act, or the “extreme” ideological subset of Islam the person or group in question adheres to. Subsequently, the individual perpetrator may be labelled as a “radical”, “extremist”, or “crazy”, calling into question his frame of mind or justification for the attacks. They might also admonish the particular nation or culture from which the Muslim terrorist or his group hails from, attempting to blame culture rather than Islam for such depraved actions, maintaining the precious facade of Islam's equality – that Islam is a religion just like any religion - or superiority to other religions. But the terrorism that is extreme to different religions or cultures remains perfectly normal to an Asuric creed claiming that ‘God’ explicitly ordained the slaughter and subjugation of “unbelievers”. It is a type of taqiyah, like previous ones, that disintegrates when confronted with the clear infrarational revelations demanding that the *entire* Quran be followed *literally* – a fact supporting the “extremist” stance rather than the “moderate” one the dissimulators are alleged to practice.

Though the clever concealers of the actual Islamic nature have no response to the scriptural evidence, it is not often that they face such pointed rebuttals, with mainstream non-Muslim society too busy or distracted to investigate the issue further, usually accepting the reassuring message of taqiyah while ignoring their growing unease that Islam is something decidedly different than what “moderate” Muslims tell them it is. And this is certainly providential for the pious ones, because in an age where the believers are leagues behind non-Muslims in military technology and strength, it is absolutely vital that the religion's intention to kill or subjugate all who disbelieve be hidden. Islam's severe deficit in military prowess, a byproduct of its fundamental weakness of being an extremely rigid organism, is both the root of taqiyah's current necessity and its refuge in asymmetric warfare of which bombing civilians and riots and thuggery are occasional spectacles. Indeed, Islam's best option in its quest for power in infidel lands is to simply *out-reproduce* the enemy without alerting them to their horrific fate – a fine undercutting of the unbeliever's military superiority.

While Islam's pervasive paranoia and hatred make it difficult for Muslims, in spite of all their efforts to dissimulate, to perfectly practice the patient deception, the long game needed to make their great strength of demographic warfare work without calling into question their ambitions, the reproductive

strategy nevertheless offers Islam its greatest current chance of fulfilling the Asura of Falsehood's design. It is an approach that cleverly extends beyond the use of Muslim women as weapons; also sought after are the non-Muslim women who might be converted and yield more potential mujahideen. By getting non-Muslim women to convert for them, Islam at once weakens the demographics of the kuffar while improving – through the resultant Muslim children – their own. It is an outcome that is often not the original motive of the Muslim, for whom an intimate relationship with an unbeliever may begin with all the right intentions, with the Muslim often unconscious of Islam's orders regarding such liaisons. Yet by the time of marriage – usually too late for the now emotionally attached kafir to break the bond – he *or* she will either learn on their own or through an Imam that Allah commands Muslims to not marry the unbelievers unless they convert:

And do not marry the idolatresses until they believe, and certainly a believing maid is better than an idolatress woman, even though she should please you. And do not give (believing women) in marriage to idolaters until they believe, and certainly a believing servant is better than an idolater, even though he should please you. These invite to the fire, and Allah invites to the garden and to forgiveness by His will, and makes clear His communications to men, that they may be mindful. (Quran 2:221)

The Muslim about to marry an Infidel knows that he or she cannot disobey any single one of the Asura's revelations, at the risk of being branded a hypocrite for whom murder is justified. Thus even the believer naturally inclined to let his or her spouse follow their choice of faith will ultimately, after consulting their Imam and the scripture, make them convert. Though it is true that Islam allows both its females *and* males to convert then marry a previously unbelieving partner, the overwhelming majority of these conversions will take place between the Muslim male and non-Muslim female, because the religion promotes both physical and sexual aggression among its males, who – as we shall decidedly see - are programmed to view unbelieving women as worthy of sexual conquest, with Muslim women also viewed as inferior beings who should have minimal contact or exposure with males in general, making it quite difficult for them to attract a non-Muslim mate in the first place. Indeed an authentic hadith somewhat confirming the notion that Muslim women are not as useful for converting spouses relates how Mohammed refused to send back believing women (at the time were married to men who had failed to convert to Islam) to the Polytheists – violating treaty terms when previously he even acquiesced to sending back tortured Muslims:

Narrated Marwan and al-Miswar bin Makhrama:

(from the companions of Allah's Apostle) When Suhail bin Amr agreed to the Treaty (of Hudaibiya), one of the things he stipulated then, was that the Prophet should return to them (i.e. the pagans) anyone coming to him from their side, even if he was a Muslim; and would not interfere between them and that person. The Muslims did not like this condition and got disgusted with it. Suhail did not agree except with that condition. So, the Prophet agreed to that condition and returned Abu Jandal to his father Suhail bin Amr. Thenceforward the Prophet returned everyone in that period (of truce) even if he was a Muslim. During that period some believing women emigrants including Um Kalthum bint Uqba bin Abu Muait who came to Allah's Apostle and she was a young lady then. Her relative came to the Prophet and asked him to return her, but the Prophet did not return her to them for Allah had revealed the following Verse regarding women:

“O you who believe! When the believing women come to you as emigrants. Examine them, Allah knows best as to their belief, then if you know them for true believers, Send them not back to the unbelievers, (for) they are not lawful (wives) for the disbelievers, Nor are the unbelievers lawful (husbands) for them.” (60.10) (Sahih Bukhari Volume 3, Book 50, Number 874)

While the verse in question again brings forth Allah's disapproval of the practice – whether Muslim male or female - of maintaining marriage vows with an unbeliever, it did not go as far as preventing Muslim males from travelling back to fulfil the treaty terms:

O you who believe! When believing women come to you as emigrants, then examine them; Allah knows best their faith. Then if you find them to be believing women, do not send them back to the unbelievers, for they are not lawful (wives) for them, nor are the unbelievers lawful (husbands) for them, and give them what they have spent. And no blame attaches to you in marrying them when you give them their dowries; and hold not to the ties of marriage of unbelieving women, and ask for what you have spent, and let them (the unbelievers) ask for what they have spent. That is Allah's judgement; He judges between you, and Allah is Knowing, Wise. (Quran 60:10)

Though the slight scriptural emphasis on females altogether avoiding potential marriage with unbelievers - contrasted with the large practical discrepancy in which Muslim males constitute the vast majority of such arrangements with non-Muslim females - is important to observe, the overall need for believers to have their mates convert prior to marriage is fundamentally a sign of Islam's cultish nature, where instead of accepting the diversity, one leading to cultural growth and strength, that the “disbelievers” could bring to the union, Islam demands they reject their own heritage entirely. Close-minded, vainly deluded that they have already received the entire ‘truth’, Muslims only succeed in luring their mate into the downward spiral whereby their progeny's only chance of true internal growth exists in having significant contact with either the native majority non-Muslim culture, or through emigration to such lands. That their own religion provides no natural outlet for evolution gives away its origin as Asuric, for it is falsehood to assume that any single text or belief system alone is the eternal truth.

While the stipulation of having the kafir mate convert is integral to the religion's overriding fanaticism, most of the time the initial contact of a Muslim with their future spouse is without the ulterior motive of conversion; only later, when the partner is too intertwined to reject, is it demanded. On occasion however, the objective of conversion is present – though unknown to the naive infidel prey – from the beginning. One example is the notorious “love jihad”, differing in intent from the usual pattern of spousal conversion. Indeed, love jihad often does not involve marriage, as either simply getting the girl to fall ‘in love’, or the compromising state of sexual activity or pregnancy, is enough to entice them to convert. It is an exceedingly clever, albeit unscrupulous tactic, perfectly consensual as its effectiveness revolves around manipulating the immature emotions of the girls in question, especially when it comes to ‘love’. Though the aspect of converting any sexual conquest, girlfriend or fiancée involves varying levels of perfidy, there is no reason for a Muslim to feel regret over betraying, if made, any promises of *not* asking for her conversion, because the believer is *religiously* allowed to lie in order to strengthen the cause of his ‘God’ and religion, both of which are superior to the feelings of unbelievers or women.

And if the emotions of the deceived women are not enough to assuage any shame transmitted by the Psychic within over their actions, Muslims only need turn to their Prophet, the seal of Apostles, the greatest mortal to have graced the planet, Allah's “exemplar” for the human race, to discover that “love jihad” is actually an altogether *civilized* arrangement in comparison with Mohammed's degraded actions toward kuffar and Muslim women, including his notorious marriage to a non-Muslim woman named Safiyya. This union, arising strictly out of compulsion, occurred in the aftermath of the Prophet's victory at Khaibar where, having slaughtered the unbelieving enemy, he then took what the Asura of Falsehood told him was ‘divinely’ sanctioned:

Narrated Abdul Aziz:

Anas said, “When Allah's Apostle invaded Khaibar, we offered the Fajr prayer there yearly in

the morning when it was still dark. The Prophet rode and Abu Talha rode too and I was riding behind Abu Talha. The Prophet passed through the lane of Khaibar quickly and my knee was touching the thigh of the Prophet. He uncovered his thigh and I saw the whiteness of the thigh of the Prophet. **When he entered the town, he said, ‘Allahu Akbar! Khaibar is ruined. Whenever we approach near a (hostile) nation (to fight) then evil will be the morning of those who have been warned.’** He repeated this thrice. The people came out for their jobs and some of them said, ‘Mohammed (has come).’ (Some of our companions added, “With his army.”) **We conquered Khaibar, took the captives, and the booty was collected. Dihya came and said, ‘O Allah's Prophet! Give me a slave girl from the captives.’ The Prophet said, ‘Go and take any slave girl.’ He took Safiya bint Huyai. A man came to the Prophet and said, ‘O Allah's Apostles! You gave Safiya bint Huyai to Dihya and she is the chief mistress of the tribes of Quraiza and An-Nadir and she befits none but you.’ So the Prophet said, ‘Bring him along with her.’ So Dihya came with her and when the Prophet saw her, he said to Dihya, ‘Take any slave girl other than her from the captives.’” Anas added: “The Prophet then manumitted her and married her.”**

Thabit asked Anas, “O Abu Hamza! What did the Prophet pay her (as Mahr)?” He said, “Her self was her Mahr for he manumitted her and then married her.” Anas added, “While on the way, Um Sulaim dressed her for marriage (ceremony) and at night she sent her as a bride to the Prophet. So the Prophet was a bridegroom and he said, ‘Whoever has anything (food) should bring it.’ He spread out a leather sheet (for the food) and some brought dates and others cooking butter. (I think he (Anas) mentioned As-SawTq). So they prepared a dish of Hais (a kind of meal). And that was Walrma (the marriage banquet) of Allah's Apostle.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 1, Book 8, Number 367)

While this hadith unquestionably demonstrates the barbarity of Mohammed's personal practice, if it stood alone the “moderate” Muslim might be able dissimulate it away, delineating between reported tradition and the infrarationally revealed word of Allah. But this argument weakens considerably when we recall Mohammed's great fidelity to the voice he began hearing during his seclusion in the caves: It is unlikely that the Prophet, intoxicated with the Vital flood emerging out of this Asuric contact, would base further actions on his own impulse after having found such a fearsome guide. Thus a further study of the circumstances surrounding this sham marriage, one in which Safiya by default had no choice, leads us to a specific infrarational communication sanctioning prisoners of war, slaves (“right hand” possessions), and marriages to slave girls, of whom Safiya initially belonged:

O Prophet! Surely We have made lawful to you your wives whom you have given their dowries, **and those whom your right hand possesses out of those whom Allah has given to you as prisoners of war**, and the daughters of your paternal uncles and the daughters of your paternal aunts, and the daughters of your maternal uncles and the daughters of your maternal aunts who fled with you; and a believing woman if she gave herself to the Prophet, if the Prophet desired to marry her - **specially for you, not for the (rest of) believers**. We know what We have ordained for them concerning their wives and those whom their right hands possess in order that no blame may attach to you, and Allah is Forgiving, Merciful. (Quran 33:50)

Believing the Asura of Falsehood's word to be ‘divine’ law, the only problem left for Mohammed was making sure his followers understood Safiya to be his new wife rather than an ordinary slave girl – a task accomplished by way of the veil:

Narrated Anas: “The Prophet stayed for three rights between Khaibar and Medina and was married to Safiya. I invited the Muslim to his marriage banquet and there was neither meat nor bread in that banquet but the Prophet ordered Bilal to spread the leather mats on which dates, dried yogurt and butter were put. The Muslims said amongst themselves, ‘Will she (i.e. Safiya)

be one of the mothers of the believers, (i.e. one of the wives of the Prophet) or just (a lady captive) of what his right-hand possesses.’ Some of them said, ‘If the Prophet makes her observe the veil, then she will be one of the mothers of the believers (i.e. one of the Prophet's wives), and if he does not make her observe the veil, then she will be his lady slave.’ So when he departed, he made a place for her behind him (on his) and made her observe the veil.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 5, Book 59, Number 524)

As the civilized nations of the modern world have enacted laws against forced marriages, recognizing their inherent savagery, degradation of females and corrosive effect on families and society, when Muslims – believing such actions as perfectly consistent with their inverted idea of truth – encounter their enemies, the clash of cultures over these discrepant laws can by itself lead to a mental agitation unrelated to any overt sign of hostility from the kuffar. The believer, after all, has been taught from birth that Islam is the ‘true religion’ and that all of mankind should follow it, therefore anger naturally rises when he tries to comprehend the divergence between Infidel and Sharia law. It is the respective motive-forces behind the opposing laws of each culture that prevents him from understanding their rationale, because the unbeliever's legislation tends to emerge out of life, based on a mixture of past experience, intuition, philosophy, religion, and the will of the people - a combination closer to the plastic inherent law. Sharia law lacks such fluidity, as it is *infrarationally* revealed (suprarational revelation is fluid and not restricted to a certain time or location) and final, with the believer's will stamped out completely to create a teeming mass of headless soldiers under the direction of a select minority of Imams.

These Mullahs are well aware that Safiyya's ‘consent’ to marriage was that of a slave girl, and that such unions are clearly allowed by Islam - justified by different scripture beyond the previously cited, as we shall later extensively document. As they understand that the vast majority of non-Muslim cultures are decidedly against such barbaric sexual crimes and impulses, they seek to reassure infidels that forced marriages are illegal, that Islam does not allow its believers to kidnap non-Muslim women and make them their forcefully converted wives. It is a claim, however, that crumbles when confronted with direct evidence of Mohammed's actions and Allah's endorsement of it. Therefore to tell non-Muslims that Islam does not allow coercion in marriage is to engage in taqiyyah, a tactical lie to keep the kuffar ignorant of actual Sharia. To get away with such dissimulation, a Muslim must earn the trust of the naive infidel, getting him to reflexively turn toward the individual Muslim for opinions on crucial matters – including terrorism and forced marriage - regarding Islam, rather than using his own mental faculties to research the religion and discover its depraved reality. To do this, a Muslim often uses the generally frowned upon – especially when Islam dominates – practice of developing friendship with infidels, a situation usually forbidden *except* when permitted for taqiyyah:

Let not the believers take disbelievers for their friends in preference to believers. **Whoso doeth that hath no connection with Allah unless (it be) that ye but guard yourselves against them, taking (as it were) security.** Allah biddeth you beware (only) of Himself. Unto Allah is the journeying. (Quran 3:28)

Viewing this infrarational revelation, the genuine Muslim realizes that any “friendship” with the enemy can only be a tactical arrangement, void of genuine affection for the other party, designed to give Muslims time - “guard yourself against them” - to gain a foothold in kuffar-majority lands. Relations with unbelievers should be considered by the faithful as similar to contractual alliances, and fond feelings for the other must be rejected or suppressed, especially if it interferes with the jihad for world conquest. Befitting a cult, true friendship is only allowed among the chosen members, because the non-cult members are not to be trusted, lest they somehow bring confusion or ‘impurity’ into the minds of the chosen, leading to a betrayal of Islamic thought, practices and belief. The Asura of Falsehood's mentality hovers over this Islamic tenet, as the rejection of unbelieving friends on the basis of a

fanatical attachment to one's group identity is a quality opposite of the Psychic in humanity, for which genuine friendship is considered the most divine of ordinary human relationships, as it is less often based on attachment and flows naturally without consideration for desire or the friend's religious beliefs.

If a particular Muslim is initially ignorant of friendship's – with the non-Muslims - *haram* (forbidden) status in the Islamic religion, when he does learn the facts, he need not abandon the relationship from an external standpoint, because he knows that it may serve some purpose for the cause of Islam's supremacy, and any betrayal of his previous friend – or potential spouse - can be done without a guilty conscience, because lying is perfectly fine if it strengthens Islam, and after all, the person being lied to is a heinous kafir. No shame can be placed upon a believer for using non-Muslims, whether through friendship or romantic affections, as the believers reflect their true Lord, the Asura of Falsehood, for whom the desires or ideals, loves or friendships of humanity are looked upon with callous indifference. Humans – even the believers, though unbeknownst to them – are strictly to be used by him then discarded after they are deemed utterly worthless; along this dark path will his followers proceed, using those judged expendable, with the exception – assuming there still exist official non-Muslims - of Muslims whom the faithful also consider to be real believers.

Unfortunately for the Muslim, intoxicated by his quest for glory and spoils against the kuffar, the ideal of a perfect, harmonious, completely Islamic world is a mirage, one derided by the Asura himself. For the Lord of Falsehood, reflecting his name, wants the exact opposite, and if he *uses* Muslims to increase Islam's sway over the planet, convincing them that a great 'peace' will dominate when they win, it is a lie, because the inevitable outcome of his infrarational revelations is *perpetually reviving division*, with one group of "true" believers always needing to unmask and then fight "hypocrites". Well before Muslims are faced with this dystopian nightmare, they succumb to the lure of conquest, to the pride in taking the only 'true religion' and imposing it upon the deluded non-Muslims, the ones who dare to worship other deities and 'persecute' the faithful. Though this alleged persecution – exaggerated during our modern time and the Prophet's – has often been invoked to instigate Muslim riots, with the believers indignant over concocted or distorted kafir actions, only a small amount of the scripture justifying taqiyah was done so with protection of 'persecution' in mind.

For it is clearly not enough that Islam become immune from real or imagined provocations from the kuffar, because the Asuric religion wants to impose itself upon the entire planet, including locations which may have never heard of Islam. The desire for a world conquest consisting of physical and sexual subjugation and violence, requires both the idea that one's ideology is worth spreading across the planet, and the impetus to aggressively pursue this outcome, rather than a defensive posture to avoid persecution. Thus if the *initial* infrarational revelations advocating dissimulation were made to protect the believer, when Mohammed's army became stronger, taqiyah *remained* a beneficial strategy encompassing both the battlefield and the street, and was developed in further verses by the Asura. While the claim of 'persecution' remains a helpful part of dissimulation, it functions more as a means for the Imams to selectively elicit anger from the faithful. Rage, however, cannot be a persistent state for an Islamic community surrounded by the Infidel, as it will draw too much attention, with the unbeliever potentially awakening to Islam's ambition.

The importance of the Imams in calibrating this process cannot be understated, as a militarily weaker group seeking to subjugate a stronger one must be careful with its use of force. Initially, the Imam will promote the greatest asymmetric weapon at his disposal, the – currently - superior reproductive rate of Muslim women, doing so by emphasizing infrarational revelations that can be interpreted as a call for Muslims to increase their numbers. During this incubation phase, the religious leaders will somewhat minimize the messages of hatred and violence, turning a blind eye to their flock immersing themselves in non-Muslim ideals; they will, however, at least seek to keep them nominally Muslim, and will urge

them to – especially if marrying an unbeliever – obtain conversions. By doing so, they not only add to Muslim numbers while depleting the enemy's, but also maintain the possibility that future generations will follow the legitimate jihad of their inherited religion. An Imam might even, to obtain the seed for ensuing generations of jihadis, either allow the non-Muslim to *not* convert (as long as the children are raised Islamic) or facilitate the conversion through the lie that the unbeliever will subsequently be entering a cosmopolitan religion!

As the Imam's flock continues to make demographic gains, his followers begin to naturally identify themselves more with their specific community, becoming less inherently individualistic – the more the individual develops along inner lines, the better the outcome for Psychic growth – and more curious about how to properly adhere to their Islamic background. As Muslim males learn more – especially through contact with increasingly emboldened Imams – about the supposed plotting of the kuffar against Islam, and as the Asuric message – also transmitted from their personal reading of the scripture – begins to invade their minds, they start to view themselves as rightful rulers over their unbelieving counterparts, and their alienation and anger towards the majority kuffar increases, with any slight or insult intensifying the circulating paranoid thoughts. All of this fury requires the inevitable outlet of violence, whether paroxysmal or calculated, against the Infidel. Nevertheless, during this time frame there will remain plenty of ordinary “Muslims”, and perhaps a handful of scandalously uninformed Imams, who are still blissfully unaware that their religion sanctions this primitive violence.

At this crucial juncture the knowledgeable majority of Imams will either consciously promote the latter's unconscious intellectual dissimulation, or simply decline to counter the misinformation of the universal thinkers nominally known as “Muslim”, letting the ideas of the latter attach to the name of Islam, securing the trust of the kuffar. For it is, as we recall, easier to tell a lie when one actually believes it, and if a pious Imam believes that such unconscious taqiya is assisting the jihad, he might even encourage it. Later, when the Muslims ascend to the majority and can implement Sharia, the now unusable intellectuals can be denounced as heretics and killed if they persist with their fallacies, whether originating from a sheer ignorance of the scripture; or a failure to realize that Gabriel sent specific infrarational revelations against either changing the Quran or selectively following verses; or from an over-reliance on ambiguous verses or hadith (devotees of Sufism fall under this category, as we shall document) as evidence of their heretical positions when a dozen clear examples of authentic scripture will contradict their allegations; or most pathetic of all, in the case of the dreamers, simply continuing to take their imagined interpretation of Islam for fact.

Of course, there are numerous academic or intellectual Muslims who are simply liars, who know the inaccuracy of what they are saying, who secretly understand why they must deceive the non-Muslims. These are, like the majority of Imams, a thoroughly unscrupulous type; both, in their different styles, are capable of bridging the two worlds, Non-Islamic and Islamic, without the potential internal schism, because they understand the scriptural justification for, and the purpose of, dissimulation. While these kind of Muslims, from the kuffar viewpoint, appear to be, and indeed are Janus-faced, the subjective perspective of a true believer engaging in taqiya is unified, as what is a lie in the opinion of the unbeliever is irrelevant to the chosen ones. They do not care what the “dogs” think, for Allah will give them a befitting reply in hell if the Muslims do not attain enough strength upon earth to destroy them terrestrially. It is only for the intellectuals who actually believe the inaccuracies they propagate that an uneasiness – whether conscious or not – will exist, gnawing away with each instance of Islamic aggression, with every counter-argument or opinion that attempts to bring reality to their delusions.

In this second category of “Muslim” intellectual, the schism between the strains of truth versus the competing fantasies erected often lead to the most outrageous of dissimulations, or at least the most intensive effort at maintaining the illusion of a sagacious, harmonious and benevolent Islam. Though these particular Muslims are often quite intelligent, creative and broad-minded, their inability to accept

the destructive falsehood of Islam's ideology has its roots in the downfall of many of the greats of world history: Egoism. For it is sheer egoistic attachment to their cultural upbringing; their childhood education – erroneous, though they will fail to admit – on religion; their group – ironic as they are more likely than the rest of their community to view themselves as individuals; their pride, the most difficult of all to let go of, which makes them attached to the nonsense – one they likely propagate to all interested in hearing – that Islam is the greatest religion precisely *because* it preaches the universal values of brotherhood, tolerance of other religions, equality between the sexes, or the pursuit of higher learning, to name a few of the classical ideals contained within this mythical Islam.

Rather than confronting the gnawing intuition that all is not right with his idea of Islam, this type of intellectual progresses to increasingly complex mental gymnastics, trying to convince himself and others that his religion represents all he presumes it to be – much easier is this than having his precious ideal destroyed under the unflinching truth that Islam codifies the exact opposite. The latter process is quite difficult, especially for the Muslim intellectual with *faith* in the scripture, who upon learning of Islam's antipathy and depraved principles, may still believe that a rejection of either certain tenets or the entire scripture will send him to hell, and in turn will introduce all sorts of contortions into his interpretation of the verses. For though these individuals are often brilliant, it does not mean they are immune from the fears of the ordinary masses, including those of the afterlife – even the high achievers of officially Muslim *society* remain mortals susceptible to the lower ego of which fear is perhaps the most primitive and therefore least extinguishable. They will, however much they deny it to themselves, wish to avoid being branded an unbeliever; because of this root fear, the comparatively uncultured Imams can yet exert control over those who in reality should be their superiors.

Consequently, in the preliminary stages of jihad these intellectuals became useful tools for the Imam, one component of a dissimulation campaign to obfuscate Islam's ambitions, helpful in taking advantage of the unbeliever's (especially Polytheists like the Hindus) inherent respect for diversity of faith, keeping them tranquil while Muslim demographics, “love jihads”, conversions through marriage or even kidnapping, rioting, “Sharia zones”, and “no-go” areas for non-Muslims, increasingly dominate the picture. The resulting atmosphere leads to multiple layers of confusion for the nervous unbeliever, unsure that he is being told the truth by this growing minority. The nature of his discourse with Allah's chosen ones assumes an Orwellian character, with war and riots accompanying a “religion of peace”; where offers of friendship and goodwill are laced with betrayal; the appearance of respect and mutual tolerance masking a savage hatred; obscurantism and falsehood passed off as “truth” to the bewilderment of non-Muslims aspiring for goodwill between all; and actions deemed those of a “good” Muslim striking the Kafir as markedly evil.

His discomfiture worsens if he – like many Hindus – has knowledge of Sufism, the version of Islam credited with obtaining many of the subcontinent's converts. Especially for those Hindus who offer prayers at sufi shrines, the idea that Islam is fundamentally a religion of falsehood is difficult to digest, because his view of Islam is distorted by what he initially finds in Sufism, with its numerous superficial similarities to the Sanatana Dharma. Unfortunately for him and indeed for many of its “Muslim” adherents, this mystical version of Islam, as we shall explore in depth in the next chapter, is in fact renegade from the infrarational word of Gabriel, with its practices clearly rejected in the Asura's communications and the *authentic* hadith. Of all the dissimulations used by Islam, Sufism is perhaps the most dangerous for Hindus, a remnant of pre-Islamic West Asian spirituality that attached itself, in order to survive, to certain Islamic tenets while maintaining ancestral *forms* of worship, leading to a cursory similarity with the Sanatana Dharma. Though it is clearly a transgression from the Asura of Falsehood's commands, in the subcontinent it remains a useful means for both the conversion of Hindus and taqiyah designed to make them believe a lie that Islam loves the infidel's spiritual outlook.

Though Sufism is markedly different to the other types of dissimulation mentioned, it does share with

them at least one pertinent characteristic: chiefly, that it emerged organically out of life, a natural development related to the time and circumstances. In Sufism's case, while it initially represented a mechanism by which the ancient spiritual practices survived, it later became an avenue for taqiyyah against the kuffar. While some of the other dissimulations also arose from the same survival instinct, the difference is that these were from the beginning designed to help *Islam's* propagation rather than assist the old way. But irrespective of such details, they all continue, initially to maintain Islam's sheer existence, increasingly for world conquest and subjugation of the 'other'. Included as well among this multifarious obfuscation of Islam's malevolent nature and stratagems is a denial of the very use of taqiyyah, because if unbelievers become aware of this process, their suspicions regarding the content of Islamic teaching would naturally arise, and jihad might die in infancy. If the believers wish to succeed in their quest to destroy the hated non-Muslims, it is of most importance that they conceal from the enemy *all* of the tactics inspired by the scripture, from taqiyyah and reproductive jihad to the *jizya* and surprise assaults, that they plan on implementing. For though the faithful are only subconsciously aware of it, the Asura of Falsehood understands that many of these same weapons constitute part of the blueprint for Islam's own demise.

* * * *

To further understand how the Asura was able to arouse the most base of group passions, how he instigated the rapid expansion of a creed presented to mankind by a quite ordinary mortal in one of the harshest and isolated areas of the planet, and how he continues to channel fear into externalized rage and aggression toward the unbelievers, we must devote special attention to Gabriel's moulding of Mohammed, from the point of the latter's personal ego along with his perceived status among his fanatical supporters. It was a process, paralleling the development of taqiyyah, that reflected a need for caution (indeed this word is the *literal* translation for taqiyyah) during an uncertain time for the Lord of Falsehood's burgeoning cult. But unlike taqiyyah, whose Orwellian contradictions can be reconciled in the mind of intelligent believers by the justification of world conquest, the psychology of Mohammed's ego and the manner in which his followers appreciate him and other central features of Islam, contain a hypocrisy buried deep under the weight of the religion's incessant propaganda, a pretence that when unmasked destroys most of Islam's claim to uniqueness and the inspiration for its violence.

To begin comprehending this remarkable schism between a Muslim's self-perception and his religion's true psychological reality, we must recall that the Asura initially had for his Prophet a decidedly simpler goal than the raging jihad that we find today. His instrument was merely to offer guidance to those not blessed with the divine contact Gabriel professed to have. In lieu of this, he was told by the false Lord, on one occasion, "Say: 'I do not ask you for any reward for it; nor am I of those who affect: **It is nothing but a reminder to the nations.** And most certainly you will come to know about it after a time.' " (Quran 38:86-88) It was the Day of Judgement, the Hour, that he was warning about, having been specifically instructed to do so by Gabriel, who told him, "They ask you about the hour, when it will come. About what! You are one to remind of it. To your Lord is the goal of it. You are only a warner to him who would fear it." (Quran 79:42-45) Of course, the Hour was not the only reminder he was to send; along with it came the admonition against Polytheism: "Therefore fly to Allah, surely I am a plain **warner** to you from Him. And do not set up with Allah another god. Surely I am a plain warner to you from Him." (Quran 51:50-51) The message to him was that no god existed besides Allah, and Mohammed was only to be a "plain" deliverer of this dictum: "Say (O Mohammed): 'I am only a warner, and there is no god but Allah, the One, the Subduer (of all), the Lord of the heavens and the earth and what is between them, the Mighty, the most Forgiving.' Say: 'It is a message of importance,

(And) you are turning aside from it. I had no knowledge of the exalted chiefs when they disputed. Naught is revealed to me save that I am a plain warner.’ ” (Quran 38:65-70)

Mohammed, a humble warner himself, was simply offering the familiar guidance delivered by messengers before him. If his audience called him a liar, then they were following a well-travelled pattern of disbelievers who turned away from previous prophets and the “illuminating book”, only to find themselves facing the wrath of Allah:

Thou are naught but a warner. Surely We have sent you with the truth as a bearer of good news and a warner, and there is not a people but a warner has gone among them. And if they call you a liar, so did those before them indeed call (their messengers) liars. Their messengers had come to them with clear arguments, and with scriptures, and with the illuminating book. Then did I punish those who disbelieved, and how was the manifestation of My disapproval! (Quran 35:22-26)

It was the chastisement of hellfire that Mohammed had come to put in the mind of his compatriots, urging them to fear it and the ‘one true god’. And for them to know that all of the previous groups privy to a messenger, only to subsequently reject that particular messenger, failed to receive mercy from the hellfire, because they did not follow the primitive impulse of fear - of the ‘Divine’ no less!

And for those who disbelieve in their Lord is the punishment of hell, and evil is the destination. When they shall be cast therein, they shall hear a loud moaning of it as it heaves, Almost bursting for fury. Whenever a group is cast into it, its keeper shall ask them: “Did there not come to you a warner?” They shall say: “Yea! Indeed there came to us a warner, but we rejected (him) and said, ‘Allah has not revealed anything, you are only in a great error.’ ” And they shall say: “Had we but listened or pondered, we should not have been among the inmates of the burning fire.” So they shall acknowledge their sins, but far will be (forgiveness) from the inmates of the burning fire. (As for) those who fear their Lord in secret, they shall surely have forgiveness and a great reward. (Quran 67:06-12)

Better to fear the insatiable rage of a ‘God’ than to face the inevitable consequences experienced by towns immemorial. Mohammed, believing the Asura of Falsehood’s dictates in full, took it as ‘spiritual’ for ‘God’ to destroy towns failing to heed a “warning”; thus, infinitesimal that he was in occult form, the terrestrial medium of an entity without either light or a Psychic, he believed it the height of religious thought that Allah could kill and perpetually burn those who simply *disagreed*. As he did not have the power, at the time of Gabriel’s early infrarational revelations, to do anything about kuffar disbelief, Mohammed was instructed to only warn them and declare himself free of the unbeliever’s disobedience to Allah:

And We did not destroy any town but it had (its) warners, to remind, and We are never unjust. And the Satans have not come down with it. And it behoves them not, and they have not the power to do (it). Most surely they are far removed from the hearing of it. So call not upon another god with Allah, lest you be of those who are punished. And warn your nearest relations, And be kind to him who follows you of the believers. And if they disobey thee, say: “Lo! I am innocent of what they do.” And put thy trust in the Mighty, the Merciful. (Quran 26:208-217)

As should be evident by now, numerous communications were made characterizing Mohammed as a humble conduit for the infrarational word of Allah, someone repeating what had already been said before by multiple ‘prophets’ in numerous locations. He was not only the latest in a long line of messengers, his stature in the eyes of Allah was also considered insignificant enough – at the time of the early Asuric revelations including the following – for Gabriel to communicate that his fate at Allah’s hands was *uncertain*:

We did not create the heavens and the earth and what is between them two save with truth and (for) an appointed term. Those who disbelieve turn aside from what they are warned of. Say: "Have you considered what you call upon besides Allah? Show me what they have created of the earth, or have they a share in the heavens? Bring me a book before this or traces of knowledge, if you are truthful." And who is in greater error than he who invokes besides Allah, upon those that will not answer him till the day of resurrection, and are heedless of their call? And when men are gathered together (at the Resurrection) they shall be their enemies, and shall be deniers of their previous worship of them. And when Our clear communications are recited to them, those who disbelieve say with regard to the truth when it comes to them: "This is clear magic." "Nay," they say, "He has forged it." Say: "If I have forged it, you do not control anything for me from Allah. He knows best what you utter concerning it. He is enough as a witness between me and you, and He is the Forgiving, the Merciful." Say: **"I am not the first of the messengers, and I do not know what will be done with me or with you. I do not follow anything but that which is revealed to me, and I am nothing but a plain warner."** Say, O Mohammed: "Have you considered if it is from Allah, and you disbelieve in it, and a witness from among the children of Israel has borne witness of one like it, so he believed, while you are big with pride. Surely Allah does not guide the unjust people." And those who disbelieve say concerning those who believe: "If it had been a good thing, they would not have gone ahead of us in attaining it." And as they do not seek to be rightly directed, thereby they say: "It is an old lie." (Quran 46:03-11)

Mohammed was to continue delivering the warning even when accused, as the Polytheists were wont to do, of the dreaded forgery of the pristine infrarational revelations, which we know to be a 'crime' that establishes disbelief, according to Islam:

Suad, I swear by the Quran, full of admonition. Nay! Those who disbelieve are in self-exaltation and opposition. How many did We destroy before them of the generations, then they cried while the time of escaping had passed away. And they wonder that there has come to them a warner from among themselves, and the disbelievers say: "This is an enchanter, a liar. What! Makes he the gods a single Allah? A strange thing is this, to be sure!" And the chief persons of them break forth, saying: "Go and steadily adhere to your gods, this is most surely a thing sought after. We never heard of this in the former faith; this is nothing but a forgery. Has the reminder been revealed to him from among us?" Nay! they are in doubt as to My reminder. Nay! They have not yet tasted My chastisement! (Quran 38:01-08)

Though Allah's Apostle was the final messenger, the one who delivered Allah's ultimate admonition of Polytheism, the "exemplar" of a faith currently followed by around one-fifth of humanity who have at their disposal the full record of the Quran and the authentic hadith, he cannot be said to have succeeded, *among his own followers*, in eliminating either Polytheism or the essence of it. For as we are about to see, the message delivered by him ironically creates the perfect environment for a manner of worship decidedly *against* the monotheism Muslims like to believe they practice. Far different is it also to his modest declaration depicting his status as the last messenger:

Narrated Jabir bin Abdullah:

The Prophet said, "My similitude in comparison with the other prophets is that of a man who has built a house completely and excellently except for a place of one brick. When the people enter the house, they admire its beauty and say: 'But for the place of this brick (how splendid the house will be)!'" (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 56, Number 734)

By describing his position in that humble fashion, he presented himself as equal to all of the other prophets, differentiated only by the time of his arrival upon earth, not by any criteria of greatness.

Likewise, all of the messengers, including the final brick in the house, are to stand equal with the ordinary masses in front of Allah, since they are all, according to certain communications including the following, human:

Ha Mim! A revelation from the Beneficent, the Merciful Allah, A Book of which the verses are made plain, an Arabic Quran for a people who know. A herald of good news and a warner, but most of them turn aside so they hear not. And they say: "Our hearts are under coverings from that to which you call us, and there is a heaviness in our ears, and a veil hangs between us and you, so work, we too are working." Say, O Mohammed: "**I am only a mortal like you**; it is revealed to me that your Allah is one Allah, therefore follow the right way to Him and ask His forgiveness. And woe to the polytheists, those who do not give poor-rate and they are unbelievers in the hereafter." (Quran 41:01-07)

Of course, in the religion of Islam, mortality is defined as bondage to Allah, with all of mankind in reality a separately conscious slave of Allah, including the historic messengers incorrectly exalted as "sons" of Allah by the ignorant:

And they say: "The Beneficent hath taken unto Himself a son." **Be He Glorified! Nay, but (those whom they call sons) are honoured slaves.** They speak not until He hath spoken, and they act by His command. He knoweth what is before them and what is behind them, and they cannot intercede except for him whom He accepteth, and they stand in awe of Him. And one of them who should say, "Lo! I am a god beside Him," that one We should repay with hell. Thus We Repay wrong-doers. (Quran 21:26-29)

Besides the clear theological difference displayed here between Islam and Christianity, the description of all mortals as "slaves" is markedly different from the Sanatana Dharma, in which the Self-Realized Yogi is neither a mortal nor a slave. Instead, the Consciousness of the Yogi is United with the Divine Reality, with the individual ceasing to function as an *egoistic* unit of Prakriti, having evolved into a "Godhead" or outpost of God into Her earthly manifestation. Islam however, both rails against the possibility of uplifting the consciousness into the Supreme Consciousness, and adopts the pretence that it is against the assigning of superiority to certain Muslims above other believers. But the latter is an unconscious self-deception, which is why Mohammed, unable to comprehend his own role in the grand lie, explicitly demanded his followers to refer to him as a "slave" of Allah:

Narrated Umar:

I heard the Prophet saying, "Do not exaggerate in praising me as the Christians praised the son of Mary, for I am only a Slave. So, call me the Slave of Allah and His Apostle." (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 55, Number 654)

If the previous citations are taken by themselves, one might truly believe the Prophet to be the epitome of self-effacement, the humblest and therefore most completely devoted of all to Allah, yet still a mortal slave at the same level as all the genuine believers. But as we continue to review the infrarational revelations and hadith, we find them slowly eroding the notion, replacing this superficial appearance with Orwell's famous dictum, paraphrased, that while all believers are equal, some are more equal than others. Reflecting this, we find in one instance, his followers commanded by Allah to abstain from speaking louder than Mohammed:

O you who believe! Be not forward in the presence of Allah and His Messenger, and be careful of (your duty to) Allah; surely Allah is Hearing, Knowing. O you who believe! **Do not raise your voices above the voice of the Prophet, and do not speak loud to him as you speak loud to one another, lest your deeds became null while you do not perceive. Surely those who lower their voices before Allah's Messenger are they whose hearts Allah has proved**

for guarding (against evil); they shall have forgiveness and a great reward. (Quran 49:01-03)

While it was logical for both the Asura and Mohammed to want the ordinary rank and file to lower their voices while their military commander was speaking, the infrarational passage in question extends beyond this ordinary arrangement between a leader and his group. For the Lord of Falsehood, through this communication, incredibly turned a simple impropriety into a crime against Allah, with the believers engaging in such a sin losing the benefits of all their good deeds before Allah, and those lowering their voice able to obtain their god's forgiveness from the hellfire! By associating a simple act of speaking louder than the Prophet with Allah's wrath, the Asura subtly reinforced the notion that Mohammed was not an ordinary mortal, contrary to some of the previous scripture cited. Similarly, when the believer comes across passages like the following, infrarational revelations that grant Mohammed laws *specific to himself*, it only helps to elevate their internal perception of Mohammed, raising his importance above themselves and the rest of men throughout history. And as the Asura understands - contrary to some of his communications - the necessity of a central figure to a movement, he methodically orchestrated the process:

You, O Mohammed, canst defer whom thou wilt of them and receive unto thee whom thou wilt, and whomsoever thou desirest of those whom thou hast set aside (temporarily), it is no sin for thee (to receive her again); that is better; that they may be comforted and not grieve, and may all be pleased with what thou givest them. Allah knoweth what is in your hearts (O men), and Allah is ever Forgiving, Clement. (Quran 33:51)

Through this verse, Mohammed was granted special sexual dispensation, with Gabriel's intention likely to have involved keeping his instrument's base impulses satisfied along with inflating his self-esteem. After all, the aggrandizement of the Prophet's ego was the inevitable consequence of Allah deeming the former worthy of special communications *solely* pertaining to a particular "slave". And this was far from an unusual case, with the previously mentioned war booty – twenty percent of which went to the Prophet, its overall ownership belonging to *both* Allah and his final messenger rather than the ordinary believers – offering a pattern of Mohammed being hoisted above the mass of ordinary Muslim slaves of Allah. In a sign of his awareness of the privileged position he held, the Hadith illustrate Mohammed's anger when *his* booty was tampered with:

Narrated Abu Huraira:

When we conquered Khaibar, we gained neither gold nor silver as booty, but we gained cows, camels, goods and gardens. Then we departed with Allah's Apostle to the valley of Al-Qira, and at that time Allah's Apostle had a slave called Midam who had been presented to him by one of Banu Ad-Dibbab. While the slave was dismounting the saddle of Allah's Apostle an arrow the thrower of which was unknown, came and hit him. The people said, "Congratulations to him for the martyrdom." **Allah's Apostle said, "No, by Him in Whose Hand my soul is, the sheet (of cloth) which he had taken (illegally) on the day of Khaibar from the booty before the distribution of the booty, has become a flame of Fire burning him."** On hearing that, a man brought one or two leather straps of shoes to the Prophet and said, "These are things I took (illegally)." On that Allah's Apostle said, "This is a strap, or these are two straps of Fire." (Sahih Bukhari Volume 5, Book 59, Number 541)

Even if the rest of the believers played a major role in murdering the unbelieving enemy, the spoils belonged to Mohammed along with Allah, and punishment was awaiting those who dared to claim their reward prior to the Prophet's acquiescence. Another hadith confirms Mohammed's special allotment, noting that Allah gave certain spoils only to his beloved Apostle:

Narrated Malik bin Aus Al-Hadathan An-Nasri:

He said, “Now I am talking to you about this matter. Allah the Glorified favoured His Apostle with something of this Fai (i.e. booty won without fighting) which He did not give to anybody else. Allah said:

‘And what Allah gave to His Apostle (Fai Booty) from them - For which you made no expedition With either Calvary or camelry. **But Allah gives power to His Apostles over whomsoever He will** And Allah is able to do all things.’ ” (Quran 59.6) (Sahih Bukhari Volume 5, Book 59, Number 367)

But Mohammed's exclusive terrestrial control over the spoils of war was not strictly for his enjoyment, as the mentioned verse in the previous hadith, the one declaring Allah to grant power to certain Muslims (the Apostles) over “whomsoever” (including ordinary Muslims), also outlines the advantageous reasons for the Prophet to have such absolute command:

And that which Allah gave as spoil unto His messenger from them, ye urged not any horse or riding-camel for the sake thereof, but Allah giveth His messenger lordship over whom He will. Allah is Able to do all things. That which Allah giveth as spoil unto His messenger from the people of the townships, it is for Allah and His messenger and for the near of kin and the orphans and the needy and the wayfarer, that it become not a commodity between the rich among you. And whatsoever the messenger giveth you, take it. And whatsoever he forbiddeth, abstain (from it). And keep your duty to Allah. Lo! Allah is stern in reprisal. (Quran 59:6-7)

Though the Prophet's control of the spoils of war was for more than just selfish reasons, its charitable allotment was not simply an altruistic endeavour, because the Asura of Falsehood knew that the growing Muslim community could not continue without a relatively balanced distribution of the spoils helping to ensure its basic survival. Irrespective of the booty in question, the crucial point here is that Mohammed cannot be considered a mere “warner”, nor an ordinary mortal or slave when Allah is authorizing him specific powers unattainable to regular Muslims. And if his desire to spread the wealth to believers (not, of course, to the unbelievers who instead were worthy of famines) had noble underpinnings on a personal level, other laws, including the following infrarational revelation we have previously cited, *specifically* pertaining to him, were decidedly for his crude pleasure:

O Prophet! Surely We have made lawful to you your wives whom you have given their dowries, and those whom your right hand possesses out of those whom Allah has given to you as prisoners of war, and the daughters of your paternal uncles and the daughters of your paternal aunts, and the daughters of your maternal uncles and the daughters of your maternal aunts who fled with you; and a believing woman if she gave herself to the Prophet, if the Prophet desired to marry her - **specially for you, not for the (rest of) believers**. We know what We have ordained for them concerning their wives and those whom their right hands possess in order that no blame may attach to you, and Allah is Forgiving, Merciful. (Quran 33:50)

Mohammed was a law unto himself, and failed to see the contradiction inherent to the infrarational revelations he received, having already accepted them as *the* ‘truth’ untainted by logic or consistency. There was no need for him to ponder the paradox of a status leaving him equal to, and yet elevated above, fellow Muslims from the egoistic standpoint upon earth (rather than the non-egoistic samata that accounts for temporary differences in earthly standing); for an infrarational religion only calls for unthinking and slavish obedience – a nation of thought-slaves. In contrast, those who were deemed hostile to the Prophet (there is no mention of *Allah* in the following verse) in his lifetime, failing to heed his clear instructions, were to find themselves in hell:

And whoever acts hostilely to the Messenger after that guidance has become manifest to him, and follows other than the way of the believers, We will turn him to that to which he has (himself) turned and make him enter hell; and it is an evil resort. (Quran 4:115)

While this Asuric revelation is best interpreted in combination with Gabriel's clear denunciation of apostasy (failing to follow the "guidance" of the infrarationally revealed verses) or outright battle against the Prophet, it can possibly be used to support the notion that slandering the Prophet, a type of hostility, is alone enough to send one to hell. Especially when we consider a hadith narrated by Ali relating how **"the Prophet said, 'Do not tell a lie against me for whoever tells a lie against me (intentionally) then he will surely enter the Hell-fire.'**" (Sahih Bukhari Volume 1, Book 3, Number 106) Another authentic hadith details further the sin of slandering Mohammed, who is recorded as specifically noting that prevarications against him are *unequal* to lies concerning the rest of Allah's slaves:

Narrated Al-Mughira:

I heard the Prophet saying, **"Ascribing false things to me is not like ascribing false things to anyone else. Whosoever tells a lie against me intentionally then surely let him occupy his seat in Hell-Fire."** I heard the Prophet saying, "The deceased who is wailed over is tortured for that wailing." (Sahih Bukhari Volume 2, Book 23, Number 378)

Mohammed, as with the vast majority of his declarations to his followers, found support for his superiority to the herd in the occultly received communications, including an infrarational revelatory passage representing the decisive shift in terms of Islamic equality, with the Prophet now presented as equal to *Allah* instead of the ordinary believers:

Surely (as for) those who speak evil things of Allah and His Messenger, Allah has cursed them in this world and the here after, and He has prepared for them a chastisement bringing disgrace. And those who malign believing men and believing women undeservedly, they bear the guilt of slander and manifest sin. (Quran 33:57-58)

Though there is a price to pay for maligning the ordinary believers, this selection prominently separates both Allah *and* the Messenger from the mass of Muslims, describing the punishment more colourfully for those affronting the former pairing. While one might understand why Allah, as the childish yet exclusive supreme being of the religion, would curse and punish those hurting his ultra-sensitive emotions, the addition of Mohammed to this lofty status hints at the aggrandizement of an ordinary mortal ego beyond the humble slave he is proclaimed, in other verses, to have been. As the "evil things" said of the two are not specified in the communication, different verses, including the below, inform that one interpretation involves rudimentary criticism or disagreement with the "messenger of Allah":

And of them are those who vex the Prophet and say, "He is only a hearer." Say: "A hearer of good for you, who believeth in Allah and is true to the believers, and a mercy for such of you as believe." **Those who vex the messenger of Allah, for them there is a painful doom.** (Quran 9:61)

To make vexing the Prophet through various means - whether due to disbelief in his relay of the infrarational word, or different squabbles - a 'crime', part of the last 'Word of Allah', again illustrates the glorification of a mortal ego exceeding the supposed limits one would expect to define a slave of Allah. After all, if Allah is to specifically declare that doom awaits those merely annoying or questioning the Prophet's guidance, his status as a man can only assume a paramount standing. While it is likely that Gabriel's intention through the particular infrarational revelation was to soothe the hurt feelings of his instrument, to remind him of his unique significance and keep him focused on the Asuric mission, it still remains at least another example of the contradictory nature of the supposedly final 'Word'. Of course, there are also clearer scriptural examples helping to establish the 'sin' of insulting the Prophet - the following Quran surah concerns an Arab named Abu Lahab:

Perdition overtake both hands of Abu Lahab, and he will perish. His wealth and what he earns will not avail him. He shall soon burn in fire that flames, **And his wife, the bearer of fuel, Upon her neck a halter of strongly twisted rope.** (Quran 111:01-05)

From the Hadith arrives the explanation helping us to understand this vicious surah from a benevolent 'God', one slicing through the lie of Mohammed's claim to be a simple warner or slave:

Narrated Ibn Abbas:

When the Verse: 'And warn your tribe of near kindred.' (26.214) was revealed, Allah's Apostle went out, and when he had ascended As-Safa mountain, he shouted, "O Sabahah!" The people said, "Who is that?" Then they gathered around him, whereupon he said, "Do you see? If I inform you that cavalymen are proceeding up the side of this mountain, will you believe me?" They said, "We have never heard you telling a lie." Then he said, "I am a plain warner to you of a coming severe punishment." **Abu Lahab said, "May you perish! You gathered us only for this reason?" Then Abu Lahab went away. So the "Surat: ul-Lahab" 'Perish the hands of Abu Lahab!' (111.1) was revealed.** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 6, Book 60, Number 495)

Unlike previous verses in which Allah told Mohammed to leave the likes of Abu Lahab to him for rejecting *Allah's* – rather than Mohammed - communications, illuminating the Prophet on his humble status as a slave who was not to concern himself with those sort of individuals, in this example Allah decided that the insult to the Prophet was enough for a communication specifically declaring Abu Lahab's future residence in hell. While it may seem that Abu Lahab's comments were too strong, they were nevertheless made in response to Mohammed's provocative statements foretelling a horrible death, a 'warning' – not of the cavalry but of the supernatural punishment soon to be meted out by Allah. It is natural to be annoyed after being dragged out of one's routine to hear such a cruel and vindictive message telling one that they are going to hell, and thus Abu Lahab's response is not unusual for the circumstance, even if he might have approached it in a different manner. Indeed the troubling – for those believing Allah to be a kind and merciful god - outcome of the event lies in the outright petulant – and sickening - response of a so-called immortal. After all, Allah not only succumbs to the childish level of the two participants, he sadistically goes further and assigns Abu Lahab's wife the indignity of a strangulation combined with the hellfire. This is not the psychology one intuitively belongs to God, because one expects the Divine to have an innate calmness completely opposite to the tumultuous sadism characteristic of Allah - or rather, the Asura of Falsehood.

As this vital entity, entirely devoid of truth, was Mohammed's Lord, it was inevitable that he eventually began to project his own egoistic ambitions upon Mohammed, inflating the ego of a previously ordinary human to the extent that 'God' would take a mortal's side in such an insignificant squabble. Of course, the Asura's swiftness in soothing Mohammed's rage at being rejected, via aggrandizing the instrument's ego, was also pivotal to keeping the instrument confident in the work he was facilitating. That it served to reinforce the Prophet's growing idea of his own importance above other mortals was not of concern to the Asura, because Mohammed was not partaking in sadhana. The Asura of Falsehood, unlike God, does not care if the ego of man grows uncontrollably and imbalanced. As long as his occult mediums are following his commands, he does not need to transform their narcissism – he merely checks it in times when it serves his ambitions to do so. Thus Mohammed was told he was simply a 'warner' and a 'slave' *initially*, because the need of the hour was patience, with any swelling of self-esteem on the instrument's part potentially destroying the movement. Later, the Lord of Falsehood would stoke the flames of Mohammed's vanity to the extent that those insulting the Prophet could be murdered, without any 'Divine' communication ordering restraint. In one example of this progression, the Arab poet Ka'b bin Al-Ashraf was assassinated on the direct orders of Allah's Apostle:

Narrated Jabir bin Abdullah:

Allah's Apostle said, **“Who would kill Ka’b bin Al-Ashraf as he has harmed Allah and His Apostle?”** Muhammad bin Maslama (got up and) said, “I will kill him.” So, Muhammad bin Maslama went to Ka’b and said, “I want a loan of one or two Wasqs of food grains.” Ka’b said, “Mortgage your women to me.” Muhammad bin Maslama said, “How can we mortgage our women, and you are the most handsome among the Arabs?” He said, “Then mortgage your sons to me.” Muhammad said, “How can we mortgage our sons, as the people will abuse them for being mortgaged for one or two Wasqs of food grains? It is shameful for us. But we will mortgage our arms to you.” So, Muhammad bin Maslama promised him that he would come to him next time. **They (Muhammad bin Maslama and his companions) came to him as promised and murdered him. Then they went to the Prophet and told him about it.** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 3, Book 45, Number 687)

A similar assassination was ordered for Abu Rafi, a man who, per the hadith, “used to hurt Allah's Apostle and help his enemies against him.” Because of this, Mohammed “sent a group of Ansari men to kill Abu-Rafi,” who met with success (Sahih Bukhari Volume 5, Book 59, Number 371). In both circumstances, the primary crime involved the slander of the Prophet and his companions. But as the two were also noted to provide some amount of material support to the Polytheists, one might argue, especially in the case of Al-Ashraf, that these actions were justified because Mohammed was at war. Yet even with this caveat, the hadith are important in showing the unusual distinction bestowed upon the Prophet by a religion which at other times asserts that all believing men are equal slaves before Allah. For the previous hadith *specifically* bemoan the harm done *to the Prophet*, with Allah not even mentioned in the Abu Rafi narration. The detail is very important, because Mohammed could have easily gotten his minions to kill the two men by informing them that invectives and nefarious acts had been made against Allah *alone* – the focus was instead placed upon a ‘slave’ mostly raging over insults faced, with the alleged slave asking for the same punishment that initially was only sanctioned for the ‘crime’ of insulting Allah. As his concrete power on earth grew, as the Asura of Falsehood continued to flatter him through infrarational revelations, the Prophet's sense of self-worth grew to such an extent that he believed himself to have a direct conduit to Allah's wrath even during relatively minor situations:

Narrated Abu Huraira:

Allah's Apostle (pointing to his broken canine tooth) said, “Allah's Wrath has become severe on the people who harmed His Prophet. Allah's Wrath has become severe on the man who is killed by the Apostle of Allah in Allah's Cause.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 5, Book 59, Number 400)

If Gabriel and his instrument truly believed in the equality of all Muslims espoused in multiple infrarational revelations, the recently cited traditions would have not referred to Mohammed specifically, with his name instead replaced by “Muslims” or “Slaves of Allah”. But there was no need for the Asura of Falsehood to even bother with presenting a consistent message, because incongruities are only the perceptions of the rational mind – an *infrarational* religion that rejects the alterations of its message can claim immunity from such an accusation, finding sanctuary in a rigid adherence to the ‘Word’ that it inverts as superior to rational thinking. While the forced acceptance, by the Muslim believer or Islamic thought-slave, of such a discrepancy between the alleged equality of all Muslims as slaves against the specific laws favouring a supposed mortal – Mohammed - over the others, certainly contributes to at least a subconscious psychological imbalance, that is again not of concern to the Asura, so long as his sheep continue to fear the rumoured hellfire, the alleged punishment for *shirk* and *abstaining* from the murder of non-Muslims.

Thus there was no need for the Lord of Falsehood to *sustain* his instrument's discipline, to continue correcting his medium's natural tendency to grandiosity, a characteristic that can certainly emerge in an unregenerate ego like Mohammed's when experiencing increasing terrestrial power in combination

with direct contact with such an extraordinary occult force much wider than any previous experience. Fuelling this transition, the Asura, after abandoning his initial persistence that Mohammed was a mere “warner” and “slave”, went beyond communicating Allah's ‘last Word’ that the Prophet held privileges forbidden to other Muslims. These previous entitlements, though placing Mohammed on a distinct pedestal above his followers, were not unusual for someone holding the type of power he did. What arrived next, however, exorbitantly inflated the Apostle into the company of those with powers deemed immortal, including the angels *and* Allah, both infrarationally revealed to individually *bless* the Prophet, along with asking ordinary believers to call for divine benediction upon this most special of Muslims:

Surely Allah and His Angels bless the Prophet: “O you who believe! Call for (Divine) blessings on him and salute him with a worthy salutation.” (Quran 33:56)

To have the sole benefactor calling upon the rest of the equals to, without question, pray for someone supposedly of their own, makes a mockery of Mohammed's previously defined ranking as a slave. After all, to infrarationally reveal that the Lord and his angels are blessing a particular human is one thing, but to then make other mortals pray for him creates a curious situation in which the believers of a allegedly non-idolatrous religion are attempting to summon Divine blessings upon an earthly object. The Asura of Falsehood, contrary to his protestations in other occult communications, would have use for such an aggrandizement, as long as the vessel in question continued to heed the infrarational revelations. Besides the instrument's burgeoning confidence in Islam's mission, his inflated status by the Asura accentuated his subsequent utilization as a living “exemplar” of a genuine Muslim, one that could be imitated by ensuing generations in all of his barbarity. After all, the Asura does not really care if Muslims, praying for an earthly figure, in turn disobey an Islamic tenet – this particular sin ironically sanctioned by Allah!

The Lord of Falsehood's only concern is that mankind descend into a quagmire of hatred, division, separation (of the ego from Ishwara, *and* between earthly groups) and violence; as long as Islam made this psychological state more likely, the Asura was more than willing to lower his guard against the creeping idolatry of Mohammed. It served then, and continues to now, a dual purpose of channelling the believer's anger against the ‘sin’ of ‘idolatry’ supposedly practised by the ‘other’, along with maintaining an attachment to the lower egoistic patterns. For by making Mohammed an enemy of idolatry *and* quietly shaping him to be the prime idol of Islam, the importance of the authentic hadith swelled: with it, the believers find - gratuitously supplementing the Quran - a plethora of hatred, violence and separation to base their lives upon. The Asura knows the need of a physical example upon earth that mankind can imitate, and if Mohammed's aggrandizement secretly led to idolatry, it was irrelevant to Gabriel as long as Islam's falsehood spread. Thus we find in the Hadith astonishing examples of Mohammed's supraphysical power, including an ability to bring the rain crashing down:

Narrated Anas bin Malik:

Once in the lifetime of the Prophet the people were afflicted with drought (famine). While the Prophet was delivering the Khutba on a Friday, a Bedouin stood up and said, “O, Allah's Apostle! Our possessions are being destroyed and the children are hungry; Please invoke Allah (for rain).” So the Prophet raised his hands. At that time there was not a trace of cloud in the sky. By Him in Whose Hands my soul is as soon as he lowered his hands, clouds gathered like mountains, and before he got down from the pulpit, I saw the rain falling on the beard of the Prophet. It rained that day, the next day, the third day, the fourth day till the next Friday. The same Bedouin or another man stood up and said, “O Allah's Apostle! The houses have collapsed, our possessions and livestock have been drowned; Please invoke Allah (to protect us).” So the Prophet raised both his hands and said, “O Allah! Round about us and not on us.” So, in whatever direction he pointed with his hands, the clouds dispersed and cleared away, and

Medina's (sky) became clear as a hole in between the clouds. The valley of Qanat remained flooded, for one month, none came from outside but talked about the abundant rain. (Sahih Bukhari Volume 2, Book 13, Number 55)

While certainly the scriptures in Hinduism speak of occult powers mortals are capable of accessing, including a command of awe-inspiring acts of Prakriti such as invoking rain, they make clear to delineate these particular powers from the Realization of the Purusha. For though such capabilities are impressive in their own right, they only represent an intensification of the ordinary nature – the triple sheath of the mental, vital and physical that can secretly access non-Divine yet significant powers of the occult domains - rather than the transcending of ego into the Divine Consciousness. Indeed, the Hindu scriptures indicate that an ability to perform such ‘miracles’ is often a curse rather than a blessing, *potentially* increasing the vanity of the individual, itself a major obstacle to living as the Purusha, especially if the vanity leads one to believe himself a ‘God’ simply due to the occult access he has. Such powers, like the nuclear bomb in the hands of say, an Atheist, are neutral in quality; again, it is the psychology of the user that is paramount, not the actual action, whether it involves invoking the wind or decimating an enemy supply line.

In the case of Mohammed's unique – to the ordinary *Muslim* mortal – faculties, the question is not of his character, which we know to involve his contrary request that Allah bring famine upon the unbelievers. What his ascribed powers do show however, is Mohammed's clear ascension beyond the mortality placed upon him during his initial Asuric contact. Of course, the elevation is according to the Islamic version of ‘divine’ powers, with Mohammed having the same ability as Allah and the angels to bring destruction for “disbelief”, because if he could call upon the rain at will, the unbelieving towns should certainly have feared the fate of yore, this time delivered by *him*, upon them for their ‘crime’. While no record exists of Mohammed using any supraphysical force on the towns, the mere fact he *could* do so instantly catapults him far closer to Allah and the angels than the rest of the Muslim slaves. It is a proximity that, considering Islam's incessant boasts of monotheism, strikes one as Polytheistic in nature. Indeed the Prophet himself told of a power he possessed that should – in a monotheistic idea of divinity – belong strictly to the ‘one true god’:

Narrated Jabir bin Abdullah:

The Prophet said, “I have been given five things which were not given to any one else before me. 1. Allah made me victorious by awe, (by His frightening my enemies) for a distance of one month's journey. 2. The earth has been made for me (and for my followers) a place for praying and a thing to perform Tayammum, therefore anyone of my followers can pray wherever the time of a prayer is due. 3. The booty has been made Halal (lawful) for me yet it was not lawful for anyone else before me. 4. **I have been given the right of intercession (on the Day of Resurrection)**. 5. Every Prophet used to be sent to his nation only but I have been sent to all mankind.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 1, Book 7, Number 331)

This prerogative of Mohammed's, granting him the ability to call upon Allah to transfer a person out of hell and into heaven, placed him, according to the Hadith, in a unique stratum to his messenger peers. In one authentic hadith detailing his exclusive power, each of his main predecessors decline the call of the believers to intercede for them - leaving the matter solely to the final Prophet:

Narrated Anas:

The Prophet said, “On the Day of Resurrection the Believers will assemble and say, ‘Let us ask somebody to intercede for us with our Lord.’ So they will go to Adam and say, ‘You are the father of all the people, and Allah created you with His Own Hands, and ordered the angels to prostrate to you, and taught you the names of all things; so please intercede for us with your Lord, so that He may relieve us from this place of ours.’ **Adam will say, ‘I am not fit for this**

(i.e. intercession for you).’ Then Adam will remember his sin and feel ashamed thereof. **He will say, ‘Go to Noah, for he was the first Apostle, Allah sent to the inhabitants of the earth.’ They will go to him and Noah will say, ‘I am not fit for this undertaking.’ He will remember his appeal to his Lord to do what he had no knowledge of, then he will feel ashamed thereof and will say, ‘Go to the Khalil-r-Rahman (i.e. Abraham).’ They will go to him and he will say, ‘I am not fit for this undertaking. Go to Moses, the slave to whom Allah spoke (directly) and gave him the Torah.’ So they will go to him and he will say, ‘I am not fit for this undertaking’ and he will mention (his) killing a person who was not a killer, and so he will feel ashamed thereof before his Lord, and he will say, ‘Go to Jesus, Allah's Slave, His Apostle and Allah's Word and a Spirit coming from Him.’ Jesus will say, ‘I am not fit for this undertaking, go to Mohammed the Slave of Allah whose past and future sins were forgiven by Allah.’ So they will come to me and I will proceed till I will ask my Lord's Permission and I will be given permission. When I see my Lord, I will fall down in Prostration and He will let me remain in that state as long as He wishes and then I will be addressed.’ (Mohammed!) Raise your head. Ask, and your request will be granted; say, and your saying will be listened to; intercede, and your intercession will be accepted.’ I will raise my head and praise Allah with a saying (i.e. invocation) He will teach me, and then I will intercede. He will fix a limit for me (to intercede for) whom I will admit into Paradise. Then I will come back again to Allah, and when I see my Lord, the same thing will happen to me. And then I will intercede and Allah will fix a limit for me to intercede whom I will let into Paradise, then I will come back for the third time; and then I will come back for the fourth time, and will say, ‘None remains in Hell but those whom the Quran has imprisoned (in Hell) and who have been destined to an eternal stay in Hell.’ ” (The compiler) Abu Abdullah said: “ ‘But those whom the Quran has imprisoned in Hell,’ refers to the Statement of Allah: ‘They will dwell therein forever.’ ” (Quran 16.29) (Sahih Bukhari Volume 6, Book 60, Number 3)**

While this hadith delineates the actual raising up of people from Hell into Paradise as a process ultimately belonging to Allah, the extent of Mohammed's intercession power is extraordinary, as nowhere do we find Allah rejecting any of Mohammed's invocations. The Apostle, allegedly a mere warner and slave, was given the proverbial *carte blanche* among the potential furnace dwellers. As it was an invocation strictly belonging to Mohammed, it not only sets him leagues apart from his followers, but also begs the question of whether or not to consider him a god, or at least a god by proxy. After all, if the primary ‘spiritual’ objective in Islam is to ascend to heaven, then Mohammed's ability to – at will – supernaturally transform the fate of his followers, rendering their previous sins null and void, taking them out of an eternal punishment into a delightful and eternal setting, is surely the power of an Islamic god. It is a condition perilously close to the Polytheism intensely derided in the final book of Allah. But as previously mentioned, at a certain point in time, there was no need for Gabriel to check this heathenous development, especially if the resulting arrangement did nothing to loosen Islam's hold over its slaves. Such was the outcome of Mohammed's intercession power, as detailed in numerous hadith including the following which, after detailing Allah's uncritical granting of the Prophet's invocation, proceeds to identify a certain requirement for those brought out of Hell:

“They would come to me and I would say, ‘I am for that.’ Then I will ask for my Lord's permission, and it will be given, and then He will inspire me to praise Him with such praises as I do not know now. So I will praise Him with those praises and will fall down, prostrate before Him. **Then it will be said, ‘O Mohammed, raise your head and speak, for you will be listened to; and ask, for yours will be granted (your request); and intercede, for your intercession will be accepted.’** I will say, ‘O Lord, my followers! My followers!’ And then it will be said, ‘Go and take out of Hell (Fire) all those who have faith in their hearts, equal to the

weight of a barley grain.' I will go and do so and return to praise Him with the same praises, and fall down (prostrate) before Him. Then it will be said, 'O Mohammed, raise your head and speak, for you will be listened to, and ask, for you will be granted (your request); and intercede, for your intercession will be accepted.' I will say, 'O Lord, my followers! My followers!' It will be said, 'Go and take out of it all those who have faith in their hearts equal to the weight of a small ant or a mustard seed.' I will go and do so and return to praise Him with the same praises, and fall down in prostration before Him. It will be said, 'O, Mohammed, raise your head and speak, for you will be listened to, and ask, for you will be granted (your request); and intercede, for your intercession will be accepted.' I will say, 'O Lord, my followers!' **Then He will say, 'Go and take out (all those) in whose hearts there is faith even to the lightest, lightest mustard seed. (Take them) out of the Fire.' I will go and do so."**

When we left Anas, I said to some of my companions, "Let's pass by Al-Hasan who is hiding himself in the house of Abi Khalifa and request him to tell us what Anas bin Malik has told us." So we went to him and we greeted him and he admitted us. We said to him, "O Abu Said! We came to you from your brother Anas Bin Malik and he related to us a hadith about the intercession the like of which I have never heard." He said, "What is that?" Then we told him of the hadith and said, "He stopped at this point (of the hadith)." He said, "What then?" We said, "He did not add anything to that." He said, "Anas related the hadith to me twenty years ago when he was a young fellow. I don't know whether he forgot or if he did not like to let you depend on what he might have said." We said, "O Abu Said! Let us know that." He smiled and said, "Man was created hasty. I did not mention that, but that I wanted to inform you of it. Anas told me the same as he told you and said that the Prophet added, 'I then return for a fourth time and praise Him similarly and prostrate before Him the same as he 'O Mohammed, raise your head and speak, for you will be listened to; and ask, for you will be granted (your request): and intercede, for your intercession will be accepted.' **I will say, 'O Lord, allow me to intercede for whoever said, 'None has the right to be worshipped except Allah.' Then Allah will say, 'By my Power, and my Majesty, and by My Supremacy, and by My Greatness, I will take out of Hell (Fire) whoever said: None has the right to be worshipped except Allah.'**" (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 93, Number 601)

Another intercession hadith has the Prophet, after relating the primary story of his returning to Allah four times to intercede, again mentioning the common thread of the raised up people:

The Prophet added, "There will come out of Hell (Fire) everyone who says: 'La ilaha illal-lah,' and has in his heart good equal to the weight of a barley grain. Then there will come out of Hell (Fire) everyone who says: 'La ilaha illal-lah,' and has in his heart good equal to the weight of a wheat grain. Then there will come out of Hell (Fire) everyone who says: 'La ilaha illal-lah,' and has in his heart good equal to the weight of an atom (or a smallest ant)." (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 93, Number 507)

It is this additional component that explains Gabriel's indifference (as far as maintaining scriptural consistency) to Mohammed's quasi-divine power, because the Islamic intercession, in the end, primarily serves to reinforce the – questionable when a mortal can conjure up such intercessory magic - messages that there is no God but Allah, and all other forms of worship are false. As the exclusivity of the religion is again emphasized as the most important tenet for Muslims to follow, the Asura of Falsehood uses intercession to once more perpetuate the psychology of separation, between "believers" and "unbelievers", channelling thought and energy away from the pervasive Unity of the Purusha. That Mohammed was bequeathed an authority arguably supreme is obscured by the subsequent focus on the need to worship Allah alone. Nevertheless, Mohammed certainly was quite aware of the stupendous power he had, and dangerously identified, in one hadith, his ability to alter someone's afterlife fate as

something belonging to *him*:

Narrated Abdullah bin Al-Harith bin Naufal:

Abbas bin Abdul Muttalib said, “O Allah's Apostle! Did you benefit Abu Talib with anything as he used to protect and take care of you, and used to become angry for you?” **The Prophet said, “Yes, he is in a shallow place of Fire. But for me he would have been in the lowest part of the Fire.”** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 8, Book 73, Number 227)

If Mohammed had truly been a humble slave, he would have attributed this particular power – in the example, intercession did not lead to heaven but at least resulted in an improved section of the hellfire – as belonging to Allah alone, rather than assuming credit for it. From the status of a mere warner, the Prophet's ego had swollen far beyond that of the ordinary mortal, to the point where he called upon his followers to pray for *his* own elevation:

Narrated Jabir bin Abdullah:

Allah's Apostle said, “Whoever after listening to the Adhan says, ‘Allahumma Rabba hadhihi-d-da' watit-tammami was-salatil qa'imati, ati Muhammadan al-wasilata wal-fadilata, wab' athhu maqaman mahmudan-il-ladhi wa' adtahu’ [O Allah! Lord of this perfect call (of not ascribing partners to You) and of the regular prayer which is going to be established! Kindly give Muhammad the right of intercession and superiority and send him (on the Day of Judgement) to the best and the highest place in Paradise which You promised him], then intercession for me will be permitted for him on the Day of Resurrection.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 1, Book 11, Number 588)

Though Muslims are technically not being asked to pray *to* Mohammed, because they are endlessly barraged with the threat that they are in danger of an unceasing hellfire (and lured with Paradise as the great escape from the terror of Hell), they will quickly take up this prayer as a means to be lifted from the hellfire if they happen to initially land there. The fact that Mohammed asked Muslims to pray for his ascension is tantamount to the Polytheism that Muslims take delight in hating, an apotheosis of a mortal to a position where he holds *the* most important power – removing someone from Hell - as defined by Islam. Far above is Mohammed then from the status of messenger, a rank that irrespective of the frequency by which he is referred to in the scripture, is not his actual standing when viewing the record in its entirety. One infrarational revelation in particular acknowledges as much, explicitly hoisting Mohammed's word over those of ordinary believers, with the spectre of Allah's punishment for anyone disobeying:

Do not hold the Messenger's calling (you) among you to be like your calling one to the other; Allah indeed knows those who steal away from among you, concealing themselves; therefore let those beware who go against his (the Messenger's) order lest a trial afflict them or there befall them a painful chastisement. (Quran 24:63)

Gabriel went further than such understandable – for a leader of an army rather than a lowly slave – commandments, proceeding to equate Mohammed with *Allah* in certain infrarational revelations, in one instance asking, “Do they not know that whoever acts in opposition to Allah **and** His Messenger, he shall surely have the fire of hell to abide in it? That is the grievous abasement.” (Quran 9:63) In a similar communication, the Asura of Falsehood demands Muslims to practice complete obedience to Mohammed, abandoning secret counsels and insubordination, for otherwise they will face Allah's wrath:

Have you not seen those who are forbidden secret counsels, then they return to what they are forbidden, and they hold secret counsels for sin and revolt and **disobedience to the Messenger**, and when they come to you they greet you with a greeting with which Allah does not greet you,

and they say in themselves: **“Why does not Allah punish us for what we say?” Hell is enough for them - they shall enter it, and evil is the resort.** O you who believe! **When you confer together in private, do not give to each other counsel of sin and revolt and disobedience to the Messenger,** and give to each other counsel of goodness and guarding (against evil). And be careful of (your duty to) Allah, to Whom you shall be gathered together. **Secret counsels are only (the work) of the Satan that he may cause to grieve those who believe,** and he cannot hurt them in the least except with Allah's permission, and on Allah let the believers rely. (Quran 58:08-10)

Along with fearing Allah, Mohammed's companions were to live in cultish trepidation of the Prophet, obeying all of his orders, refraining from dissension, avoiding all possibility of insulting him - just as they were commanded to practice with regards to Allah. While Mohammed did not have the actual supernatural ability to send believers into hell (raising them up in the afterlife is another matter), by linking both Allah's punishment and Satan to any non-cooperation or defiance toward Mohammed, the latter becomes subconsciously associated with the powers a Muslim believes to belong to ‘God’, and their view of the Prophet accordingly becomes reverential. For if Islam teaches one that the height of religion is to fear Allah alone, yet Allah himself is associating the specific punishment for abandoning this fear *with* disobedience to Mohammed, then the Prophet subconsciously becomes commensurate with Allah. But there are additional, and more provocative, verses supporting the placement of Mohammed as either ‘Divine’ or exceedingly close to it. For his companions were not restricted to obeying their Prophet in an exclusively terrestrial sense, related to his military demands or proscriptions on daily habits. Their deference to him even extended to the possibility of ‘Divine’ mercy, with the early believers chastised for not going to Mohammed and asking *him* to obtain Allah's forgiveness for them!

And We did not send any messenger but that he should be obeyed by Allah's permission; **and had they, when they were unjust to themselves, come to you and asked forgiveness of Allah and the Messenger had (also) asked forgiveness for them, they would have found Allah Oft-returning (to mercy), Merciful.** (Quran 4:64)

In different communications, Allah's Apostle was not described as merely a conduit for Allah's Grace, with one verse commanding Muslims to “obey Allah **and the Messenger, that you may be shown mercy.**” (Quran 3:132) Similarly, mankind are “invited” to *both* Allah and His Messenger prior to the final judgement:

The response of the believers, when they are invited to Allah and His Messenger that he may judge between them, is only to say: “We hear and we obey”: and these it is that are the successful. (Quran 24:51)

Though Allah remains the sole entity, in this verse, judging the believers, by including Mohammed in the invitation when one would expect Allah alone (Mohammed, we recall, is only supposed to be the “warner”), the believers cannot help but link someone besides Allah with the Day of Judgement, an Hour taught to be exclusive to Allah. And Mohammed himself, the Seal of the prophets, the “exemplar” for humanity, the greatest intercessor with Allah, the sole recipient of the final ‘Divine Word’ and thus automatically the best interpreter of it, thought his association with Allah so intertwined that obedience – or the lack of – to him represented the crucial determinant in *entering Paradise*, the ultimate ‘spiritual’ goal of the Islamic religion:

Narrated Abu Huraira:

Allah's Apostle said, “All my followers will enter Paradise except those who refuse.” They said, “O Allah's Apostle! Who will refuse?” He said, **“Whoever obeys me will enter Paradise, and whoever disobeys me is the one who refuses (to enter it).”** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book

If this is not enough to convince the believer of Mohammed's virtually divine ranking, his equality with Allah rather than with the rest of the ordinary Muslim slaves, further reading of the Hadith offers additional confirmation of the infrarationally revealed verses demanding equal submission to both Allah and his Prophet:

Narrated Jabir bin Abdullah:

Some angels came to the Prophet while he was sleeping. Some of them said, "He is sleeping." Others said, "His eyes are sleeping but his heart is awake." Then they said, "There is an example for this companion of yours." One of them said, "Then set forth an example for him." Some of them said, "He is sleeping." The others said, "His eyes are sleeping but his heart is awake." Then they said, "His example is that of a man who has built a house and then offered therein a banquet and sent an inviter (messenger) to invite the people. So whoever accepted the invitation of the inviter, entered the house and ate of the banquet, and whoever did not accept the invitation of the inviter, did not enter the house, nor did he eat of the banquet." Then the angels said, "Interpret this example to him so that he may understand it." Some of them said, "He is sleeping." The others said, "His eyes are sleeping but his heart is awake." And then they said, **"The houses stands for Paradise and the call maker is Mohammed; and whoever obeys Mohammed, obeys Allah; and whoever disobeys Mohammed, disobeys Allah.** Mohammed separated the people (i.e., through his message, the good is distinguished from the bad, and the believers from the disbelievers)." (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 92, Number 385)

Having rejected the Polytheist and even the Christian trinity, one gathers from these multiple scriptural examples that Islam only replaced it with a Duality in which Mohammed had – and knew he had – the same, if not superior given his status as "call maker", power as Allah regarding the individual Muslim's potential to reach the pinnacle of the Islamic religion - the avoidance of Hell. Encouraging the idea of this Duality further, Muslims are told by the Asura to *believe* in both Allah *and* Mohammed:

Say: "O people! Surely I am the Messenger of Allah to you all, of Him Whose is the kingdom of the heavens and the earth: there is no god but He. He brings to life and causes to die, therefore **believe in Allah and His messenger**, the Unlettered Prophet who believes in Allah and His words, and follow him so that you may walk in the right way." (Quran 7:158)

Though the word "believe" in the preceding verse might be interpreted to involve Mohammed's earthly orders, pairing the call to specifically *believe* in Allah and the Prophet at the very least serves to subconsciously equate a previously humble mortal with the presumed Omnipotent. In another coupling far less open to such accommodating analysis, one finds the infrarational revelation most damaging to the claim of Islam's monotheism and purported destiny to conquer the world *specifically* for that monotheism to reign supreme:

And it behoves not a believing man and a believing woman that they should have any choice in their matter when **Allah and His Messenger have decided a matter; and whoever disobeys Allah and His Messenger, he surely strays off a manifest straying.** (Quran 33:36)

After reading this, it becomes difficult to claim Islam as monotheistic when Allah is admitting that an ordinary mortal holds such monumental power, that a 'slave' is granted equal status with Allah in *deciding* a "matter". One would not expect, after all, a monotheistic deity to share such omnipotence with a mortal who is only supposed to *receive* and then communicate decisions *already* decided by the 'one true god'. Yet here is Mohammed catapulted – through an infrarational revelation in the 'Last Word' to mankind - to a god, no longer a mere transmitter of Allah's message, instead an active

participant in a process which should solely belong to the 'one true god' according to the majority of his communications to Mohammed. It is a declaration of – *a version of* - Polytheism somewhat casually included, one that, because it is overwhelmed by a flood of verses chastising the "Polytheism" of others, is likely to be missed by the indoctrinated. Nevertheless, it is present and is the obvious conclusion of a verse that grants a "warner" equal decision making power – confirmed by the threat toward those who disobey - with Allah.

Of course, the polytheism we find in Islam has one crucial distinction to what is practised in the Sanatana Dharma; namely, that Muslims are not technically praying *to Mohammed*, even though he has quasi-divine faculties. Instead, prayers involving the Prophet are to Allah, begging that the former be granted intercessory powers; it is an invocation appreciating the source of Mohammed's endowment. Yet even if we acknowledge that the verses conveying Mohammed's status as equal to Allah in deciding things are not *precisely* polytheistic, the very fact that Allah has granted Mohammed this stupendous determining factor, means that the reverence towards Mohammed can never be the same as that towards an ordinary warner. After all, if we consider alone the prayer asking for Mohammed to have the intercession power, it remains an appeal only superficially directed toward Allah, because the prayer is asking for a transfer of *His* power upon the mortal Mohammed. Such transfers *potentially* make the receiving individual a god, even if he is not the origin of the force. Joined with the clear Asuric revelation authorizing him identical decision-making rights with Allah, it becomes inevitable for Muslims to, at the very least, hold a feverish *attachment* to this mortal, when one would expect their religion to guard against such dangerous inclinations. This inappropriate attachment, more than even the polytheistic flavour of the religion, marks the dissonance of a religion claiming itself a champion of "truth" against the "false" ways of the ancient. And though the message of Islamic monotheism is fatally flawed by its inconsistency, if we ignore that particular assertion and direct our focus upon the elevation of Mohammed beyond the ordinary slave to his demigod position, we find a pattern – seen in the following hadith in which Mohammed tested the limit of his partnership with Allah - perfectly representing the psychology of the Asura of Falsehood:

Narrated Ibn Abbas:

The Prophet, while in a tent (on the day of the battle of Badr) said, "O Allah! I ask you the fulfilment of Your Covenant and Promise. O Allah! If You wish (to destroy the believers) You will never be worshipped after today." Abu Bakr caught him by the hand and said, "This is sufficient, O Allah's Apostle! You have asked Allah pressingly." The Prophet was clad in his armour at that time. He went out, saying to me: "There multitude will be put to flight and they will show their backs. Nay, but the Hour is their appointed time (for their full recompense) and that Hour will be more grievous and more bitter (than their worldly failure)." (54.45-46) Khalid said that was on the day of the battle of Badr. (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 52, Number 164)

Abu Bakr, for his part, was certainly nervous over the content of Mohammed's prayer, one with a threatening undertone, or at least the type of bargaining uncharacteristic of a loyal slave. The words of Mohammed's closest companion are telling, as he sensed that the Prophet was possibly overstepping the boundaries, warning *Allah* instead of sending reminders to mankind. Indeed, the Prophet's impetuous words to the 'one true god' seem more of a demand than a prayer, and are on the edge of becoming an *order*. Clearly present is the subtle threat that *Allah* would be a failure if he didn't do as Mohammed desired. Certainly a more humble ego would have accepted whatever outcome as the result of Allah's plan, rather than insisting that Allah could possibly fail by not helping Mohammed. To suggest otherwise, ironically, opened Mohammed up to the dreaded accusation of hypocrisy (in this case, due to a lack of *faith* in certain verses when all should be obeyed), if we recall the three infrarational revelations (previously cited) in which Allah unquestionably declares that Islam will

conquer and subjugate the different religions.

Mohammed's inability to fulfil the – initial – ideal of a complete submission to Allah (his obedience to Gabriel, on the other hand, was intact) was the inevitable outcome of being assailed with a message of separation and inequality between different groups of mankind *and* man's status relative to God. As his occult benefactor heavily stressed the qualities of the lower ego of which *sincere* humility is absent, any possibility of a true bhakta before Allah faded with the Prophet's expanding terrestrial gains. And by the time of the Battle of Badr, his barely concealed impudence in relation to his 'Lord' betrayed the gargantuan ego that had developed, one precisely mirroring the psychology of the Asura of Falsehood, who let us recall believes himself superior to God, having forgotten his true origin as an emanation 'fallen' from the Supreme Mother at the beginning of the manifested existence. As it was the Lord of Falsehood guiding Mohammed rather than the Purusha or a God or Goddess, the delusion that he was superior to the Supreme – hinted at in the previous hadith – was the far more likely finale than an effacement leading to Self-Realization.

That is the actual result, if allowed to fully play out, of the Islamic indoctrination that began with its first earthly recipient, Mohammed. For though Islam boasts of its brotherhood, even a completely Islamic world inevitably degenerates into a splitting of groups proclaiming superiority over a freshly-created 'other', a 'brotherhood' devouring itself until the last 'believer' (or the ruler of the victorious group) can claim superiority over the rest. From that position it is only a matter of time before the ego, at a loss over which 'other' to target next, or perhaps bored with dealing with mortals, anoints itself above God. This, while the root falsehood of the Asura and a prime impetus for his earthly machinations, is nevertheless not explicitly expressed within either the infrarational revelations or the authentic hadith. Gabriel did, however, have a calculated reason for such restraint, as he had an instrument believing in the message of "Allah" rather than the occult "angel" who apparently was only a relayer of the message - deviating from that hierarchy could have triggered an undesirable confusion in Mohammed, hindering the movement. But though he abjured from identifying himself as superior to Allah, there were still plenty of infrarational revelations hinting at the Asura's perverse perception of his occult standing versus God, with the dozens of communications in question uncovering this self-elevation through the pronouns he used. The particular verses in question display a simple, though perhaps easily overlooked, discrepancy striking at the heart of the monotheistic status of the Muslim's supreme 'Lord', who is described in verses like the following as responsible not only for the 'Last Word', but also all of creation:

Blessed is **He** Who hath revealed unto **His** servant the Criterion (of right and wrong), that he may be a warner to the peoples. **He** unto Whom belongeth the Sovereignty of the heavens and the earth, **He** hath chosen no son nor hath **He** any partner in the Sovereignty. **He** hath created everything and hath meted out for it a measure. Yet they choose beside **Him** other gods who create naught but are themselves created, and possess not hurt nor profit for themselves, and possess not death nor life, nor power to raise the dead. Those who disbelieve say: "This is naught but a lie that he hath invented, and other folk have helped him with it, so that they have produced a slander and a lie." And they say: "The stories of the ancients - he has got them written - so these are read out to him morning and evening." (Quran 25:01-05)

In different verses, Allah is similarly identified as "**He** it is Who created for you all that is in the earth, and He directed Himself to the heaven, so He made them complete seven heavens, and He knows all things", (Quran 2:29) and "**He** Who created you and then sustained you, then causeth you to die, then giveth life to you again. Is there any of your (so-called) partners (of Allah) that doeth aught of that? Praised and Exalted be He above what they associate (with Him)!" (Quran 30:40) In another verse, the Islamic god is described as "Allah, Who hath created the heavens and the earth, and hath appointed darkness and light. Yet those who disbelieve ascribe rivals unto their Lord." (Quran 6:01) That the

power of creation belonged to Allah alone is an appropriate conclusion from these four Quran selections, to go along with the overriding theme of Allah as the sole god to exist – with the subsequent assumption that Allah is the Creator of the world. One would not expect, especially after reading those verses in isolation, that there could be any other conscious entity or deity assisting with the establishment of the material existence. But if we read further, we come across infrarational revelations in which the tale of creation (including that of man) is attributed to *multiple* entities:

And certainly **We** created man of an extract of clay, Then **We** made him a small seed in a firm resting-place, Then **We** made the seed a clot, then **We** made the clot a lump of flesh, then **We** made (in) the lump of flesh bones, then **We** clothed the bones with flesh, then **We** caused it to grow into another creation, so blessed be Allah, the best of the creators. (Quran 23:12-14)

The use here of the first person plural “We” to describe functions one presumes – using different verses as support – to be the singular function of Allah alone, is as we shall see, far from an isolated event. To add further confusion to the perplexing matter of a ‘monotheistic’ religion that, in its infrarationally revealed verses, assigns Allah's power to multiple entities, we come across further – including the following - passages in which the first person singular and the first person plural are used *simultaneously* in the description!

And listen on the day when the crier shall cry from a near place, The day when they shall hear the cry in truth; that is the day of coming forth. **Surely We give life and cause to die**, and to **Us** is the eventual coming; The day on which the earth shall cleave asunder under them, they will make haste - that is a gathering together easy to **Us**. We know best what they say, and you are not one to compel them; therefore remind him by means of the Quran who fears **My** threat. (Quran 50:41-45)

In this passage, we have an apparent set of multiple entities holding the previously monotheistic right of spawning life and taking it away, yet at the end the threat of death is attributed to Allah alone, with the first person singular “My” resurrecting itself instead of the singular third person “His”. It is an inconsistency remarkable for its regular appearance in the ‘Last Word’, with another example attributing creation to Allah alone (in singular third person), yet the punishment (“My threat” in the above verse) to multiple entities:

And **He** it is Who created the heavens and the earth in six periods - and His dominion (extends) on the water - that He might manifest to you, which of you is best in action, and if you say, surely you shall be raised up after death, those who disbelieve would certainly say: “This is nothing but clear magic.” And if **We** hold back from them the punishment until a stated period of time, they will certainly say: “What prevents it?” Now surely on the day when it will come to them, it shall not be averted from them and that which they scoffed at shall beset them. (Quran 11:07-08)

The changes between the singular and plural, first and third person, attribution of ‘Divine’ powers are frequent, with little rhyme or reason to the assignment of the solitary and multiple. Indeed, the switches are often done in the most casual of manners, far from the careful consideration one might expect of a set of infrarational revelations purported to be the ‘last Word’ for mankind. Often, as in the following, the alternation is between the third person singular to first person plural:

And when harm afflicts men, they call upon their Lord, turning to Him, then when **He** makes them taste of mercy from Him, lo, some of them begin to attribute partners with their Lord, So as to be ungrateful for what **We** have given them. But enjoy yourselves (for a while), for you shall soon come to know. Or, have **We** sent down upon them an authority so that it speaks of that which they associate with Him? And when **We** make people taste of mercy they rejoice in it, and if an evil befall them for what their hands have already wrought, lo, they are in despair.

(Quran 30:33-36)

Ironically, such passages of infrarational revelations are at once damning towards Polytheism, yet in the same breath ask mankind to be grateful for what *multiple* conscious entities have provided them, including a scriptural authority – the Quran – transmitted by *multiple* beings, who are also the dispensers of Islam's inverted mercy! One can easily interpret these sort of descriptions as polytheistic, with the verdict that many *gods* are responsible for Islam, even if all of them paradoxically chastise the very practice of believing that a group of gods are responsible for Islam and the greatness in the world. But such a conclusion is not what Gabriel necessarily intended with these frequent communications, for although the Asura of Falsehood is not at all attached to the concept of monotheism, viewing it as simply one means to achieve his desired chaos, neither was it precisely his motive to play a cruel joke upon his unsuspecting instrument Mohammed and the rest of the slavish adherents to his religion of falsehood.

Instead, what occurred was mostly related to the curious position that Gabriel, the Lord of Falsehood's particular disguise at the time, found himself in. For just as Mohammed was deemed an earthly intermediary between mortal slaves and Allah, so did Gabriel position himself as an intermediary between Mohammed and Allah. The Asura probably thought it the most plausible explanation – to Mohammed – to identify as an angel instead of claiming to be Allah, because by that time in Arabia – proximate to the spread of Judaism and Christianity – there was a strong cultural belief in the possibility of such interactions with angels, evidenced by Waraqa's instant proclamation, upon hearing of Mohammed's encounter, that the 'Angel Gabriel' had spoken to the Prophet. Though it was easier for the Asura to proclaim himself an angel, he was left with an unfortunate dilemma in which he had to pretend that the 'Word' he was transmitting to Mohammed originated from someone distinct from himself. Consequently, Gabriel had to assign credit for *his* dictates to someone else, a difficult action – the Asura is not infallible – due to both his monstrous ego and the sheer practicality of using the correct pronouns when it is simply easier to use a grammatical person that either overtly incorporates the Asura into the revelation ("We" rather than the "I" or "My" one would expect from *Allah's* communications), or subtly does so – seen in the use of "He", the third person singular, a clear indication that the speaker in question, the Asura, is the one creating the verse, for if Allah had done so and Gabriel was simply repeating it verbatim (as he should have been), "I" would be the prominent pronoun, as Allah would preferably not refer to himself as "He". Thus in some of the infrarational revelations, the use of incorrect pronouns can be considered an inadvertent error for someone already disinclined to take the humble position of an intermediary submitting before another being - the Asura, after all, believes himself superior to God!

On the other hand, there is also the possibility that multiple 'angels' – Asuras, if we keep in mind the quality of the Islamic message – were infrarationally revealing the 'Word' to the Prophet, helping to explain the use of plurals, reflecting the numerous agents involved in creating the Quran: in other words, multiple vital entities were taking *turns* with the Prophet. While this is a genuine possibility given Mohammed's subliminal access and overall lack of Psychic discrimination, the general tenets of Islam are more consistent with the Asura of Falsehood as opposed to different Asuras, and Mohammed – as we shall see – did indeed have some ability to distinguish between different types of vital world hostiles, including the Jinns, he encountered (at least in comparison to Gabriel). As the primary themes of Islam were consistently of falsehood, and as Gabriel was unlikely to share an instrument due to his very nature and belief in his superiority, *including over the other Asuras*, that alone eliminates the possibility that multiple Asuras were involved with the *specific* production of the Quran through instructing Mohammed, as the Lord of Falsehood was sure to have jealously guarded *his* creation. At any rate, as further hadith will display, even during times when Mohammed was in contact with different 'angels', Gabriel was present as the primary communicator, with the other vital emanations

usually observing: In addition, there is no authentic scripture indicating that any other ‘angel’ was involved in concocting the Quran.

In lieu of the subliminal reality of multiple Asuras having an unmistakeable, yet indirect (the permeation of the atmosphere rather than occult possession), control over vast swaths of humanity, for certain infrarational revelations we may even consider the possibility that Gabriel had let loose the proverbial Freudian slip, the use of “We” exhibiting his occult awareness that multiple agents of darkness take part in the machinations leading to humanity's degradation. But as the Asura of Falsehood is absolutely against sharing his authority with any of these other subliminal emanations, his use of “We” was far more likely to represent *his* partnership with Allah instead of anyone else. In relation to this, there remains yet another reason for the incorrect grammatical tone, one seen in multiple examples, with Gabriel – visible as he was to Mohammed – wanting to subconsciously enhance his fearsomeness before Mohammed. This intelligent understanding of how to manipulate a weak instrument led to multiple infrarational revelations, including the below, in which he presented the delivering of punishment as belonging to the group instead of Allah alone:

(It is only) a provision in this world, then **to Us shall be their return. Then We shall make them taste severe punishment** because they disbelieved. (Quran 10:70)

Although it is imprecise if the “We” in question refers to Gabriel and Allah, or the multiple angels (we have previously discussed this as the likely possibility) and Allah, it is still a deviation, repeated in other examples like the next, from the idea that Allah alone decides things, including punishment:

And repentance is not for those who go on doing evil deeds, until when death comes to one of them, he says, “Surely now I repent,” nor (for) those who die while they are unbelievers. These are they for whom **We** have prepared a painful chastisement. (Quran 4:18)

If verses like this were actually consistent to Islam's assertion of Gabriel relaying Allah's ‘Word’ and his predominance, the final portion would read as “My Angels and I have prepared a painful chastisement”, language that excludes a different origin of the particular communication. Similarly, we would not find Allah's wrath being described, in a different Quran passage, as belonging to more entities than just Allah:

And most of them believe not in Allah without associating partners (with Him). Do they then feel secure that there may come to them an extensive chastisement from Allah or (that) the hour may come to them suddenly while they do not perceive? Say: “This is my Way: call on Allah with sure knowledge. I and whosoever followeth me - Glory be to Allah! - and I am not of the polytheists.” **We** sent not before thee (any messengers) save men whom **We** inspired from among the folk of the townships - Have they not travelled in the land and seen the nature of the consequence for those who were before them? And verily the abode of the Hereafter, for those who ward off (evil), is best. Have ye then no sense? Till, when the messengers despaired and thought that they were denied, then came unto them **Our help**, and whom **We** would was saved. And **Our wrath** cannot be warded from the guilty. (Quran 12:106-110)

The allegation that both Gabriel and Allah, or Allah and His angels, or perhaps the angels alone, sent down the Messengers for mankind is repeated in multiple verses, with one posing the question, “And ask those of **Our messengers** whom **We** sent before you: ‘Did We ever appoint gods to be worshipped besides the Beneficent Allah?’ ” (Quran 43:45) In another, both the presence of Apostles and the most important Islamic testimony, the first part of the shahada declaring that only Allah exists, are attributed to multiple entities:

Or have they taken gods from the earth who raise (the dead). If there were therein gods beside Allah, then verily both (the heavens and the earth) would have been disordered. Glorified be

Allah, the Lord of the Throne, from all that they ascribe (unto Him). He will not be questioned as to that which He doeth, but they will be questioned. Or have they chosen other gods beside Him? Say: "Bring your proof (of their godhead). This is the Reminder of those with me and those before me." But most of them know not the Truth and so they are averse. **And We sent no messenger before thee but We inspired him, (saying): "There is no God save Me (Allah), so worship Me."** (Quran 21:21-25)

Once again we find here the quick transition between plural and singular, when it should be "Allah" or "I" sending out messengers and inspiring them. But not only do we discover previous messengers to have been sent by *multiple* parties - renegade from the implicit understanding that as Allah is the sole creator and inspiration (as opposed to "We inspired him", because the angelic conduits are only relayers rather than the shared source of the inspiration behind the 'divine' words), messengers should be "sent" or, more accurately, chosen by him *alone* -, we similarly find previous apostles infrarationally revealed to have "called upon" the same multiplicity, whether that consists of the angels alone, or Allah and his angels. This *group* is then, astonishingly, proclaimed to be the best direction for one's prayers!

And certainly most of the ancients went astray before them. And certainly We sent among them warners. Then see how was the end of those warned, Except the servants of Allah, the purified ones. **And Noah did certainly call upon Us, and most excellent answerer of prayer are We.** And We delivered him and his followers from the mighty distress. And We made his offspring the survivors. And We perpetuated to him (praise) among the later generations. Peace and salutation to Noah among the nations. Thus do We surely reward the doers of good. Surely he was of Our believing servants. Then We drowned the others. (Quran 37:71-82)

Other translations use the word "hearer" of prayers, which somewhat softens the transgression to Polytheism. Nevertheless, a genuinely monotheistic religion would only describe Allah as the recipient of the prayer, rather than allowing multiple parties, including the angels, to hear the prayers. And the deliverance of Noah is something that one would expect – similar to the punishment of mortals – to be attributed solely to Allah rather than the angels or any *group* ("We"). Though Allah might sanction some punishment or deliverance details to the angels, their function would be similar to Mohammed's in the Islamic narrative of existence, with the latter a transmitter of Allah's 'Word' and the angels a *conveyor*, but *not* the owner, of Allah's punishment and deliverance. The language used in the infrarational revelations is that of *ownership*, with the angels possessing the power of deliverance and even humans, who similarly belong to them:

Allah sets forth an example to those who disbelieve, the wife of Noah and the wife of Lut: they were both under two of **Our righteous servants**, but they acted treacherously towards them so they availed them naught against Allah, and it was said: "Enter both the fire with those who enter." (Quran 66:10)

In a more benign division of function, Gabriel is included among those providing nations with the rituals done prior to eating, along with the wealth that they spend:

And for every nation have **We** appointed a ritual, that they may mention the name of Allah over the beast of cattle that He hath given them for food. And your god is One God, therefore surrender unto Him. And give good tidings (O Mohammed) to the humble, Whose hearts fear when Allah is mentioned, and the patient of whatever may befall them, and those who establish worship and who spend of that **We** have bestowed on them. (Quran 22:34-35)

But the Asura of Falsehood was also authorized, along *with* Allah, more serious obligations, including the ownership of the "Reminder", the same message that Mohammed was tasked with relaying to mankind:

Thus do We relate to you (some) of the news of what has gone before, and indeed **We have given to you a Reminder from Ourselves**. Whoever turns aside from it, he shall surely bear a burden on the day of resurrection. Abiding in this (state), and evil will it be for them to bear on the day of resurrection. (Quran 20:99-101)

The “Reminder”, of course, should monotheistically only be owned by Allah instead of Allah *and* other parties (“Ourselves”), including the angelic intermediaries for the infrarational word. Continuing with this theme of Islam's ironic heresy against itself, the Lord of Falsehood also infringes upon the responsibility of “commanding” Muslims, incorporating himself alongside Allah, with those disobedient to the directives tasting a punishment that he – disguised as the angel Gabriel - takes part in:

And (We made) the wind (subservient) to Solomon, which made a month's journey in the morning and a month's journey in the evening, and We made a fountain of molten copper to flow out for him, and of the jinn there were those who worked before him by the command of his Lord. **And whoever turned aside from Our command from among them, We made him taste of the punishment of burning.** (Quran 34:12)

Though one might possibly accede the plural assignment of punishment, the grammatical possession by Gabriel of “command” (it should instead be presented as “My command”) represents a violation of the hierarchy expected of Islam, as Muslims should be following Allah's directives alone, rather than both Allah and the angels, who then assume divine powers and functions similar to the gods of the ancients Arabs. Yet contrary to Islam's claim of monotheism, the angels – including the fearsome Gabriel – are, along with the rights of creation, command, punishment, deliverance and recipient of prayers, also to inherit the earth:

And lo! Allah is my Lord and your Lord. So serve **Him**. That is the right path. The sects among them differ, but woe unto the disbelievers from the meeting of an awful Day. See and hear them on the Day they come unto **Us**! yet the evil-doers are today in error manifest. And warn them of the Day of anguish when the case hath been decided. Now they are in a state of carelessness, and they believe not. Lo! **We, only We, inherit the earth and all who are thereon, and unto Us they are returned.** (Quran 19:36-40)

Again present in this selection is evidence that the origin of the infrarational revelations was distinct from Allah, especially observed in the portion stating “So serve Him”, which one would instead expect to read, “So serve Me”, if Gabriel had indeed been a relayer instead of *the* creator of the verses. Passages like this only add to the believer's confusion, for while it tells them that the believers are to be returned to multiple entities, in different infrarational revelations they are to return exclusively to Allah, who will then pass judgement:

Follow what is revealed to you from your Lord: there is no god but He: and withdraw from the polytheists. And if Allah had pleased, they would not have set up others (with Him) and **We** have not appointed you a keeper over them, and you are not placed in charge of them. Revile not those unto whom they pray beside Allah lest they wrongfully revile Allah through ignorance. Thus unto every nation have **We** made their deed seem fair. **Then unto their Lord is their return, and He will tell them what they used to do.** (Quran 6:106-108)

Although this offers a grammatical presentation more consistent with Islam's myth of the source of the infrarational word, one would still expect, if Gabriel was truly a conduit between Allah and Mohammed, the use of the singular person, with “I” and “My” used instead of “He”, to go along with eliminating the use of “We”. The nonchalant manner in which first person plural, third person singular and first person singular interchange in the communications is quite common, with another passage initially crediting the recollection of past chastisements to multiple entities, then in the next breath

describing the destruction of unfaithful towns as belonging to Allah:

This is an account of (the fate of) the towns which We relate to you. Of them are some that stand and (others) mowed down. And **We** did not do them injustice, but they were unjust to themselves, and their gods whom they called upon besides Allah did not avail them naught when the decree of your Lord came to pass. And they added but to their ruin. And such is the punishment of your Lord when **He** punishes the towns while they are unjust. **Surely His punishment** is painful, severe. Most surely there is a sign in this for him who fears the chastisement of the hereafter; this is a day on which the people shall be gathered together and this is a day that shall be witnessed. (Quran 11:100-103)

While this selection, involving the Asura of Falsehood's practice of casually changing between grammatical persons, presents a polytheistic-like division of power, there does exist one circumstance – seen in passages like the following – related to the dispensation of Islamic justice in which the crediting of a task to multiple entities is appropriate, and still aligns with Islam's theme of one god delivering the 'last Word' and remaining exclusively Omnipotent:

And on the day **We** gather them together **We** shall say unto those who ascribed partners (unto Allah): "Where are (now) those partners of your make-believe?" Then will they have no contention save that they will say: "By Allah, our Lord, we never were idolaters." See how they lie against themselves, and (how) the thing which they devised hath failed them! (Quran 6:22-24)

This is one of the rare examples in which the use of the singular plural does not bring up concern for Polytheism (although it continues to call into question the Islamic contention that Gabriel was steadfastly relaying *Allah's* word, because "We" is more appropriately replaced by "My angels will"), because all that the angels are doing here is bringing the Polytheists before Allah and verbally chastising them. Allah, after all, conceivably could share the delivering of such criticism with others, relatively insignificant as that function is. Similarly, one could possibly imagine Allah – as infrarationally revealed – granting the angels the small responsibility of separating the unbelievers from each other in hell:

On the day when **We** gather them all together, then **We** say unto those who ascribed partners (unto Us): "Stand back, ye and your (pretended) partners (of Allah)!" And **We** separate them, the one from the other, and their (pretended) partners will say: "It was not us ye worshipped Allah sufficeth as a witness between us and you, that we were unaware of your worship." (Quran 10:28-29)

One can also picture Allah including the angels in other verbal criticisms of those transgressing his rules, including a verse declaring, "And certainly you have known those among you who exceeded the limits of the Sabbath, so **We** said to them: 'Be (as) apes, despised and hated.'" (Quran 2:65) But for the majority of verses in the plural person, the paradox of an omnipotent, omniscient, singular god sharing his powers with *anybody*, is hard to reconcile. Thus passages such as the following, where the 'false' gods of the unbelievers are not able to defend the Polytheists from "Us", strike one as the boast of one polytheistic religion to another, rather than the ultra-monotheism Islam is alleged to practice:

Say: "Who guards you by night and by day from the Beneficent Allah?" Nay, they turn aside at the mention of their Lord. Or, have they gods who can defend them against **Us**? They shall not be able to assist themselves, nor shall they be defended from **Us**. (Quran 21:42-43)

Why should Allah grant such demigod or divine status to anyone when the ability to destroy the unbelievers should be solely sanctioned to Him, the 'one true god' who will punish the Polytheist gods because the latter gods paradoxically do not exist at all? It is a question that cannot be convincingly

answered by a religion contradicting its indignant monotheism at every instance, including the creation of man out of contemptible water, something Allah apparently was also not able to complete alone!

For what Day is the doom fixed? For the Day of Decision. And what will make you comprehend what the Day of Decision is? Woe on that day to the rejecters. Did **We** not destroy the former generations? Then did **We** follow them up with later ones. Ever thus shall **We** deal with the guilty. Woe on that day to the rejecters. **Did We not create you from contemptible water?** Which Then We placed it in a secure resting-place, Till an appointed term? So **We** proportion it - how well are We at proportioning (things). Woe on that day to the rejecters. Have **We** not made the earth to draw together to itself the living and the dead, And made therein lofty mountains, and given you to drink of sweet water? Woe on that day to the rejecters. (It will be said to them) "Walk on to that which you called a lie. Depart unto the shadow in three branches, (Which yet is) no relief nor shelter from the flame. Surely it sends up sparks like palaces, As if they were tawny camels." Woe on that day to the rejecters. This is the day on which they shall not speak, And permission shall not be given to them to put forth excuses. Woe on that day to the rejecters. This is the day of decision: We have gathered you and those of yore. So if you have a plan, plan against Me (now). Woe on that day to the rejecters. Surely those who guard (against evil) shall be amid shades and fountains, And fruits such as they desire. (Unto them it is said:) "Eat, drink and welcome, O ye blessed, in return for what ye did." Surely thus do **We** reward the doers of good. Woe on that day to the rejecters. Eat and enjoy yourselves for a little; surely you are guilty. Woe on that day to the rejecters. And where it is said to them, "Bow down", they do not bow down. Woe on that day to the rejecters. In what announcement, then, after this, will they believe? (Quran 77:12-50)

Almost everything here, from the mountains to the sweet water, the ultimate reward to the creation of man from filthy material, is attributed to the group when surely the insurmountable Allah should have done the work himself. But the assignment of these divine actions to a set of multiple entities is not in itself the most sacrilegious offence found in the *Quran*, of all places, against the cherished notion of Islamic monotheism, the primary reason for its proclaimed superiority to all the other religions. For the infrarational revelations themselves, the pristine 'last Word' of the sole god, the ultimate guidance for mankind that – as asserted by the believers - only Allah conceived of, is often described by the Quran as belonging to multiple parties. In some verses, like the following, the Plurality behind the verses is presented in a manner that while not explicit, is nevertheless easily understood:

And thus We have sent you among a nation before which other nations have passed away, that you might recite to them **what We have revealed to you** and (still) they deny the Beneficent Allah. Say: "He is my Lord, there is no god but He; on Him do I rely and to Him is my return." (Quran 13:30)

In numerous additional verses, the language is much stronger, with the infrarational communications clearly existing as the *possession* of a Plurality, which they have infrarationally revealed to prophets in eras prior to Mohammed:

And Noah, when he cried aforetime, so We answered him, and delivered him and his followers from the great calamity. And We helped him against the people who rejected **Our communications**. Surely they were an evil people, so We drowned them all. (Quran 21:76-77)

Similarly did the people of Al-Hijr reject the Plurality's messengers and infrarational revelations, with Gabriel telling Mohammed, "And the dwellers in Al-Hijr denied (**Our**) messengers. **And we gave them Our revelations**, but they were averse to them. And they used to hew out dwellings from the hills, (wherein they dwelt) secure. But the (Awful) Cry overtook them at the morning hour, And that which they were wont to count as gain availed them not." (Quran 15:80-84) In a different passage

chastening Ad and Samood of yore, in which the grammatical person actually interchanges in a logical fashion, with Allah (albeit “He” instead of “I”) ordaining the seven heavens, the mysterious Plurality (likely the angels in this case) the lower heaven with brilliant stars, the communications are still credited to the group even if Allah is identified as the sole force behind creation:

Say, O Mohammed: “What! Do you indeed disbelieve in Him Who created the earth in two periods, and do you set up equals with Him? That is the Lord of the Worlds.” And He made in it mountains above its surface, and He blessed therein and made therein its foods, in four periods, alike for the seekers. Then He directed Himself to the heaven and it is a vapour, so He said to it and to the earth: “Come both, willingly or unwillingly.” They both said: “We come willingly.” **So He ordained them seven heavens** in two periods, and revealed in every heaven its affair; and **We adorned the lower heaven with brilliant stars and (made it) to guard.** That is the decree of the Mighty, the Knowing. But if they turn aside, then say: “I have warned you of a scourge like the scourge of Ad and Samood.” When their messengers came to them from before them and from behind them, saying, “Serve nothing but Allah”, they said: “If our Lord had pleased He would certainly have sent down angels, so we are surely unbelievers in that with which you are sent.” Then as to Ad, they were unjustly proud in the land, and they said: “Who is mightier in strength than we?” Did they not see that **Allah Who created them** was mightier than they in strength, and **they denied Our communications?** So We sent on them a furious wind in unlucky days, that We may make them taste the chastisement of abasement in this world's life. And certainly the chastisement of the hereafter is much more abasing, and they shall not be helped. And as to Samood, We showed them the right way, but they chose error above guidance, so there overtook them the scourge of an abasing chastisement for what they earned. And **We delivered** those who believed and guarded (against evil). (Quran 41:09-18)

Other verses repeat this pattern, with Allah having to share the infrarational revelations, yet getting credit for different powers, when all powers should technically be his in a monotheistic religion. One verse assigns him the lesser function of instigating error (in comparison to the Plurality's ownership of the infrarational revelations), with Gabriel telling Mohammed, “**And they who reject Our communications are deaf and dumb, in utter darkness.** Whom Allah pleases He causes to err and whom He pleases He puts on the right way.” (Quran 6:39) Of course, as the Asura of Falsehood's word is plagued by inconsistency, additional infrarational revelations assign the Plurality supernatural powers such as yellow wind, to go along with making unbelievers deaf and in error:

And if **We** send a wind and they see it to be yellow, they would after that certainly continue to disbelieve. For surely you cannot make the dead to hear and you cannot make the deaf to hear the call, when they turn back and Nor can you lead away the blind out of their error. You cannot make to hear any but those who believe in **Our communications** so they shall submit. (Quran 30:51-53)

The Asura made sure to inform Mohammed of the punishment for disbelieving the infrarational revelations that he – as the Quran indicates – took a shared part in creating, telling his instrument, “those who disbelieve and deny **Our revelations**, they are owners of hell-fire.” (Quran 5:86) Similarly, the transgression from the way of Islam, in certain verses the sole propriety of Allah, who also punishes those he has caused to err, is in different communications a sin that leads the disbeliever to return to the *Plurality* whose message he rejected, with Gabriel saying, “Surely they who deviate from the right way concerning **Our communications** are not hidden from Us. What! Is he then who is cast into the fire better, or he who comes safe on the day of resurrection? Do what you like, surely He sees what you do.” (Quran 41:40) While this verse does permit Allah the minor individual function of sight, he nonetheless has to *share* the sadistic glory of Islamic punishment, with Gabriel and company taking part in gathering the unbelievers on their knees in hell, at the same time endowed with the knowledge

of the heathen's sins *and* able to deliver those who recited *their* infrarational revelations:

So by your Lord! We will most certainly gather them together and the Satans, then shall **We** certainly cause them to be present round hell on their knees. Then We will most certainly draw forth from every sect of them him who is most exorbitantly rebellious against the Beneficent Allah. **Again We do certainly know best those who deserve most to be burned therein.** And there is not one of you but shall come to it; this is an unavoidable decree of your Lord. **And We will deliver those who guarded (against evil), and We will leave the unjust therein on their knees. And when Our clear communications are recited to them,** those who disbelieve say to those who believe: "Which of the two parties is best in abiding and best in assembly?" And how many of the generations have We destroyed before them who were better in respect of goods and outward appearance! (Quran 19:68-74)

In another passage, both the Asuric revelations and the famous "will" of Allah – including, of course, his ability to annihilate disbelievers - are credited to a Plurality, placing question on the veracity of the Islamic cry of *Inshallah*:

And those who disbelieve say: "The hour shall not come upon us." Say: "No! By my Lord, the Knower of the unseen, it shall certainly come upon you. Not the weight of an atom becomes absent from Him, in the heavens or in the earth, and neither less than that nor greater, but (all) is in a clear book That He may reward those who believe and do good; these it is for whom is forgiveness and an honourable sustenance." And (as for) those who strive hard in opposing **Our communications**, these it is for whom is a painful chastisement of an evil kind. And those to whom the knowledge has been given see that which has been revealed to you from your Lord, that is the truth, and it guides into the path of the Mighty, the Praised. And those who disbelieve say (in ridicule): "Shall we point out to you a man who informs you that when you are scattered the utmost scattering you shall then be most surely (raised) in (to) a new creation? He has forged a lie against Allah or there is madness in him?" Nay! Those who do not believe in the hereafter are in torment and in great error. Have they not observed what is before them and what is behind them of the sky and the earth? If **We will, We** can make the earth swallow them, or cause obliteration from the sky to fall on them. Lo! Herein surely is a portent for every slave who turneth (to Allah) repentant. (Quran 34:03-09)

Again present in this passage is the use of fear to subjugate the believers to the dictates of the Asura of Falsehood, with the identification of a "clear book" in which the deeds and beliefs of the believers are jotted down. The existence of such a list only fuels the obsessive tendencies of the faithful Muslim, who becomes more likely to repetitively practice the prayers and rituals demanded by the Quran and Hadith, lest he suffer the fateful verdict. The motivation for the rituals is infused with the terror of what will happen if he does *not* perform them, rather than out of a love for God. For the Muslim is taught that any deviation from "Our communications" leads to a severe punishment handed out by *multiple* entities:

And those who disbelieve say: "Do not listen to this Quran and make noise as it is read, that ye may overcome." But **We will most certainly make those who disbelieve taste a severe punishment, and We will most certainly reward them for the evil deeds they used to do.** That is the reward of the enemies of Allah - the fire. For them therein shall be the house of long abiding, **a reward for their denying Our communications.** And those who disbelieve will say: "Our Lord! Show us those who led us astray from among the jinn and the men that we may trample them under our feet so that they may be of the lowest." (As for) those who say, "Our Lord is Allah", then continue in the right way; the angels descend upon them, saying: "Fear not, nor be grieved, and receive good news of the garden which you were promised. We are your guardians in this world's life and in the hereafter, and you shall have therein what your souls

desire and you shall have therein what you ask for, A provision from the Forgiving, the Merciful.” (Quran 41:26-32)

The previous passage is yet another example of the incorrect grammatical person being used, as “We” should again be replaced by “My Angels and I” if we are to truly respect Islam's claim of a monotheistic source for its ‘Word’. Instead we find the Plurality to be the possessors of Islamic reward and punishment, as one might expect of a group powerful enough to declare ownership of the ‘Word’ and worthy enough to have a primary seat on the most crucial Day of a mortal's existence:

Surely those who do not hope in **Our meeting** and are pleased with this world's life and are content with it, and those who are heedless of **Our communications**: (As for) those, their abode is the fire because of what they earned. (Quran 10:07-08)

Any possibility that the language of these infrarational revelations represents the actual ‘Word’ of Allah rather than the individual dictates of the Asura of Falsehood claiming to be an intermediary, disintegrate when we consider certain Asuric communications presented to Mohammed in a grammatical, and factual, manner consistent with Islam's alleged account of the word's transmission to the Prophet. The most important of these crucially states that the scripture was sent to Mohammed *through* Gabriel, by Allah's *permission*:

Say (O Mohammed, to mankind): **“Whoever is an enemy to Gabriel - For he it is who hath revealed (this Scripture) to thy heart by Allah's permission, confirming that which was (revealed) before it, and a guidance and glad tidings to believers - Who is an enemy to Allah, and His angels and His messengers, and Gabriel and Michael! Then, lo! Allah (Himself) is an enemy to the disbelievers.”** (Quran 2:97-98)

The grammatical person here, unlike with the majority of verses specifically concerning the communications, is more appropriate, with the third person singular being used in a fashion consistent with the double intermediary aspect of the Quran, whereby Allah allegedly sent his ‘Word’ to mankind via Gabriel and *then* Mohammed. Gabriel is in this passage said to be a revealer of scripture, *but only by Allah's authorization*, an important caveat that is absent from the countless verses in which the distinction between Allah and Gabriel fails to appear. Indeed a truly consistent message of monotheistic communication would have, in the numerous verses already cited, included a few words similar to “by Allah's permission”, or even better, eliminated entirely the use of the first person singular and third person plural, replacing them solely with “I” and “My” to fully cancel any confusion over the grammatical person and the ownership of the infrarational revelations.

But the Asura could not – nor, to be frank, did he need to after a certain period of time when his psychological hold upon Mohammed became inescapable for the latter – resist the urge to at least project himself *with* – for he knew it would be too much for him to identify himself, an alleged angel, as the Lord – Allah rather than exclusively assign a supremacy to someone other than himself. Indeed one finds in 2:97-98 a subconscious hoisting of Gabriel through the use of the word “revealed”, language that in Islam has certain connotations; in that particular communication, words like relayed or recited would be more appropriate if Gabriel was truly a humble servant of Allah that everyone, including the angels, are supposed to be. The language used functions to directly associate Gabriel with the word revelation (which is then later associated with multiple entities) when he should only be a conduit. While the description of the source of the ‘Word’ is more appropriately presented - according to Islam's official claim - in 2:97-98 than in the majority of verses, a genuinely monotheistic religion – or at least one that claims its ‘Word’ to belong to one god – would consistently present the origin of its scripture in the first person singular found at the beginning of the following Quran passage:

My communications were indeed recited to you, but you used to turn back on your heels, In arrogance, talking nonsense about the Quran, and left him like one telling fables by night. Is it

then that they do not ponder over what is said, or is it that there has come to them that which did not come to their fathers of old? Or is it that they have not recognized their Messenger, so that they deny him? Or do they say: "There is madness in him?" Nay! He has brought them the truth, and most of them are averse from the truth. And should the truth follow their low desires, surely the heavens and the earth and all those who are therein would have perished. Nay! We have brought to them their reminder, but from their reminder they turn aside. Or is it that you ask them (O Mohammed) a recompense? But the recompense of your Lord is best, and He is the best of those who provide sustenance. And most surely you invite them to a straight way. And most surely those who do not believe in the hereafter are deviating from the way. And if We show mercy to them and remove the distress they have, they would persist in their obstinance, blindly wandering on. And already We overtook them with chastisement, but they were not submissive to their Lord, nor do they humble themselves. Until when We open upon them a door of severe chastisement, lo, they are in despair at it. (Quran 23:66-77)

While this selection contains numerous identifications of a Plurality ("We), at the very least the ownership of the scripture – albeit only initially - is presented correctly, in the proper grammatical person when we remember that both Gabriel and Mohammed are double intermediaries. Thus "My communications" (rather than the third person singular of "Allah's permission" in 2:97-98) is a consistent articulation of the message, because the 'Word' should belong only to Allah, and the most likely manner of his presentation to Gabriel, the supposed relayer, would have been first person singular. The verses should never have been displayed in a fashion indicating any sort of ownership by a mysterious Plurality, as occurred in the following:

And they serve besides Allah that for which He has not sent any authority, and that of which they have no knowledge. And for the unjust there shall be no helper. And when **Our clear communications** are recited to them you will find denial on the faces of those who disbelieve; they almost spring upon those who recite to them **Our communications**. Say: "Shall I inform you of what is worse than this? The fire! Allah has promised it to those who disbelieve, and how evil is the destination!" O people! A parable is set forth, therefore listen to it: surely those whom you call upon besides Allah cannot create even a fly, though they should all gather for it, and should the fly snatch away anything from them, they could not take it back from it so weak are the invoker and the invoked. (Quran 22:71-73)

The manner of this passage – in totality, not simply the attribution of scriptural creation - leads one to believe that the words presented are from the viewpoint of Gabriel rather than Allah, with both mankind and Allah described from the Asura's grammatical perspective, separate to him even if he is granting a certain amount of authority to Allah. At least that particular extract is grammatically consistent within the passage; in others such as the next verse, we again find the rapid transition from one grammatical person to the next:

Or lest you should say, "If the Book had been revealed to us, we would certainly have been better guided than they." So indeed there has come to you clear proof from your Lord, and guidance and mercy. Who then is more unjust than he who rejects **Allah's communications** and turns away from them? We will reward those who turn away from **Our communications** with an evil chastisement because they turned away. (Quran 6:157)

The Asura of Falsehood is here *perhaps* lost in two minds, trying to maintain the facade of the one true god's infrarational revelation with the reality – obscured in plural grammatical form – of his own dominion over the scripture. Conversely, Gabriel might very well have made a conscious decision to change the grammatical person within the same verse, as part of his conditioning of Mohammed to associate Allah with the group, and hence, Gabriel. By continuing to use the words "We" and "Our" in relation to the communications and especially the punishment, Mohammed was to – in contrast to the

verses telling mankind that they should fear Allah alone – also live terrified of Gabriel, beholden to *his*, rather than *Allah's*, word and presence. For Mohammed had occult sight of Gabriel, not of Allah, and thus the raw sensation of fear could be concretely associated by sight and hearing – of *Gabriel* – instead of the lesser intensity of thoughts and emotions arising from fear from an *unseen* Allah. The visual and auditory senses, after all, are often very powerful in impressing a certain tenet upon a person's mind and vital.

Thus the Asura of Falsehood, by linking his occult form and voice with the ‘Divine’ command to fear infrarational revelations of which he became *co-creator*, was more likely to make sure that Mohammed feared, and thus obeyed, him alongside Allah. Unlike the Prophet's apprehension of Gabriel, his dread of Allah was only a strongly held belief – itself a potent mechanism for maintaining fear – since he had not seen Allah. Though the idea or belief alone – as we see by the multitudes of ordinary Muslims – is enough to elicit terror, by adding the other sensory components, the Asura of Falsehood made himself equivalent to God in the eyes of Mohammed, even if the latter was not aware of the reality of his relationship to this ‘angel’. The imposing nature of the Asura made it more likely that Mohammed would both obey him and fervently spread the message of fear, which is what Islam really is, forever rooting mankind to an impoverished existence. Thus there was no need for Gabriel to consistently maintain the appropriate grammatical person that he did in certain communications such as the following, in which we at times see a better – though not perfect – delineation of roles:

These are the communications of Allah which We recite to you with truth. Then in what announcement would they believe after Allah and His communications? Woe to every sinful liar, Who hears the communications of Allah recited to him, then persists proudly as though he had not heard them. So announce to him a painful punishment. And when he comes to know of any of Our communications, he takes it for a jest - these it is that shall have abasing chastisement. Before them is hell, and there shall not avail them aught of what they earned, nor those whom they took for guardians besides Allah, and they shall have a grievous punishment. This is guidance. And (as for) those who disbelieve in the communications of their Lord, they shall have a painful punishment on account of uncleanness. (Quran 45:06-11)

Leaving aside the usual rapid transitions between grammatical person, we at least find here the correct term for what Gabriel should have, per Islam's presumed narrative, *consistently* described himself as doing: reciting. That alone should have been the function of this ‘angel’, rather than the group (“We” and “Our”) indicated in the language of the verses. Of course, having described it somewhat correctly at the beginning of the passage, immediately afterwards the communications again become the property of both Allah and Gabriel. In another verse, it is an ownership attributed to the Plurality from the very start of Mohammed's occult experience:

Lo! We revealed it on the Night of Power. Ah, what will convey unto thee what the Night of Power is! The Night of Power is better than a thousand months. The angels and Gabriel descend in it by the permission of their Lord for every affair. (Quran 97:01-04)

The Night of Power was the first night of occult discourse between Mohammed and Gabriel, an event glorified by the believers to this day, as it marks the initial development of their holiest of all objects, the Quran. The book in question, a sum total of the infrarational revelations claimed to be made by the ‘one true god’, is – similar to the descriptions of the communications alone – specifically declared to belong to a Plurality, with Gabriel in one case telling Mohammed, “Surely **We** have revealed the Book to you with the truth that you may judge between people by means of that which Allah has taught you. And be not an advocate on behalf of the treacherous.” (Quran 4:105) In another verse, only the unbelievers are said to deny the “Book” provided by Gabriel and others:

And thus have **We revealed the Book to you**. So those whom We have given the Book believe in it, and of these there are those who believe in it, and none deny **Our communications** except the unbelievers. (Quran 29:47)

It was not Allah alone who was periodically illuminating Mohammed with the “Truth” - the Asura informing his instrument, “With Truth have **We revealed it**, and with truth hath it descended; and We have not sent you but as the giver of good news and as a warner. **And it is a Quran which We have revealed in portions** so that you may read it to the people at intervals: and **We have revealed it in portions.**” (Quran 17:105-106) Similarly, the Quran is a collection that a *group* of non-human entities have granted mankind as a reminder:

We have not revealed the Quran to you that you should be distressed. Nay, it is a reminder to him who fears, A revelation from Him Who created the earth and the high heavens. (Quran 20:02-04)

Gabriel and Allah, and perhaps more unknown beings, previously entrusted Moses with the Book, having sent him and others as reminders for humanity:

And most certainly **We gave Moses the Book and We sent messengers after him** one after another. And We gave Jesus, the son of Mariam, clear arguments and strengthened him with the holy spirit. What! Whenever then a messenger came to you with that which your souls did not desire, you were insolent so you called some liars and some you slew. (Quran 2:87)

Another segment of the ‘true scripture’, along with deriding those who desire to take a middle course, also grants ownership of the Book and the Messengers to the Islamic Plurality:

Then **We gave the Book** for an inheritance to those whom We chose from among **Our servants**. But of them is he who makes his soul to suffer a loss, **and of them is he who takes a middle course**, and of them is he who is foremost in deeds of goodness by Allah's permission - this is the great excellence. Gardens of perpetuity, they shall enter therein, they will be made to wear therein bracelets of gold and pearls, and their dress therein shall be silk. And they shall say: “(All) praise is due to Allah, Who has made grief to depart from us; most surely our Lord is Forgiving, Multiplier of rewards, Who has made us alight in a house abiding for ever out of His grace; toil shall not touch us therein, nor shall fatigue therein afflict us.” (Quran 35:32-35)

If there was any doubt, even with such examples involving unequivocal descriptions, as to whom the Quran belongs to, another piece of the scripture uses even stronger possessive language:

Nay! They wonder that there has come to them a warner from among themselves, so the unbelievers say: “This is a wonderful thing.” What! When we are dead and have become dust (that we will be brought back again)? That is a far (from probable) return.” We know indeed what the earth diminishes of them, **and with Us is a writing that preserves**. Nay, they rejected the truth when it came to them, so they are (now) in a state of confusion. (Quran 50:02-05)

This is another substantial indicator of – if we take the Islamic narrative of Gabriel and Allah existing as separate entities for the believer – Gabriel's scandalous usurpation of Allah's rightful status as the complete and unpartnered sovereignty over the most fundamental aspect of Islam: the Quran. It is, after all, a book that should only belong to Allah, rather than him having to share it with partners. If the scripture was to genuinely support the prevailing doctrine that Allah alone created and holds the Quran, then verses like the above would describe the angels as mere *reciters* – as was done in a previous example – of the writing, rather than owners of it, with the infrarational revelation alternatively reading “and with Me is a writing”. But the Quran fails to consistently support the myth that Islam is a religion created out of the last ‘Word’ of *only* Allah, and often presents a decidedly polytheistic element that negates its supposed distinction from different religions. In an added twist to the previously described

Duality, Gabriel is found ordering mankind to obey Allah, *and* Mohammed - the latter of whom does not belong to Allah alone:

Has there not come to you the story of those who disbelieved before, then tasted the evil result of their conduct, and they had a painful punishment. That is because there came to them their messengers with clear arguments, but they said: "Shall mortals guide us?" So they disbelieved and turned back, and Allah does not stand in need (of anything), and Allah is Self-sufficient, Praised. Those who disbelieve think that they shall never be raised. Say: "Aye! By my Lord! You shall most certainly be raised, then you shall most certainly be informed of what you did. And that is easy to Allah." Therefore believe in Allah and His Messenger and the Light which We have revealed, and Allah is Aware of what you do. On the day that He will gather you for the day of gathering, that is the day of loss and gain. And whoever believes in Allah and does good, He will remove from him his evil and cause him to enter gardens beneath which rivers flow, to abide therein forever. That is the great achievement. And (as for) those who disbelieve and reject **Our** communications, they are the inmates of the fire, to abide therein - and evil is the destination. No affliction comes about but by Allah's permission. And whoever believes in Allah, He guides aright his heart; and Allah is Cognizant of all things. **And obey Allah and obey the Messenger, but if you turn back, then upon Our Messenger devolves only the clear delivery (of the message).** (Quran 64:05-12)

The passage starts off appropriately enough, even if Allah is referred to in the third person – one could possibly imagine Allah doing as such if He indeed was actually relaying his 'Word' to the Asura of Falsehood. Soon however, Islam's latent Polytheism returns, the inevitable byproduct of an extremely egoistical emanation forced by expediency to initially assume a position of lower prominence to an entity (Allah) he was claiming to be in contact with. Gabriel, the actual occult source of the communications, could never claim himself as the rightful owner, as that would have been too much of a transgression, and even the submissive Mohammed would have been perturbed to hear Gabriel claim that he, an "angel", was the real creator, the origin, of the scripture and Islam. Consequently, Quran passages like the one cited above give the impression of an Islamic *trinity* consisting of Allah, Gabriel and Mohammed, each of whom the pious Muslim is commanded to obey; in doing so they are following the religious decree of a *group* of entities, of a variant of Polytheism that they are ironically fond of deriding.

As the prevailing Arab belief was that the angels – rather than God - were likelier to speak to mortals, the Asura of Falsehood took the occult disguise of the angel Gabriel in order to unburden his task. His frequent grammatical errors - often related to a conscious decision to attach himself to Allah's power in order to reinforce Mohammed's fear - and a sheer egoistic need to project his own power even as a partner, came as the consequences, eroding the initial consistency – in which the reading of verses leads one to agree with the idea that Islam is a monotheistic faith - of the language used. But when we find the words "We", "Our" and "Us" in the context of the creation of the Quran, the dispensing of punishment, the deliverance of communications, and even the creation of mankind and earth, the mind looks aghast at the presence of Muslim self-righteousness over their perceived uniqueness and rationale for world conquest in relation to this purported tenet of monotheism. For why should "We", "Our" and "Us" ever be used in a monotheistic faith whose infrarational revelations are purported to arise only from the communications of a solitary god?

All power should belong to Allah, and the 'Word' should be his alone – the rest should only be able to *recite* his creation, basking in the glory of earth and mankind that he alone spawned out of contemptible water. Why should he ever feel the need to place an angel or a prophet as equal to him, commanding mankind to obey someone else other than he? Mohammed, when repeatedly exposed to that particular theme, had no other recourse except to include himself in partnership with his god and

Gabriel, because he was not self-aware enough to realize, as events proceeded, the transgression within the 'Word' itself. There should never be any room, in a religion that prides itself on being the only faith that genuinely believes in one god without partners, for justifiable conclusions to the contrary: thus the first person plural grammatical person should **never** appear, with the first person singular, such as "My revelations" or "My book", predominating. The only other grammatical person that could be allowed to emerge is the third person singular, with Allah describing himself in that tense. Of course, that particular grammatical person only works under Islam's dogma if the word used is "Allah", rather than "His" or "He", since the latter two indicate that *someone else* other than Allah is speaking, rejecting the idea that Gabriel was a simple conduit or relay of Allah's message. The Asura, after all, should only have been reciting verbatim Allah's 'Word' – which one would expect to be full of the first person singular – to Mohammed, without any alteration or description of the Islamic 'truth' from *his* (Gabriel's) observational outpost.

Islam's only saving grace from the hated 'crime' of Polytheism, which if a technically accurate account of their religious *hierarchy* on a scriptural basis, is as previously mentioned the absence of prayer *directly* afforded to pivotal Islamic figures such as Gabriel and Mohammed, even if the latter is considered the "exemplar" for mankind whose actions should be obeyed, and has copious hadith devoted to the record of his life. It is precisely this particular characterization, however, that leads us to the most practical manifestation of Islam's hoisting of Mohammed and Gabriel to places they should never have been near. For if Islam can reasonably be argued to *not* be polytheistic (at least in the form of conscious worship rather than function) since the prayers of Muslims are to be strictly directed towards Allah, and as Gabriel and Mohammed are not explicitly declared to be gods by the scripture, the recurrent elevation of these two to a status at least equal with, if not superior than, Allah - and in the case of Mohammed, a constant need to praise his greatness and live according to his daily habits -, leads to an excessive fondness toward entities other than Allah, resulting in perhaps the most damning charge of all: Idolatry.

This most injurious of accusations to a Muslim is not based upon the presence of photos of Mohammed or Gabriel or Allah in their mosques or living spaces, nor too is it founded upon so-called "idols" one might discover in Hindu temples. For contrary to the conception that Islam has of idolatry – in Islam, the formulation is based upon physical objects -, the truest type of idolatry belongs to the subjective element of the individual, and begins with the excessive attachment to things or persons not *consciously* Divine, including prophets who are specifically identified as mortals. Psychological attachment is by default a subjective feature, determined only by the internal thoughts and beliefs of the individual in question, not by their external habits. Which means, of course, that a person can be attached to a non-Divine individual or thing *without* having a picture or figurine or sculpture of the particular object of attachment in their house or place of worship; the attachment is instead objectified by the internal mind and vital of the idolater in question - indeed an idea or ideal can also become the non-physical object of egoistic attachment.

Accordingly, the fervent attachment of Muslims to their final prophet, to the belief in Allah as the sole deity, to the subjugation of the kuffar, to the permanent dualities of believer and unbeliever, heaven and hell - all indoctrinated through their infrarational religious scripture -, are to the extraordinary levels of idolatry, because they represent an excessive and blind devotion to *tenets* – which are earthly constructs just as the so-called idol is - instead of God, to the extreme where heresy – which can simply be an abandonment of Islamic *beliefs and doctrine* – is punishable with death. Blasphemy results from the idolatrous nature of religious dogma, in which the believers become angry after someone dares to deviate from the mutually held group *attachment*, leading to anger and then violence against that 'apostate'. Indeed is such wrath, as the Bhagavad Gita illumines, the direct result of the attachment to the sense objects – the mind, in which the Muslim's attachment to his religion is cultivated, is

considered one of the six sense-receiving organs - and the desires emerging out of that excessive psychological bondage:

When dwelling on objects of the senses a person develops attachment to the sense objects; from attachment desires are born; from desire anger arises. Anger leads to bewilderment, from bewilderment comes loss of memory; and by that the intelligence is destroyed; from destruction of intelligence he perishes. But that self-controlled individual who follows the Vedic directions while amidst the objects of the senses, is freed from attachment and aversion, with the senses governed by the Self; attained has he the precious mercy of the Ultimate Personality. (Bhagavad Gita 2:62-64)

In Islam's case, it is the psychological objectification of the Asuric *ideal* of a world completely Islamic, one which is ruined through apostasy, that the believer is fixated upon to the extent of bloodshed. Such is the intensity of their attachment, that even if there did not exist the call to kill heretics within the Quran, the anger emerging out of the desire for world conquest and complete groupthink is enough to instigate such violence. The attachment to the ideal, however, can be a difficult one for mankind to reach in its pure form, bereft as it is of tangible components; which is why certain Islamic archetypes, like the Apostle of Allah, are more easily clung to than others. For it is much simpler for humans to identify with someone described as a human (even with his supraterrrestrial powers, the superficial Islamic narrative is that Mohammed was a man) rather than an ideal flying alone in the mental world, without a concrete representative in the physical. Making the attachment more likely to occur among the believers, Mohammed was described as the perfect human archetype, the “excellent exemplar” (Quran 33:21), the one whose practices a Muslim has to follow, for “he who does not follow my tradition in religion, is not from me (not one of my followers).” (Sahih Bukhari Hadith Volume 7, Book 62, Number 1) But it is nothing but idolatry, a blind devotion to a presumed mortal, to hoist Mohammed to the level where his daily customs must be imitated by the believers, with the spectre of apostasy if failing to do so. To give him such importance only leads to an excessive attachment to the point where any insults against him – simple words – alone are enough to kill, as in the example of Ibn Khatal:

Narrated Anas bin Malik:

Allah's Apostle entered Mecca in the year of its Conquest wearing an Arabian helmet on his head and when the Prophet took it off, a person came and said, “Ibn Khatal is holding the covering of the Ka’ba (taking refuge in the Ka’ba).” The Prophet said, “Kill him.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 3, Book 29, Number 72)

The distinguishing feature of Ibn Khatal's murder was the presence of two female singers under his dominion, “who used to sing satirical songs about the apostle, so he ordered that they should be killed with him.” (Ibn Ishaq, *Sirat Rasul Allah*, translated by A. Guillaume, p. 551) The presence of such a murderous response to insults and other non-violent offences especially signifies the idolization of Mohammed, a theme we continue to observe in the modern world, with a recent example involving the protests over Danish cartoons insulting Mohammed and the ghastly murder of twelve at the French newspaper Charlie Hebdo for both their insults to Islam and their drawings of the Prophet – one type of idolatry (killing over insults or images) ironically superseding a presumed idolatrous act (the drawing of images). The latter type of action, let us recall, is in its origin a neutral function, and only assumes a positive or negative aspect in relation to the psychology of the individual. The mentality of the Muslim is far from this neutral stance, with his attachment to the archetype of a non-pictorialized, pristine Mohammed, leading to rage when his egoistic conception of an inordinately elevated mortal is disrupted.

The idolatry of Mohammed differs significantly from the worship of the Guru by Hindus, with the most

distinguishing feature lying in the former's mortality and the latter's divinity. Though Muslims do not technically worship Mohammed, they are attached to the idea of him like one would expect of a worshipper to his God; it is a type of subconscious devotion, reflecting his extraordinary importance. But he is officially *not* to be considered a god by Muslims, even if his powers and occasional depictions in the scripture are to that level. The Guru, on the other hand, as the Purusha, the Soul in All, having taken Conscious control of the mental, vital and even physical sheaths constituting the previously ego-limited mortal, is a natural object of worship, since the object is the appropriate target: God. Naturally, charlatans may claim to be a Guru when they actually remain of the non-Divine consciousness, but that is not always the case, and the practice of the Guru (in its original meaning, not the modern derivative applied to ordinary mortals) being worshipped by the devotee *cannot* be, when applying the Hindu perspective, a form of idolatry, because the devotee is worshipping Brahma having taken over the individual, instead of worshipping a mortal who maintains his ego-consciousness.

If the Hindu devotee also decides to take up certain practices of his or her Guru, it is likewise not idolatry, because it is the Divine placed upon such a pedestal rather than another mortal such as the Prophet. Nevertheless, a Guru will not demand the extreme fidelity characteristic to Mohammed's example, in which failing to heed the latter's tradition leads to apostasy, for the Guru knows the truth of the Gita, previously cited, that "It is better to follow one's natural law (svadharma), even though faulty, than an alien law perfectly. Even death in following one's natural law is better; perilous is it to follow an alien law." (Bhagavad Gita 3:35) The attachment to Mohammed that Islam demands of its believers, an idolatry described in more convenient terms by them, is a contravention of the Sanatana Dharma, an imposition of a *mortal's* law of living upon all of his followers, a transgression from the inherent law of being that the individual is supposed to discover and progressively base his life upon, with the eventual Realization of the Self. The Guru is not supposed to dictate a rigidly specific pattern of thinking and acting for his disciple; rather, He or She is to guide the devotee according to the latter's internal law of being in a fluid fashion, towards the Ultimate and Unrestricted Truth.

The Asura of Falsehood, on the other hand, acts in direct opposition to both svadharma and the aspired result of it, the discarding of ego into Satchitananda. As he is the overseer of falsehood, he naturally does not wish for the conscious realization of the Purusha, or even a set of guiding principles that seeks to direct mortals towards that luminous peak; hence the idolatry of Mohammed and the command to live life according to someone whose law is most likely in conflict with one's svadharma. By exaggerating the importance of one man, the Asura succeeded not in Islam's alleged goal of eliminating idolatry altogether - a task that is best accomplished through the practice of yoga (especially karma, jnana and bhakta) -, or even an intermediary goal of merely reducing attachment toward material and psychological objects, a detachment which concentrates the consciousness inward toward the Purusha: Instead, Gabriel accomplished a goal strategically efficient, one taking advantage of mankind's natural tendency to magnify the importance of the limited mental, vital and physical realities at the expense of the Purusha.

For if it is indeed a psychologically restricted – relatively speaking – perspective to place undue attachment upon things of the ordinary world, it is yet a normal part of human development, and thus not something that should justify violence – even if, for instance, the trumped up charge of Polytheist “idolatry” were genuine, which is not the case, as we shall see – or ‘Divine’ retribution. The attachment described in the Bhagavad Gita, which could conceivably include the type of idolatry falsely attributed by Muslims to Hindus, has for results in the ordinary rajasic human, consequences that occur *within* earth, are proportional to the attachment, are almost entirely transient, with a denouement predominantly psychological rather than the death or hellfire of Islam, and in fact are of benefit – rather than the unceasing Islamic punishment - to the growth of the individual's Psychic Being. Not all of humanity, after all, is Self-Realized, and thus an individual's attachment to objects or thoughts in

actuality represent opportunities to evolve through a process of a gradual sattvic detachment eventually leading to the Purusha.

Returning to the Asura's strategy behind the amplification of Mohammed's importance, we must recall the truth of Prakriti's stupendous myriad of thought and form, one reflecting the similar diversity of internal laws. As Man is an evolving consciousness, not yet Self-Realized, he thus has an infinite amount of thought and form that he might attach himself to, perhaps excessively. Knowing humanity's tendency to do this, the Asura of Falsehood, while purporting to create a religion eliminating all idolatry, in fact cleverly set about hoisting Mohammed to the status of *the most important idol*, if not the only one. By attempting to remove all competitors that mankind could direct their focus upon, eliminating the “worship” of all other “idols”, Mohammed was to remain as the last existing *animate* idol, subconsciously worshipped (in some cases, as we will discuss in the next chapter, consciously worshipped). Even if, unlike the non-Muslim practice, there were to be no images of Mohammed, his psychological characteristics – including the Falsehood qualities of hatred, separation, uninhibited lust, rage and obscurantism - would persist in the Quran and authentic hadith, all enough to create the archetype that Muslims can excessively – through their emotional mentality - attach upon, like one would expect of an idol.

But if Mohammed was to remain the living embodiment of Islam, the human ideal for the believer to fixate upon, the most crucial of Islam's idols, the idolizing of whom could pass unnoticed after his pictorialization was outlawed and Muslims were indoctrinated to associate idolatry *only* with prayer in the direction of the physical form, there was nevertheless still plenty of room for the Asura of Falsehood to engender further idolatry in Islam. Indeed the realm of material objects is itself not without idols for Muslims, with Mohammed outlining to them another object for them to become obsessed with:

Narrated Salim's father:

The Prophet said, “Not to wish to be the like of except the like of two (persons): **a man whom Allah has given the knowledge of the Quran and he recites it during the hours of the night and the hours of the day**; and a man whom Allah has given wealth and he spends it (in Allah's Cause) during the hours of the night and during the hours of the day.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 93, Number 620)

Additionally, Muslims who read and teach the Quran are said by Mohammed to be the most superior among the already chosen ones:

Narrated Uthman bin Affan:

The Prophet said, “The most superior among you (Muslims) are those who learn the Qur'an and teach it.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 6, Book 61, Number 546)

The recitation of the Quran repetitively throughout the day, with the memorized ‘knowledge’ leading a Muslim to a superior status within the supposed brotherhood of equal slaves, only serves to exaggerate the importance of a *book*, fixating the mind on what remains, in form, a sense object (the mere reading, reciting and listening to the Quran, after all, involve three of the basic senses) that while the printed ‘Word’ of Allah, is *not* Allah. It clearly is insufficient to simply believe that Allah is the sole deity – standing alone, without the subsequent declaration of the mortal Mohammed's elevated status, this would not be idolatrous – when Mohammed declares the Quran reciters to be of a higher class:

Narrated Abu Musa:

The Prophet said, “The example of a believer who recites the Quran is that of a citron (a citrus fruit) which is good in taste and good in smell. And the believer who does not recite the Quran

is like a date which has a good taste but no smell. And the example of an impious person who recites the Quran is that of Ar-Rihana (an aromatic plant) which smells good but is bitter in taste. And the example of an impious person who does not recite the Quran is that of a colocynth which is bitter in taste and has no smell.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 93, Number 649)

The Quran, as we have already covered, is a book to be interpreted in uniform fashion by the flock, with any differences in opinion, per Mohammed, requiring a moratorium on its recitation:

Narrated Abdullah:

The Prophet said, **“Recite (and study) the Qur’an as long as you agree about its interpretation, but if you have any difference of opinion (as regards to its interpretation and meaning) then you should stop reciting it (for the time being).”** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 6, Book 61, Number 580)

The uniformity is meant to include the external senses along with the homogeneity of thought and belief, which are internal functions. For Mohammed not only wanted all believers to interpret the Quran in an unthinking, homogeneous fashion, he also demanded of them a monotonous, automaton character that one expects of soldiers rather than devotees:

Narrated Abdullah:

That he heard a man reciting a Quranic Verse which he had heard the Prophet reciting in a different way. So he took that man to the Prophet (and told him the story). The Prophet said, “Both of you are reciting in a correct way, so carry on reciting.” **The Prophet further added, “The nations which were before you were destroyed (by Allah) because they differed.”** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 6, Book 61, Number 582)

Just as the previous nations were “destroyed” because of their natural differences in belief and religious practice, so were their very “idols” naturally myriad, individualized, without the centralization of Islam's objects of attachment – *external* or superficial centrality the fundamental difference between Abrahamic and non-Abrahamic practice. The externals of the latter can be quite discordant to the former's eye, with different artwork and statues adorning temples or houses, whereas the Abrahamic faiths maintain a certain consistency to their exalted psychological or material objects such as the “exemplar” Mohammed and the Quran. By narrowing the range of objects for his desired psychological attachment, the Asura was able to create more avenues for control and propagation of the Falsehood of fearing God, because the primary idols of Islam - Mohammed and the Quran - are excellent at returning straying Muslim *thought* back to Islam's primitive beliefs and thought, to a uniformity that in most Muslims is comprised of a rigid set of external laws and attachments *opposed* to their own secret, inherent, plastic svadharma.

If the excessive importance placed on a solitary religious book is by itself an idolatrous arrangement, worse still is the Islamic tenet of the Quran containing the ‘last’ - infrarational - revelations of God to mankind, the sole important communication that God has provided. By believing such a declaration, Muslims are once more guilty of an inordinate attachment to something non-Divine; in this case, the psychological and material limitations of human mortality. While one can understand why the Asura, in his effort for thought-control and propagation of falsehood, wished to declare his message the final and sole word of “God”, for a human to believe such a thing is for them to secretly believe God as similar to themselves, bound to time. It is an attachment to their own egoistic projections upon God, that his consciousness is likewise limited, that he restricted himself to a final messenger and decided to cease all occult transmissions from thereon, just as certain swaths of humanity believe their current life to be the only one they will ever live, with all of their creations in their brief lifetime to be the sum of ‘their’

output for eternity.

Nowhere in the scripture of the Sanatana Dharma do we find this conception of a 'Last Word', because God is experienced to be Illimitable and Eternal, yet also transcending the formulations of time and space, Ageless yet beyond the conception of age, capable of incarnating as an Avatar in multiple epochs, and – in all times – unmasking Himself to Himself, communicating a limitless Word to the worshipper who knows the Word to in fact belong to *him* as well, since all is Brahma. We also do not find any rationale for placing a limit on the Supreme in the manifestation, as He is to evolve his manifestation (not yet Consciously Himself) from behind the "veil", with the consciousness of the individual growing into the Consciousness of God. Brahma can be Active, or Silent but nevertheless not mute, capable, in any time period or nation, of transmitting his Consciousness into the manifestation via a properly developed individual who can access that Consciousness through careful spiritual practice. There is no reason for God to confine Himself to one solitary set of communications or manifestation of his Consciousness, as it would go against the ultimate destiny of His Consciousness actively participating in the physical world – in its very cellular material no less - rather than from behind the thick veil between ordinary human awareness and Satchitananda.

Just as He is capable of communicating an Unlimited Word to mankind in different time periods or individuals, he can also do so in whatever form of communication he chooses, with human language representing the best means of approximating and relaying the Divine Consciousness which, at an evolutionary advanced level to regular human *consciousness*, can never be fully described in human language, because mortal language and thought are lower forms of consciousness to Satchitananda. Nevertheless, verbal or written communication, especially of a Self-Realized individual who lives fully aware of the One Consciousness behind all existence, can be very important to help other humans progress in their spiritual and Psychical development. And as God is Illimitable, so is his choice of mortal language for expression unrestricted. Islam, however, presents an alternative, programming its believers – albeit unconsciously - to exalt Arabic over all other types of language. The manner in which this occurs is subtle, involving sheer repetition of the language of the verses. One example has Gabriel telling mankind, "Surely We have revealed it - an Arabic Quran - that you may understand." (Quran 12:02) The 'last Word' is also described as "An Arabic Quran without any crookedness, that they may guard (against evil)", (Quran 39:28) and "A Book of which the verses are made plain, an Arabic Quran for a people who know." (Quran 41:03) The Quran is also rendered an Arabic confirmation of the Book of Moses, with Gabriel saying, "And before it the Book of Moses was a guide and a mercy: and this is a Book verifying (it) in the Arabic language that it may warn those who are unjust and as good news for the doers of good." (Quran 46:12) The infrarational revelations are also more than the 'last Word', but a "true judgement in Arabic":

And thus have We revealed it, a true judgement in Arabic, and if you follow their low desires after what has come to you of knowledge, you shall not have against Allah any guardian or a protector. (Quran 13:37)

While there is no apparent rationale, in the previous verses, for the adjective use of Arabic to describe the Quran, in others we find an appropriate need for it, such as when Gabriel told Mohammed, "Surely We have made it an Arabic Quran **that you may understand.**" (Quran 43:03) In another passage, the primary reason for having to relay it in Arabic emerges:

And if We had made it a Quran in a foreign tongue, they would certainly have said: "Why have not its communications been made clear? What! A foreign (tongue) and an Arabian!" Say: "It is to those who believe a guidance and a healing. And (as for) those who do not believe, there is a heaviness in their ears and it is obscure to them; these shall be called to from a far-off place." (Quran 41:44)

As Mohammed only understood Arabic, it was logical for the infrarational word to be presented to him in the language he was familiar with:

And most surely this is a revelation from the Lord of the worlds. The Faithful Spirit has descended with it Upon your heart that you may be of the warners In plain Arabic language. And most surely the same is in the scriptures of the ancients. Is it not a sign to them that the learned men of the Israelites know it? **And if we had revealed it to any of the non-Arabs So that he should have recited it to them, they would not have believed therein.** (Quran 26:192-199)

If it were simply verses like these alone, one could perhaps expect the Arabic language to have less of an influence upon the minds of non-Arabic Muslims, who might simply view it as the expected language of transmission to Mohammed since that was the only language he understood. But when other verses, including the following, unnecessarily – as far as the message of the verse – emphasize the Arabic language, an undue importance begins to imprint upon their minds:

And thus have We sent it down an Arabic Quran, and have distinctly set forth therein of threats that they may guard (against evil) or that it may produce a reminder for them. (Quran 20:113)

This verse, like some of the others previously mentioned, would convey the same point whether or not the Quran is described as Arabic. That the Asura of Falsehood repetitively chose to describe the Quran in the language of its dictation represents a conscious decision to essentially remind his followers that Arabic must, by its status as the language of the communications, be the best of the languages. Though they may have been subtle reminders, even without the multiple verses indicating the language's prominence, the mere narrative of Islam hoists the Arabic language above all others, for the Quran is the 'last Word' of Allah, and thus the language of the final scripture becomes far more important than even one's native tongue, as we notice in global madrassas, including those in the Indian subcontinent, where young Muslim boys, though scarcely fluent in the language itself, are taught to recite the Quran in its original Arabic verse. The constant mention of Arabic and the need to recite verses in Arabic only serve to reinforce the exaltation of the Arabic language above its appropriate status among human languages.

Human language, after all, is part of the manifestation, and though it at times can beautifully – and partially - express a reality above our ordinary awareness, it is not That Supreme Consciousness, and thus one particular language should not be raised above the others. The ancient Hindu scripture, for example, was recorded in Sanskrit, a language infrequently used in current times. Its lack of use, however, does not negate the truth of the ancient scripture; nor does the sole expression of the Rishi's experience in Sanskrit mean that subsequent expressions of the Divine Truth must only be in Sanskrit, as if Sanskrit is the only 'Divine' language. Nowhere do we find in the Hindu scripture an exaltation of Sanskrit above all, and – more importantly since the Quran does not explicitly do that - likewise nowhere is there presented a tenet that the scripture in question is the 'last Word'. Even the Bhagavad Gita, the Word of the Divine incarnate in a rare Avatar manifestation, is not declared to be His final expression in a material existence that, let us recall, is in latency He alone. Indeed, the Sanatana Dharma holds that God can manifest himself, or emerge in the consciousness of the seeker, in potentially any time and place, irrespective of the language of the sadhak or matters such as their formal education.

The Divine Truth can be, through the best vocabulary of the particular language the Yogi or Guru chooses, expressed in any language, whether Sanskrit or Arabic, English or Mandarin, or perhaps even sign language. Human language is not the Divine Consciousness; it is a means to an end to try and express a Consciousness that cannot be totally described in human terms, or it is the end result of a creative stream from above, an elegant dress adorning the beautiful woman. That Arabic is given such

standing, to the extent of the *requirement* for non-Arabs to repeat the verses in the original Arabic form instead of the local translation, represents another example of excessive attachment to things not consciously God, as the invocations of *certain* Sanskrit mantras are for the specific reason of trying to uncover the Divinity within (rather than to exalt the Sanskrit language), whereas the repetition of the Quran only fosters attachment to the Asura's religion of permanent division from the Purusha. Though the aggrandizement of Arabic is not as conspicuous as the idolatry of Mohammed and the Quran, if we include it in the propagation of a certain type of nationhood, we find it to be part of another egregious deviation from the myth of an idol-free Islam. For having already created the individual and scriptural idols for the flock to place inordinate importance toward, the Asura of Falsehood proceeded further, giving them a wider object for unwarranted acclaim – themselves:

And thus We have made you a **just nation** that you may be the bearers of witness to the people and (that) the Messenger may be a bearer of witness to you. And We did not make that which you would have to be the qiblah but that We might distinguish him who follows the Messenger from him who turns back upon his heels, and this was surely hard except for those whom Allah has guided aright. And Allah was not going to make your faith to be fruitless; most surely Allah is Affectionate, Merciful to the people. (Quran 2:143)

A hadith providing context to this particular verse not only depicts the Islamic nation as both “just” and “the best”, but also as a superior witness to those of the past, including the nation of the prophet Noah:

Narrated Abu Said Al-Khudri:

Allah's Apostle said, “Noah will be brought (before Allah) on the Day of Resurrection, and will be asked, ‘Did you convey the message of Allah?’ He will reply, ‘Yes, O Lord.’ And then Noah's nation will be asked, ‘Did he (Noah) convey Allah's message to you?’ They will reply, ‘No warner came to us.’ Then Noah will be asked, ‘Who are your witnesses?’ He will reply, ‘(My witnesses are) Mohammed and his followers.’ Thereupon you (Muslims) will be brought and you will bear witness.” Then the Prophet recited: “**And thus We have made of you (Muslims) a just and the best nation, that you might be witness over the nations, and the Apostle a witness over you.**” (2.143) (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 92, Number 448)

Though we cannot, the above notwithstanding, necessarily place “best” into the translations of the verse in question, the hadith confirms that the Muslim nation is to be the finest bearer of witness, a distinction certainly elevating them over the status of mere slaves they are described as elsewhere; they are instead the lucky ones who appropriately fear the sadistic yet somehow merciful Allah. And the description of “just” certainly makes them superior to the ‘unjust’ disbeliever who practices *shirk*. While this alone is enough to confirm the scriptural aggrandizement of the religious group, another infrarational revelation takes the next logical step:

You have been the best nation that has been raised up for mankind. You enjoin what is right, forbid what is wrong, and believe in Allah. If the People of the Book believed it, it would be better for them; there are believers among them, but most of them are backsliders. They will not harm you but a slight hurt. If they fight you, they shall turn their backs to you (to flee), and they shall not be helped. Abasement has been imposed on them wherever they are found, except under a covenant with Allah and a covenant with men, and they have become deserving of wrath from Allah, and humiliation is made to cleave to them. This is because they disbelieved in the verses of Allah and slew the prophets unjustly. This is because they disobeyed and exceeded the limits. They are not all alike; among the People of the Book there is an upright party; they recite Allah's verses in the nighttime, falling prostrate. They believe in Allah and the Last Day, they enjoin what is right and forbid what is wrong, and they hasten to good works. Those are among the righteous. Whatever good they do, they shall not be denied it. Allah knows the pious.

(Quran 3:110-115)

The Muslims are the greatest race to exist, superior even to their relatives “of the book” – this is not an unconscious grandiose delusion of the collective, it is a ‘truth’ declared by Allah, the only god to exist. The verse confirms what a Muslim is likely to have suspected without reading his scripture, as it is the inevitable conclusion for a believer to arrive at when his faith teaches that the only people going to Paradise are Muslims who believe in Allah as the sole god and Mohammed as the final prophet. The Christians and Jews are not spared, because they fail to take Mohammed as the last Apostle; and in the former's case, are guilty of believing in a Trinity. The natural outcome of this declaration is a corrosive arrogance based around a rigid attachment to particular teachings the believer has been indoctrinated with from an early age; a conceit so deep-seated as to make them completely unaware of their own psychology, prone to projecting their arrogance upon others: regarding this projection, the believers are also *taught* to level such accusations at the unbeliever - the scripture providing ample justification:

Narrated Abu Huraira:

The Prophet said, “Paradise and Hell (Fire) quarrelled in the presence of their Lord. Paradise said, ‘O Lord! What is wrong with me that only the poor and humble people enter me?’ **Hell (Fire) said, ‘I have been favoured with the arrogant people.’** So Allah said to Paradise, ‘You are My Mercy,’ and said to Hell, ‘You are My Punishment which I inflict upon whom I wish, and I shall fill both of you.’ ” The Prophet added, “As for Paradise, (it will be filled with good people) because Allah does not wrong any of His created things, and He creates for Hell (Fire) whomever He will, and they will be thrown into it, and it will say thrice, ‘Is there any more, till Allah (will put) His Foot over it and it will become full and its sides will come close to each other and it will say, ‘Qat! Qat! Qat! (Enough! Enough! Enough!).’ ” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 93, Number 541)

The irony of a group declaring itself as the “best” and most “just” of nations, yet at the same chastising those infrarationally revealed to be “arrogant” because of a simple disagreement in belief, is lost upon the “humble” believers, because an Asurically revealed, self-declared literalist and finalized creed of thought-control is automatically an obstacle to the introspection necessary to uncover irony or paradox. The Asuric indoctrination received by Muslims does not develop the subtle mental processes needed for such analysis, as it is designed to promote a rudimentary thought-slavery and agitation for a specific goal; thus brazen contradictions are taken without pause, including the “best” of nations glorifying the forcible conversion of non-Muslims through torture:

Narrated Abu Huraira:

The Verse: “You (true Muslims) are the best of peoples ever raised up for mankind” means, the best of peoples for the people, as you bring them with chains on their necks till they embrace Islam. (Sahih Bukhari Volume 6, Book 60, Number 80)

Though this hadith is not a recollection of Mohammed's, it is nevertheless unquestionably in line with Islamic teaching, given its ‘divinely’ sanctioned forced conversions and exaltation of sadistic cruelty towards the unbelievers. The aggrandizement of the Muslim group ego, outlined explicitly through the two previous infrarational revelations, does nothing for the spiritual transformation of the Muslim, serving only to provide another psychological construct to keep them in bondage to their lower nature, instead of the release into a higher consciousness that one might expect to be a religion's aspiration. The only achievement of these verses is the idolatry of the Islamic group, of Islamic ‘brotherhood’ and the comfort of belonging to a ‘superior’ race. For the Asura of Falsehood, these verses are of critical necessity to confirm the believer's perception of their, and their religion's, status in the world; and as a means to organize his flock, swelling their vanity and - in combination with the message of fear - crystallizing their permanent division from the rest of mankind and heightening the importance of their

participation in Islam's objective of global domination.

The idolization of the most “just” and “best” race – in this case global Muslims - is the perfect vessel for all sorts of evil, as anything such a group does must automatically be righteous and without blemish, because they have already been declared to be perfect by their Maker. The ideas of Mohammed as the perfect man, the Quran as the quintessential scripture and ‘last Word’, and global Muslims as the superior group, are in themselves not divine but psychological – and fanatically held - *beliefs*, belonging to the ordinary mortal functions of the mind; thus the exaggeration of their importance by Muslims qualifies as an earthly attachment, with the rabid fervour behind their exaltation of mere psychological constructs quite worthy of the accusation of idolatry, given the negative connotations associated with the latter. This reality of Islamic idolatry is yet thoroughly inconsistent with the overriding message indoctrinated into the believers, who are taught that Islam is synonymous with an iconoclasm both figurative and literal:

And We verily gave Moses and Aaron the Criterion (of right and wrong) and a light and a Reminder for those who keep from evil, Those who fear their Lord in secret and who dread the Hour (of doom). This is a blessed Reminder that we have revealed: Will ye then reject it? And certainly We gave to Abraham his rectitude before, and We knew him fully well. When he said to his father and his people: **“What are these images to whose worship you cleave?”** They said: “We found our fathers worshipping them.” He said: “Certainly you have been, (both) you and your fathers, in manifest error.” They said: “Have you brought to us the truth, or are you one of the triflers?” He said: “Nay! Your Lord is the Lord of the heavens and the earth, Who brought them into existence, and I am of those who bear witness to this: **And, by Allah! I will certainly do something against your idols after you go away, turning back.**” **So he broke them into pieces, except the chief of them, that haply they might return to it.** They said: “Who has done this to our gods? Most surely he is one of the unjust.” They said: “We heard a youth called Abraham speak of them.” Said they: “Then bring him before the eyes of the people, perhaps they may bear witness.” They said: “Have you done this to our gods, O Abraham?” He said: “But this, their chief hath done it, therefore ask them, if they can speak.” Then they turned to themselves and said: “Surely you yourselves are the unjust.” Then they were made to hang down their heads: “Certainly you know that they do not speak.” He said: “What! Do you then serve besides Allah what brings you not any benefit at all, nor does it harm you? Fie on you and on what you serve besides Allah. What! Do you not then understand?” They said: “Burn him and help your gods, if you are going to do (anything).” We said: “O fire! Be a comfort and peace to Abraham.” And they desired a war on him, but We made them the greatest losers. (Quran 21:49–70)

Another passage also infrarationally reveals Abraham to have taken part in the destruction - done after accusing the unbelievers of worshipping that which they sculpted - of different Polytheist “idols”:

And most surely Abraham followed his way. When he came to his Lord with a free heart, When he said to his father and his people: **“What is it that you worship? Is it a falsehood - gods besides Allah - do you desire?** What is then your idea about the Lord of the worlds?” Then he looked at the stars, looking up once, Then he said: “Surely I am sick (of your worshipping these).” So they went away from him, turning back. Then he turned aside to their gods and said: “What! Do you not eat? What is the matter with you that you do not speak?” **Then he turned against them secretly, smiting them with the right hand.** So they (people) advanced towards him, hastening. **Said he: “What! Do you worship what you carve out?** But Allah has created you and what you make!” They said: “Build for him a furnace, then cast him into the burning fire.” And they desired a war against him, but We brought them low. (Quran 37:83-98)

Religious images – and all pictures in general – are so disparaged in Islam that the Prophet was

recorded as saying, “Angels do not enter a house which has either a dog or a picture in it.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 54, Number 539) Just as the pictures and sculptures of the Polytheist are derided as idols, so is their attribution of divinity to animals such as the cow:

(As for) those who took the calf (for a god), surely wrath from their Lord and disgrace in this world's life shall overtake them, and thus do We recompense the devisers of lies. (Quran 7:152)

But the vicious criticism of Polytheistic religious practice displays a primitive misunderstanding of the real function of sculptures and painting, along with a misconception afforded the exaltation of certain animals, especially – and this is crucial in a practical sense, because it is the last widespread Polytheist tradition – in the Sanatana Dharma. With regards to the primary criticism – by all Abrahamic religions – that Polytheists like the Hindus are in fact idol worshippers, Islam's pathological ire is primarily directed towards the sculptures and pictures made by the Hindus, items that in reality should be described as spiritual artwork instead of “idols”. Muslims however, are indoctrinated otherwise, and presume that Polytheists believe these often quite beautiful handicrafts to *be* God, that they actually worship the “idols” as an *animate* divinity, the “idol” capable of responding to the prayers. After all, goes their decidedly limited reasoning, multiple Islamic prophets righteously destroyed such artwork in order to try and teach their Polytheist countrymen a lesson, warning them in the process of the wrath of Allah.

Yet contrary to the notions of barbarians, the religious artwork of the Hindu is not mistaken or alleged by them to be *dynamically* God: Rather, there are two inclusive functions to the paintings and sculpture created by the Hindu artist – one is the for aesthetic element in life, and the other is for the *process*, rather than the *Object*, of worship. As has already been discussed, such beautiful artwork is created to attempt and aesthetically objectify – while understanding perfectly that God will always transcend the human concept of objectification – God, but is not done with the misguided perception that God *is* the artwork alone, because the Hindu will know that Brahma exists behind everything and within everything, not just a solitary material object. Nor does the Hindu believe that such artwork assumes *vital* characteristics, as if the material form will all of a sudden begin a discourse with them. Rather, the aesthetic principle at play is that of the artist seeking to Beautify life according to what he intuitively perceives Brahma to exist in His aspect of *Beautitude*, just as a great piece of poetry may be considered Divinely inspired, with the poet channelling the secret Divine faculties within.

Having, as part of his svadharma or inner law as the artist, created a beautiful sculpture or drawing as a luminous flow from within outward into the material form, the resulting creation does *not* become God in active Consciousness, but now functions as a *symbol* or *representation* of the Divine, especially the Divine Beautitude. Though the Sanatana Dharma teaches that God is at least latent within all of His creation, the Yogin experience is that God is both formless and capable of taking form, and also beyond both form and formlessness. Because of this, the aspirant is not to take a form *alone* – in this case an alleged “idol” – as Consciously Brahma, because that would be an action of ignorance, for that identification would limit Brahma the Illimitable, reducing him to one particular materialization, similar to how Islam falsely asserts itself as the only manifested ‘truth’ and claims its infrarational revelations as final. Doing so would subsequently limit the worshipper's own aspiration, at best leaving him to experience a limited reality instead of the Satchitananda that pervades, and includes, *everything*, whether animate or inanimate.

As the “idols” cannot, by very guidelines of the Sanatana Dharma's aspiration, function as Islam believes, then what are its practical uses for the Hindu beyond the important domain of beauty in life? The answer for that returns us to the spiritual artwork's material application as a *symbol* or *representation*, not the whole truth. As such, they can be taken to be an inert physical (but not the vital personality or active consciousness) manifestation, though infinitesimal in comparison, of a Divine Truth. But as the *sadhak* lives in the terrestrial world, he may well decide to use certain materials as a

jumping point, as a place for concentration. For in their spiritual practice, sadhaks are often engaged in meditation, a means by which to silence the mind and uplift their consciousness into something higher and deeper than their ordinary awareness. It is here that the artwork emerges as part of the *process*, becoming an objective *symbol* of the higher state the believer is trying to reach; for instance, a statue of Lord Krishna is *not* Lord Krishna (though like *every* other physical object, it contains the Lord inert within), but instead becomes a concentration point during a meditation, something the worshipper casts his eyes upon, with the imagery helping to narrow the focus *and* serve as a *reminder* of the aspiration.

Though one might allow, for the sake of argument, that some of the Polytheists actually believed their statues to be Divine, what is more likely is that many of the Arab Pagans believed the images to help them ward off enemies or give them luck; this sort of belief can indeed lead to – though not always, as the statue can function as a symbol of such beliefs, reminding them of the need to pray to God for luck or protection - an excessive attachment, but that does not differentiate the Arab Polytheists from the “monotheistic” religions in any way other than the attachment's superficial *form*. And even if things had devolved to that extent, the reality of the Arab middle ages is not that of the Hindu, though the Arab Pagans were likewise Polytheists; for the Sanatana Dharma calls for Self-Realization, something not propagated in Polytheist Arabia. Unfortunately, Islam does not make such distinctions, and the Hindus are quite easily lumped into the dreaded Polytheist or Idolater category in the Quran, with the subsequent damnation and earthly subjugation; and since no alterations to scripture are tolerated in Islam, no amount of explanation of the purpose of Hindu artwork can be accepted by the genuine Muslims.

And even if, hypothetically, worship in Arabia had come to the point where the Polytheists believed the mostly miniature statues and sculptures to be god (we can never be sure, because we only hear the version offered by the victorious Muslims), the “monotheist” response, most crudely developed in Islam, is actually that of a worse savagery, a move from an *avidya* or ignorant consciousness to one of Falsehood that, in this day and age in which the function of spiritual artwork can be easily deduced, should no longer be present. Unfortunately, Muslims have no need for genuinely open-minded dialogue with the ‘other’, or a dispassionate analysis of their practices, because they unquestioningly believe in their infrarationally revealed religion. Subsequently, the arguments of the non-Muslims are dismissed as part of their usual lies and plotting, and the cursory assumptions of the Quran and authentic hadith are simply reaffirmed as the perpetual ‘truth’ by the Muslims, including its criticism of a certain Polytheist practice related to their sculptures:

Say: “Shall I take a guardian besides Allah, the Originator of the heavens and the earth, and He feeds (others) and is not (Himself) fed.” Say: “I am commanded to be the first who submits himself, and not to be of the polytheists.” (Quran 6:014)

This particular verse is likely in reference to the Pagan rituals involving “feeding” of the sculptures, something still done in Hindu ceremonies to this day. This is a practice that in all times cannot be misconstrued literally, for anyone can observe that the statues are unable to eat the food offered before them; thus we cannot project upon the Arab Polytheist the allegation that they believed the artwork to be actually capable of eating the food. While we might accept the Arab to not have fully understood the ancient origin of such practices that they may have unthinkingly followed, it does not negate the particular reason for the growth of such rituals – that of the symbolic sacrifice. For the relinquishing of food to the religious statues historically commenced for the statues to serve as a point of reference for the *psychological* sacrifice the aspirant is to make in his quest for the Divine Consciousness; as an example, the food offered could be made by the sadhak to represent his vanity, a characteristic he hopes that God might help remove from his ego, loosening Prakriti's bonds. Thus the worshipper is not actually feeding the statue, but *using* it as a way to help concentrate on his task at hand, that of *psychologically* sacrificing his own mental or emotional constructs or attachments, ones that get in the

way of his true spiritual development.

The Sanatana Dharma's call for psychological attachments – Islamic examples of this include the belief that Allah is the only name of God and Mohammed his last Prophet - to be abandoned is supported most directly in the Bhagavad Gita, in which Arjuna is told by Sri Krishna, “**Relinquishing all dharmas, surrender unto Me exclusively**, I will deliver you from sinful reactions, do not despair.” (Bhagavad Gita 18:66) Dharma, let us recall, is an inner plastic law where the inner mind and vital and Psychic become central to the consciousness; this is not, however, the same as the Soul, though it is far more subtle than the law of the materialist. Because it is *not* the Divine Consciousness, one can possibly become attached to one's dharma, failing to take the next steps toward *moksha*, spiritual liberation, just as one becomes attached to psychological ideals and religious indoctrination. As Hinduism calls for the ultimate surrender, that of the psychological hold that mental and emotional constructs and material objects have on one's internal being, we find that its use of “idols” is in reality the opposite of Islam's allegations, because in the Sanatana Dharma they serve as *aids* in the removal of excessive attachment and true idolatry rather than begetting it, for as previously mentioned, it is not the object that is important, but the psychological hold of the object.

When we understand the beneficial use of religious statues in a practical manner, we find the Islamic response to the alleged ignorance of the Arab Polytheist to be reactionary, offering nothing to improve the customs of the time. For such habits of the Arab polytheist could have, with the right instruction, been integrated into a multifaceted type of worship. Instead, this alleged ignorance – we do not have full proof of it, because we only have the extremely biased Muslim historical account – was used by Islam to establish a reign of Falsehood, full of rage and fear and destruction. It continues to this day, with the Muslim unable to move beyond his barbaric interpretation of the rich Hindu symbolism governing the use of spiritual artwork; only the external aspect is seen by the former, then taken as the final judgement, for it corresponds perfectly with the myths of the Islamic scripture. As they are indoctrinated to perceive the Hindu “idols” according to a superficial reasoning, one based strictly on the physical circumstance of an aspirant praying in the direction of a piece of art, so is their reaction predominantly physical, inspired as they are by a superior prophet to Noah and Abraham:

And say: “The truth has come and the falsehood has vanished; surely falsehood is a vanishing (thing).” (Quran 17:81)

To understand this verse, and a similar one that reads, “Say: ‘The truth has come, and the falsehood shall vanish and shall not come back’”, (Quran 34:49) we turn to the authentic hadith:

Narrated Abdullah bin Masud:

Allah's Apostle entered Mecca (in the year of the Conquest) and **there were three-hundred and sixty idols around the Ka’ba**. He then started hitting them with a stick in his hand and say: ‘Truth (i.e. Islam) has come and falsehood (disbelief) vanished. Truly falsehood (disbelief) is ever bound to vanish.’ (17.81) ‘Truth has come and falsehood (Iblis) can not create anything.’ (34.49) (Sahih Bukhari Volume 6, Book 60, Number 244)

If the greatest human to ever have graced this planet went around destroying the religious artwork of the ‘unbelievers’ in order to – unbeknownst to him - create an idolatry of the Quran, himself, and ironically, a *Polytheist* structure, among other earthly objects, then a Muslim will naturally desire to likewise destroy “falsehood” according to the same methods as Mohammed, perhaps earning himself a point in favour of his quest to retire in Paradise instead of the furnace. Before we explore the fascinating history of the Polytheist structure in question, the Ka’ba, we must review further infrarational revelations denigrating the practice of “idolatry” – the frequency of such scripture is enough to give it a more than deserved importance, to the extent of creating another psychological attachment, in this case attachment to presumed iconoclasm:

That (is the command). And whoso magnifieth the sacred things of Allah, it will be well for him in the sight of his Lord. The cattle are lawful unto you save that which hath been told you. **So shun the filth of idols**, and shun lying speech, Turning unto Allah (only), not ascribing partners unto Him; for whoso ascribeth partners unto Allah, it is as if he had fallen from the sky and the birds had snatched him or the wind had blown him to a far-off place. (Quran 22:30-31)

If this passage is alone enough to associate the Polytheist, the apparently isolated user of “idols”, with filth, another infrarational revelation is more direct in its condemnation:

O ye who believe! **The idolaters only are unclean. So let them not come near the Inviolable Place of Worship after this their year.** If ye fear poverty (from the loss of their merchandise) Allah shall preserve you of His bounty if He will. Lo! Allah is Knower, Wise. (Quran 9:28)

The description of Polytheist as “idolaters” as “unclean” and unworthy of entering the Sacred Mosque adds to the strict division between ‘them’ and ‘us’, and to the rationale for their slaughter or subjugation. The unbelievers are those who dare to take other deities as equal to Allah, while the “places of worship are only for Allah, so pray not unto anyone along with Allah.” (Quran 72:18) It is simply a caste structure similar to the notorious examples found in Bharat during its decline, with the crucial exception of Islam's crystallization as the last, unalterable, ‘Word’ of God; a rigid categorization of humanity that logically is not actually present – even if Indian society erroneously interpreted the ancient Varna system - in the Hindu scripture (rather than *shastra*), because it violates the core unity of all creation and would be, from even the lower perspective of rational thought (as compared to the Divine Consciousness the Rishi lived from), a great negation of the scripture's message. Yet just as the Veda, Upanishads and Bhagavad Gita are consistent in expressing the Truth of a fundamental Unity, so is the Asura of Falsehood's most cleverly designed creed unvarying in its antithetical denigration of the Infidel as permanently inferior:

It is not for the idolaters to tend Allah's sanctuaries, bearing witness against themselves of disbelief. As for such, their works are vain and in the Fire they will abide. **He only shall tend Allah's sanctuaries who believeth in Allah and the Last Day and observeth proper worship and payeth the poor-due and feareth none save Allah.** For such (only) is it possible that they can be of the rightly guided. (Quran 09:17-18)

The assignment of the impure kuffar away from the holy mosques is yet another form of idolatry sanctioned by this most ‘pure’ of faiths, for it places an inappropriate importance upon a mere portion of the earth, magically transforming a certain space into a bastion of ‘purity’ requiring protection from the ‘impure’. While it is certainly understandable for religions, villages, towns, nations or even households, to have certain areas that they might assign for external acts of piety, places of worship - like scripture or paintings or music or poetry - should serve as mere aids for an *internal* development rather than becoming the ‘be all and end all’ of a religion to the point where rules of Falsehood govern its alleged purity. After all, the most important Temple, or whatever we might call a house of worship, lies within our triple-sheaths, and external places of worship should reflect this secret reality, offering a physical outlet to serve as the terrestrial *symbol* of an internal process of surrendering the ego, with the physical aspect of this multi-faceted spiritual practice helping to intensify the real purification towards the Purusha. And though the demand for a Muslim to conduct the required prayers – making them mandatory is itself a form of attachment – inside mosques is not the subject of as many infrarational verses as other tenets, the Quran certainly promotes an excessive attachment towards this practice, with one passage glorifying its position in the Muslim's life:

Allah is the Light of the heavens and the earth. The similitude of His light is as a niche wherein is a lamp. The lamp is in a glass. The glass is as it were a shining star. (This lamp is) kindled from a blessed tree, an olive neither of the East nor of the West, whose oil would almost glow

forth (of itself) though no fire touched it. Light upon light. Allah guideth unto His light whom He will. And Allah speaketh to mankind in allegories, for Allah is Knower of all things. **(This lamp is found) in houses which Allah hath allowed to be exalted and that His name shall be remembered therein. Therein do offer praise to Him in the morning and evenings.** (Quran 24:35-36)

So great is the idolization of the mosque that Allah's "Light", this perhaps greatest of all of Allah's qualities, is said to be specifically found in the mosque, when one might imagine such an Infinite Light to be ubiquitous to the Universe. There should be no need to aggrandize the importance of a place of worship by declaring such a particular space of land, constructed by mortals out of earthly material found everywhere, to exclusively house the lamp – even if the lamp is conceived as a similitude. Doing so places excessive attachment on a material object, with Muslims rushing as idolaters to the mosque in search of Allah's "Light", when the Divine Light is already within all and the true Lamp is the Purusha inside rather than any external object. The mosque as yet another Islamic idol is explicitly identified in a hadith relating the qualities required of Muslims to earn Allah's "shade" on the Day of Judgement:

Narrated Abu Huraira:

The Prophet said, "Seven (people) will be shaded by Allah by His Shade on the Day of Resurrection when there will be no shade except His Shade. (They will be), a just ruler, a young man who has been brought up in the worship of Allah, a man who remembers Allah in seclusion and his eyes are then flooded with tears, **a man whose heart is attached to mosques (offers his compulsory congregational prayers in the mosque)**, two men who love each other for Allah's Sake, a man who is called by a charming lady of noble birth to commit illegal sexual intercourse with her, and he says, 'I am afraid of Allah,' and (finally), a man who gives in charity so secretly that his left hand does not know what his right hand has given." (Sahih Bukhari Volume 8, Book 82, Number 798)

While the issue of compulsory – more frequently mentioned in the Hadith than the Quran - congregational prayers will be discussed later, what is clear is Islam's demand *for* the attachment to earthly objects, rather than the *psychological* disengagement – to assist the aspiration of Realizing the Soul – recommended in the Hindu scripture (through which one loses the *feeling* of "proprietorship" even when having objects such as money, since one now understands that the *only* Owner is God):

Unattached, through spiritual intelligence, from everything, controlling the mind, without material desires, one attains by renunciation the paramount perfection of the cessation of reactions. Now hear in summation from Me, O Arjuna, how one achieving this perfection attains to the supreme state of knowledge. Endowed with sattvic spiritual intelligence, fully purified and regulating the ego by determination, abandoning sense objects such as hearing and touching, **casting away obsession and repulsion**, avoiding materialistic persons, eating moderately, controlled in body, mind and speech, always absorbed in yoga, giving up desire and attachment, relinquishing egoism, violence, power, pride, lust, anger, acceptance of material things – the peaceful one without any sense of proprietorship is qualified for realizing the Ultimate Truth. (Bhagavad Gita 18:49-53)

Though attachment to the mosque or temple is obviously that of a sense object, the Hindu religion also demands the relinquishment of repulsion, which – the Muslim rejecting the entry of 'impure' kuffar into a mosque is one example – is also a form of psychological attachment and thus an obstacle to a Satchitananda free of mental, emotional or physical idols. Repulsion – including hatred toward the kuffar - is a psychological state that certainly presents itself in all time periods and cultures, but Islam took the dangerous step of perpetually *codifying* it, along with other idols psychological or physical, in a scripture deemed to be the final – infrarational - revelations of the 'one true god'. Returning to the

concrete idol of the mosque, we again recall the subtle distinction between the alleged idolatry of the Hindu and Islam's idols, for the Muslim does not go to his local mosque and direct his prayer towards that particular mosque, whereas the Hindu might *physically* situate himself towards an “idol” inside the Temple. But it is a small difference that, while remaining accurate for the majority of Islam's objects of excessive attachment, disappears with certain places and items, including mosques deemed more equal than others:

Indeed We see the turning of your face to heaven, so We shall surely turn you to a qiblah which you shall like. **Turn then your face towards the Sacred Mosque, and wherever you are, turn your face towards it.** And those who have been given the Book most surely know that it is the truth from their Lord; and Allah is not at all heedless of what they do. (Quran 2:144)

Muslims all over the world are asked to direct their prayer specifically toward the “Sacred Mosque”, the object apparently containing more of Allah's “Light” than other less worthy masjids. For a religion that chastises the excessive importance they presume spiritual artwork to have for the unbeliever, the believers are yet completely unaware of their own misplaced affection for a construction of earthly material: it is a devotion so important that, in the next inevitable step, a prayer in the two most important masjids of Islam is deemed superior to those in the inferior mosques!

Narrated Abu Huraira:

Allah's Apostle said, “One prayer in my Mosque is better than one thousand prayers in any other mosque excepting Al-Masjid-Al-Haram.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 2, Book 21, Number 282)

Not only do the infrarational revelations and hadith exalting certain mosques (over others) promote idolatry or excessive attachment, they also encourage an objective quality to prayer, something detrimental to true internal growth. No longer is the sincerity of the prayer the crucial element for the resulting fruit, because the great Mohammed has declared – supported by the Quran – prayer in a particular *place* to be decidedly superior to one made anywhere else. Such scriptural content espouses a religiosity based on external piety rather than internal aspiration, with the *formalities* of appropriate Islamic prayer crucial to one's religious status and passage to Paradise, when in fact the quality of prayer should be based upon the internal qualities of humility and psychological surrender to God *and* any result of the prayer. The particular mosque or temple one is facing, similar to the Polytheist concentrating on a particular statue, should be of minor importance to the psychological nature of the prayer; there should be no need for Allah to have to infrarationally reveal – seen in the following hadith - to Mohammed, with regards to the Ka’ba, a commandment explicitly directing mankind to pray toward a particular part of the planet, for an omniscient should know himself to be everywhere and beyond geographical dimensions:

Narrated Al-Bara:

When Allah's Apostle arrived at Medina, he prayed facing Jerusalem for sixteen or seventeen months but he wished that he would be ordered to face the Ka’ba. So Allah revealed:

“Verily! We have seen the turning of your face towards the heaven; surely we shall turn you to a prayer direction (Qibla) that shall please you.” (2.144) Thus he was directed towards the Ka’ba. A man prayed the Asr prayer with the Prophet and then went out, and passing by some people from the Ansar, he said, “I testify that I have prayed with the Prophet and he (the Prophet) has prayed facing the Ka’ba.” Thereupon they, who were bowing in the Asr prayer, turned towards the Ka’ba. (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 91, Number 358)

The Ka’ba, for which Mohammed desperately wished to direct his prayers, is located in the aforementioned Al-Masjid-Al-Haram, the Grand Mosque in the Islamic holy city of Mecca, Saudi

Arabia. The previous hadith describing this exaltation of an earthly object is reiterated multiple times (including Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 91, Number 358), with another one noting Jewish criticism of Mohammed's alteration of gaze:

Narrated Bara bin Azib:

Allah's Apostle prayed facing Baitul-Maqdis for sixteen or seventeen months but he loved to face the Ka'ba (at Mecca) so Allah revealed: "Verily, We have seen the turning of your face to the heaven!" (2:144) So the Prophet faced the Ka'ba and the fools amongst the people, namely the Jews, said, "What has turned them from their Qibla (Bait-ul-Maqdis) which they formerly observed?" (Allah revealed): "Say: 'To Allah belongs the East and the West. He guides whom he will to a straight path.' " (2:142) A man prayed with the Prophet (facing the Ka'ba) and went out. He saw some of the Ansar praying the Asr prayer with their faces towards Bait-ul-Maqdis, he said, "I bear witness that I prayed with Allah's Apostle facing the Ka'ba." So all the people turned their faces towards the Ka'ba. (Sahih Bukhari Volume 1, Book 8, Number 392)

By moving from a shared – with the People of the Book – object of worship in Jerusalem, to one that at the time was used by the Arab Polytheists, the Asura of Falsehood intended to eventually create a fixed geographical location more important than the East or the West, helping to organize his burgeoning army in a manner which also established an important centre of psychological control, all by way of his "Inspiration":

Narrated Abdullah bin Umar:

While the people were at Quba offering the morning prayer, suddenly a person came to them saying, "Tonight Divine Inspiration has been revealed to Allah's Apostle and he has been ordered to face the Ka'ba (in prayers): therefore you people should face it." Their faces were towards Sham, so they turned their faces towards the Ka'ba (at Mecca). (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 91, Number 357)

Though requiring the believers to pray in the direction of a terrestrial location, and in particular one special mosque in Mecca, by itself constitutes the blind and excessive devotion this religion is supposedly against, it nevertheless surprisingly pales in comparison to the specific emphasis on the Ka'ba, an obsession that irreparably destroys the notion of Islamic iconoclasm. For the Ka'ba, which Muslims are ordered to direct their prayers toward five times daily, is in fact, in the ultimate of ironies, historically a Polytheist landmark, a religious architectural construct of the Arab Pagan made long before the time of Mohammed, one where they performed the Tawaf ritual in honour of local gods and goddesses:

Narrated Urwa:

During the pre-Islamic period of Ignorance, the people used to perform Tawaf of the Ka'ba naked except the Hums; and the Hums were Quraish and their offspring. The Hums used to give clothes to the men who would perform the Tawaf wearing them; and women (of the Hums) used to give clothes to the women who would perform the Tawaf wearing them. Those to whom the Hums did not give clothes would perform Tawaf round the Ka'ba naked. Most of the people used to go away (disperse) directly from Arafat but they (Hums) used to depart after staying at Al-Muzdalifa. Urwa added, "My father narrated that Aisha had said, 'The following verses were revealed about the Hums: Then depart from the place whence all the people depart.' " (2.199) Urwa added, "They (the Hums) used to stay at Al-Muzdalifa and used to depart from there (to Mina) and so they were sent to Arafat (by Allah's order)." (Sahih Bukhari Volume 2, Book 26, Number 726)

The Tawaf involves a decidedly Polytheistic ritual involving the potential touch of a religious sculpture

or sacred object, followed by a specified number of circumambulations; to this day rituals similar to the Tawaf are performed in Hindu ceremonies that are usually based on ancient Vedic rites. The Hindu need not worry, however, that he indulges in such “idolatrous” actions alone – joining him are his Muslim brethren who also partake in the ancient Polytheist customs, citing their Prophet's actions as justification for doing so:

Narrated Ibn Umar:

...The Prophet performed Tawaf of the Ka’ba on his arrival (at Mecca); he touched the (Black Stone) corner first of all and then did Ramal (fast walking with moving of the shoulders) during the first three rounds round the Ka’ba, and during the last four rounds he walked. After finishing Tawaf of the Ka’ba, he offered a two Rakat prayer at Maqam Ibrahim, and after finishing the prayer he went to Safa and Marwa and performed seven rounds of Tawaf between them and did not do any deed forbidden because of Ihram, till he finished all the ceremonies of his Hajj and sacrificed his Hadi on the day of Nahr (10th day of Dhul-Hijja). He then hastened onwards (to Mecca) and performed Tawaf of the Ka’ba and then everything that was forbidden because of Ihram became permissible. Those who took and drove the Hadi with them did the same as Allah's Apostle did. (Sahih Bukhari Volume 2, Book 26, Number 750)

The Prophet's fondness for this ancient Polytheist landmark went further than touching and circling, with the father of Zaid bin Aslam noting, **“I saw Umar bin Al-Khattab kissing the Black Stone and he then said, (to it) ‘Had I not seen Allah's Apostle kissing you, (stone) I would not have kissed you.’”** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 2, Book 26, Number 679) Another authentic hadith also relates the Prophet's idolatrous affection:

Narrated Az-Zubair bin Arabi:

A man asked Ibn Umar about the touching of the Black Stone. Ibn Umar said, “I saw Allah's Apostle touching and kissing it.” The questioner said, “But if there were a throng (much rush) round the Ka’ba and the people overpowered me, (what would I do?)” He replied angrily, “Stay in Yemen (as that man was from Yemen). I saw Allah's Apostle touching and kissing it.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 2, Book 26, Number 680)

Such was the importance of Mohammed's ritual involving the Ka’ba that he decided to yell “Allahu Akbar” when reaching a corner of the Ka’ba, as if that particular part of the Islamic idol – usurped from the Arab Pagans - held more importance than the rest of the landmark, as if Allah himself was found in the stone:

Narrated Ibn Abbas:

Allah's Apostle performed the Tawaf (around the Ka’ba while riding his camel, and every time he reached the corner (of the Black Stone) he pointed at it with his hand and said, “Allahu Akbar.” (Zainab said: “The Prophet said, ‘An opening has been made in the wall of Gog and Magog like this and this,’ forming the number 90 (with his thumb and index finger).”) (Sahih Bukhari Volume 7, Book 63, Number 215)

While Hindu rituals involving religious objects usually do not involve kissing the object, the use of chanting - of a spiritual nature as opposed to the Asuric war cry infrarationally invoked by Islam - is often done at certain points in a ritual. The need for Mohammed to do both further betrays his idolizing of the Ka’ba in the physical sense, having already required his followers to pray towards this – if we take the *Islamic* definition – idol, having guided them to follow his lead and perform a *Polytheist* ritual around the *Polytheist* landmark, while claiming themselves both free of idolatry and the bringers of iconoclasm! If Islam was to have been genuinely liberated of any hint of the type of idolatry it accuses

others of practising, it would have eliminated the Ka'ba altogether, and not have designated two masjids in the Middle East more important than the rest. But the Asura does not have any genuine desire to eliminate such abnormal exaltation of material objects, as it would deprive him of certain physical centres in which to have his message of Falsehood propagated - concentration points for the Muslim to reinforce his depraved beliefs through meetings with Muslims of greater Asuric piety.

As such, the Asura of Falsehood granted Mohammed's ironic wish to direct his prayers toward a historic Polytheist object, making mandatory a Polytheist custom (directing prayers toward a religious construction, as is often done by Hindus) that is habitual to some but not at all a requirement of historic Polytheistic worship, even if Polytheist nations like the Hindus, usually during the downward portion of the nation cycle, overemphasized the importance of rituals according to varying degrees. Indeed Mohammed and his companions appear to have only accomplished the forcible takeover of a previously Polytheist centre of worship, rather than truly eliminating the Islamic conception of idolatry; otherwise one would expect him to have refused participation in Polytheistic religious behaviour quite obviously associated with that definition of idolatry. The Prophet, though he ended up engaging in clear Polytheistic rituals at the Ka'ba, nevertheless believed himself justified in usurping its Pagan dominion, 'inspired' both from Gabriel's infrarational revelation and his belief in the identity of the Ka'ba's founder:

Narrated Aisha:

Allah's Apostle said to me, "Were your people not close to the pre-Islamic period of ignorance, I would have demolished the Ka'ba and would have rebuilt it on its original foundations laid by Abraham (for Quraish had curtailed its building), and I would have built a back door (too)." (Sahih Bukhari Volume 2, Book 26, Number 655)

While one might argue that the 'fact' (only presented to us by the victorious Muslims) of Abraham's involvement in building the Ka'ba means that its use by Muslims cannot be equated to the Arab Polytheist customs, this claim fails to negate the excessive attachment Muslims – like their Prophet – have toward the Ka'ba, a physical object they pray toward, kiss with delight, combine their religious chants with - touching its black stone as if it is the foot of Allah after they have *circumambulated* it just like Polytheists. Even if Abraham was the founder, it is not as if the non-Muslim People of the Book, irrespective of their self-deceit, do not have their concrete idols. As for Mohammed, his inordinate fervour toward the Ka'ba was such that he declared Allah to be its Lord!

Narrated Abu Dhar:

I reached him (the Prophet) while in the shade of the Ka'ba; he was saying, "**They are the losers, by the Lord of the Ka'ba! They are the losers, by the Lord of the Ka'ba!**" I said (to myself), "What is wrong with me? Is anything improper detected in me? What is wrong with me?" Then I sat beside him and he kept on saying his statement. I could not remain quiet, and Allah knows in what sorrowful state I was at that time. So I said, "Who are they (the losers)? Let My father and mother be sacrificed for you, O Allah's Apostle!" He said, "They are the wealthy people, except the one who does like this and like this and like this (i.e., spends of his wealth in Allah's Cause)." (Sahih Bukhari Volume 8, Book 78, Number 633)

Though it is true that Allah is considered the Creator, Lord of All, in the religion of Islam, not every object is granted such significance for Allah to be verbally specified as its Lord, and for Mohammed to do so displays a quite idolatrous turn, exaggerating the Ka'ba's importance over other material landmarks, none of which are supposed to be the objects of such affection. In reality, the only change the Prophet engendered in his usurpation of the Polytheist utilization of the Ka'ba was to alter it from a sacred place among *many* to a select earthly object of worship, an idol above other similar concrete designs. It was a transformation further evident by his actions upon entering its confines:

Narrated Ibn Abbas:

When Allah's Apostle came to Mecca, he refused to enter the Ka'ba with idols in it. He ordered (idols to be taken out). So they were taken out. The people took out the pictures of Abraham and Ishmael holding Azlams in their hands. Allah's Apostle said, "May Allah curse these people. By Allah, both Abraham and Ishmael never did the game of chance with Azlams." Then he entered the Ka'ba and said Takbir at its corners but did not offer the prayer in it. (Sahih Bukhari Volume 2, Book 26, Number 671)

Later, the Prophet was to censure his community for letting pictures of Abraham and Mary be placed in the sacred Ka'ba, for though the Ka'ba itself was important enough for a Polytheistic ritual to be performed around it, and though the black stone was so special that it requires direct *touch* by the faithful, pictures of religious figures means idolatry and the subsequent wrath of the angels!

Narrated Ibn Abbas:

The Prophet entered the Ka'ba and found in it the pictures of (Prophet) Abraham and Mary. On that he said, "What is the matter with them (i.e. Quraish)? They have already heard that angels do not enter a house in which there are pictures; yet this is the picture of Abraham. And why is he depicted as practising divination by arrows?" (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 55, Number 570)

Though the Prophet may have removed the "idols" from the Ka'ba, all he succeeded in doing was replacing multiple "idols" with a select few, including the Ka'ba itself! For in Islam, some "idols" are better than others - the "idols" of Islam are simply bigger ones, with the figurines, statues and pictures sent to the rubbish. Mohammed and his companions defeated the Arab idolaters to – unconsciously - establish themselves as the victorious idolaters of the Arabian peninsula, taking over the vaunted Ka'ba to engage in an unwarranted attachment to a material object the Polytheists previously held sacred. But that was not the only material object of Arab Polytheist worship that was to be usurped by the Muslims:

Narrated Amr bin Dinar:

We asked Ibn Umar whether a man who had performed the Tawaf of the Ka'ba but had not performed the Tawaf between As-Safa and Al-Marwa yet, was permitted to have sexual relation with his wife. He replied, "**The Prophet arrived (at Mecca) and circumambulated the Ka'ba seven times and then offered a two Rakat prayer behind Maqam-Ibrahim and then performed the going (Tawaf) between As-Safa and Al-Marwa (seven times) (and verily, in Allah's Apostle you have a good example.**" And we asked Jabir bin Abdullah (the same question) and he replied, "He should not go near her till he has finished the going (Tawaf) between As-Safa and Al-Marwa." (Sahih Bukhari Volume 3, Book 27, Number 20)

As-Safa and Al-Marwa, two mountain peaks near the Ka'ba, are considered so important that Muslims, like the Arab Polytheists preceding them, must perform the Tawaf – in the above example prior to engaging in sexual activity. Allah's Apostle had included their Tawaf, along with the Ka'ba, as necessary for intimidation of the Polytheist, warning them of the new Islamic power seeking to take these "idols" for its own use:

Narrated Ibn Abbas:

Allah's Apostle performed Tawaf of the Ka'ba and the Sa'i of Safa and Marwa so as to show his strength to the pagans. (Sahih Bukhari Volume 2, Book 26, Number 711)

So intertwined was the Tawaf of these mountains with Arabian Polytheistic culture, it came as a *surprise* to Mohammed's companions – similar to the implied amazement of Umar that Mohammed had kissed the black stone - that he practised such a ritual, to the extent of it requiring the 'Word' of

Allah for them to acknowledge the importance of its practice:

Narrated Asim bin Sulaiman:

I asked Anas bin Malik about Safa and Marwa. Anas replied, **“We used to consider (i.e. going around) them a custom of the pre-Islamic period of Ignorance, so when Islam came, we gave up going around them.** Then Allah revealed, ‘Verily, Safa and Marwa (i.e. two mountains at Mecca) are among the Symbols of Allah. So it is not harmful of those who perform the Hajj of the House (of Allah) or perform the Umra to ambulate (Tawaf) between them.’ ” (2.158) (Sahih Bukhari Volume 6, Book 60, Number 23)

Crucial here is the infrarational revelation that the mountains are “symbols” of Allah, a rare acknowledgement of the psychological component to material items which, if critical thinking were allowed in Islam, would be utilized for the analysis of Polytheistic customs, some of which Muslims are literally continuing to practice. Mohammed's companions rightly assumed, given the incessant message of Gabriel, that as these rituals were practised by the kuffar, that they were undoubtedly idolatrous, for surely the infidel was not capable of symbolic worship. But this, as we are aware, is not the case, with the entire Veda a luminous decree on the emblematic representation of secret truths that exist in different planes of Prakriti's creation; likewise, the global Polytheist culture of antiquity was not without certain hidden, occult meanings for particular rituals and objects - rather than a simple barbarism of total nature worship it is often accused of. It is only another display of unfettered vanity for the “monotheistic” faiths to believe themselves the only ones capable of symbolic thought, as if civilization and its subtle thought processes – of which symbolism is pivotal – did not exist before them.

But that – of a supposed ancient darkness – is what the Muslims must tell themselves, justifying all that has been done – and what is still yet to be done - in the name of Islam, for to understand the truths of the ancients and what they strived for, to – in the case of Islam in India – realize the subtle and symbolic nature of the Vedic scripture of which the Sanatana Dharma is founded upon, would raise doubt towards the limited teachings imparted upon them, leading to confusion and negating the Islamic scripture's impetus to destroy. It thus became important for the Asura of Falsehood to emphasize the symbolic nature of these mountains (the Ka'ba or its black stone, on the other hand, are not explicitly declared to be symbols) while at the same time distancing the practice from the *same* Polytheistic ritual, through the derision of all Polytheist activity as “idolatrous”, as if others were not capable of symbolism in their religion! In another hadith confirming this curious disconnect, Aisha used the Asuric revelation in question to inform one believer that Tawaf of the mountains is fine for those engaging in the Hajj (or Haj) pilgrimage:

Narrated Urwa: I said to Aisha, the wife of the Prophet, and I was at that time a young boy, “How do you interpret the Statement of Allah: ‘Verily, Safa and Marwa (i.e. two mountains at Mecca) are among the Symbols of Allah.’ So it is not harmful of those who perform the Hajj to the House of Allah) or perform the Umra, to ambulate (Tawaf) between them. In my opinion it is not sinful for one not to ambulate (Tawaf) between them.” Aisha said, “Your interpretation is wrong for as you say, the Verse should have been: ‘So it is not harmful of those who perform the Hajj or Umra to the House, not to ambulate (Tawaf) between them.’ This Verse was revealed in connection with the Ansar who (during the Pre-Islamic Period) used to visit Manat (i.e. an idol) after assuming their Ihram, and it was situated near Quda'id (i.e. a place at Mecca), and they used to regard it sinful to ambulate between Safa and Marwa **after** embracing Islam. When Islam came, they asked Allah's Apostle about it, whereupon Allah revealed:

‘Verily, Safa and Marwa (i.e. two mountains at Mecca) are among the Symbols of Allah. So it is not harmful of those who perform the Hajj of the House (of Allah) or perform the Umra, to

ambulate (Tawaf) between them.’ ” (2.158) (Sahih Bukhari Volume 6, Book 60, Number 22)

The Haj is the mandated Muslim pilgrimage to Mecca, a pillar of the faith, something to be performed at least once in the believer's life. But like the Ka'ba, it was an element of Arabic religion practised by pre-Islamic Arabs of all faiths, including the Polytheists. The Arab Polytheists may have projected limited egoistic qualities upon the Divine, but they were hardly the first to have done so, and their religious life was far more syncretic than the parochial Abrahamics, who banned the former from partaking when they ascended to power:

Narrated Abu Huraira:

Abu Bakr, on the day of Nahr (i.e. slaughtering of animals for sacrifice), sent me in the company of others to make this announcement: “After this year, no pagan will be allowed to perform the Hajj, and none will be allowed to perform the Tawaf of the Ka'ba undressed.” And the day of Al-Hajj-ul-Akbar is the day of Nahr, and it called Al-Akbar because the people call the Umra Al-Hajj-ul-Asghar (i.e. the minor Hajj). Abu Bakr threw back the pagans covenant that year, and therefore, no pagan performed the Hajj in the year of Hajj-ul-Wada of the Prophets. (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 53, Number 402)

Like Christianity before it, Islam engaged in the practice of acculturation, taking the practices of the Polytheists and claiming it as their own. Subsequently, they either wilfully ignore their theft or claim that the latter engaged in the practices wrongfully. To acknowledge otherwise would diminish the boast of bringing the sole ‘truth’ to an area of historic ‘darkness’, an idea based on a staggering mental disconnect that ignores the growth of customs from generation to generation, preferring to believe in a myth that *all* was darkness and only at a certain point in time did the ‘truth’ and all of its rituals arrive. But we know this to be not only false but impractical, along with a knowledge that much of Islam - including its psychological principle of egoistic separation, or its fasting rituals – derives from Pre-Muslim tradition:

Narrated Aisha:

During the Pre-Islamic Period of ignorance the Quraish used to observe fasting on the day of ‘Ashura’, and the Prophet himself used to observe fasting on it too. But when he came to Medina, he fasted on that day and ordered the Muslims to fast on it. When (the order of compulsory fasting in) Ramadan was revealed, fasting in Ramadan became an obligation, and fasting on ‘Ashura’ was given up, and who ever wished to fast (on it) did so, and whoever did not wish to fast on it, did not fast. (Sahih Bukhari Volume 6, Book 60, Number 31)

Though Mohammed may have altered the days of fasting, he assuredly kept the Haj and the Tawaf of the Ka'ba, As-Safa and Al-Marwa, leading to another delicious irony, one more obvious than the practice of idolatry which Muslims believe themselves liberated from:

Narrated Ibn Abbas:

The Prophet said, “**The most hated persons to Allah are three:** (1) A person who deviates from the right conduct, i.e., an evil doer, in the Haram (sanctuaries of Mecca and Medina); (2) **a person who seeks that the traditions of the Pre-Islamic Period of Ignorance, should remain in Islam;** (3) and a person who seeks to shed somebody's blood without any right.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 83, Number 21)

This hadith presents the ultimate dilemma for the more scripturally aware Muslims, who on the one hand are told to engage in an obligatory pilgrimage and Tawaf, both part of the pre-Islamic tradition, yet on the other hand are told they will be hated by Allah for doing so. The Muslim who understands this devastating contradiction must force himself to reconstruct a different pre-Islamic past, ignoring or

fantastically reinterpreting scriptural evidence of pre-Islamic tradition contained within the hallowed Polytheism-free mythology of Islam. Though the impetus for this is natural and can be effective in minimizing the mental disconnect, in other circumstances, as we find in states like “Pakistan”, the grander the pre-Islamic civilization and its unyielding influence, the harder it is to reimagine the past, with the disconnect finding a fruitful outlet in violence and a zeal to physically destroy evidence of an illustrious heritage. Such destructive actions, however ably undertaken by the believer, are nevertheless incapable of erasing the past and the truth of things, which is based upon an infinite diversity that Islam desires to repress, one that seeks to move beyond the ego towards the Supreme Consciousness.

It is the former ego-principle that defines Islam, marking them not as true monotheists or monists like the Hindu - who believes the Divine to be *everything* and *all* names, to be both Polytheistic and Monotheistic -, but as, in essence, faux-Polytheists, projecting upon spiritual matters the Vital impulse to dominate. Consequently, the Islamic polytheism is that of multiple vital “gods” *competing* for the throne of world champion, with the believers simple extensions of that impulse, the “gods” of the losers falling away as they are vanquished in battle. Contrary to this, there is a sublime truth to the One God in Hinduism, a truth enveloping the narrow conception of divinity in the Abrahamic religions, a Oneness so wide that there is not even the faintest idea of an ‘other’ to compare with, to label as ‘false’. Even the Asuras, when the Ultimate Truth is considered, from Consciousness at its most profound depth or highest peak, are part of a complete Universal Unity – this is a Realization, however, that only occurs as Consciousness in the Soul or Self, which means for the ordinary mortal, the Asura remains an entity whose psychology must be rejected, with the rejection facilitating one's evolution toward the Purusha or Atman.

If the Asura has its place in Hindu cosmology, if the existence of the great vital world Shadow yet fails to result in a Divine Consciousness in which the principle of separation is part of the Divine Truth, then there is absolutely no issue for the world to contain the relatively minor and functionally beneficial religious statue, artwork which at its finest is the manifestation of the flow of Divine energy through the artist. It is a natural element of religious and spiritual life, one that continues to be found among Muslims, who are far more attached to the Ka’ba, the ancient Arab Polytheist landmark, than the Hindu is to any figurine he uses as a concentration point for prayer or meditation. Even more pronounced is the Muslim idolatry of the Quran, the Hadith and Mohammed himself, idols that they fail to associate with the ‘crime’ of heathenism they accuse others of, even as their extreme attachment to Mohammed in particular motivates them to kill unbelievers for ‘insulting’ him, and leads them – in accordance with the Hadith - to even imitate, as we will later discuss, his mundane activities including personal grooming!

It is a remarkable hypocrisy in which the believer fails to reflect upon his blind adoration of even physical items like the Sacred Mosque and the Ka’ba, the Black Stone and the ‘holy’ pages of the Quran - material items not divine in their construct and therefore not at all worthy of the idolatry afforded to them by Muslims. Undoubtedly, excessive attachment does not represent the sort of idolatry Muslims imagine of the Polytheists, because they perceive the latter, including Hindus, to believe the “idol” of directly answering their prayers - the concrete material to have active vital property! While the believers certainly misinterpret, guided as they are by an Asuric scripture, the purpose of religious artwork in the Sanatana Dharma, they are also incapable of understanding the source of their own idolatry, for the literal nature of their teaching impairs a genuine understanding of what idolatry really is. As their scripture is also guilty of propagating a decidedly limited religious aspiration of Paradise (a simple exaggeration of earthly vital pleasures), not only are Muslims ignorant of their feverish attachments, they also find no need to eliminate them, because their religious indoctrination does not include the liberation from attachment articulated in the following Bhagavad Gita passage:

One who, giving up attachment, dedicates all his activities to Brahman, is not affected by sin,

just as the lotus in water. Therefore the Yogin, abandoning attachment, perform work by the mind, by the body, by the intelligence and by the separated senses for purifying the self. By abandoning attachment to the fruit of the works, a performer of prescribed actions obtains uninterrupted peace; on the other hand, a performer of fruitive activities becomes bound by an obsession to the results of the action due to a desire to enjoy the fruits of the work. (Bhagavad Gita 5:10-12)

Muslims are not only attached to the fruit of their work, whether that be genocide of the kuffar or Paradise or world conquest, but are indeed obsessed by the objects – psychological or material – identified as superior by their religion. It is the disengagement from attachment to the sense – including the mental – objects, on the other hand, that characterizes the aspiration of Hinduism toward a Supreme Knowledge:

One who has his senses subdued fully from the objects of the senses, O mighty armed Arjuna, is established in perfect knowledge. (Bhagavad Gita 2:68)

Islam brings about the exact opposite, even when not explicitly instructing its followers that attachment is expected of a good Muslim. Of course, the attachment is only to certain mental and concrete idols, including the Quran and Hadith, Mohammed himself, and the Ka'ba. If the Arab Polytheist of Mohammed's time was guilty of being overly attached to their religious sculptures, then by the same criteria are Muslims convicted of an even more insidious and mostly inextricable attachment to the objects they value dearly. Muslims are far more idolatrous than the Hindus they love to accuse of that 'crime' - the limited man's self-reflection by accusing the 'other', rearing its head once more. But it is an inevitable outcome of an Asuric creed that does not, befitting its maker, seek to transcend the ego, preferring instead to aggrandize egoistic tendencies; for it is the nature of the ego to attach itself to worldly objects, initially as a method to organize its movement and purpose within the lifetime, subsequently as a means for the transition from the ego to the Psychic, during which *all* attachment is to be *relinquished*. Attachment is not meant to be either the status quo or the pinnacle of earthly religious life, and when taken to excess like in Islam, it becomes an obstacle to the realization of Purusha or Atman – precisely what the Asura desires.

For the Lord of Falsehood, the idolatry engendered by his creation – yet concealed from the pious believer via the simple propagation of the fantasy that they will *destroy* idolatry and replaced it with a 'true' religion free from it – through the unseemly adoration of Quran and Mohammed, Mosque and Hadith, jihad and group superiority, is more than enough compensation for the loss of various strands of religious artwork other than the Ka'ba, with the obliteration of the former serving to distract the faithful from the hypocrisy of their alleged iconoclasm. Indeed even when describing certain objects like the Safa and Marwa mountains as "symbolic", the Muslim nevertheless cannot help but become attached, because he has nothing *higher* to aspire toward, leading to the domination, albeit now intensified, of the usual ego patterns. Thus the need not only for psychological objects like their status as the superior group, or their faith in the 'last Word', or Mohammed as the ideal "exemplar" whom they are to imitate, but also the *physical* objects, especially the Sacred Mosque in Mecca, the Ka'ba and its black stone.

It is with the latter objects and the mandated pilgrimage to Mecca that must be undertaken by a Muslim once in his or her lifetime, that we find another subtle type of idolatry, inescapable for the believer desperate for Paradise, one combining the physical and psychological. Here we speak of the centrality of Arabia to the Islamic faith, with the placement of its land, idols, and even its natives on an undeserved pedestal; an adoration further demolishing the idea of a global equality among Muslim 'brethren'. The relationship between Arabs and 'other' Muslims is one that, while inevitable with the spread of Islam and its idols specific to Arabia, was not characteristic of Mohammed's generation, given its limited geopolitical advancement at the time. But for ensuing generations of non-Arabs,

required to face the direction of Mecca five times daily when praying, ordered to undertake the Haj and see the holiest of all earthly lands, touching and praying at the most exalted idol on the planet, often instructed to learn the Quran in its original language of Arabic, it becomes difficult to eliminate the subconscious impression that Arabia is the most superior of all lands.

Similarly is it problematic for both Arabs and non-Arabs – the latter subconsciously - to reconcile the innate superiority of the former's land with the supposed equality between Arab and non-Arab believers. Though there is scant scripture explicitly declaring the Arabs to be the greatest of all Muslim groups, when a religion claims to have delivered its *final* 'Word', the geographical race of the recipient – in this case the Arab – can take precedence, especially when prior, though lesser, prophets of the religion hailed from the same race. The Arabic language on the other hand, is specifically hailed as the chosen language; likewise does the general narrative – including the Quran's language - of the religion implicate the Arabs as the chosen race, the one Allah in his grand 'Will' decided to bless with the 'final truth'. This fact of the Arab's special status, though negating already feeble boasts of intra-religious equality, does not prevent the non-Arab from entering Paradise. But by making the entrance to heaven contingent upon praying toward Arabia and performing pilgrimage in Mecca, the idolatry of Arabia and certain Arab objects is ensured, along with an inappropriate affinity for the Arab, whom the non-Arab's are naturally inclined to turn toward in matters religious, given the formers likely mastery of the chosen Arabic language of the scripture, and their sheer presence (especially Arabic Imams) at the sole important pilgrimage.

It is a relationship (between human groups) which is, if containing certain elements of idolatry, yet unlike the exaltation of the Arab *objects*, perhaps better described by a term associated with the geopolitics, expansionism and conquest at the heart of the Islamic vital ambition: Imperialism. It is here that the Asura of Falsehood's practical use of Arab idols, whether through the human idol Mohammed or the still present sacred mosques, stones and mountains, becomes evident – the Arabs the dominant group, most equal among equals, with their lands becoming the crucial point of *centralization* the Asura needs. The Arabs, by way of their superior status, gain both vanity and extra spoils from the lands colonized by Islam - the implicitly chosen race afforded an inordinate respect on their travels to 'other' believing lands, further reinforcing *their* belief in the vital aggrandizement known as Islam, increasing their propensity to spread it as far wide as possible, for both the 'truth' and the war tax that this great 'truth' contains. They are the best sub-group in the best of nations, the ones with actual blood lineage to the greatest of men, the inheritors of the idols that all Muslims turn and face five times daily. With the Haj, there is the added economic benefit, as waves of believers arrive from across the planet to stand before the great idol; but the sense of national superiority emerging from this centrality is of far superior value, blessed as the Arabs believe themselves, belonging to the race the 'one true god' chose to disseminate his final message.

In reality however, there is no need for the Divine to have a chosen race, for it is a restriction similar to that of the last 'Word', a projection of human limits upon the Illimitable. All races are capable of receiving the Divine Word - or if they wish, like Mohammed, the Asura of Falsehood's infrarational revelations -, as all humans potentially have openings into the occult or mystic planes of consciousness from which such contact or experience arises. Presenting the Arabs as the premier race, whether subtly done or not, is another indication of the Asuric hand in the creation of Islam, as it strikes against the concept of svadharma, with the Arab more naturally inclined to practice a literalist type of religion based upon the psychological climate of their land. This particular bent of their nature certainly provides them an additional advantage in controlling non-Arab Muslims, as the latter's original culture – especially those from the Indian subcontinent - is often ill-suited to the rigidity and harshness of Islam. Indeed as non-Arab Muslims are following something alien – for the most part – to their inherent law, they subsequently turn to the Arab for instruction, concluding – with justification – him to

be a better source for interpretation and guidance. It is not that they disbelieve in what is imparted upon them by local Imams; it is just that there exists a reflexive tendency to the ancient plastic culture, especially if they are surrounded by reminders of the old tradition, whether in human or material form. It is the intermittent return to the old ways that is of concern, for it brings up the dreaded possibility of Islamic hypocrisy (apostasy), of deviation from portions of the scripture. A lack of consistent practice, from the Islamic view, a plastic and fluid faith from the Hindu and classical perspective, creates the confusion from which the Arab is *perceived* to be helpful in resolving; or, in which the Arab arrives, censuring the intermixture of religious practices as a sin. If it is the latter, the Arab's message of more literal Islam is still followed, for he is thought to have an innate grasp of Islam's core, closer as it is to his nature, including the practical matter of language.

Though the literalism of Islam is not exactly the law of the Arab, where a greater amount of religious fluidity was present before the ascent of Islam, because the projection of ego unto God and the domination of one 'deity' over the others was practised even in the Polytheistic Arab tradition, there was enough of a vital foundation from which the Asura could accentuate and codify a law of falsehood; and the insufficient Psychic element in Arab life – as opposed to the subcontinent – continues to help minimize movements toward a religious environment based upon an inherent natural law. The Arab Muslim inclination to the Vital tendencies of man, of which Islam is an exaggerated form, makes him more likely to accept the message of global domination and egoistic usurpation without much argument; whereas in the non-Arab tradition, such as in "Pakistan", significant Psychic components remain - for now. The tension arising out of this secret battle between Vital and Psychic movements makes the subcontinental Muslim, when encouraged toward the original literalist Islam, violently move in that direction in order to ease the divergent internal pull on his nature.

But it is a turn that if successfully or near-successfully completed, as in "Pakistan", only leads to an even greater violence and destruction: for to follow, however expertly, an alien dharma is to commit the worst of fallacies, more than any relatively minor missteps or errors occurring through one's svadharma. Indeed, the status of the Arab as the special group can paradoxically make the non-Arab seek to – if they feel the Arab to not practice Islam well enough – try to outdo the Arabs in piety as a means to prove themselves 'better' Muslims, thereby worsening the internal schism and self-violence. There is no need to look toward the foreign psychology of Islamic falsehood, nor its secret idols masked by the boast of iconoclasm, when the fluid internal law beckons one on a profound inner journey to the Self in all. This is the truth of the Veda, the call inward to the Purusha, relinquishing in the process the attachments of the mental and vital ego, whether that be places of worship, scripture or ambitions of world conquest. There is no such thing as idolatry in the Vedic path, for idolatry is not an external impression of the worshipper's relationship to religious objects, and in taking that multi-varied path the devotee is not to have internal attachments to *any* worldly object, including the mentalized ideal of which the Prophet Mohammed becomes the premier of attachments for Muslims.

The conception of prophethood, like the idolatry that arrives with it, is also foreign to the Sanatana Dharma, because prophethood exaggerates the importance – whether indirectly or not – of humans with a self-declared *mortal* consciousness: The feverish attachment of Muslims to Mohammed is far removed from the relationship between sadhak (or bhakta) and Guru, because the latter is not – acknowledging the exception of charlatans – a mortal, but rather a Self-Realized *Godhead* freed from the ordinary bounds of ego. The sadhak in this relationship does not heed the instructions, nor pray toward, an ordinary mortal – that would be an earthly attachment similar to a Muslim's view of Mohammed; it is God, having *Consciously* taken over an earthly form, that is being worshipped by the bhakta. The status of Guru or Yogi or Rishi as Self-Realized is utterly different to the idea of Islamic prophethood, because the latter is based upon separation of the "messenger" from God, with each prophet remaining conscious of his distinct ego-form even in the afterlife, instead of, like the Guru,

Uniting his awareness in the Divine Reality. Another way in which prophethood differs from the Guru-Disciple relationship is the aspect of prophesy distinguished from the mere reception of the ‘Word’ – namely, future predictions. In the Abrahamic faiths, the former primarily involves the arrival of hellfire and the Anti-Christ, and signs related to those events. While this is a property curiously attributed to mortals in the Abrahamic tradition, it is not considered important in the Sanatana Dharma, even though God is experienced in certain individuals who later become Guru to others. This is because the Guru, whether we take the Guru to be God as an earthly *and Dynamic* Consciousness within an individual unit, or the Silent Transcendental God not involved with the creation and multiplicity, has not envisioned a *specific* future outcome of events. Though it is certainly within His power to have done so, the Divine whether as Inactive Consciousness or the Self-Realized Seer upon earth, prefers to see future *possibilities* rather than a distinct set of events.

For the individualized Guru, the relationship with the disciple is much more about helping that sadhak free himself or herself from the chains of ego - which of course consist of all types of physical, vital and mental attachments - than trying to tell him or her what will happen in the future. The Guru knows that not only is His vision of the future only one of multiple possibilities, neither is the Islamic prophesy of hellfire - of which Muslims are excessively attached to in both intellectual understanding and emotional fear – a legitimate denouement for mankind, because the ultimate conclusion for the mortal consciousness is a complete Unity with the One Consciousness that also exists as a Multiplicity, a state of Eternal Satchitananda transcending the attachment promoted in Islam or anywhere else. The fear of a mythical hellfire, the idol of a human's habits whether violent or mundane, the protection of a scripture's desecration, the belief in religious superiority, the fantasy of global domination, the prayer to a favoured land and mosque, the touch of a stone and structure, all become unnecessary expenditures of energy and concentration when taken as the height of religio-spiritual life: Only the pursuit of the Soul is truly worthy of such attention.

* * * *

While it is now certainly evident that Islam disseminates an ideology of rigid separation, hatred, obscurantism, thought restriction and emotional control through fear, glorification of lying in the name of ambition, and an incapacity for transformation or “Reformation” due to specific scriptural dictates, the compelling question, the one concerning the actual origin of this now global religion, may continue to remain in some. These are often the same individuals who, though acknowledging the pervasive falsehood throughout the Quran and Hadith, nevertheless have difficulty in conceptualizing the existence of an occult force working behind the scenes to devise an organized ‘religion’ as one of the multiple avenues for him to obstruct the manifestation of Satchitananda in life. It is a premise that is a step too far for those who find it perplexing to envision a reality beyond the ordinary physical body, thoughts and life patterns. For them, the matter of a revealed religion – irrespective of the particular entity transmitting the revelations – itself is a fallacy, illogical and without easily attainable evidence; all must be man-made, including the Quran. These are the types previously lambasted by “Allah” during Mohammed's time for daring to imagine that Mohammed had “forged” the final scripture.

It is an argument likely to be taken up by modern non-Muslim individuals adopting the rationalist interpretation of events. They are supported by the convenience by which Gabriel infrarationally revealed particular verses – like those rapidly communicated after Abu Lahab's insult – to Mohammed, with the sceptical inclined to favour the scripture to be either a concoction by the Prophet – considering how often the infrarational revelations accommodate Mohammed - or later Islamic figures that officially compiled the scripture. That the Quran verses were wilfully created by humans is an opinion

most palatable to rationalists who are unable to envision a reality of varied forces behind the ordinary mental and vital turn of mortals, who take our sense-based earthly perceptions – in truth a small fragment of an infinite consciousness – as the summit. As the logical intellect represents the currently accepted acme of Prakriti's evolution from Inconsciousness to the Supreme, the conclusion of the rationalists provides a distinct sense of superiority to the infrarational mentality required of the Muslim believing in Islam's message.

But to only approach Islam from the ordinary intellect is to succumb to the sensory limits, of which the basic mind is one, accustomed as it is to the surface thought and analysis. It is certainly a fine instrument to use in dismantling the inconsistencies of Islam's assertions, but it fails in a truly comprehensive understanding, as more tools are required to investigate a creed whose influence has spread throughout the world. Such an exploration requires more than just the superficial components, beginning with the essential premise that all is not merely what is on the surface, and that the totality or universality of consciousness is of an unlimited character, ranging from the sublime to the repugnant; thus the use of the ordinary facets for analysis will only provide a small window into a construct of wider significance. From this imperative acceptance of the existence of varying forms of consciousness and emanations, and worlds beyond the surface ranging from the Supermind to the Vital, can we only proceed with our examination. It is a recognition that helps us to explain the highly unusual ascent of Islam from an isolated, uncivilized backwater to the global reach it has today, with around one-fifth of the planet nominally adhering to it – and all in a relatively short timespan. It is a growth astonishing to behold when we review hadith documenting the paucity of believers during Mohammed's lifetime, including one that records their numbers as less than a thousand:

Narrated Al-Amash:

“We (listed the Muslims and) found them five hundred.” And Abu Muawiya said, “Between six-hundred to seven-hundred.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 52, Number 294)

In another, their total is said to have only been around twice as much:

Narrated Hudhaifa:

The Prophet said (to us), “List the names of those people who have announced that they are Muslims.” So, we listed one thousand and five hundred men. Then we wondered, “Should we be afraid (of infidels) although we are one thousand and five hundred in number?” No doubt, we witnessed ourselves being afflicted with such bad trials that one would have to offer the prayer alone in fear. (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 52, Number 293)

That such a small group, albeit one desiring eventual world conquest and domination of their religion, would multiply its numbers so quickly, conquering Arabia and then rapidly expanding to much of the classical world, is itself an indicator of the cosmic forces (though in these sort of cases of rapid expansion, not always Asuric or hostile) propelling its advance. After all, they would hardly be the first or last group to have the ambition of global power: desire is one thing, accomplishing it another – it is here that forces beyond the ordinary control of a mortal have their impact. Islam was not the first, nor the last, movement to extend beyond its humble origins – the fact that an at least temporarily irresistible force was the thrust behind its ascent is, when taken alone, merely an outward sign of a cosmic power, not the proof of the Asuric hand. For as Prakriti is in truth perpetual motion, She will have for her work numerous forces to help push man or nations beyond the ordinary arc of their existence, to try and create something greater – whether that accomplishment is in the ordinary vital or mental planes, or even higher.

Though the hastened growth of a religion or ideology is indicative of an unusual power behind it, a determination of the actual source once again can – in the absence of direct occult or mystic experience

obtained in the subliminal consciousness – only be arrived at through studying the psychology of the creed in question, a study taking into account the influence of non-sensory worlds beyond the terrestrial. And as Islam promotes ignorance, falsehood and direct opposition to the Supreme Truth, it has all the hallmarks of an Asuric weltanschauung, with the Lord of Falsehood using his favourite method of gaining complete mastery over a single instrument and progressively guiding the obedient and diminutive slave from political and military weakness to strength. Thus was Mohammed, like Hitler much later, carefully manipulated to do his master's bidding, through a means occult yet direct, when usually the Asura prefers to influence the general atmosphere: the former method is another aspect of the cosmic reality that we must accept to more exhaustively understand the Islamic phenomenon.

For just as the subliminal parts of our individual being – the inner mental, vital and physical regions – have access to the Divine Consciousness and the Psychic, whether through inspiration, intuition, revelation, discrimination, or perhaps contact with Divine entities, so is that subtle body at risk for occult interaction with emanations having decidedly different motivations. As these meetings with non-physical entities are done through the subtle or occult body, we must once again explore the avenues by which the individual can proceed beyond the ordinary surface consciousness into wider and murkier worlds. And for this we have no better example than the Prophet Mohammed, a once-ordinary man who actively sought out a consciousness he thought greater to his own – in his case one of the Arab names for God, Allah. As already cited, Mohammed's initial period of occult experience came during his frequent trips to the Cave of Hira, where he fervently worshipped Allah on a daily basis: bhakta is indeed one of the possible avenues to occult or mystic experiences, either through the granting of a prayer request – though not necessarily by God, as a hostile occult force might step in and assume the role of God – or by the sheer concentration that intense prayer engenders. It is the same type of result that might occur with meditation, which is also the concentration of one's awareness on a particular object or thought, with the goal to still the whirling mind enough to enter another arena of consciousness distinct from the ordinary thought. However, similar to an intensive bhakta, meditation does not necessarily – if a subliminal experience occurs – lead one to the deity expected. Indeed, one might emerge through meditation into the pure silence, perhaps mistaking it for the height of consciousness and concluding that the ordinary world is in truth a void or illusion.

But bhakta and meditation are only two of multiple paths – often used in some sort of combination - to mystic experiences, with the ultimate finale – unbeknown to many – Self-Realization or Consciously Uniting with the Purusha. The option of karmayoga, the renunciation of action, is another path, albeit poorly understood and widely unapplied until recently. While bhaktayoga, karmayoga, meditation and the seeking of knowledge (jnanyoga) are indeed tried and tested, there exist further techniques to at least have entry into *some* regions of the subliminal worlds. Corporeal methods can occasionally have effect, from the subtle physical process of *hathayoga* to the more extreme methods, including the use of fasting, something that may have occurred during Mohammed's sojourns in Hira cave (although the hadith record him as having taken provisions of food with him). In other cases, rare individuals are born with natural openings into the subliminal worlds, leading to experiences either during certain times of the waking or sleep consciousness. It was during the latter, as already mentioned, in which Mohammed received – per Aisha – his first occult experiences, though for him they occurred after a concerted effort rather than through an innate ability:

Narrated Aisha:

The commencement of the Divine Inspiration to Allah's Apostle was in the form of true dreams. The Angel came to him and said, “Read, in the Name of your Lord Who has created (all that exists), has created man a clot. Read! And your Lord is Most Generous” ..(96.1,2,3) (Sahih Bukhari Volume 6, Book 60, Number 479)

This initial experience was the result of his subtle body encountering the Asura of Falsehood during its travel through the Vital world, a passage undertaken regularly during sleep. That Mohammed was able to frequently remember these experiences points to a robust ability on his part to concentrate enough during the sleep consciousness, as the majority of mankind tends to forget their Vital sleep experiences because their individual consciousness is travelling through multiple regions of the wider subliminal consciousness – the main difficulty behind concentrating well enough to remember the events of the night. It was a *subtly* intense focus also required of him during the waking consciousness, the scene of further occult experiences to arrive:

Narrated Aisha:

(the mother of the faithful believers) Al-Harith bin Hisham asked Allah's Apostle, "O Allah's Apostle! How is the Divine Inspiration revealed to you?" Allah's Apostle replied, "Sometimes it is (revealed) like the ringing of a bell, this form of Inspiration is the hardest of all and then this state passes off after I have grasped what is inspired. **Sometimes the Angel comes in the form of a man and talks to me and I grasp whatever he says.**" Aisha added: Verily I saw the Prophet being inspired Divinely on a very cold day and noticed the sweat dropping from his forehead (as the Inspiration was over). (Sahih Bukhari Volume 1, Book 1, Number 2)

While the ringing of bells is the sign of the inner consciousness opening up (though the bell itself was later chastised by Mohammed - we will discuss this in the next chapter), that aperture does *not* preclude the mystic from being captured by hostile vital entities like Asuras, because the subliminal consciousness is vast and the mystic's initial entry, by itself, does not indicate arrival at the Supreme Consciousness. And though Gabriel would often appear before Mohammed – whether waking or in the dream state – in the form of a man, Mohammed believed himself to have only witnessed Gabriel's actual form on two occasions:

Narrated Masruq:

I said to Aisha, "O Mother! Did Prophet Muhammad see his Lord?" Aisha said, "What you have said makes my hair stand on end! Know that if somebody tells you one of the following three things, he is a liar: **Whoever tells you that Mohammed saw his Lord, is a liar.**" Then Aisha recited the Verse:

'No vision can grasp Him, but His grasp is over all vision. He is the Most Courteous Well-Acquainted with all things.' (6.103) 'It is not fitting for a human being that Allah should speak to him except by inspiration or from behind a veil.' (42.51) Aisha further said, "And whoever tells you that the Prophet knows what is going to happen tomorrow, is a liar." She then recited:

'No soul can know what it will earn tomorrow.' (31.34) She added: "And whoever tell you that he concealed (some of Allah's orders), is a liar." Then she recited: 'O Apostle! Proclaim (the Message) which has been sent down to you from your Lord.' (5.67) Aisha added, "**But the Prophet saw Gabriel in his true form twice.**" (Sahih Bukhari Volume 6, Book 60, Number 378)

Of course, what Mohammed accepted to be the Asura of Falsehood's real form was likely another guise made by a habitual liar, just as his claim to be an angel and his appearance to other mediums in the superficial making of a god. The Asura can assume the form of, or call himself, anything he chooses, including 'God', because he does not care for honesty or accuracy, as long as he obtains the results he desires. This, as we know, is another marker, obtaining results above all other higher considerations, that characterizes his psychology. Mohammed was no match for the machinations of this ancient creature, especially as he was not under the guidance of a Guru. For though the Transcendent God ultimately is the Guru, when She is Realized by the earthly individual, the subsequently ego-less adhar

(now the Divine Individualized in the Multiplicity) can directly function as God in the traditional Guru-Sadhak relationship, helping the seeker attain to a Consciousness already achieved by his or her master. The Individualized Guru, liberated from the ordinary egoistic consciousness, is capable of a luminous discrimination, a quality crucial to the needs of his disciples as they attempt to proceed on the path to Self-Consciousness as God.

It is this discrimination that helps to differentiate between Asura's claiming to be divine, and the true Gods or Goddesses - the Personalities or Aspects of Brahma equal (in Central Consciousness) to the Atman or the Purusha. As it is difficult for an initiate to already have that particular Intuitive Mind discrimination fully developed, the Guru's importance is paramount in preventing the sadhak's entry into one of multiple deviant pathways in his occult journey – including the possibility of a mystic possession by the Asura of Falsehood. The latter protection is of the most importance, because the Asuras actively seek to go against the Truth, whereas other errors along the way are more rapidly recovered from - an Asuric possession, to the contrary, destroys any possibility of experiencing the Unity of Consciousness. Lacking the guidance of a Self-Realized Guru, Mohammed's initially admirable aspiration to seek out Allah was quickly usurped by the Asura of Falsehood, who used his newfound instrument's primitive awe of magical appearances as a means to convince it of his 'angelic' nature. One instance has previously been cited but is worthy of another examination:

I heard the Prophet describing the period of pause of the Divine Inspiration. He said in his talk, "While I was walking, I heard voices from the sky. I looked up, and behold! I saw the same Angel who came to me in the cave of Hira sitting on a chair between the sky and the earth. I was too much afraid of him (so I returned to my house) and said, 'Fold me up in garments!' They wrapped me up. Then Allah revealed: 'O you wrapped...and desert the idols before the prayer became compulsory.' " Rujz means idols. (Sahih Bukhari Volume 6, Book 60, Number 447)

Mohammed's fear of what he saw provided further indication for Gabriel to proceed with continued fantastical appearances, as Mohammed was incapable of discriminating that the stupendous does not necessarily equal the Divine. In another instance, the Asura of Falsehood was to appear before his smitten target with hundreds of wings, 'evidence' of the former's angelic nature:

Narrated Abu Ishaq-Ash-Shaibani:

I asked Zir bin Hubaish regarding the Statement of Allah: "And was at a distance Of but two bow-lengths Or (even) nearer; So did (Allah) convey The Inspiration to His slave (Gabriel) and then he (Gabriel) Conveyed (that to Muhammad)." (53.9-10) On that, Zir said, "Ibn Masud informed us that **the Prophet had seen Gabriel having 600 wings.**" (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 54, Number 455)

Later, Gabriel was to present himself in another outlandish setting, standing in a cloud to inform his vessel of another "Angel", that of the mountains, present to assist the Apostle:

Narrated Aisha:

That she asked the Prophet, "Have you encountered a day harder than the day of the battle) of Uhud?" The Prophet replied, "Your tribes have troubled me a lot, and the worse trouble was the trouble on the day of Aqaba when I presented myself to Ibn Abd-Yalail bin Abd-Kulal and he did not respond to my demand. So I departed, overwhelmed with excessive sorrow, and proceeded on, and could not relax till I found myself at Qarnath-Tha-alib where I lifted my head towards the sky to see a cloud shading me unexpectedly. I looked up and saw Gabriel in it. He called me saying, 'Allah has heard your people's saying to you, and what they have replied back to you, Allah has sent the Angel of the Mountains to you so that you may order him to do

whatever you wish to these people.’ The Angel of the Mountains called and greeted me, and then said, ‘O Mohammed! Order what you wish. If you like, I will let Al-Akh-Shabain (i.e. two mountains) fall on them.’ ” The Prophet said, “No but I hope that Allah will let them beget children who will worship Allah Alone, and will worship None besides Him.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 54, Number 454)

Wondrous occult experiences like those can undoubtedly give the ordinary mortal such as Mohammed, one with an unrefined vital or mental perception, one with poorly developed intuition or discrimination, one without the Divine guidance from a Guru, the ‘proof’ he desires that the emanation he is in contact with is a ‘God’ or an agent from God. The Asura of Falsehood is quite adept, as he did with Mohammed, at appealing to the romantic or fantastical in man, and as Mohammed did not have the subliminal qualities or guidance mentioned to ascertain the nature of “Gabriel”, his sole potential recourse was a psychological analysis of the content of the Asura's message. Unfortunately, Mohammed did not even have this lesser tool to help himself, and as he had already achieved an initial opening to the subtle worlds, the chances of him continuing to receive the Asuric dictates increased exponentially, for once an individual creates such a passage, it becomes easier for the mortal to access that particular channel to obtain experiences, whether the pathway leads to Asuric possession, something in-between, or experiences Divine.

Mental traits that Mohammed *did* have included his innate ability to remember his dreams, and a learned skill to recall verbatim the “inspirations” that occurred during his waking consciousness – here we refer to the previously cited instructions from Gabriel telling his instrument to refrain from moving his lips or tongue when receiving a revelation:

...he asked Said bin Jubair regarding (the statement of Allah). ‘Move not your tongue concerning (the Quran) to make haste therewith.’ He said, “Ibn Abbas said that the Prophet used to move his lips when the Divine Inspiration was being revealed to him. So the Prophet was ordered not to move his tongue, which he used to do, lest some words should escape his memory. ‘It is for Us to collect it’ means, ‘We will collect it in your chest;’ and its recitation means, ‘We will make you recite it. But when We recite it (i.e. when it is revealed to you), follow its recital; it is for Us to explain it and make it clear,’ (i.e. We will explain it through your tongue).” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 6, Book 60, Number 450)

Unable to subliminally ascertain who “Gabriel” truly was, not privy to individuals with true spiritual experience (rather than his wife's cousin) and thus without competing influences, devoid of the psychological development necessary to recognize characteristics of actual falsehood, prone to the ambitions and desires of the ego, yet also having the required openings to the subliminal vital world and the ability to remember events of the sleep state and waking infrarational revelations without losing his steadiness, Mohammed was indeed as close to the perfect instrument the Asura is capable of fashioning. Having done very little by way of effort, yet completely convincing Mohammed that he was the Angel Gabriel, the Lord of Falsehood went about repeatedly using the developed infrarational mystic channel to present himself before Mohammed and occultly teach him the Quran:

Narrated Ibn Abbas:

Allah's Apostle was the most generous of all the people, and he used to reach the peak in generosity in the month of Ramadan when Gabriel met him. Gabriel used to meet him every night of Ramadan to teach him the Qur'an. Allah's Apostle was the most generous person, even more generous than the strong uncontrollable wind (in readiness and haste to do charitable deeds). (Sahih Bukhari Volume 1, Book 1, Number 5)

So intensive was this discourse that Gabriel read the Quran to Mohammed in multiple dialects, all required to ensure his instrument received and remembered the message correctly:

Narrated Ibn Abbas:

Allah's Apostle said, "Gabriel read the Qur'an to me in one way (i.e. dialect) and I continued asking him to read it in different ways till he read it in seven different ways." (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 54, Number 442)

Gabriel also desired that his slave conduct the prayers in a particular fashion, to the extent that he used Mohammed's channel between the material and subliminal to "descend" and lead Mohammed during prayers:

Narrated Ibn Shihab:

Once Umar bin Abdul Aziz delayed the Asr prayer a little. Urwa said to him, "Gabriel descended and led the prayer in front of the Prophet." On that Umar said, "O Urwa! Be sure of what you say." Urwa said, "I heard Bashir bin Abi Masud narrating from Ibn Masud who heard Allah's Apostle saying, 'Gabriel descended and led me in prayer; and then prayed with him again, and then prayed with him again, and then prayed with him again, and then prayed with him again, counting with his fingers five prayers.' " (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 54, Number 444)

In more precarious times, the Asura of Falsehood again took advantage of his instrument's occult passageway to ably assist the latter in battle – in one example appearing on the day of Badr to sustain Mohammed's confidence:

Narrated Ibn Abbas:

The Prophet said on the day (of the battle) of Badr, "This is Gabriel holding the head of his horse and equipped with arms for the battle." (Sahih Bukhari Volume 5, Book 59, Number 330)

That his mujahideen companions were unable to see the Asura was irrelevant, for the Asura – Gabriel - of Falsehood's presence, as confirmed by the last Prophet, was certain to galvanize the Muslims, as the 'angelic' presence indicated Allah's hand supporting them. That is, of course, if they were true believers, as evident by their dedication to war and their refusal to defect. For that, as we are aware, is a terrible crime, one that Gabriel, in a different example of his presence in the war-setting, hinted at in another occult meeting with Mohammed in which he censured him for laying down his arms and urged him to resume battle:

Narrated Aisha:

When the Prophet returned from Al-Khandaq (i.e. Trench) and laid down his arms and took a bath, **Gabriel came and said (to the Prophet), "You have laid down your arms? By Allah, we angels have not laid them down yet. So set out for them." The Prophet said, "Where to go?" Gabriel said, "Towards this side," pointing towards Banu Quraiza.** So the Prophet went out towards them. (Sahih Bukhari Volume 5, Book 59, Number 443)

Hadith like the previous two, along with similar examples already cited, are especially useful in countering a charge made by some of his contemporaries *and* modern detractors: that he was fabricating his encounters. While this is certainly an easy proposition for rationalists who do not believe in subliminal experiences as an inflexible opinion, like all matters mystical or occult, the only incontrovertible evidence one really has is the subjective. Thus the outsider cannot absolutely say whether or not the person in question is really having mystic – whether Supreme or infrarational or other *intermediate* - experiences, as we are not privy to their individual consciousness. In the example of Mohammed, we can nevertheless obtain an idea as to the consistency of the meetings presented in the Hadith. Here we find that the majority of encounters with Gabriel involved recitation of a scripture that in general was mostly consistent in its message of separation, exclusive worship of the name of

Allah, hatred of the unbeliever, results above all other considerations, exaltation of the fear of God, and the resort to murder for differences in opinion, among other tenets that psychologically reflect the Asuric outlook.

Continuing with whether or not the encounters presented in the Hadith are consistent with an occult emanation guiding Mohammed, we have for supplementary data certain authentic hadith in which contemporary observers saw distinct changes to Mohammed's behaviour during the precise time periods when the infrarational inspiration was taking hold of him. While some of these pertinent passages, such as the observation that he was perspiring when receiving an infrarational revelation, or the record of his lip movements while the Asura was speaking to him (a habit he was subsequently instructed to correct), have already been cited, there are yet further selections of note, including the following, in which Ibn Masud witnessed the Prophet receiving an infrarational communication from Gabriel. Though Masud did not have the occult sight required to visually witness the "angel", he was nevertheless certain - by both the transformation of Mohammed's behaviour during the occult seizure, and the recitation of a new Quran verse immediately afterwards - that Mohammed had indeed received a 'divine' inspiration:

I was with the Prophet at one of the farms of Medina while he was leaning on a date palm leaf-stalk. He passed by a group of Jews and some of them said to the other, Ask him (the Prophet) about the spirit. Some others said, "Do not ask him, lest he should tell you what you dislike." But they went up to him and said, "O Abal Qasim! Inform us about the spirit." **The Prophet stood up for a while, waiting. I realized that he was being Divinely Inspired, so I kept away from him till the inspiration was over.** Then the Prophet said, "(O Mohammed) they ask you regarding the spirit, Say: The spirit its knowledge is with my Lord (i.e., nobody has its knowledge except Allah)." (17.85) (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 92, Number 400)

It is very difficult to fabricate mystic experiences over a prolonged period of time to those whom one is familiar with, especially when the experiences were initially intermittent, the result of a – in the realm of mystic practices – typical course beginning after an intense period of prayer that leads to the first subliminal breakthrough. Mohammed's physical and behavioural patterns during periods of "inspiration" were persistent and dependable to his inner circle, and they had complete faith in his infrarational visions and revelations, even if they could not see Gabriel themselves:

Narrated Aisha:

Allah's Apostle said, "O Aisha! This is Gabriel sending his greetings to you." I said, "Peace, and Allah's Mercy be on him (Gabriel). You see what we do not see." (She was addressing Allah's Apostle). (Sahih Bukhari Volume 8, Book 74, Number 266)

But more than the consistency of the message or the widespread agreement by his companions on how he looked when receiving an Asuric revelation, is the sheer confidence by which he went about spreading his message to his fellow Arabs. It was a confidence that Hitler was to share, one that led both men to take daring actions that would never have been considered if not for their near-resolute faith in the emanation they assumed, respectively, to be God and God's agent. If Mohammed was merely falsifying his occult experiences, he would not have been able to replicate the astonishing confidence he had in battle, in which he – a man without military experience or training prior to Gabriel – was able to lead a paltry number of Muslims against a superior army: his confidence was strengthened through frequent encounters with the Asura, including highly important communications such as the one telling him that a Muslim army could defeat an enemy ten times its size. Though logic indicated otherwise, Mohammed believed his army capable of winning, as an 'angel' had told him it was his destiny – the same 'angel' who was present during battles to assist Mohammed, the same Asura of Falsehood who infrarationally revealed Allah to actively weaken the Infidel, the same Gabriel who

presented himself to Mohammed in a visual form far greater than anything an Infidel could muster:

Narrated Aisha:

Whoever claimed that (the Prophet) Muhammad saw his Lord, is committing a great fault, for he only saw Gabriel in his genuine shape in which he was created covering the whole horizon. (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 54, Number 457)

The confidence engendered through subliminal contact with the Asura was not a sign of the truth of Islam, because that consideration is subject to either a psychological understanding or a profound Psychic discrimination. What it did give Mohammed, to the detriment of his contemporary foes, was an insurmountable *belief* in what he was seeing and hearing, to the extent that the arguments of his detractors were bound to fail irrespective of their merit, for he was *experiencing* something subjectively concrete, even if he *misinterpreted* the experiences. The only possible means by which Mohammed would have changed his mind involved either meeting an earthly Guru instructing him otherwise due to the psychology of the message or the Guru's own Psychic discrimination as to who Gabriel truly was; stumbling upon a different subliminal vision or experience; or receiving a message from a counteracting subliminal entity. Though such counter-measures would still have had difficulty penetrating Mohammed's mind (because of the hold the Lord of Falsehood quickly gained over him), they would have at least had a better chance than the opinions of ordinary Arabs of the time, some of whom fairly accurately attributed his experiences to a "Satan", the West Asian figure closest in description to the Asuras of the Cosmos:

Narrated Jundab bin Abdullah :

Gabriel did not come to the Prophet (for some time) and so one of the Quraish women said, "His Satan has deserted him." So came the Divine Revelation: "By the forenoon And by the night When it is still! Your Lord (O Mohammed) has neither Forsaken you Nor hated you." (93.1-3) (Sahih Bukhari Volume 2, Book 21, Number 225)

Though the particular infrarational revelation seems fortuitous, because Mohammed already had the opening to the infrarational vital worlds, it was always possible for Gabriel to return, and he may have felt it appropriate to boost his instrument's confidence immediately after the Quraish woman's comment. Another reason, we must recall, why it is unlikely that Mohammed "forged" the verses is the simple fact of his fear: before an Asura who told him of the punishment Allah meted to forgers, disbelievers, and hypocrites, an Asura who was as large as the horizon and also partook in the punishment. Better to follow Gabriel's message verbatim than stray from the 'Word' and be punished, even if his experiences and repeated verbal recollections of his meetings to contemporary Arabs led him to be accused of insanity, a charge made frequently enough for Allah to have to correct mankind, informing them of Mohammed's lack of madness:

And on the day when He will gather them all together, then will He say to the angels: "Did these worship you?" They shall say: "Glory be to Thee! Thou art our Guardian, not they. Nay! They worshipped the jinn - most of them were believers in them." So on that day one of you shall not control profit or harm for another, and We will say to those who were unjust: "Taste the chastisement of the fire which you used to deny." And when Our clear communications are recited to them, they say: "This is naught but a man who desires to turn you away from that which your fathers worshipped." And they say: "This is naught but a lie that is forged." And those who disbelieve say of the truth when it comes to them: "This is only clear enchantment." And We have not given them any books which they read, nor did We send to them before you a warner. And those before them rejected (the truth), and these have not yet attained a tenth of what We gave them, but they denied My messengers, then how was the manifestation of My disapproval? Say: "I exhort you only to one thing, that rise up for Allah's sake in twos and

singly, then ponder: **there is no madness in your fellow-citizen: he is only a warner** to you before a severe chastisement.” (Quran 34:40-46)

It is of course completely understandable why many of his fellow Arabs – and modern observers of the historical record - viewed him as insane, for here was a man claiming to have seen and spoken with an Angel Gabriel, the latter of whom was telling him to inform *them*, repetitively, of *their* impending doom for practising their ancestral Polytheism. That he was encountering this ‘angel’ so frequently may alone have been enough for some of the Arabs to view him as mad, because it has always been unusual for humans to make such consistent contact with non-physical entities – the infrequency is why most do not believe in their existence in the first place, because the vast majority have no similar experience to make comparisons with. They may also interpret such interactions or experiences to be “hallucinations”, with the crucial implication that the experiences are not real. While it is certainly possible for humans to have actual hallucinations, in which what they hear or see is not related to either a physical *or* subliminal reality, in Mohammed's case that was unlikely for multiple reasons, including the sheer frequency of *similar* subliminal experiences – all involving “Gabriel” identifying himself consistently, though in different occult appearances at times.

But consistency was only one element: Additionally, the experiences involved understandable communications from the vital entity in question, with either philosophical – of a falsehood variety – teachings or directives to action presented to Mohammed. The *interaction* – rather than the contradictory and then abrogated revelations - as a whole had an organization to it, as opposed to the disorganization one might expect to see from sheer hallucinations – disorganization a sign of a detachment from some sort of reality, which was hardly the case with Mohammed. The difference between Mohammed and his fellow citizen was that the former was experiencing an evil occult reality while the latter were only hearing about the meetings through him – a discrepancy reminding us of the subjective nature of occult events. For even with a case of apparent disjointedness, which can certainly happen when proper hallucinations are occurring, we must remember that in a minority of individuals what *appears* to be chaos does not necessarily imply internal disorganization, as it is possible that one might be quite coherent of internal experiences yet have the external parts of the nature disintegrate.

Usually, however, the chaotic outward reality one finds in the insane is simply a reflection of their internal state – it is just that the outsider cannot be *absolutely* certain that the inner mind and vital of the - likely - deranged is equal to their external presentation. In Mohammed's example, any outward sign of madness was not the result of an internal disconnect from some *type* of reality, but instead the natural manifestation of a real, though subliminal, contact with *the* stupendous force of Falsehood. If, for instance, Mohammed impresses upon us as pathologically paranoid and hateful toward unbelievers, with those attributes often seen in the insane, these signs were not due to his inner being splintering – rather, the cause was his succumbing to the lure of the Asura of Falsehood. It is an appraisal frankly logical in nature, as long as one can entertain the notion of *conscious* vital emanations existing in the subliminal consciousness mostly undiscovered by the majority of mankind, with the Asura, Rakshasa and Pishacha known to be the hostile vital types distinctly working in favour of Falsehood and Ignorance.

Though there are countless other vital entities who are not Divine, it is these three who are most concerning to the mystic seeker on his journey, as they can lead to a possibly irreparable fall from the path to the Purusha. The three types, though of different natures – the Asura a mentalized yet still vital being, the Rakshasa strictly vital and notable for rapacious consumption, the Pishacha of the lower vital -, are similar in their callous disregard for the mortals they possess. They goad their vessels to actions the latter might otherwise not do, with the need for tactical restraint only prominent among the emanations – usually an Asura - with broader ambitions. Though some of the instrument's actions can appear “mad”, it is usually done for a particular reason if it is the Asura supporting. The lower beings,

on the other hand, are more likely to betray their co-opted vessels with either directions or impulses autonomous to an intelligent aim, making the instrument more vulnerable than they should otherwise be. As they are all – Asuric, Rakshasic or Pischachic – vital emanations of darkness and from a psychological sense extreme manifestations– though expressed differently – of the worst aspects of the ego, they are naturally also at war with themselves along with anything even approaching the Truth, for any alliances they might make with one another are only temporary and designed to obtain an advantage, a type of *taqiyah* in the occult dimension, with each party trying to eventually usurp the other, because agents of darkness do not believe in the profound peace upon which true equality, brotherhood and allegiance is founded. Reflecting this reality, there were occasions during his lifetime when other occult beings attempted to wrest control of Mohammed from the Asura of Falsehood:

Narrated Abu Huraira:

The Prophet said, “Last night a big demon (afreet) from the Jinns came to me and wanted to interrupt my prayers (or said something similar) but Allah enabled me to overpower him. I wanted to fasten him to one of the pillars of the mosque so that all of you could See him in the morning but I remembered the statement of my brother Solomon (as stated in Quran): ‘My Lord! Forgive me and bestow on me a kingdom such as shall not belong to anybody after me (38.35).’ ” The sub narrator Rauh said, “He (the demon) was dismissed humiliated.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 1, Book 8, Number 450m)

Mohammed's opening to the Vital clearly extended beyond Gabriel, and though it is practically an impossible prospect for a Jinn – as these lower vital beings are known in Arabia – to displace a primary instrument of the Asura of Falsehood, they will nevertheless try to take advantage of a potential vessel for their own perverse enjoyment. The fact that the Asura will have no problem – if he chooses - ousting them from contention is irrelevant, as none of the hostile vital entities – whether Pischachic, Rakshasic or Asuric - are necessarily subservient to one another; if the Asuras, especially the Lord of Falsehood, defeat the others it is simply because of their greater intelligence, power and ruthlessness. Thus the Jinns – from their description minor Rakshasic or Pishachic creatures – were often infrarationally revealed in the Quran to be inimical to Mohammed or Islam. That they did not succeed in controlling Mohammed is further evidence of his Asuric possession in that the Rakshasa is not likely to seek to conquer with a specific ideological basis (as he is not mentalized), and the Pishacha simply does not have the ability to achieve that ambition. And if the Prophet's engagement with the occult and its myriad demons did not lead to madness or actual hallucinations *devoid* of some type of cosmic reality, his reception of the subliminal vital worlds certainly led to an extraordinary vanity, in no small part aided by the Asura through the latter's use of less than subtle imagery:

Narrated Ibn Abbas:

The Prophet said, “The people were displayed in front of me and I saw one prophet passing by with a large group of his followers, and another prophet passing by with only a small group of people, and another prophet passing by with only ten (persons), and another prophet passing by with only five (persons), and another prophet passed by alone. And then I looked and saw a large multitude of people, so I asked Gabriel, **‘Are these people my followers?’ He said, ‘No, but look towards the horizon.’ I looked and saw a very large multitude of people. Gabriel said, ‘Those are your followers, and those are seventy thousand (persons) in front of them who will neither have any reckoning of their accounts nor will receive any punishment.’** I asked, ‘Why?’ He said, ‘For they used not to treat themselves with branding (cauterization) nor with Ruqya (get oneself treated by the recitation of some Verses of the Qur’an) and not to see evil omen in things, and they used to put their trust (only) in their Lord.’ ” On hearing that, Ukasha bin Mihsan got up and said (to the Prophet), “Invoke Allah to make me one of them.” The Prophet said, “O Allah, make him one of them.” Then another man got up and said (to the

Prophet), “Invoke Allah to make me one of them.” The Prophet said, “Ukasha has preceded you.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 8, Book 76, Number 549)

How could the practically irrelevant – in comparison – Mohammed have viewed this scene with anything other than breathless attention? Here was a minor mortal viewing the epic finale of mankind – or so it seemed. For the vision he had was presented and narrated by the Asura of Falsehood, the least trustworthy of guides. In it, not only do we find group members failing speak to the Prophet, their purpose in the vision was explained to him strictly by Gabriel, who had great reason to lie – as he did about his own identity - in order to continue to inflate Mohammed's ego and maintain his trust. Additionally, as the Lord of Falsehood resides *in* the Vital dimension, one with a near infinite range of possibilities (definitely more than the physical world restricted by time and space), he had more control over what he presented to Mohammed, the latter of whom could only passively absorb what he heard and saw. Thus the Asura could either have contrived the scene in question or taken Mohammed to a part of the Vital world where what the Prophet was seeing had little relation to Gabriel's description and interpretation of it. The latter scenario, as we shall shortly discuss, is primarily what transpired, especially when we consider the particulars of different scenes witnessed by Mohammed:

Narrated Asma:

After the prayer, the Prophet praised and glorified Allah and then said, “Just now at this place I have seen what I have never seen before, including Paradise and Hell. No doubt it has been inspired to me that you will be put to trials in your graves and these trials will be like the trials of Masiah-ad-Dajjal or nearly like it (the sub narrator is not sure which expression Asma used). You will be asked, ‘What do you know about this man (the Prophet Mohammed)?’ Then the faithful believer (or Asma said a similar word) will reply, ‘He is Mohammed Allah's Apostle who had come to us with clear evidences and guidance and so we accepted his teachings and followed him. And he is Mohammed.’ And he will repeat it thrice. Then the angels will say to him, ‘Sleep in peace as we have come to know that you were a faithful believer.’ On the other hand, a hypocrite or a doubtful person will reply, ‘I do not know, but I heard the people saying something and so I said it.’” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 1, Book 3, Number 86)

Though it is certainly possible for an occultist to have a vision of Paradise or Hell, these type of experiences do not indicate, by themselves, either the highest spiritual aspiration or the truth – in Mohammed's case – of one's ideology. For heaven and hell are indeed part of the *Cosmic* consciousness, vital-mental constructs existing in the non-material planes; just because one has an experience of witnessing them does not mean that one has witnessed the “Truth” and then must proceed to convert all of mankind to an ideology representing this vision. After all, even the ordinary understanding of Nirvana, a superior consciousness to Heaven, is not the Ultimate Consciousness – and Paradise pales in comparison to both. There is also the crucial – with regards to a detailed understanding of Mohammed's experiences – occult fact of *multiple* vital worlds rather than a simple dichotomy of “heaven” and “hell” in the Vital realm. Indeed within the Puranas we find numerous accounts of a plethora of netherworlds (Patalas) or lower vital worlds, including places that were considered, by the Sage Narada no less, *superior* in *aesthetic* quality to that of Swarga or Heaven:

Earth's total height is 70,000 Yojans. In her depth, are situated seven nether worlds with a depth of 10,000 Yojans each respectively. Names of these seven nether worlds are Atal, Vital, Nital, Gamastiman, Mahatal, Satal and Patal. **These nether worlds have beautiful palaces, and have lands which are white, black, red and yellow in colour with gravel, rocky and golden soil. Scores of races including Danav, Daitya, Yaksha and Nagas live there.**

Once upon a time, Narada visited these nether worlds. When he returned to heaven, he

told the people there that the nether world was more beautiful than heaven. He told them that ornaments of the Nagas contained precious gemstones and the womenfolk of Daitya and Danavas were an attraction even for the gods. The sun was illuminating in the nether worlds but not scorching. Similarly, the Moon only shone there but did not cause bitter cold. (Vishnu Purana, Part II, Chapter V)

Of importance in this description besides the aesthetic quality are the residents of these worlds, including the Danavs who are the sons of the Asura Danu, and the Daityas – one of which was the Asura Hiranyakashipu - who are the sons of the demon Diti. In another Purana we find a similar account of some of the residents of the netherworlds, with Linga Purana noting, “All these netherworld have the same expanse as the earth. Rasatal is the place where Vasuki resides. **Talatal is the dwelling place of mighty demons like Virochan and Hiranyaksha.** It is also the place where hell is situated. The netherworld named Satal is the dwelling place where Tarka, Agnimukh and Prahlada live. Tala is the dwelling place of mighty warriors like Mahakumbh, Hayagreeva etc.” (Linga Purana, Part III) While the Patalas are not *entirely* the abode of hostile beings like the Asuras, these worlds are nevertheless their exclusive location in the Cosmos, because as mentioned previously, the Asuras do not incarnate into the material world, preferring to exert their sizeable terrestrial influence through specific mediums, along with subtly invading the group-atmosphere. And as a consequence of the Asuras residing in Patalas that are lovelier in appearance than the actual *Svarga*, it is entirely probable that the Asura of Falsehood was able to visually – through Mohammed's occult sight – present both the Islamic “Paradise” (in actuality a lovely and luxurious netherworld) and “Hell” that are contained within the vast Vital domain.

That an entity who is the cause of so much evil and depravity could be so associated with the fine aesthetic quality of the netherworlds should come as no surprise when we remember the ultimate spiritual aspiration: the Union of Consciousness. Even the real *Svarga* or Heaven should not be, and simply is not, the ultimate destination: Indeed the fact of *Svarga* having lesser aesthetic quality than the netherworlds is entirely logical when we understand Self-Realization as the aspiration, for though Brahma does not at all want to negate His Beautitude within life, He also needs the *adhar* to go through a period of psychological detachment from the aesthete (remember, the Mental *Svarga* is *also intermediate* to the Supreme Consciousness and the Divine Aesthete, though it certainly is a more proximate consciousness than the Patalas), not entirely rejecting it but requiring a certain liberation from some of the excesses of the netherworlds, which usually maintain *attachment* to objects, including objects of beauty and luxury. It is in this fashion that the Asura of Falsehood uses *vital* beauty, as a means to keep the consciousness *separate* from God, whereas God manifests a Beautitude in life that emerges *out of* a Union of Consciousness, with the Divine Aesthete a different Aspect of the Supreme Truth.

Understanding how the Lord of Falsehood can yet superficially use beauty and luxury for his hostile purposes, we can subsequently perceive how the Asura utilized this facet of the ordinary life to mislead Mohammed into believing the “Paradise” that he witnessed to be the ultimate state of existence. The Prophet, after all, was a mortal easily beguiled by the awe-inspiring and supernatural: The only way, again, for the mortal to ascertain the real nature of what is being presented in an occult vision is either through the Psychic discrimination – of the scene or more importantly, the narrator of the experience – or an impartial psychological analysis. To be capable of accessing this illumination requires the proper guidance, discrimination or education Mohammed unfortunately did not have, and his primitive psychological state in combination with the rare gifts of occult sight and audition allowed the Asura of Falsehood to open Mohammed up to these Netherworlds or Patalas, with an understanding that his slavish medium would interpret the experiences strictly according to the Asura's narrative, rather than a higher intuition that would perceive these underworlds for their limited nature. The Asura also knew

that a secondary result of these visions was the creation of a gargantuan ego obsessed with Islamic domination and his own role in the “Cause of Allah”, with Mohammed admitting a desire to have more followers than other prophets:

Narrated Abu Huraira:

The Prophet said, “There was no prophet among the prophets but was given miracles because of which people had security or had belief, but what I was given was the Divine Inspiration which Allah revealed to me. **So I hope that my followers will be more than those of any other prophet on the Day of Resurrection.**” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 92, Number 379)

It was unnecessary, other than for his vanity, for him to desire more followers than the preceding prophets – if he had been without ego, he would have only wished for all of mankind to follow Islam without mentioning himself. There was no need to compare himself to other prophets except for the unrefined vital competitiveness that Gabriel accentuated in his instrument instead of transforming. The Asura's decision to do this, though inevitable *and* practical due to his requirement of an instrument both confident and capable of following commands, was fraught with danger precisely because of the crude qualities he amplified in Mohammed's ego. For though we have ascertained that Mohammed was only guilty of Asuric possession and not madness, he was nevertheless a psychologically unbalanced individual – imbalance, though an obvious manifestation of madness, can also be present in those yet to cross the line into insanity. His imbalance was evident at the beginning of the occult contact, with one of the most frequent results of such disequilibrium, suicide, emerging as an unambiguous possibility:

Narrated Aisha:

...But after a few days Waraqa died and the Divine Inspiration was also paused for a while and the **Prophet became so sad as we have heard that he intended several times to throw himself from the tops of high mountains and every time he went up the top of a mountain in order to throw himself down, Gabriel would appear before him and say, “O Mohammed! You are indeed Allah's Apostle in truth” whereupon his heart would become quiet and he would calm down and would return home. And whenever the period of the coming of the inspiration used to become long, he would do as before, but when he used to reach the top of a mountain, Gabriel would appear before him and say to him what he had said before.** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 87, Number 111)

For a vessel supposedly privy to the ‘Last Word’ of the only god, which in Islam marks him as the mortal to have experienced the highest of ‘spiritual’ or ‘religious’ truths, it is striking how histrionic and unhinged he was – hardly characteristic of the peace and stillness one would presume to occur after communicating with an ‘angel’. Having been blessed to see someone only a select few, presumably, were able to have seen before, Mohammed like a spoilt infant was “sad” that his newfound master was not “visiting” him regularly; one might have expected at least a certain gladness, if not tranquillity, after having such a unique experience. Of course, it went beyond mere sadness – that he was upset to the point of attempting to kill himself speaks to a personality lacking in Psychic influence, which would have given him the perspective and the necessary balance to remain patient and wait for the next meeting. It is the Psychic in man, the Purusha's extension into the Ignorance, that provides this stability even during testing times; the Psychic intuitively guides men away from suicide, as it understands that the purpose of each lifetime is for the growth of Itself, with the law of reincarnation meaning that any attempted escape is temporary, for the lessons *will* be learned eventually.

Indeed, even a partially active Psychic provides one with the *inherent* understanding that Immortality and Unity is the truest reality of all – thus why attempt to kill oneself when death is merely a transient reality based upon a partial consciousness? This small portion of the Divine Wisdom, if only felt intuitively, is enough to prevent the taking of one's life in even those natures, like the Apostle of Allah,

subject to the most dire of internal vicissitudes. But Mohammed's Psychic was not developed enough to prevent an impulse to hurl himself onto his own death – it took the frequent interventions of Gabriel to halt his instrument's plunge into the next phase of consciousness. These multiple acts of supposed mercy were, unbeknownst to the vessel, not made out of great concern for Mohammed's well-being – the Asura only saved Mohammed because he wanted to *use* him. If Mohammed could not have served the Lord of Falsehood's agenda, a self-inflicted death was the likely denouement, with his Psychic too weak to counter the aberrant impulse – the quick resort to suicide helping to confirm Mohammed's experiences as *Vital*, rather than Psychic or of the Intuitive Mind.

That Mohammed, even with his theatrical and unbalanced personality, did not completely lose his poise, is not a testament to his own psychology or the benevolence of the 'angel', but rather the result of the Asura's practical needs – if the Lord of Falsehood ceased to have a requirement for Mohammed the latter would have met the same fate as Hitler, his neck snapped when the Asura realized his instrument of the time had no further use. The numerous acts of 'mercy' served a dual purpose in keeping a potentially effective instrument in play, and at once making the vessel ever more dependent on Gabriel – with both fear and the memory of the 'angel' saving his life increasing the subservience of an individual far removed from the Truth of a Purusha free from trepidation and attachment to others. Though a desperate reliance on the Asura only increases the eventual likelihood of suicide, with the Psychic progressively withdrawing its influence as the Asura's grip increases, the vessel may at least temporarily have an extraordinary level of control – but only if the Lord of Falsehood cares enough to use and command it. Once the Asura departs, the false stability he previously ensured crumbles and the individual is completely subject to the extremes of the Vital world, of which Mohammed, from the mid-level demons previously cited to the lower workings of magic, was entirely vulnerable:

Narrated Aisha:

That Allah's Apostle was affected by magic, so much that he used to think that he had done something which in fact, he did not do, and he invoked his Lord (for a remedy). Then (one day) he said, "O Aisha! Do you know that Allah has advised me as to the problem I consulted Him about?" Aisha said, "O Allah's Apostle! What's that?" He said, "Two men came to me and one of them sat at my head and the other at my feet, and one of them asked his companion, 'What is wrong with this man?' The latter replied, 'He is under the effect of magic.' The former asked, 'Who has worked magic on him?' The latter replied, 'Labid bin Al-Asam.' The former asked, 'With what did he work the magic?' The latter replied, 'With a comb and the hair, which are stuck to the comb, and the skin of pollen of a date-palm tree.' The former asked, 'Where is that?' The latter replied, 'It is in Dharwan.' " Dharwan was a well in the dwelling place of the (tribe of) Bani Zuraiq. Allah's Apostle went to that well and returned to Aisha, saying, "By Allah, the water (of the well) was as red as the infusion of Hinna, and the date-palm trees look like the heads of devils." Aisha added, "Allah's Apostle came to me and informed me about the well. I asked the Prophet, 'O Allah's Apostle, why didn't you take out the skin of pollen?' He said, 'As for me, Allah has cured me and I hated to draw the attention of the people to such evil (which they might learn and harm others with).'"

Narrated Hisham's father: **Aisha said, "Allah's Apostle was bewitched, so he invoked Allah repeatedly requesting Him to cure him from that magic."** Hisham then narrated the above narration. (Sahih Bukhari Volume 8, Book 75, Number 400)

As it is the Psychic which easily deflects away the normally inconsequential efforts of "black magic" – which includes the summoning of lower vital forces to try and negatively influence another -, Mohammed remained prey to a type of hostile force that barely registers in an evolved mind. For the Soul, barring the occasional Psychic flicker, had no dominion over him, and because the Asura – his unquestioned controller – is an outside force unable and unwilling to continuously (as in minute by

minute) remain and assist the medium, during times when his master was absent, Mohammed's fear of the lower vital forces worsened, as he did not have the capacity to develop his own internal Psychic strength to shrug off the various hostilities - his power, after all, was strictly the result of his enslavement to the Lord of Falsehood. That he was afraid of black magic *and* so open to subliminal possession left him in a precarious position if the Asura ever decided to discard him, especially as his openings made him susceptible to becoming the toy of competing vital demons if the ruler of the Vital became bored or found a better medium.

This particular occult seeker was also far from a sturdy enough material for the Divine Realization, because the regulation of the triple-sheath channels into the subliminal worlds needs to be more stable in the receptacle, for moksha to occur. An instrument that contemplates suicide and trembles in fear of "black magic" is hardly the adhar one expects of an individual ready for Self-Realization, or even of one guided by an actual emanation of Light or a being from the Psychic worlds. Mohammed is a classic example of occult possession, by a force infrarational who controlled him through direct occult vision and interactions in the dream consciousness. The dream state, as we have mentioned, consists of the subtle body traversing through the non-physical planes of existence, along with the impressions and dreams of the poorly formed subconscious material. Mohammed's capacity as an instrument was in no small part related to his ability to recall the time of his sleep, some of which involved extraordinary meetings and dialogue with the Asura of Falsehood and others, including the celebrated night of his ascension to the heavens, when Mohammed for once received auditions from whom he thought to be *Allah*:

Narrated Malik bin Sasaa:

The Prophet said, **"While I was at the House in a state midway between sleep and wakefulness, (an angel recognized me) as the man lying between two men. A golden tray full of wisdom and belief was brought to me and my body was cut open from the throat to the lower part of the abdomen and then my abdomen was washed with Zam-zam water and (my heart was) filled with wisdom and belief.** Al-Buraq, a white animal, smaller than a mule and bigger than a donkey was brought to me and I set out with Gabriel. When I reached the nearest heaven, Gabriel said to the heaven gate-keeper, 'Open the gate.' The gatekeeper asked, 'Who is it?' He said, 'Gabriel.' The gate-keeper, 'Who is accompanying you?' Gabriel said, 'Mohammed.' The gate-keeper said, 'Has he been called?' Gabriel said, 'Yes.' Then it was said, 'He is welcomed. What a wonderful visit his is!' Then I met Adam and greeted him and he said, 'You are welcomed O son and a Prophet.' Then we ascended to the second heaven. It was asked, 'Who is it?' Gabriel said, 'Gabriel.' It was said, 'Who is with you?' He said, 'Mohammed.' It was asked, 'Has he been sent for?' He said, 'Yes.' It was said, 'He is welcomed. What a wonderful visit his is!' Then I met Jesus and John who said, 'You are welcomed, O brother and a Prophet.' Then we ascended to the third heaven. It was asked, 'Who is it?' Gabriel said, 'Gabriel.' It was asked, 'Who is with you?' Gabriel said, 'Mohammed.' It was asked, 'Has he been sent for?' 'Yes,' said Gabriel. 'He is welcomed. What a wonderful visit his is!' (The Prophet added) There I met Joseph and greeted him, and he replied, 'You are welcomed, O brother and a Prophet!' Then we ascended to the 4th heaven and again the same questions and answers were exchanged as in the previous heavens. There I met Idris and greeted him. He said, 'You are welcomed O brother and Prophet.' Then we ascended to the 5th heaven and again the same questions and answers were exchanged as in previous heavens. There I met and greeted Aaron who said, 'You are welcomed O brother and a Prophet.' Then we ascended to the 6th heaven and again the same questions and answers were exchanged as in the previous heavens. There I met and greeted Moses who said, 'You are welcomed O brother and a Prophet.' **When I proceeded on, he started weeping and on being asked why he was**

weeping, he said, **‘O Lord! Followers of this youth who was sent after me will enter Paradise in greater number than my followers.’** Then we ascended to the seventh heaven and again the same questions and answers were exchanged as in the previous heavens. There I met and greeted Abraham who said, ‘You are welcomed o son and a Prophet.’ Then I was shown Al-Bait-al-Mamur (i.e. Allah's House). **I asked Gabriel about it and he said, ‘This is Al Bait-ul-Mamur where 70,000 angels perform prayers daily and when they leave they never return to it (but always a fresh batch comes into it daily).’** Then I was shown Sidrat-ul-Muntaha (i.e. a tree in the seventh heaven) and I saw its Nabk fruits which resembled the clay jugs of Hajr (i.e. a town in Arabia), and its leaves were like the ears of elephants, and four rivers originated at its root, two of them were apparent and two were hidden. I asked Gabriel about those rivers and he said, ‘The two hidden rivers are in Paradise, and the apparent ones are the Nile and the Euphrates.’ Then fifty prayers were enjoined on me. I descended till I met Moses who asked me, ‘What have you done?’ I said, ‘Fifty prayers have been enjoined on me.’ He said, **‘I know the people better than you, because I had the hardest experience to bring Bani Israel to obedience. Your followers cannot put up with such obligation.** So, return to your Lord and request Him (to reduce the number of prayers).’ I returned and requested Allah (for reduction) and He made it forty. I returned and (met Moses) and had a similar discussion, and then returned again to Allah for reduction and He made it thirty, then twenty, then ten, and then I came to Moses who repeated the same advice. Ultimately Allah reduced it to five. When I came to Moses again, he said, ‘What have you done?’ I said, ‘Allah has made it five only.’ He repeated the same advice but I said that I surrendered (to Allah's Final Order).’” Allah's Apostle was addressed by Allah, “I have decreed My Obligation and have reduced the burden on My slaves, and I shall reward a single good deed as if it were ten good deeds.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 54, Number 429)

While this description relates the journey to Paradise to have happened between sleep and wakefulness, different hadith (Sahih Bukhari Volume 5, Book 58, Number 227) describe it specifically as his “night journey”, and any experience occurring during the particular time between sleep and wakefulness is most likely the dream consciousness – the only difference is that the waking consciousness is closer to one's awareness during that brief interval than the rest of sleep, perhaps leading to intrusions of the dense subconsciousness into the subliminal vital sojourn. Having established part of the process by which Mohammed apparently ascended into the heavens, we return to the actual event, which began with the most extraordinary – for the easily impressionable – of actions, the “golden” tray of “wisdom” and the washing of his body with “zam-zam” water. In an additional authentic hadith describing this important event in Islamic history, we are presented with another crucial fact – that of multiple ‘angels’ presenting themselves to Mohammed, with Gabriel the one who eventually “took charge”:

Narrated Anas bin Malik:

The night Allah's Apostle was taken for a journey from the sacred mosque (of Mecca) Al-Ka’ba: Three persons came to him (in a dream while he was sleeping in the Sacred Mosque before the Divine Inspiration was revealed to Him). One of them said, “Which of them is he?” The middle (second) angel said, “He is the best of them.” The last (third) angel said, “Take the best of them.” Only that much happened on that night and he did not see them till they came on another night, i.e. after The Divine Inspiration was revealed to him. ...and he saw them, his eyes were asleep but his heart was not - and so is the case with the prophets: their eyes sleep while their hearts do not sleep. So those angels did not talk to him till they carried him and placed him beside the well of Zam-Zam. From among them Gabriel took charge of him. Gabriel cut open (the part of his body) between his throat and the middle of his chest (heart) and took all the material out of his chest and abdomen and then

washed it with Zam-Zam water with his own hands till he cleansed the inside of his body, and then a gold tray containing a gold bowl full of belief and wisdom was brought and then Gabriel stuffed his chest and throat blood vessels with it and then closed it (the chest). He then ascended with him to the heaven of the world and knocked on one of its doors. (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 93, Number 608)

It is here that we are reminded of one of the possibilities behind the ubiquitous Quran verses detailing a Plurality, that a *group* of ‘angels’ occultly were involved in the infrarational revelations. But his interaction with multiple Asuras was in fact extremely uncommon and only recorded during the dream state, with Gabriel usually accompanying them, and with the other Asuras never confirmed to have infrarationally revealed anything to the Prophet. While the reality of multiple ‘angels’ visiting Mohammed makes it again possible - if we recall instances such as Mohammed praying for famine, the classic punishment of the Asura of Suffering – that numerous Asuras were vying for this medium, the hadith above actually helps to eliminate that chance, as it notes that Gabriel was the only one communicating with and taking “charge” of Mohammed - the accompanying ‘angels’ merely observers. Having written that, we nevertheless find in the Quran acknowledgement by the Asura of Falsehood of the existence of different Asuras alleging themselves as divine intermediaries (we will also later document an authentic hadith in which additional ‘angels’ traversed through the Vital with Mohammed, yet without offering him any infrarational revelations):

And they say: “What! When we have become lost in the earth, shall we then certainly be in a new creation?” Nay! They are disbelievers in the meeting of their Lord. **Say: “The angel of death who is given charge of you shall cause you to die, then to your Lord you shall be brought back.”** And could you but see when the guilty shall hang down their heads before their Lord: “Our Lord! We have seen and we have heard, therefore send us back, we will do good. Surely (now) we are certain.” And if We had pleased We would certainly have given to every soul its guidance, but the word (which had gone forth) from Me was just. I will certainly fill hell with the jinn and men together. So taste, because you neglected the meeting of this day of yours. Surely We forsake you, and taste the abiding chastisement for what you did. (Quran 32:10-14)

The “angel of death” is none other than the Asura of Death, an emanation described by numerous cultures according to terms like ‘angel’ or ‘god’ when these terms are better applied to entities of Light who are connected in Consciousness to Brahma. Yet if these cultural descriptions emerged out of the *avidya* or Ignorance, the Asura sought to make them a permanent inversion of occult ‘wisdom’. It is a fixed inversion of definitions, entirely consistent with the Asura's exacerbation of Ignorance into Falsehood, that is similarly seen in the concept of spiritual ‘light’, with the hadith of the Night of Ascension bringing up the possibility that an actual emanation of light took hold of Mohammed and guided him through a sublime spiritual experience. But to believe in this account of things, one must be of the type quickly caught up by romantic notions or fantasies, gullible like Mohammed, consumed by appearances instead of applying a balanced measure of scepticism. While too much questioning could derail the progress of a spiritual seeker, a certain amount is healthy and needed, especially if there is no Guru for guidance or if the Psychic discrimination is non-existent. Without it, one might assume, just because their subliminal body has been filled with “light” and “zam-zam” water, that the materials are actually of a Divine quality and the entity performing the action either God or Her emissary. Unfortunately, it is not so simple, because just as in the terrestrial, where there are multiple forms of light and water, the electrical to the solar, the impure delta water to the pure mountain source, in the subliminal worlds there are different types of light and fluid, with the false or impure light a distinct possibility along with everything else. Indeed some types of Vital world lights are visible to the ordinary human eye (whereas the Divine Lights are only capable of being seen by the inner eye): It is only the Psychic or Suprarational discrimination or intuition that - especially in the murky Vital - is

capable of instantly recognizing the false from the pure, whether that be the Asura of Falsehood impersonating God or an angel, or the true quality of the light witnessed.

The Asura is quite capable of imitating profound mystic experiences or symbolic actions or invocations, including the descent of Divine light and water into the subliminal body, a mystic reality often concentrated upon during meditation. He can certainly assume varied voices as well – which accounts for the rare audition of Allah that Mohammed experienced during the night journey. The Vital world inhabited by the Asura is not governed by the same rigidity to form characterized by the material plane, making it more difficult to validate an experience strictly based on the objective data of what one witnesses, and one can easily be carried away by the presentation if too attached to cultural norms like the Arabian romance of “prophets” or even the ubiquitous Heaven one finds in most global religions. It is for the latter subliminal reality that a comprehensive psychological understanding of the totality of consciousness becomes a very useful tool in guarding *against*, for though the ideal of Heaven or Paradise or Swarga is not a consciousness of Falsehood, because it is *not* Divine, it can actually be used by the Asura for his aims, especially when he can traverse – taking the instrument along with him - the netherworlds that easily mimic the actual Swarga. Although this sounds contradictory, as even the Patalas seems quite pleasant places, we must remember that the basic Asuric aim is *not* to punish, even if he uses the fear of “hellfire” for his ambitions: the Asura's initial goal is to *obstruct* one from the Divine Consciousness – it is here that Paradise, which in Islam and other religions is conceptualized or experienced as a more grandiose version of earthly desires, serves his purpose, for its placement as the ultimate aspiration posits that the aggrandizement of the ego is superior to its transcendence.

And though it might appear illogical for an emanation of Falsehood and Evil to make use of something seemingly elevated as Heaven, that is only if we fashion our understanding around the Abrahamic mythology of Demons or Satan residing in hell, the most abominable of habitats, punishing others for their ‘sins’. For as the Asura only needs to obstruct or cover the Divine Truth, it is much easier for him to extol desire as the means of preventing the ascendancy into a Satchitananda liberated from desire. He may be the Lord of Falsehood, but that is only the description of his deficient psychology, not his *residence*, and he can easily present himself as living palatially in luxurious underworlds he calls “Paradise” - it is similar to how many proponents of evil in the material world, having usurped the higher purposes of money, live in the most plush of dwellings. Thus the Islamic underworld known as Paradise, with its opulence and lovely maidens, free-flowing water and sumptuous surroundings, is an easy way to direct mankind into a spiritual impasse, perhaps removed from Falsehood but far from the ego-less Divine: Indeed even in Swarga, God remains separate from the seeker, who must still work for the Ultimate Consciousness. Heaven and the underworlds may not be falsehoods in themselves, but as they confirm the transient phenomena of separation, it serves the Asuric purpose well to exaggerate their importance, just as other things – like altruism - placed on a pedestal by mortals can similarly be used by him. Gabriel's heaven, as with all of mankind's formulations of the place, is without the transcending or resolution of ego, with Islam's opposite aggrandizement of the ego specifically seen in the interaction of Moses and Mohammed during the night journey:

...The dwellers of the Heaven asked, “Who is it?” He said, “Gabriel.” They said, “Who is accompanying you?” He said, “Mohammed.” They said, “Has he been called?” He said, “Yes.” They said, “He is welcomed.” So the dwellers of the Heaven became pleased with his arrival, and they did not know what Allah would do to the Prophet on earth unless Allah informed them. The Prophet met Adam over the nearest Heaven. Gabriel said to the Prophet, “He is your father; greet him.” The Prophet greeted him and Adam returned his greeting and said, “Welcome, O my Son! O what a good son you are!” Behold, he saw two flowing rivers, while he was in the nearest sky. He asked, “What are these two rivers, O Gabriel?” Gabriel said, “These are the sources of the Nile and the Euphrates.”

Then Gabriel took him around that Heaven and behold, he saw another river at the bank of which there was a palace built of pearls and emerald. He put his hand into the river and found its mud like musk Adhfar. He asked, “What is this, O Gabriel?” Gabriel said, “This is the Kauthar which your Lord has kept for you.” ...Then he ascended with him to the fourth Heaven and they said the same; and then he ascended with him to the fifth Heaven and they said the same; and then he ascended with him to the sixth Heaven and they said the same; then he ascended with him to the seventh Heaven and they said the same. On each Heaven there were prophets whose names he had mentioned and of whom I remember Idris on the second Heaven, Aaron on the fourth Heavens another prophet whose name I don't remember, on the fifth Heaven, Abraham on the sixth Heaven, and Moses on the seventh Heaven because of his privilege of talking to Allah directly. **Moses said (to Allah), “O Lord! I thought that none would be raised up above me.”**

But Gabriel ascended with him (the Prophet) for a distance above that, the distance of which only Allah knows, till he reached the Lote Tree (beyond which none may pass) and then the Irresistible, the Lord of Honour and Majesty approached and came closer till he (Gabriel) was about two bow lengths or (even) nearer...Among the things which Allah revealed to him then, was: “Fifty prayers were enjoined on his followers in a day and a night.”

Then the Prophet descended till he met Moses, and then Moses stopped him and asked, “O Mohammed! What did your Lord enjoin upon you?” The Prophet replied, “He enjoined upon me to perform fifty prayers in a day and a night.” Moses said, “Your followers cannot do that; Go back so that your Lord may reduce it for you and for them.” So the Prophet turned to Gabriel as if he wanted to consult him about that issue. Gabriel told him of his opinion, saying, “Yes, if you wish.” So Gabriel ascended with him to the Irresistible and said while he was in his place, “O Lord, please lighten our burden as my followers cannot do that.” So Allah deducted for him ten prayers where upon he returned to Moses who stopped him again and kept on sending him back to his Lord till the enjoined prayers were reduced to only five prayers. Then Moses stopped him when the prayers had been reduced to five and said, “O Mohammed! By Allah, I tried to persuade my nation, Bani Israel to do less than this, but they could not do it and gave it up. However, your followers are weaker in body, heart, sight and hearing, so return to your Lord so that He may lighten your burden.”

The Prophet turned towards Gabriel for advice and Gabriel did not disapprove of that. So he ascended with him for the fifth time. The Prophet said, “O Lord, my followers are weak in their bodies, hearts, hearing and constitution, so lighten our burden.” On that the Irresistible said, “O Mohammed!” the Prophet replied, “Labbaik and Sadaik.” Allah said, “The Word that comes from Me does not change, so it will be as I enjoined on you in the Mother of the Book.” Allah added, “Every good deed will be rewarded as ten times so it is fifty (prayers) in the Mother of the Book (in reward) but you are to perform only five (in practice).”

The Prophet returned to Moses who asked, “What have you done?” He said, “He has lightened our burden: He has given us for every good deed a tenfold reward.” Moses said, “By Allah! I tried to make Bani Israel observe less than that, but they gave it up. So go back to your Lord that He may lighten your burden further.” Allah's Apostle said, “O Moses! By Allah, I feel shy of returning too many times to my Lord.” On that Gabriel said, “Descend in Allah's Name.” The Prophet then woke while he was in the Sacred Mosque (at Mecca). (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 93, Number 608)

Even if these multiple authentic hadith document the rare experience of Mohammed having direct audition from Allah (Mohammed denied ever seeing Allah), that in itself means nothing with regard to the psychological quality of Islam, because “Allah” – rather than the intermediary Gabriel – is merely

ordering a specific amount of prayers that fail in any way to negate or even reduce the horrific falsehood of the religion, from its hatred and obscurantism to its sanctioning of genocide and rape. The very falsehood that governs the religion and its Asuric creative force is also easily consistent with an understanding that the voice of “Allah” that Mohammed heard was the result of the Asura of Falsehood's propensity to deceive, a misdirection designed not even to bring any sort of Asuric ‘knowledge’, but simply to keep the Prophet's belief in Islam's ‘truth’ intact by permitting the instrument the delusional belief of hearing the voice of ‘God’, with the encounter confirming his superiority to even Moses (who had similarly heard Allah). Yet is the underlying falsehood of Islam's insistent ‘truth’ further exposed in that instructive dialogue between Mohammed and Moses, the naked reality of an occult experience that while beginning with apparent light and holy water, devolved into an egoistic squabble.

It is an argument that utterly discredits one of the monumental events of Islam, for we find Moses indulging in petty grievances to try and preserve his status as the greatest prophet, to the point where he deliberately attempts to reduce the amount of Mohammed's prayers in order to uphold his own status. That this presentation of Paradise came with grand flowing rivers and palaces of pearls cannot hide the rampant ego remaining, with all of its ugly competition, something the Self-Realized Yogi is liberated from. The unabashed presence of egoistic discord is also additional evidence that the region Mohammed had been taken to was simply a more fantastical portion of the Vital, rather than part of the Psychic or Overmind; it was an intermediate sort of experience, not a Divine one, but as it contained stupendous imagery and historically great figures that Mohammed was being elevated above, it only aided in worsening Mohammed's vanity and dependence on Gabriel. Similarly were other dreams – or aspects of them - important to the Asura of Falsehood's shaping of his vessel, including the use of symbols that often accompanies subliminal experiences:

The Prophet said, “I met Moses on the night of my Ascension to heaven.” The Prophet then described him saying, as I think, “He was a tall person with lank hair as if he belonged to the people of the tribe of Shanu's.” The Prophet further said, “I met Jesus.” The Prophet described him saying, “He was one of moderate height and was red-faced as if he had just come out of a bathroom. I saw Abraham whom I resembled more than any of his children did.” The Prophet further said, “(That night) I was given two cups; one full of milk and the other full of wine. I was asked to take either of them which I liked, and I took the milk and drank it. On that it was said to me, ‘You have taken the right path (religion). If you had taken the wine, your (Muslim) nation would have gone astray.’ ” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 55, Number 647)

Pseudo-symbolism like this, however, pales in comparison to the truths of the Rishi that are to be perceived allegorically – at least for those who have yet to concretely experience them - by the ordinary man, for the Islamic version only informs on mere vital constructs pertaining to the superficial Abrahamic conception of a duality. Yet were they important in appealing to Mohammed's sense that he was partaking in something enduring, that the ‘wisdom’ imparted on him was profound. Similarly, one can easily see him swayed by a dream like the following, in which he was presented, through symbols, with multiple Islamic ‘truths’:

Allah's Apostle very often used to ask his companions, “Did anyone of you see a dream?” So dreams would be narrated to him by those whom Allah wished to tell. One morning the Prophet said, “Last night two persons came to me (in a dream) and woke me up and said to me, ‘Proceed!’ I set out with them and we came across a man Lying down, and behold, another man was standing over his head, holding a big rock. Behold, he was throwing the rock at the man's head, injuring it. The rock rolled away and the thrower followed it and took it back. By the time he reached the man, his head returned to the normal state. The thrower then did the same as he had done before. I said to my two companions, ‘Subhan Allah! Who are these two persons?’

They said, ‘Proceed!’ So we proceeded and came to a man Lying flat on his back and another man standing over his head with an iron hook, and behold, he would put the hook in one side of the man's mouth and tear off that side of his face to the back (of the neck) and similarly tear his nose from front to back and his eye from front to back. Then he turned to the other side of the man's face and did just as he had done with the other side. He hardly completed this side when the other side returned to its normal state. Then he returned to it to repeat what he had done before...So we proceeded and came across something like a Tannur (a kind of baking oven...)” I think the Prophet said, “In that oven there was much noise and voices.” The Prophet added, “We looked into it and found naked men and women, and behold, a flame of fire was reaching to them from underneath, and when it reached them, they cried loudly...And so we proceeded and came across a river.” I think he said, “... red like blood.” The Prophet added, “And behold, in the river there was a man swimming, and on the bank there was a man who had collected many stones. Behold, while the other man was swimming, he went near him. The former opened his mouth and the latter (on the bank) threw a stone into his mouth whereupon he went swimming again. He returned and every time the performance was repeated...And we proceeded till we came to a man with a repulsive appearance, the most repulsive appearance, you ever saw a man having! Beside him there was a fire and he was kindling it and running around it...So we proceeded till we reached a garden of deep green dense vegetation, having all sorts of spring colours. In the midst of the garden there was a very tall man and I could hardly see his head because of his great height, and around him there were children in such a large number as I have never seen...So we proceeded till we came to a majestic huge garden...and found in it, men with one side of their bodies as handsome as the handsomest person you have ever seen, and the other side as ugly as the ugliest person you have ever seen. My two companions ordered those men to throw themselves into the river. Behold, there was a river flowing across (the city), and its water was like milk in whiteness. Those men went and threw themselves in it and then returned to us after the ugliness (of their bodies) had disappeared and they became in the best shape.” The Prophet further added, “My two companions (angels) said to me, ‘This place is the Eden Paradise, and that is your place.’ I raised up my sight, and behold, there I saw a palace like a white cloud! My two companions said to me, ‘That (palace) is your place.’ I said to them, ‘May Allah bless you both! Let me enter it.’ They replied, ‘As for now, you will not enter it, but you shall enter it (one day).’ I said to them, ‘I have seen many wonders tonight. What does all that mean which I have seen?’ They replied, ‘We will inform you: **As for the first man you came upon whose head was being injured with the rock, he is the symbol of the one who studies the Quran and then neither recites it nor acts on its orders, and sleeps, neglecting the enjoined prayers.** As for the man you came upon whose sides of mouth, nostrils and eyes were torn off from front to back, he is the symbol of the man who goes out of his house in the morning and tells so many lies that it spreads all over the world. And those naked men and women whom you saw in a construction resembling an oven, they are the adulterers and the adulteresses; and the man whom you saw swimming in the river and given a stone to swallow, is the eater of usury (Riba) and the bad looking man whom you saw near the fire kindling it and going round it, is Malik, the gatekeeper of Hell **and the tall man whom you saw in the garden, is Abraham and the children around him are those children who die with Al-Fitra (the Islamic Faith).**”...The Prophet added, “My two companions added, ‘The men you saw half handsome and half ugly were those persons who had mixed an act that was good with another that was bad, but Allah forgave them.’ ” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 87, Number 171)

Unlike the lower vital Islamic themes presented by these different ‘angels’, the Rishi's experiences and symbols (from the perspective of the ordinary human consciousness) were at a Suprarational plane of consciousness, with the narrative couched in objects of Prakriti requiring a deeper understanding

beyond the form, one that – and this is the primary difference between the Sanatana Dharma and the Abrahamic faiths – acknowledges the ultimate purpose of birth to be a Conscious Unity with God, who is the real Self. As the Seers were aware of reality from their stupendous heights, their ‘symbolism’ was of a mystic truth native or functioning in those regions (for instance, the Sun in the higher plane has a different truth to it than in the terrestrial existence), not the brutal infrarational code of Islam presented figuratively. Though the Islamic motifs are of falsehood, it does not take away from the remarkable subliminal awareness of Mohammed, who was able to travel through different parts of the Vital, mostly with Gabriel but at times without. Indeed, Mohammed on rare occasion appeared to truly live up to his status as a prophet, peering into the future to a fairly accurate degree:

Narrated Anas bin Malik:

Whenever Allah's Apostle went to Quba, he used to visit Um Haram bint Milhan who would offer him meals; and she was the wife of Ubada bin As-samit. One day he went to her house and she offered him a meal, and after that he slept, and then woke up smiling. **She (Um Haram) said, “I asked him, ‘What makes you laugh, O Allah's Apostle?’ He said, ‘Some people of my followers were displayed before me as warriors fighting for Allah's Cause and sailing over this sea, kings on thrones,’ or said, ‘like kings on thrones.’ ...I (Um Haram) said, ‘O Allah's Apostle! Invoke Allah that He may make me one of them.’”** He invoked (Allah) for her and then lay his head and slept again and then woke up smiling. **I asked, “What makes you laugh, O Allah's Apostle?” He said, “Some people of my followers were displayed before me as warriors fighting for Allah's Cause and sailing over this sea, kings on the thrones,” or said, “like kings on the thrones.”** I (Um Haram) said, “O Allah's Apostle! Invoke Allah that He may make me one of them.” He said, “You will be amongst the first ones.” It is said that Um Haram sailed over the sea at the time of Muawiya, and on coming out of the sea, she fell down from her riding animal and died. (Sahih Bukhari Volume 8, Book 74, Number 299)

Though Um Haram, and perhaps Mohammed, interpreted the dream provincially, it is one of the few dreams or visions *not* concerning the Day of Judgement that is prophetic. And as we are well aware of the spread of Islam across seas in all directions from Arabia, we might even question if the sea in Mohammed's particular dream was rather an indicator of future global conquests than just one particular area. Dreams like this – most likely during the actual vital portion of sleep – were also useful to boost his confidence, giving him signs that the Asuric jihad would emerge victorious. Gabriel did, however, have to repeatedly present either infrarational revelations or different occult experiences to his medium in order to prevent a return to his previous impulses diverting from a steadfast devotion to Islam's falsehood. For not only was Mohammed of an unstable personality, he was also, as we have seen, prone to frequent bouts of panic - this root fear of Mohammed, emerging from his obsessive nature, was both easily manipulated by the Asura and the cause of a certain amount of distortion to the character of his dreams, through a mechanism partially explained in the following hadith:

Narrated Abu Huraira:

Allah's Apostle said, “When the Day of Resurrection approaches, the dreams of a believer will hardly fail to come true, and a dream of a believer is one of forty-six parts of prophetism, and whatever belongs to prophetism can never be false.” Muhammad bin Sirin said, “But I say this.” He said, “It used to be said, ‘There are three types of dreams: **The reflection of one's thoughts and experiences one has during wakefulness, what is suggested by Satan to frighten the dreamer, or glad tidings from Allah.**’ So, if someone has a dream which he dislikes, he should not tell it to others, but get up and offer a prayer.” He added, “He (Abu Huraira) hated to see a Ghul (i.e., iron collar around his neck in a dream) and people liked to see fetters (on their feet in a dream). The fetters on the feet symbolizes one's constant and firm adherence to religion.” And Abu Abdullah said, “Ghuls (iron collars) are used only for necks.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9,

There was definitely an element of reality to the first part of this description, and for that we have no better example than Allah's Apostle himself, who was afflicted with frequent dreams of the hellfire and jinns, things that he *feared* and constantly thought about during wakefulness: therein lies the variable to the origin of some of Mohammed's dreams, for though he certainly had experiences of the subliminal vital worlds, because certain dreams are indeed reflections of the ordinary thoughts and experiences, we can surmise that a good amount of what Mohammed saw emerged from the subconscious rather than vital part of sleep. The more one continuously thinks on a subject, the more it is likely to appear in one's subconscious dreams, as repetitive thoughts and fears are closer to the physical mind which is characterized by a mechanical quality - and the physical consciousness is linearly only one grade above the subconscious mind. Thus many of his dreams on hell, Satan and other demons, will always have an unclear origin between either the true vital or the subconscious, as the mental formations of his waking state likely made their way into the subconscious.

Though the Prophet's never-ending instability forced Gabriel to appear frequently and sustain his vessel's confidence, it also served the latter's aim by reinforcing Mohammed's fear of the hellfire, the most important tenet that the Asura wants Muslims to believe in, as it is the most powerful of bondages or obstacles to the Divine Consciousness. Gabriel did not necessarily need to take Mohammed on a tour of the hellfire for him to believe in it – but the visit to the underworld ‘heavens’ helped to affirm the dichotomy, with Paradise solidified as the perfect escape from the fire and Satan, who is the source of certain dreams according to the Prophet. It is here that we observe another component of Mohammed's primitive mentality, one similar to his fear of “black magic” and also responsible for his rapid yielding to the Asura – his own suggestibility, a failing that in turn caused him to fear being turned by Satan's apparently quiet machinations. For magic and “suggestions”, omens and signs (at least the signs spoken of in Islam) are in reality of a superficial quality, and the fact Mohammed was at once so consumed by, and fearful of them again speaks to a crude nature without a stable central vital, an individual with access to the occult but void of the psychological foundation to grow from it, a slavish vessel rather than an evolving centre of consciousness. It was an anxiety that ironically, also made him guilty of Islam's definition of hypocrisy, as the believer is only supposed to fear *Allah*. Fear is an emotion that also stands in marked contrast, due to the element of obsession, with a sadhak's vigilance toward Asuric or similar hostile influences or thoughts; vigilance, as opposed to an endless fixation, is a balanced position, one reflecting the non-attachment expected of a sadhak, because the aspiration is to emerge above the duality of which apprehension is a component. Not for the sadhak then are small-minded and bizarre rituals designed to negate the supposed machinations of Satan:

Narrated Abu Qatada:

The Prophet said, “A good dream is from Allah, and a bad dream is from Satan. **So whoever has seen (in a dream) something he dislike, then he should spit without saliva, thrice on his left** and seek refuge with Allah from Satan, for it will not harm him, and Satan cannot appear in my shape.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 87, Number 124)

Instead of spitting thrice, the sadhak and ordinary mortal has only to remain calm and non-attached to the content of the “bad” dream, gently seeking to understand if there is any particular meaning to the dream but not obsessing over it, because the latter action only makes it likelier for one to remain upset and even have a recurrence of the dream. Rituals are of no real use when dealing with dreams – it is the psychology that is paramount. Standing back from a dream deemed to be “bad” also helps to bring a more rational perspective, as opposed to the simpleton duality of a good dream equalling ‘God’ and a bad dream equalling Satan. It is hardly the wisdom of the illumined that one finds from Mohammed, even after all of his subliminal experiences and his ‘angel’ guiding him. His understanding was minimal and of an infrarational quality, reflecting his master and mentality - that he was able to offer

the occasional insight was an inevitable outcome of simply encountering subliminal events and worlds hidden to most mortals. In general however, his unfamiliarity with the complexities of the occult was extraordinary, and best identified in the following hadith:

Narrated Abu Huraira:

The Prophet said, “**Name yourselves after me (by my name), but do not call yourselves by my Kuniya, and whoever sees me in a dream, he surely sees me, for Satan cannot impersonate me (appear in my figure).** And whoever intentionally ascribes something to me falsely, he will surely take his place in the (Hell) Fire.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 8, Book 73, Number 217)

This is a completely unfounded assertion, one based on a gullible individual's vanity and ignorance, for the beings of the vital worlds are more capable of assuming multiple forms than humans of the physical who, let us remember, also have the wherewithal to assume different appearances. Things are not necessarily as they seem, otherwise we might mistake the world as we know it for the highest of consciousness; likewise in the subliminal vital can conscious entities masquerade as others, including the Asura of Falsehood adopting the appearance of either God or an angel. Many mortals, like Mohammed, would not know any better, especially if they were unprepared for what they were encountering, without the Guru or Psychic discrimination, or even the occult knowledge that actual Divine emanations in the subliminal have forms with a halo of purity and without shadows, eyes that do not blink, and feet that do not touch the ground. Other than naivety, the only other rationale for his belief lies in a narcissism perhaps equating himself with Allah, rather than the humble slave he is supposed to have been – after all, one might expect that only a God-like figure could be free from Satan's impersonation.

The Asura had picked the perfect instrument, a simpleton with the rare capacity to access the occult vital worlds, yet someone so trustworthy and foolishly obedient that he assumed that this mysterious figure ordering him to tell others of their doom, commanding him to slaughter and destroy, was the angel he claimed to be. These are the perfect toys for the Lord of Falsehood, child-like and without the capacity to either *think* or intuit – they thus inevitably become extensions of him, receptacles for the most perverse of ideologies, the inversion of wisdom that these infrarational mystics absurdly believe to be “Divine Inspiration”!

Narrated Ibn Abbas:

...(Sufyan the subnarrator said: We said to Amr, “Some people say, ‘The eyes of the Prophet sleep but his heart never sleeps.’” Amr said, “**Ubai bin Umar said, ‘The dreams of the Prophets are Divine Inspirations.’**” Then he recited, ‘(O my son), I have seen in dream that I was slaughtering you (offering you in sacrifice).’ (37.102) (Sahih Bukhari Volume 1, Book 12, Number 818)

But none of his dreams or waking interactions with Gabriel were Divine; not everything experienced out of the ordinary awareness belongs to God – the Cosmic consciousness is vast and contains ranges of emanations and experiences of an even greater diversity than the already varied material plane. His dreams were not “Inspirations”, if we seek to keep the word's definition linked to experiences of the Intuitive Mind and Psychic regions, which are both superior to the ordinary mind and vital; and while he was the recipient of revelations, they were, just like his inspirations, of an infrarational quality rather than Divine. It is an analysis easily obtained through a psychological study of the communications he was bombarded with, which fashioned him into a vessel capable of spewing forth similar messages without the constant need of directives from his Asuric Possessor. In a few of these self-created announcements, we are reminded that although the Asura of Falsehood was the primary possessor of Mohammed, within the latter's weltanschauung were certain characteristics of other Asuras:

Narrated Aisha:

I asked Allah's Apostle about the plague. He said, "That was a means of torture which Allah used to send upon whom-so-ever He wished, but He made it a source of mercy for the believers, for anyone who is residing in a town in which this disease is present, and remains there and does not leave that town, but has patience and hopes for Allah's reward, and knows that nothing will befall him except what Allah has written for him, then he will get such reward as that of a martyr." (Sahih Bukhari Volume 8, Book 77, Number 616)

Though the plagues are not cardinal to the Lord of Falsehood himself, because Mohammed presented this as 'knowledge', a falsehood alleging itself to be a truth, this hadith actually supports the notion that Gabriel was the *only* hostile vital entity possessing the Prophet. After all, Mohammed was conveying the inverted 'wisdom' of Islam, that Allah *consciously* tortures those he dislikes, instead of the absolute profundity of the Yogin Consciousness in which God *is* everything, in which ignorance and falsehood are only *implicitly* sanctioned as transient phenomena, and are not the ultimate Reality of existence. If the Asura of Falsehood was Mohammed's primary master, it did not necessarily mean that the practices of other Asuras would be excluded, because their perversions, when presented as the ultimate religious 'knowledge', is certainly characteristic of the Lord of Falsehood along with being helpful to his ambitions. And if one of these ingredients, torture, is of all things actively pursued by this concocted God, then the – in relation – mixed practice of slavery will certainly find acceptance in an ideology so attached to the nadir of existence.

For if slavery is often associated with the worst of human behaviours, its basic premise of one human becoming the property of another belongs to an ignorance of samata and the inherent freedom of all living creatures; it is not exactly Asuric, because the slave-holder does not necessarily link his slave-ownership to a sign of his own egoistic superiority to God, nor does he obtain them for the overt ambition of preventing the manifestation of the Divine Consciousness. That the practice of slavery often leads to a departure from Psychic qualities is due to the old maxim of power – in this case owning humans as property – corrupting, taking the slave-holder from ignorance into falsehood and other Asuric tendencies such as torturing the slave. But that turn is related to the choice of the individual, even if the practice sets him up for the fall – there have been a few historic examples of slave-owners treating their slaves with qualities associated with the Psychic, and a few nations where reasonable structures were put in place to allow the slave to emerge out of his or her predicament into the legal status of freedom. Nevertheless, due to the extreme discrepancy of power between the two parties of slaver and slave, the practice should be – and is – avoided in civilizations seeking to create a society closer to the Truth of the Purusha, in which the reality of an inherent oneness *approximates* the external nature of society – thus if natural differences in standing between individuals emerge they do not become extreme, protecting against the rigid separation of groups seen in falsehoods like Islam or Nazism. For it is the false idea of a permanent separation, we recall, that so easily facilitates a transition to outright depravities – it therefore should come as no surprise to us to find slavery having an exalted place in Islam, including 'Divine' revelations acknowledging it as Allah's 'law', even if in one of the verses Muslims are specifically advised to be "good" to their slaves:

And serve Allah and do not associate any thing with Him and be good to the parents and to the near of kin and the orphans and the needy and the neighbour of (your) kin and the alien neighbour, and the companion in a journey and the wayfarer and **those whom your right hands possess**; surely Allah does not love him who is proud, boastful. (Quran 4:36)

Slavery was so commonplace in Mohammed's era that Allah, in his infinite 'wisdom', has forever allowed Muslim women the option of removing their veils while in the presence of slaves "whom their right hands possess":

And say to the believing women that they should lower their gaze and guard their modesty, that they should not display their beauty and ornaments except what (must ordinarily) appear thereof, that they should draw their veils over their bosoms and not display their beauty except to their husbands, their fathers, their husband's fathers, their sons, their husbands' sons, their brothers or their brothers' sons, or their sisters' sons, or their women, **or the slaves whom their right hands possess**, or male servants free of physical needs, or small children who have no sense of the shame of sex; and that they should not strike their feet in order to draw attention to their hidden ornaments. And O ye Believers! turn ye all together towards Allah, that ye may attain Bliss. (Quran 24:31)

Naturally, slaves are commanded to respect the privacy of their female master:

O you who believe! Let those **whom your right hands possess** and those of you who have not attained to puberty ask permission of you three times: before the morning prayer, and when you put off your clothes at midday in summer, and after the prayer of the nightfall; these are three times of privacy for you; neither is it a sin for you nor for them besides these, some of you must go round about (waiting) upon others. Thus does Allah make clear to you the communications, and Allah is Knowing, Wise. (Quran 24:58)

While Mohammed's Arabia was certainly not the only nation to have practised slavery, what distinguishes it from others is, as discussed, the perpetual and rigid codification of its values through the construction of the Islamic religion. Thus if in different nations or times, slavery presents initially as a primitive law that society eventually evolves out of, in Muslim countries the practice remains explicitly sanctioned for eternity, set to the laws made by the Asura yet purported to be of divine origin. And by making it into the 'last Word' and law, the Lord of Falsehood, befitting his nature, turned an aspect of ignorance into falsehood, because it is the opposite of a fluid and Illimitable Consciousness to specify an item of rigid separation as divine, even if the possibility of such an outcome is implicitly sanctioned by Her creation of a world permeated by *avidya*. Taking this depravity further, Gabriel sought to use the Islamic law of slavery as justification for another falsehood:

And Allah hath favoured some of you above others in provision. Now those who are more favoured will by no means hand over their provision to those (slaves) whom their right hands possess, so that they may be equal with them in respect thereof. Is it then the grace of Allah that they deny? And Allah hath given you wives of your own kind, and hath given you, from your wives, sons and grandsons, and hath made provision of good things for you. Is it then in vanity that they believe and in the grace of Allah that they disbelieve? And they worship beside Allah that which owneth no provision whatsoever for them from the heavens or the earth, nor have they (whom they worship) any power. (Quran 16:71-73)

The Asura's underlying argument is that if Muslims refuse to share their provisions with their slaves, then likewise why would they dare include other Gods in their prayers? Nowhere is a critique of slavery present; it is rather an acknowledgement that slavery is part of Allah's primitive law, with the Asura extending the ignorance of slavery into 'Divine' jurisprudence, and linking it to another falsehood – that of only one form of worship or God. All of this represents a rigidity far removed from the fluid Sanatana Dharma, in which diversity is paramount as each has his or her own natural internal law to discover and follow until it leads to the greatest of Realizations – this is what allows Hindus to work through societal ignorance like *hereditary* caste, for there is no 'last Word' in the religion restricting them from doing so. In Islam, the only options away from slavery belong to a few limited paths whereby a slave can be freed, including rituals in which the manumission of a slave is used to correct an error:

And (as for) those who put away their wives by likening their backs to the backs of their

mothers then would recall what they said, they should free a captive before they touch each other; to that you are admonished (to conform); and Allah is Aware of what you do. (Quran 58:03)

Such infrarational revelations fail to disabuse the fact of slavery's pristine status in Islam; indeed they do the opposite, because through the communications of multiple avenues by which slaves can be freed, the believer begins to view slavery as a perfectly normal practice, an unalterable tenet, one Allah deemed fit to regulate through his communications, including the following, in which a Muslim guilty of killing another believer by mistake may have to free a slave as punishment, or fast for two months if without a slave to offer:

And it does not behove a believer to kill a believer except by mistake, and whoever kills a believer by mistake, he should free a believing slave, and blood-money should be paid to his people unless they remit it as alms; but if he be from a tribe hostile to you and he is a believer, the freeing of a believing slave (suffices), and if he is from a tribe between whom and you there is a covenant, the blood-money should be paid to his people along with the freeing of a believing slave; but he who cannot find (a slave) should fast for two months successively: a penance from Allah, and Allah is Knowing, Wise. (Quran 4:92)

What we have here is one of the few verses explicitly confirming the harmonious union between Arab tribal law and the Asuric creed, with the barbaric customs of “blood-money” and slavery fused with the overriding falsehood of separation between believers and disbelievers; the killing of the former requiring punishment, the death of the latter leading to afterlife gains. As the Arab tribal code was unrefined, reflecting the lower vital ego, it was quite easy for Gabriel to incorporate elements of it - from its acceptance of slavery to its punishment of amputating the hand for stealing - into actual infrarational revelations, leading Muslims to believe that ‘God’ has sanctioned a savage thirst for blood and dominance. Indeed, by attaching his creed of falsehood to the ‘last Word’ of God, the Asura achieved a remarkable combined benefit of making a primitive doctrine absolute *and* providing that same set of tenets with the necessary accelerant for its rise in the world. And if the ‘Word’ of Allah, forever unchangeable, with the crime of hypocrisy and reversion into disbelief for those disobeying its strict mandates, is not enough for the Muslim to acknowledge Islam's practice of slavery, they have for specific example the Prophet Mohammed, the finest of all mortals and also an undisputed slave-holder:

O Prophet! Say unto those captives who are in your hands: “If Allah knoweth any good in your hearts He will give you better than that which hath been taken from you, and will forgive you. Lo! Allah is Forgiving, Merciful.” And if they intend to betray you, so indeed they have betrayed Allah before, but He gave (you) mastery over them. And Allah is Knowing, Wise. (Quran 8:70-71)

As the verses imply, any slave belongs to the bottom of the Islamic dichotomy – included with unbelievers and hypocrites (the historic captives in this passage). For it is only the kafir, whether the original or *munafiq* version, who can “betray” Allah and thus require his forgiveness. Thus even if there is no explicit mandate against holding fellow Muslims as slaves, one would hardly expect the believer to keep his brother in chains if he felt him to be without the scent of hypocrisy. It is only in the ample population of the ‘other’ that the Muslim is to find his slaves, a reward for following the call of Allah to jihad – indeed the Prophet was specifically told that he was only deserving of captives *if* he waged war in the land, with such wars only authorized against the non-Muslims:

It is not for any prophet to have captives unless he has fought and triumphed in the land. Ye desire the lure of this world and Allah desireth (for you) the Hereafter, and Allah is Mighty, Wise. (Quran 8:67)

Beyond the ‘divine’ sanction of waging war (some translations of this verse have it as inflicting a

“massacre”) to obtain captives – Allah's preferred method for doing so, as opposed to acquiring them from a slave market –, the verse is helpful in illuminating a crucial difference between Islam and the Sanatana Dharma regarding one of the fundamental components of human life - that of desire, which in the Hindu Dharma is something for the mortal to progressively disengage from if he wishes to liberate himself from the ego and unite with the Illimitable Consciousness:

After giving up attachment to the fruitive results, always satisfied, indifferent to external phenomena, he in spite of being engaged in activities is not the doer of work. **Bereft of desire**, controlled in mind and body, relinquishing all conceptions of proprietorship, he does not incur sinful reaction, as actions are performed only to maintain sustenance. Satisfied with whatever comes by its own accord, tolerant of dualities, devoid of envy of others, equipoised in failure and success, is not bound by his acts. For one unattached to material nature, who is liberated, whose heart is situated in transcendence, who performs all actions as a sacrifice unto the Divine, all his work is dissolved. (Bhagavad Gita 4:20-23)

This crucial principle of Indian spirituality, patiently articulated by Sri Krishna to Arjuna throughout their discourse on the battlefield of Kurukshetra, previously illumined by the Seers of the Veda and Upanishad in their different expressive forms, is one that stands opposed to the Islamic exaltation of desire in which even ‘God’ is a participant. For if in the previously cited revelation (8:67) Allah appears to be somewhat disappointed by Mohammed's desire for worldly gains, he has yet failed to instruct his prophet to free himself from its grip. Instead, Allah – a supposed deity - has only countered with his own *desire* to see Mohammed in Heaven, an astonishing falsehood when we remember that as God is *everything*, there is no need for Him to even desire Paradise, because the psychology of desire is based upon the evolving consciousness of the ego and its construction of the separative consciousness, whereby the ego longs for an ‘object’ that it, in its ignorance, believes itself permanently unique from and incapable of uniting with, even *after* obtaining the object – the explanation for why desire is never satiated for long.

If desire in its own standing is a characteristic of the Ignorance or *avidya*, Islam raises it to a falsehood by both, as mentioned, failing to explicitly ask believers to liberate themselves from *all* forms of desire, and by having a ‘Divine’ entity desire something that should be absolutely integral to his own Consciousness. For Heaven belongs to God like everything else, and Allah's “desire” for his believers to attain to Heaven, instead of consciously uniting with him, represents another falsehood, as it places a desire for an object above the transcending of human psychology, whereas the Sanatana Dharma, while acknowledging the partial reality of desire, seeks to have mortals transform themselves into the Supreme Who by nature has nothing to desire since He is above the subjective and objective of which desire emerges from. Indeed a craving for the actual heaven is to be rejected by the Hindu since Swarga is a consciousness where one is *separate* from God, with the devotee distinct in identity – it is thus of only partial benefit to the irrepressible evolution of mankind's partial awareness into the One United Consciousness.

But as Islam is a product of the Asura of Falsehood, it undoubtedly would not have the impetus to stamp out desire from its adherents, because the darker ego motions are to be intensified rather than transcended or transformed. Due to this, it better served the Asura to *encourage* Mohammed's earthly appetites while acknowledging that Allah *desired* his believers to eventually reside in the separative consciousness of Paradise - the true purpose of mentioning Allah's specific wish was to simply reinforce the fear of the hellfire of which the relative escape into Paradise prevents the believer from experiencing the most cruel of torture. While this root fear remained the most important component of Gabriel's message, it only had to serve as a slight addendum to his lack of admonition – in verse 8:67 – for the Islamic tenet of capturing slaves from the kuffar population. But this is a rarity, because in different verses and hadith, some already mentioned and others forthcoming, the allegedly ‘Divine’

right of Muslim males to make slaves of the non-Muslims is presented without any caveats, providing the Muslim with Allah's eternal and unequivocal backing to satisfy his perverse impulses, of which the capture of kuffar female slaves – historically supported by the Prophet's actions – provides an outlet:

Narrated Anas bin Malik:

Allah's Apostle offered the Fajr prayer when it was still dark, then he rode and said, "Allah Akbar! Khaibar is ruined. When we approach near to a nation, the most unfortunate is the morning of those who have been warned." The people came out into the streets saying, "Mohammed and his army." **Allah's Apostle vanquished them by force and their warriors were killed; the children and women were taken as captives. Safiya was taken by Dihya Al-Kalbi and later she belonged to Allah's Apostle who married her and her Mahr was her manumission.** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 2, Book 14, Number 68)

This hadith, whose contents were repeated numerous times by Bukhari (see also Sahih Bukhari Volume 5, Book 59, Number 512), confirms the practice of capturing female and child slaves of the non-Muslims, and brings us back again to the important example of Safiya, who was married, under obvious coercion, to the Prophet after her husband had been killed by the former's army. She was not the only example of Mohammed's practice of forced marriage after killing the woman's husband, as his marriage to Juwairiya followed the same pattern - except on this occasion it was Bani Mustaliq who were attacked, with its women and children taken as slaves after the men were killed:

Narrated Ibn Aun:

I wrote a letter to Nafi and Nafi wrote in reply to my letter that the Prophet had suddenly attacked **Bani Mustaliq without warning** while they were heedless and their cattle were being watered at the places of water. **Their fighting men were killed and their women and children were taken as captives; the Prophet got Juwairiya on that day.** Nafi said that Ibn Umar had told him the above narration and that Ibn Umar was in that army. (Sahih Bukhari Volume 3, Book 46, Number 717)

As these marriages were by nature compulsory, with the women forced into them under the extreme circumstances of witnessing the genocide of their townsmen (including their husbands), so were their conjugal relations characterized by worst of human behaviour: Rape. For it cannot be anything but rape, on this occasion women freshly converted to Islam, for a man to engage in sexual relations with a female who he has forced into marriage after killing her husband and enslaving her townfolk. Though the women might be mentally aware of the barbarian's intent, that does not negate the depravity of the act, especially when considering that they have just witnessed the man they are about to 'marry' partake in mass murder, a fact – and this confirms the coercive nature of the sexual activity – they would likely remind themselves off if they considered resisting his lascivious advances. The two women in question at least had a sliver of status and minor protection, forcibly married as they were to the warlord on the ascendancy and the Prophet of Islam, Mohammed. Though it was a convenience paltry in comparison to the ordeals they suffered, it did provide them with a modicum of control of their respective fates *relative* to the other women of the town forced into the rank of slave girl, who were subject to the whims of the Prophet's followers and had no status at all. And as non-Muslim slave girls are 'divinely' permitted, due to Islam's status as the 'last Word', to Muslim males *in all time periods*, this 'right' serves to help motivate the believer to jihad, as powerless and perhaps beautiful kuffar slave girls represent quite the bounty, the reward at times hinted at rather than overtly mentioned:

We set out along with the Prophet during the year of (the battle of) Hunain, and when we faced the enemy, the Muslims (with the exception of the Prophet and some of his companions) retreated (before the enemy). I saw one of the pagans over-powering one of the Muslims, so I struck the pagan from behind his neck causing his armour to be cut off. The pagan headed

towards me and pressed me so forcibly that I felt as if I was dying. Then death took him over and he released me. Afterwards I followed Umar and said to him, "What is wrong with the people?" He said, "It is the Order of Allah." Then the Muslims returned (to the battle after the flight) and (after overcoming the enemy) **the Prophet sat and said, "Whoever had killed an Infidel and has an evidence to this issue, will have the Salb (i.e. the belonging of the deceased e.g. clothes, arms, horse, etc.)."** I (stood up) and said, "Who will be my witness?" and then sat down. Then the Prophet repeated his question. Then the Prophet said the same (for the third time). I got up and said, "Who will be my witness?" and then sat down. The Prophet asked his former question again. So I got up. The Prophet said, "What is the matter, O Abu Qatada?" So I narrated the whole story; A man said, "Abu Qatada has spoken the truth, and the Salb of the deceased is with me, so please compensate Abu Qatada on my behalf." Abu Bakr said, "No! By Allah, it will never happen that the Prophet will leave a Lion of Allah who fights for the Sake of Allah and His Apostle and give his spoils to you." The Prophet said, "Abu Bakr has spoken the truth. Give it (the spoils) back to him (O man)!" So he gave it to me and I bought a garden in (the land of) Banu Salama with it (i.e. the spoils) and that was the first property I got after embracing Islam. (Sahih Bukhari Volume 5, Book 59, Number 610)

The Prophet's words are only a more basic confirmation of the general theme of the Asura of Falsehood, that of vital domination and the forceful usurpation of another's property, which in the mentality of tribal Arabia, one forever sanctified by Islam, includes kuffar women of whom the believers might subsequently include among their "right hand" possessions. It is not just merely an earthly entitlement of the Muslim male, but more importantly a 'Divine' mandate, with Mohammed having likened it to "Allah's Judgement":

Narrated Abu Said Al-Khudri:

Some people (i.e. the Jews of Bani bin Quraiza) agreed to accept the verdict of Sad bin Muadh so the Prophet sent for him (i.e. Sad bin Muadh). He came riding a donkey, and when he approached the Mosque, the Prophet said, "Get up for the best amongst you" or said, "Get up for your chief." Then the Prophet said, "O Sad! These people have agreed to accept your verdict." Sad said, **"I judge that their warriors should be killed and their children and women should be taken as captives."** The Prophet said, **"You have given a judgement similar to Allah's Judgement (or the King's judgement)."** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 5, Book 58, Number 148; this hadith is repeated elsewhere, including Sahih Bukhari Volume 5, Book 59, Number 447)

Mohammed had ample justification for describing the kidnapping of female and child slaves as Allah's judgement – if he had not, he would have been a hypocrite. Indeed the Prophet also had 'God's' explicit consent for the rape of these female slaves, including the aforementioned revelation that sexual activity was "lawful to you your wives whom you have given their dowries, **and those whom your right hand possesses out of those whom Allah has given to you as prisoners of war.**" (Quran 33:50) In another passage of infrarational revelations outlining "Allah's Judgement", Muslims are given strict guidelines as to whom they might fornicate with; in this communication, married women are deemed forbidden – unless they happen to be a female slave married to a kafir (the vast majority of enslaved women, of course, will at the time of capture be unbelievers, because by Islamic law the believers will not engage in battle against a group they consider as Muslim), the group for whom suffering rape has been permitted by 'God':

Forbidden to you are your mothers and your daughters and your sisters and your paternal aunts and your maternal aunts and brothers' daughters and sisters' daughters and your mothers that have suckled you and your foster-sisters and mothers of your wives and your step-daughters who are in your guardianship, (born) of your wives to whom you have gone in, but if you have

not gone in to them, there is no blame on you (in marrying them), and the wives of your sons who are of your own loins and that you should have two sisters together, except what has already passed; surely Allah is Forgiving, Merciful. **And all married women (are forbidden unto you) save those (captives) whom your right hands possess.** It is a decree of Allah for you. Lawful unto you are all beyond those mentioned, so that ye seek them with your wealth in honest wedlock, not debauchery. And those of whom ye seek content (by marrying them), give unto them their portions as a duty. And there is no sin for you in what ye do by mutual agreement after the duty (hath been done). Lo! Allah is ever Knower, Wise. **And whoever among you has not within his power ampleness of means to marry free believing women, then (he may marry) of those whom your right hands possess from among your believing maidens;** and Allah knows best your faith: you are (sprung) the one from the other, so marry them with the permission of their masters, and give them their dowries justly, they being chaste, not fornicating, nor receiving paramours; and when they are taken in marriage, then if they are guilty of indecency, they shall suffer half the punishment which is (inflicted) upon free women. This is for him among you who fears falling into evil; and that you abstain is better for you, and Allah is Forgiving, Merciful. (Quran 4:23-25)

This passage, unlike the selection presented just prior to it, promotes the idea of marriage to a slave girl (who are also considered lawful to rape before wedlock) as a correct behaviour for the Muslim, who are to wed them with honest intentions, free from debauchery. It is a theme – this apparent noblesse toward the slave girl – that one finds occasionally in the important Islamic texts, including an authentic hadith in which Mohammed is recorded as saying that a “double reward” is available to those who first educate – with the Islamic scripture – and then manumit and marry their female slave:

Narrated Abu Burda's father:

Allah's Apostle said “Three persons will have a double reward: 1. A Person from the people of the scriptures who believed in his prophet (Jesus or Moses) and then believed in the Prophet Mohammed (i.e. has embraced Islam). 2. A slave who discharges his duties to Allah and his master. 3. **A master of a woman-slave who teaches her good manners and educates her in the best possible way (the religion) and manumits her and then marries her.**” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 1, Book 3, Number 97)

Besides the comment on manumission, Allah's Apostle also provided a more direct exaltation of slavery than observed in different hadith or infrarational revelations. For to declare that a slave doing his or her “duties” to their master – including *not* resisting the sanctioned rape – as worthy of a double reward only helps to maintain this perverse hierarchy, providing justification for the slave holder to avoid manumission, because the slave will receive his or her reward in the afterlife. Assuming, that is, that the slave in question is a believer, because the slave that does not believe in Allah and the Prophet in turn has the double punishment of bondage upon earth and fire in the afterlife. It is a fate that the Muslim slave master has the ability – especially with female captives – of altering, offering an avenue for a supposedly benevolent relationship with a person he has taken by force; similar is this deception to an infrarational revelation that actually – though appearing to be a grand gesture – documents Allah's permission for the Muslim male to *pimp* his slave girls:

And (as for) those who ask for a writing (of emancipation) from among those whom your right hands possess, give them the writing **if you know any good in them**, and give them of the wealth of Allah which He has given you. **And do not compel your slave girls to prostitution, when they desire to keep chaste, in order to seek the frail good of this world's life. And whoever compels them, then surely after their compulsion Allah is Forgiving, Merciful.** (Quran 24:33)

Reading or listening to sermons describing both the primary tenets of Islam and the particular details of the Muslim male's relationship with his female captive, the Muslim is likely to arrive at the frankly delusional rationale that sickening actions taken to procure - from the massacre of their families and friends, to the terror of their kidnapping – these slave girls, and any activity – including rape – imposed upon the powerless slave girls, emerges from an admirable ‘moral’ standing on the part of the Muslim, in which the violence and anguish inflicted upon the girls is just part and parcel for their eventual conversion into the ‘light’ of Islam. It fits perfectly with the usual method of the Asura of Falsehood when seeking to construct an earthly ideology – that of either normalizing or exalting falsehood through the subversion – or inversion - of what is higher than it. In Islam's case, it is the association of ‘God’ with such dictates that helps to, at the very minimum, falsely normalize - along with glorifying it for others inclined to such despicable behaviour - one of the most deplorable of acts that a human can commit.

It is why the believer will not think twice about the practice of sexual slavery, because he already views the captives as belonging to the guilty party of disbelievers, and he knows that ‘God’ has eternally ‘revealed’ to Muslims that they should ‘enlighten’ the female slave, manumit then marry her. It is an infrarational justification that completely obscures the rational perspective on the matter, one that instantly marks any supposed benevolence to female captives as fundamentally dishonest. For if one uses mere logic, we find in the Asuric revelation acknowledging the Islamic practice of pimping to overlook the completely unequal relationship between the master and slave girl - because though it appears merciful to not compel the slave girl into prostitution, we must remember that they are *slaves*, and thus have no real ability to object. Thus even if the slave girl desires chastity, she will likely *not* reject either her master's sexual advances or his request for her to prostitute, as she has no actual power behind her words. The slave girls are coerced by the fact of their bondage and the inequality in their relationship with their captor, even if the Muslim master does not verbalize a threat – for the danger is always underlying, and fear will drive her to acquiesce to prostitution.

Similarly, while the Asura of Falsehood has ordained – in the previous verse 24:33 - the slave master to provide a written decree emancipating the slave who desires freedom, he added the caveat that the believer must see “good” in the slave, something that leads to all sorts of distorted Islamic interpretations – for instance, if a slave refuses to convert to Islam the captive can be considered lacking in “good” qualities. This chasm of power – with the slave owner completely in control - is the inherent problem to slavery and is why sex between master and slave can never be voluntary, because a female – or male, for that matter - captive has minimal choice. For if she chooses to resist, she faces the likelihood of a beating from her master – an act also sanctioned by Allah the “Merciful”:

Men are in charge of women, because Allah hath made the one of them to excel the other, and because they spend of their property (for the support of women). **So good women are the obedient, guarding in secret that which Allah hath guarded. As for those from whom ye fear rebellion, admonish them and banish them to beds apart, and scourge them.** Then if they obey you, seek not a way against them. Lo! Allah is ever High, Exalted, Great. (Quran 4:34)

That this infrarational revelation applies even to the wives of Muslims makes the female slave more wary of disobeying the desires – lust or prostituting or otherwise – of her master, because Allah has allowed the Muslim male to beat the wife and the slave if they rebel – including a rejection of his sexual demands - against him. Even if the idea is to eventually marry the slave, there is no ‘Divine’ reprimand for raping the slave before the union occurs, for Islam *does not even conceive of it as rape*, and her submission can be obtained through physical torture. Thus the female slave may decide to not put up a fight and avoid a beating or perhaps a more sadistic type of rape – one can hardly blame her for doing so considering the paucity of options she has while captive, especially when the Islamic

religion equates being “good” – the pathway to manumission – with obedience. And though the Asura of Falsehood provided the veneer of nobility to it by exalting those who married their slaves, he did not do this out of the goodness of his heart, but for more utilitarian purposes, including the previously cited verse relating the potential lack of money for dowry payment, and the possible inability of certain Muslim males to handle marriage to multiple ‘free’ Muslim women:

And if you fear that you cannot act equitably towards orphans, then marry such women as seem good to you, two and three and four; **but if you fear that you will not do justice (between them), then (marry) only one or what your right hands possess; this is more proper, that you may not deviate from the right course.** (Quran 4:03)

While this verse provides further evidence of Gabriel's desire to see captured kuffar girls married off to their Muslim masters, it does not illumine us on the primary reason for the Asura's apparent noblesse – that of the need for expansion. For we must recall a previously cited infrarational revelation ordaining that the believing male cannot marry an infidel female – thus when a female captive marries her master she must have already converted, and any children out of the union automatically become Muslim. Though this was a consideration most acute during the time of the Prophet, when Muslim numbers were extremely small, it still remains a useful tactic to help increase Islamic numbers globally, attempting to bring to fruition the ultimate objective of global conquest. And though one might think, since the ordinary Muslim is limited to four wives, that the ‘revealed’ desire of Allah to have his followers eventually marry the kuffar captives might lead to a restriction in the amount of sex slaves they might procure, this idea neglects to consider the ‘divinely’ sanctioned and remarkably easy ability for a Muslim male to divorce one of his wives:

Divorce must be pronounced twice and then (a woman) must be retained in honour or released in kindness. And it is not lawful for you that ye take from women aught of that which ye have given them; except (in the case) when both fear that they may not be able to keep within the limits (imposed by) Allah. And if ye fear that they may not be able to keep the limits of Allah, in that case it is no sin for either of them if the woman ransom herself. These are the limits (imposed by) Allah. Transgress them not. For whoso transgresseth Allah's limits: such are wrong-doers. **And if he hath divorced her (the third time), then she is not lawful unto him** thereafter until she hath wedded another husband. Then if he (the other husband) divorce her it is no sin for both of them that they come together again if they consider that they are able to observe the limits of Allah. These are the limits of Allah. He manifesteth them for people who have knowledge. (Quran 2:229-230)

All the Muslim male has to do is pronounce “talaq” thrice in order to obtain a full separation from the subsequently ex-wife. Even after this, she – now a Muslim if having previously been a kafir sex slave – can become lawful to him sexually, as long as she remarries and then divorces again. Due to his easy ability to marry and obtain a quick divorce, *and* his infrarationally revealed right to four wives at a time, the Muslim male is granted extraordinary license to indulge his sexual desires, because after he tires of one of his wives, he can divorce her and marry a girl beholden to him from among his captives (who he can also rape prior to the marriage, if he wishes). And if he subsequently tires of the new wife, he can continue in the same vein, as long as he never transgresses the four wife limit set by the Asura of Falsehood. It can easily be self-justified as ‘honest’ wedlock as opposed to debauchery, and the believer at any rate is unlikely to be worried that this might hurt his chances at Paradise, especially when he remembers that a conversion of the slave girl to Islam prior to the marriage brings a *double reward* for him.

Islamic world domination, after all, supersedes the personal desires and debauchery of the Muslim, and as the previously disbelieving woman in question has now been coerced – a female slave is simply without a choice when it comes to the question of marriage to her captor – into both Islam and

wedlock, any divorce is of minimal concern to the Asura, because the main purpose of the infrarational revelations allowing marriage to the slave girl – Muslim demographic expansion - has been accomplished. This is because once the girl has become Muslim, it becomes a crime punishable by death for her to leave the Islamic religion and return to her ancestral faith. And as a previously held captive is likely to be somewhat relieved to have at least escaped from bondage, and as most humans in general are prone to fear (including indoctrinated beliefs of hellfire for apostasy), the Lord of Falsehood and his followers are more than likely to have obtained a small victory, an outcome emerging out of the most brutal of human behaviour – results above all other considerations is, let us recall, is quintessential to Gabriel's character.

The highlighting of this pathway to marriage is perhaps the only way for the believer to camouflage the codification of rape into his religion, with the Muslim either fully believing or consciously adopting the delusion that sex with a slave can be consensual and justified if one plans on bringing the girl into the flock through a marriage that she likewise, per the Islamic definition, provides ‘consent’ toward. As this is a dissimulation far more difficult to convince the Infidel of than the relatively easier concoctions of “Islam means peace” and “Islam respects other religions”, it is rarely used, and the clever believer will simply ignore or deny the existence of Islam's rape culture, or seek to dissimulate it away – but only if confronted by the kafir - by claiming it to be a remnant of a distant era, when he knows that all authentic Islamic scripture stand the test of time and any choosing between Asuric revelations leads to apostasy and either the death penalty in the life or hellfire afterwards. And if the fact that sham marriages on occasion emerge out of sexual slavery is not enough to convince the non-Muslim of the ‘truth’ and ‘beneficence’ of sexual slavery, it was certainly the barest of ‘evidence’ required for the Prophet to indulge in raping captured women, of whom a couple (Safiya and Juwairiya) he later married. And as the Hadith unquestionably indicate in the example of Safiya, he had absolute power over whether or not the captured kafir female was to be married – her fate was his decision alone:

Narrated Anas:

The Prophet stayed for three rights between Khaibar and Medina and was married to Safiya. I invited the Muslim to his marriage banquet and there was neither meat nor bread in that banquet but the Prophet ordered Bilal to spread the leather mats on which dates, dried yogurt and butter were put. The Muslims said amongst themselves, **“Will she (i.e. Safiya) be one of the mothers of the believers, (i.e. one of the wives of the Prophet) or just (a lady captive) of what his right-hand possesses?”** Some of them said, **“If the Prophet makes her** observe the veil, then she will be one of the mothers of the believers (i.e. one of the Prophet's wives), and if he does not make her observe the veil, then she will be his lady slave.” So when he departed, he made a place for her behind him and made her observe the veil. (Sahih Bukhari Volume 5, Book 59, Number 524)

The night of his choice between making her his right hand possession or his wife is well-documented in the Hadith (see also Sahih Bukhari Volume 7, Book 62, Number 89), and provides just one of multiple recordings – including the following – in which we find Mohammed confirmed as an owner of female slaves for his perverse sexual pleasure:

Narrated Ali:

Fatima went to the Prophet complaining about the bad effect of the stone hand-mill on her hand. **She heard that the Prophet had received a few slave girls.** But (when she came there) she did not find him, so she mentioned her problem to Aisha. When the Prophet came, Aisha informed him about that. Ali added, “So the Prophet came to us when we had gone to bed. We wanted to get up (on his arrival) but he said, ‘Stay where you are.’” Then he came and sat between me and her and I felt the coldness of his feet on my abdomen. He said, “Shall I direct you to

something better than what you have requested? When you go to bed say ‘Subhan Allah’ thirty-three times, ‘Alhamdulillah’ thirty three times, and Allahu Akbar thirty four times, for that is better for you than a servant.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 7, Book 64, Number 274)

In a different hadith, Aisha provides confirmation that Mohammed obeyed the dictates of Gabriel, “touching” only his female slaves:

Narrated Aisha:

The Prophet used to take the Pledge of allegiance from the women by words only after reciting this Holy Verse: “...that they will not associate anything in worship with Allah.” (60.12) **And the hand of Allah's Apostle did not touch any woman's hand except the hand of that woman his right hand possessed.** (i.e. his captives or his lady slaves) (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 89, Number 321)

Naturally, the slave girls presented Mohammed with a ‘divinely’ sanctioned outlet for his carnal desires, one that helped him (and helps modern Muslims as well), more so than the use of divorce, easily circumvent the possibility that sexual activity would be left to his wives alone. Muslims, like their Prophet, also have the following verse to help justify their rape of non-Muslim sex slaves:

It is not allowed to you to take women afterwards, nor that you should change them for other wives, though their beauty be pleasing to you, **except what your right hand possesses**, and Allah is Watchful over all things. (Quran 33:52)

While this verse authorizes a minor restraint upon the Muslim male's desire to exchange wives, it only does so in the realm of lust and beauty, with other reasons for divorce not mentioned here – thus the Muslim can use other non-aesthetic rationales to divorce a wife and then obtain a fresh new one. And as can be deduced from the Asuric revelation, there is no reason for the Muslim male to use lust as a reason for divorce, when he is explicitly allowed the exception of an unlimited amount of non-Muslim slave girls to rape! For this they have Mohammed as the ultimate example, who though legally permitted more wives than the four adjudicated to ordinary Muslims, was still unable to satisfy his sexual appetite, and subsequently required the frequent acquisition of slave girls to try and keep pace with his monstrous desires. He understood– as do modern Muslims - that he could *religiously* indulge without consequence, for slave girls have *not* been included by Allah among the women that the believer must practice chastity with:

Successful indeed are the believers Who are humble in their prayers, And who shun vain conversation, And who are payers of the poor-due, **And who guard their private parts - Save from their wives or the (slaves) that their right hands possess, for then they are not blameworthy.** (Quran 23:01-06)

In a similar communication, the same tenet is repeated, with the additional warning that those going beyond the already massive pool of potential sex slaves are transgressors in danger of Allah's punishment:

And those who preserve their chastity, **Except in the case of their wives or those whom their right hands possess** - for these surely are not to be blamed, But whoso seeketh more than that, those are they who are transgressors. (Quran 70:29-31)

While this might appear to place some amount of restraint upon the rape options for the Muslim when considering kuffar females, we must remember that as there are no specifics – other than warfare – mentioned in the infrarational revelations with regards to the acquisition of slaves, and as jihad is to be waged in *all* times unless under an official and temporary truce, the question of seeking “more than that” can *only* be related to the believing women. For the Muslim male can kidnap a kafir female and

rape her, holding her hostage for repeated rapes in the Asuric 'knowledge' that he is legally (Islam's law) 'justified' in doing so. He would not be seeking "more than that", because there is no 'lawful' limit to the quantity of sex slaves that his right hand might possess; his only limit is the extent of his evil intentions, the voracity of his predatory impulses, and the severity of the response he might face – which could well go beyond his own death, with reprisals extending to many of his Muslim companions, especially those ideologically encouraging or actively partaking in the kidnapping of non-Muslim women – from the kuffar.

Though the identity of those raped is in the vast majority going to belong to the unbeliever group, Gabriel did *not* specifically declare Muslim women (those already converted or born as Muslim prior to a violent meeting with an Islamic kidnapper) as a whole forbidden from rape, even if it is slightly less likely, on the surface of things, for them to be molested. But that is only if the supply of non-Muslim sexual slaves remains intact; for if a paucity of obviously sanctified rape victims emerges, this scarcity, along with the incessant reminder of the Muslim "right" to an unlimited amount of slave girls, could easily lead some to seek girls *within* their community for captivity, justifying their actions through the classification of such women as hypocrites - women who pretend to follow, or only partially follow, Islam. And as it is often difficult for individuals to perfectly adhere to a set of rules that might not suit their nature, there will always exist a significant amount of women in Islamic societies vulnerable to *taqfir*, the accusation of apostasy. If supply constraints are only a complication in exclusively "Muslim" nations, it is not a problem for Muslims who are either a minority or marginally in the majority of a nation. For them, the captivity and rape of non-Muslim women is primarily justified by the numerous infrarational revelations, secondarily in the Hadith recording Mohammed's practice of sexual slavery and forced marriage. In the Hadith we also find, beyond the Prophet's actions, different records of the Islamic doctrine of raping unbelievers, with Mohammed's son-in-law Ali also confirmed as partaking:

Narrated Buraida:

The Prophet sent Ali to Khalid to bring the Khumus (of the booty) and I hated Ali, and Ali had taken a bath **(after a sexual act with a slave-girl from the Khumus)**. I said to Khalid, "Don't you see this (i.e. Ali)?" When we reached the Prophet I mentioned that to him. He said, "O Buraida! Do you hate Ali?" I said, "Yes." **He said, "Do you hate him, for he deserves more than that from the Khumus."** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 5, Book 59, Number 637)

If more support is needed for the Muslim to engage in remorseless rape of their female non-Muslim captives, they can look again to the words of the Prophet, who only sought to advise his followers on the particulars of the rape rather than abstaining from the heinous act itself:

Narrated Abu Said Al-Khudri:

that while he was sitting with Allah's Apostle he said, "O Allah's Apostle! We get female captives as our share of booty, and we are interested in their prices, what is your opinion about coitus interruptus?" The Prophet said, "Do you really do that? It is better for you not to do it. No soul that which Allah has destined to exist, but will surely come into existence." (Sahih Bukhari Volume 3, Book 34, Number 432)

It that is not clear enough, another authentic hadith relates the same statement, with the additional detail that the captives were obtained after Banu Al-Mustaliq (where Juwairiya was captured), a time period in which the believers were unable to maintain their celibacy, desiring to break it - through the rape of their captured slaves:

Narrated Ibn Muhairiz:

I entered the Mosque and saw Abu Said Al-Khudri and sat beside him and asked him about Al-Azl (i.e. coitus interruptus). Abu Said said, "We went out with Allah's Apostle for the Ghazwa

of Banu Al-Mustaliq and **we received captives from among the Arab captives and we desired women and celibacy became hard on us and we loved to do coitus interruptus**. So when we intended to do coitus interruptus, we said, 'How can we do coitus interruptus before asking Allah's Apostle who is present among us?' We asked (him) about it and he said, 'It is better for you not to do so, for if any soul (till the Day of Resurrection) is predestined to exist, it will exist.' ” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 5, Book 59, Number 459)

Though the Prophet is here, and in multiple other recordings of this conversation (Sahih Bukhari Volume 3, Book 46, Number 718; Sahih Bukhari Volume 8, Book 77, Number 600; Sahih Bukhari Volume 7, Book 62, Number 137; Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 93, Number 506), disapproving of the practice of coitus interruptus – ejaculating outside of the vagina to try and prevent a pregnancy – he is not criticizing the actual rape of the captives. Nor should he have, because 'God' has apparently blessed their rape, and who was Mohammed to argue with the 'last Word' of Allah? Indeed if he sought to curtail his own behaviour and those of his men, he would have been technically guilty of apostasy and punishable by death for straying from the infrarational revelations sanctioning rape! Thus his only demand that they seek to leave the possibility of pregnancy to fate, one made out of his understanding that the children born from the rape would belong to the Islamic religion. And if the rape and conversion of kuffar slave girls, and the delivering of their subsequently Muslim babies, is a barbaric method for increasing the flock, it is only considered brutal by the apparently unenlightened Infidel, those Asurically revealed to be unable to understand the 'truth' of Islam.

While the Asura, desiring results over any considerations of truth, morality, ethics, kindness, equality or honour, had no regret in granting his instrument the license to rape and forcibly procreate, and though his vessel and ensuing Muslims certainly have a more crude and perverse enjoyment – rather than simply increasing the global Islamic population – in mind when raping kuffar girls and women, this does not necessarily indicate that Gabriel himself, though the foremost champion of Falsehood, is entirely preoccupied with carnal desires or even the sadistic quality of rape. For if rape is certainly an action far removed from God, since the Asura of Falsehood stands specifically in opposition to the Divine Aspect of Knowledge-Truth, what he does is take an aspect of the Ignorance and create an ideology that *intellectually* justifies it; for the Asura is a mentalized vital emanation, not of the *strictly* lower vital from which might emerge a primitive *impulse* to rape. Thus anytime one sees the rationalizing of rape on display, we find either – and this is likely for most – the Asuric principles invading the general atmosphere (an example includes those engaging in subtle comments that can be interpreted as victim-blaming) or in the rarest of occasions, a more direct and occult possession – unlike the latter case, the former often includes those who may have never previously thought to rape.

However, as the Asura of Falsehood is the still the ruler of earth, even after acknowledging the propensity of man toward his lower ego, it remains very unlikely for him to take as a direct vessel an individual primarily concerned with either normal sexual activity or its degradation into rape, because the Asura has a much more outrageous ambition – usurping God. That this most absurd of propositions will always end in failure – hence the profound declaration by the Seers of *Satyamevajayate* – is irrelevant to the him, because his mentality is based on the falsehood he is also the source of, and thus he convinces himself otherwise, with all eventual defeats at most only providing him a temporary reminder of his status. And as he gets to instigate all sorts of chaos prior to the defeat of his – at the time – chosen party, he at least obtains a perverse enjoyment, free from the consequences of those he has coldly used, for as he does not have a Psychic, there is no shame or remorse for him to experience. That is instead for the mortals who succumb to his call, as the emotions – even the humiliation and embarrassment after a defeat – are necessary for the growth of their own Psychic.

The Asura of Falsehood need not even be annoyed for too long after a defeat, because as man is prone to the lower ego, Gabriel can begin – if he has not already started - to work upon another set of

individuals or nation or group, trying to get them to capitulate to his influence or direct contact. And when he, as he must, begins to target an individual for occult utilization, he often has to have the potential vessel adopt – at least temporarily - a perspective far removed from rape or consensual lasciviousness, a daily practice in which the most austere of sexual discipline is practised. Or, if he has not previously influenced the possible instrument, he – as in the example of the Prophet - takes possession of an individual who was initially seeking God. For Mohammed was not, at least in his own mind, attempting to become an Asuric instrument when he began his intense worship in the Cave of Hira. At the same time, neither was he preoccupied with sexual activity, especially in comparison to his later crimes and aberrations – prior to Gabriel, Mohammed was, from all accounts, married faithfully to a woman much older than him.

It was from this stability that he was able to engage in his mystic pursuit, as the seeking of any sort of experience in the subliminal planes requires a vessel whose consciousness is more likely to be stilled. The occultist or mystic must be able to calm the mind enough for the consciousness to move inward from the ordinary mental and vital whirl – from there subliminal experiences of an infinite variety can occur. Sexual activity can hinder the necessary equilibrium needed to move away from the mental and vital patterns, for as it belongs to the lowest of the Vital it by default brings about an externalization of the consciousness into the whirl of which the practice of meditation and intense bhakta are supposed to do the opposite. Thus the seeker will attempt to gain control over the sexual impulses that pull the central consciousness back into the ordinary vital grooves instead of allowing it to be released into the vast subliminal. And one of the classic methods for mastery of the sexual and other impulses is through, as it is called in India, *tapasya*, a technique partially depicted by the Prophet on an occasion when he was discussing anger:

Narrated Abu Huraira:

Allah's Apostle said, "The strong is not the one who overcomes the people by his strength, but the strong is the one who controls himself while in anger." (Sahih Bukhari Volume 8, Book 73, Number 135)

But *tapasya* is not just the matter of controlling the external manifestation of the internal emotion, because anger controlled outwardly but not inwardly, while helpful in preventing negative outward consequences, leaves the individual susceptible to a loss of control and removed from the stillness required for entry into subliminal realizations. As one might then surmise, *tapasya* involves the internal control of passion and thought, one requiring, as befitting its root Sanskrit definition, a burning intensity to vanquish unbalancing – for the seeker – patterns such as lust or rage (among many). By internally controlling the universal forces entering one's mind – intense bhakta on say, Allah, is a potential method – the seeker makes it more likely for his or her awareness to enter the murky subliminal planes. Though this *tapasya* has been, and will continue to be, of great use for the seeker of Self-Realization, it is only a means to that end: Indeed some Yogis advocate the technique of psychological disengagement (from thoughts and energy associated with lust, rage, ambition, pride and other movements of the limited ego) rather than a strict *tapasya*, because the latter, while leading to a rejection of the ego movements, sometimes does not permanently change the psychology, since the dismissal of such thoughts and energy occurs through an intensive concentration that requires vigilance and repetition, whereas a psychological disengagement, because it does not call for severe austerities, is less prone to the recoil of the lower vital that often occurs when a *tapasya* wanes.

Nevertheless, a *tapasya* is often necessary at some point in time on the spiritual journey, and there is certainly room for both *tapasya* and psychological disengagement in the pursuit of the Purusha. The former, much more so than the latter, is yet also a potential mechanism for the aggrandizement of the egoistic movements – but only *after* these same movements have been suppressed (through the *tapasya*) for a certain amount of time, during which certain subliminal powers can be accessed for that

augmentation, or if the individual becomes possessed by a vital emanation who then personally facilitates the ego intensification. While Mohammed's example is one of possession by an entity of the Vital world, other cases involve the former, including the infamous tapasya of the Rakshasa Ravana, who after a long and arduous penance was granted extra-normal powers. In Ravana we find an excellent study of the difference between tapasya and psychological disengagement from the ego, for Ravana had none of the latter, and when, after earning the hearing of Brahma through his extraordinary sacrifice and granted a boon from God, chose *egoistic* material, vital and occult power instead of the Conscious Union with the Divine.

Precisely because of his lack of psychological disengagement from vital desires, Ravana, while certainly practising countless austerities during his period of tapasya, had not, prior to obtaining his wishes from Brahma, truly changed his nature, and thus the previously suppressed vital urges re-emerged soon after, *worse than ever*. It is a pattern we find in Mohammed's timeline, with the primary difference that the latter was possessed by the Asura of Falsehood working behind the veil, whereas Ravana obtained stupendous, but non-Divine, personal power to use within the life. Nevertheless, the rhythm of severe vital suppression – *without* concurrent transformation of the psychology – then recoil into worsening and more extreme indulgence is present in the record of Mohammed, who had enough control of his thoughts and energies – including the sex impulse – during the period of his intense early worship to not let his endeavour be curtailed by a lapse into the ordinary grooves. When he subsequently became under the control of the Asura, his brief period of internal concentration and self-control was replaced by the external (to Mohammed's central ego) regulation of his new master, who *initially* did not acquiesce to any over-indulgence of the usual vital pleasures by his instrument.

This was because Gabriel needed his vessel to remain focused on obtaining power before any debauchery, as the latter can be detrimental to the goal of conquest which the Asura frequently uses to bring to fruition his primary objective of spreading an ideology – whether that be Islam, Nazism or something else – of Falsehood that restricts humanity to its current limited scope. Only later, when the dominance of Islam – at least in Arabia – was increasingly assured, was Mohammed provided with ‘Divine’ sanction to rape and wildly indulge his lust. As this pattern illustrates, the type of tapasya required from Mohammed or any potential vessel of the Asura need only be *temporary*, for though an initial entry into the subliminal often – except for those rare births who are naturally privy to it – requires a concerted effort, once the particular opening is obtained by the individual, it increasingly becomes easier for that person to gain subsequent entry, *even if* their discipline slackens. Thus Mohammed could still receive infrarational revelations from the Asura even as he indulged in the most perverse of sexual impulses and violent aggression, because maintaining a basic opening into the occult does not require the consistent discipline that one must have when ascending to the Purusha or Atman.

For though the Asura is a force much greater than the ordinary mortal, he – and all other hostile vital entities of darkness – cannot compare to the Puissance. Due to this, the sadhak wishing to unite with the Divine Consciousness must seek a comprehensive purification of his own nature, as unlike the possession by an Asura, Unity with God is a *transcending* and then – in the utmost Unity - a Divine *transformation* of the ego, not an intensification of its ordinary patterns. As part of this rising above the ordinary egoistic patterns, the seeker is offering control of his mental, vital and physical patterns to a Power infinitely Supreme to him or herself and the mental, vital and physical worlds below the Golden Lid. And as Brahma, unlike the Asura, has no inherent relation to the ordinary egoistic nature, He requires for a perfect vessel – one whose consciousness He Unites with – a profoundly stable ego, free from fluctuations that occur with ego indulgence, as such vicissitudes ruin the process of the Divine takeover due to, metaphorically, the difficulty of the Higher Power landing upon a broken runway. Further expounding on this metaphor, while in the material world the airplane landing on the corrupted runway is dangerous to the plane, in the seeking of moksha it is the *runway*, the human receptacle, that

is in danger from the Force descending if the mortal is not stable enough, because the interaction of the Infinite Puissance with an unrefined ego can lead to all sorts of problems including outright madness.

The Asura of Falsehood, however, does not require such exhaustive purification of its instrument, as it only needs a *relatively* minor avenue from the subliminal to the outward consciousness for contact, since it is not trying to unite with or take over the actual material of the individual but rather control it intellectually. Of course, there does have to be a certain amount of work done by the individual to create that opening before the Asura can take possession, but it pales in comparison to the comprehensive work required for the Divine Realization and Transformation of the ego. Once that opening is secure, as with the Prophet, the Asura only needs to – especially with indiscriminating vessels like Mohammed – both make sure the instrument maintains the basic pathway to his new master, and also teach his tool how to correctly receive the Asuric instructions. The need of the latter is why Gabriel, as already cited, forcibly directed Mohammed to close his lips and still his mouth when receiving the ‘last Word’, as failing to do so represented a lack of sheer physical control and could have possibly distorted the message or the Prophet's memory of it. The discipline of his physical movements, was the last portion of the – relative in comparison to the Yogin – overall repose the Asura required of Mohammed, beginning with – at the time of the first contact – the regulation of his mind and vital.

But the disciplining of the body is of less importance than the control of the mind and vital - especially the vital mind where the desires are reinforced – of which the sex impulse is a key component. The suppression of the sexual impulses was something Mohammed had at the beginning of his contact with the Asura, but completely lacked by the time he consolidated power in the Arabian peninsula, with the aforementioned vital recoil and Asuric sanction of his perverse behaviour the most important, though not total, precipitants of his actions. For the opening that he created into the subliminal not only placed him under the direct command of the Asura, but also, as mentioned, left him vulnerable to other monstrous entities of less power than the Lord of Falsehood. But the cosmic vital world where all sorts of beings - good or bad, mixed, agents divine and non-divine, helpful and hurtful - reside, also contains within different forms of energies that are not necessarily governed by conscious entities. Such unconscious forces can take the form of an abnormal sexual energy, one seen in Mohammed during and after his rise to power, in which a voracious lust developed in him, one extending beyond the cited rape of captives:

Narrated Muhammad bin Al-Muntathir:

on the authority of his father that he had asked Aisha (about the Hadith of Ibn Umar). She said, “May Allah be Merciful to Abu Abdur-Rahman. I used to put scent on Allah's Apostle and **he used to go round his wives**, and in the morning he assumed the Ihram, and the fragrance of scent was still coming out from his body.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 1, Book 5, Number 267)

Anas bin Malik is recorded mentioning the same exorbitant sexual energy, recalling that “the Prophet used to visit all his wives in one night and he had nine wives at that time.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 1, Book 5, Number 282) He is also recorded elsewhere in the Hadith as saying, “The Prophet used to pass by (have sexual relation with) all his wives in one night, and at that time he had nine wives.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 7, Book 62, Number 142) Another authentic hadith again documents Al-Muntathir's statement, with the obvious yet important detail that going “round” his wives meant having conjugal relations with them:

Narrated Muhammad bin Al-Muntathir: on the authority of his father that he had asked Aisha about the saying of Ibn Umar (i.e. he did not like to be a Muhrim while the smell of scent was still coming from his body). Aisha said, “I scented Allah's Apostle and he went round (had sexual intercourse with) all his wives, and in the morning he was Muhrim (after taking a bath).” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 1, Book 5, Number 270)

Another authentic hadith informs us of the same sexual addiction, but only recalls the Prophet indulging his lust with eight of his wives:

Narrated Ata:

We presented ourselves along with Ibn Abbas at the funeral procession of Maimuna at a place called Sarif. Ibn Abbas said, "This is the wife of the Prophet so when you lift her bier, do not Jerk it or shake it much, but walk smoothly because the Prophet had nine wives and he used to observe the night turns with eight of them, and for one of them there was no night turn." (Sahih Bukhari Volume 7, Book 62, Number 5)

In another, more perceptive recollection, Anas Bin Malik notes the same abnormal sexual energy, likening the Prophet's sexual habits to that of thirty men:

Narrated Qatada:

Anas bin Malik said, "**The Prophet used to visit all his wives in a round, during the day and night and they were eleven in number.**" I asked Anas, "**Had the Prophet the strength for it?**" Anas replied, "**We used to say that the Prophet was given the strength of thirty (men).**" And Sa'id said on the authority of Qatada that Anas had told him about nine wives only (not eleven). (Sahih Bukhari Volume 1, Book 5, Number 268)

Indeed, the capacity for sexual activity with approximately ten partners, in the same brief time, one repeated on a near daily basis, is not the indulgence of a normal individual, or even that of one perhaps described as having a 'high' sexual energy. To have such inordinate sexual desire, one must have lost the balance characterizing the typical sexual activity in which one partakes, perhaps daily, yet is not overwhelmed by the need to engage to anywhere close to a dozen sessions a day, for the ordinary routine of the body and lower vital is normally too exhausted after a couple of daily coital relations to resume activity – it requires the regenerative power of sleep to proceed again the next day. It is when a cosmic energy *not native* to the individual unit takes over, that the human in question becomes *used* for excessive sexual pleasure. Thus Mohammed, similar to how the Asura possessed him in the vital mind, was in his lower vital captured by an abnormal energy of which he had no control – any restraint on his activities could only *possibly* arrive from the directive of Gabriel who had intellectual command of Mohammed through fear. The Lord of Falsehood however, naturally offered religious sanction to his depravities, informing Mohammed that his women – whether wife or slave – were to be the obedient and passive fields for his rape and abnormal lust:

Your women are a tilth for you (to cultivate) so go to your tilth as ye will, and send (good deeds) before you for your souls, and fear Allah, and know that ye will (one day) meet Him. Give glad tidings to believers, (O Mohammed). (Quran 2:223)

As the presence of even a typical amount of sexual activity is not the sign of a Self-Realized individual, the fact of his aberrant perversions and lust is merely one indicator that Mohammed's realizations were far different to those of the Yogin. And though one might be excused for thinking that the Prophet's 'divinely' sanctioned excesses, from his rape of slaves and the capture of 'wives' after massacring their towns, to his nearly unquenchable amount of nightly sexual relations with his wives, would be enough, we cannot fully review Mohammed's sexual predilections without discussing his unique relationship with one wife in particular: Aisha. For if one looks on aghast at the brutality of Mohammed's rape of adult unbelievers and his subsequent lack of remorse, his actions toward Aisha represent a different type of depravity, even more appalling than his usual pattern of perversion. This is because his marriage to Aisha, somewhat similar to that of Safiya and Juwairiya, was also a sham, with the unique distinction that Aisha belonged to the believers and was, unlike the other two, a child bride:

Narrated Hisham's father:

Khadija died three years before the Prophet departed to Medina. He stayed there for two years or so and then **he married Aisha when she was a girl of six years of age, and he consumed that marriage when she was nine years old.** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 5, Book 58, Number 236)

Aisha's marriage to him at the age of 6, and her subsequent loss of virginity to him only a short while later, was confirmed by her as well:

Narrated Aisha:

that the Prophet married her when she was six years old and he consummated his marriage when she was nine years old. Hisham said: "I have been informed that Aisha remained with the Prophet for nine years (i.e. till his death)." (Sahih Bukhari Volume 7, Book 62, Number 65)

Ursa also confirms the marriage and Aisha's age when Mohammed "consummated" it, along with its length of time – cut short by the Prophet's death:

The Prophet wrote the (marriage contract) with Aisha while she was six years old and consummated his marriage with her while she was nine years old and she remained with him for nine years (i.e. till his death). (Sahih Bukhari Volume 7, Book 62, Number 88)

The Hadith record Aisha as providing the same time line, indicating that she was just a teenager at the time of his death, having lived with him for 9 years by that point:

Narrated Aisha:

that the Prophet married her when she was six years old and he consummated his marriage when she was nine years old, and then she remained with him for nine years (i.e., till his death). (Sahih Bukhari Volume 7, Book 62, Number 64)

Authentic hadith also attest that Mohammed's age at the time of his death was 63:

Narrated Aisha: The Prophet died when he was sixty three years old. (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 56, Number 736)

Thus we have, from Islam's historical record, documentation of a 54 year old Mohammed sexually "consummating" his marriage to a 9 year old Aisha, or as would be a more accurate depiction of a 54 year old's sexual contact with a prepubescent child - raping her. For it cannot be anything but rape when the matter of sexual activity occurs between an adult and child, as long as we are operating under the basic premise that sexual relations should involve a mental understanding of the act between both parties, with that assent requiring a certain level of mental development and understanding that is not seen in children. It is a natural deficiency that explains why evolving societies have sought to abolish the sexual contact between adults and children, as children do not have enough awareness of sexual matters, are *not* by nature sexual beings at that age (this begins to happen during adolescence), and are incapable of functioning on their own – hence the need for parents. If this awareness that children are not able to make a conscious decision on whether to have sexual relations with those old enough to be their parent or grandparent is obvious to many, Islam teaches otherwise, with the Prophet's pronouncements on the matter turning the rape of children from its root source as a depraved perversion of the lower vital into even *worse* - an Asuric falsehood, with the believers provided intellectual support for raping prepubescent girls:

Narrated Abu Huraira:

The Prophet said, "A matron should not be given in marriage except after consulting her; **and a virgin should not be given in marriage except after her permission.**" The people asked, "O

Allah's Apostle! How can we know her permission?" He said, "Her silence (indicates her permission)." (Sahih Bukhari Volume 7, Book 62, Number 67)

It is the most primitive of justifications, that a small child only needs to remain silent to provide "permission" for her marriage and subsequent rape by a male many years her senior. And if there were any doubt that the "consent" mentioned applied to prepubescent virgins, we need only peruse the authentic hadith narrated by Aisha, who noted in one, "I said, 'O Allah's Apostle! A virgin feels shy.' He said, 'Her consent is (expressed by) her silence.'" (Sahih Bukhari Volume 7, Book 62, Number 68) In another, the Prophet agreed that the female should be asked for consent, but if silence was the response, then that was enough to ascertain permission!

Narrated Aisha:

I asked the Prophet, "O Allah's Apostle! Should the women be asked for their consent to their marriage?" He said, "Yes." I said, "A virgin, if asked, feels shy and keeps quiet." He said, "**Her silence means her consent.**" (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 85, Number 79)

This, of course, is an outrageous form of Asuric intellectualization, because the silence of anyone, let alone a child bride, is not the same as an outright affirmation provided without duress. For instance, even an unbelieving virgin of adult age captured by a Muslim male may be too afraid to speak out against his wish to convert and marry her, because the relationship was inaugurated by violence and the woman in question is likely afraid of what the Muslim, having already used force to get to this point, might do if she rejects his demand. A prepubescent girl might likewise be in fear of a powerful adult male asking for marriage, and might be too *nervous* to express her reservations, assuming she even understands the violations that will take place after the marriage is contracted. And though Mohammed's message was specifically in relation to a young girl's consent to marriage, because the rape of a child is already sanctified through the Prophet's example, the Islamic tenet of silence equalling permission could easily be applied to a prepubescent girl's lack of verbalized consent to sexual relations, a likely scenario for one forced into marriage or sexual slavery at such an early age. The girl, not fully understanding what is about to happen, is unable to offer a permission based on choice, and is also equally as likely to not say anything due to an overwhelming fear related to the intensity of the situation and her decided lack of power compared to her potentially senile husband or captor. The Islamic predator will ignore such considerations, just as his Prophet ignored obvious signs that girls of that age cannot genuinely make a decision on such matters:

Narrated Aisha:

I used to play with the dolls in the presence of the Prophet, and my girl friends also used to play with me. **When Allah's Apostle used to enter (my dwelling place) they used to hide themselves, but the Prophet would call them to join and play with me.** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 8, Book 73, Number 151)

Putting aside for a moment the abnormal nature of their relationship, with Aisha – as a child should – playing with dolls yet married to a man old enough to be her grandfather, the previous hadith is a great example of a typical reaction a child has for a strange adult male – avoidance and nervousness. As silence is often a product of a child's fear, it can never be considered as equal to her permission, especially with regards to marrying an adult and the ensuing rape. Islam's verification of such 'logic' only further confirms its particular Asuric origin, for only an ideology of Falsehood seeks to endorse the most perverse and ignorant of mortal actions, one in which the marriage and subsequent forced sexual violations of a child - who admitted, in the following hadith, to a complete unawareness that she was about to leave her own household – by a very old man, are both considered normal:

Narrated Aisha:

The Prophet engaged me when I was a girl of six (years). We went to Medina and stayed at the home of Bani-al-Harith bin Khazraj. Then I got ill and my hair fell down. **Later on my hair grew (again) and my mother, Um Ruman, came to me while I was playing in a swing with some of my girl friends.** She called me, and I went to her, not knowing what she wanted to do to me. She caught me by the hand and made me stand at the door of the house. I was breathless then, and when my breathing became alright, she took some water and rubbed my face and head with it. Then she took me into the house. There in the house I saw some Ansari women who said, “Best wishes and Allah's Blessing and a good luck.” Then she entrusted me to them and they prepared me (for the marriage). **Unexpectedly Allah's Apostle came to me in the forenoon and my mother handed me over to him, and at that time I was a girl of nine years of age.** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 5, Book 58, Number 234)

While the seizure of Aisha from her appropriate setting of dolls and swings was both a crime and a tragedy – removing a little girl from her natural environment and destroying her progression for the mere satisfaction of an old man's wanton lust is at the very least a sad event -, an additional detail to her sham marriage and heinous rape further accentuates Mohammed's depravity, highlighting a mindset so intoxicated with Asuric power that even the consideration of friendship with a *Muslim* companion went discarded in the face of an uncontrollable lust. For Aisha was, along with being Mohammed's most favourite bride of all, the young daughter of Abu Bakr, the Prophet's most trusted of comrades. It was due to the latter relationship, but *not* the fact of his daughter's age, that Abu Bakr expressed misgivings over the proposed marriage:

Narrated Ursa:

The Prophet asked **Abu Bakr for Aisha's hand in marriage. Abu Bakr said, “But I am your brother.” The Prophet said, “You are my brother in Allah's religion and His Book, but she (Aisha) is lawful for me to marry.”** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 7, Book 62, Number 18)

Mohammed knew that Abu Bakr could not seriously object to the disturbing union, as even though it is very unnatural for someone to propose marriage to his friend's little child, Abu Bakr was powerless in opposition to the ‘Word’ of Allah legalizing it, and the terrestrial presence of the Apostle, whatever the inklings of his Psychic telling him that the marriage was wrong. Thus any Muslim can likewise seek to marry the young daughter of his friend, for Allah has not forbidden either the age of the bride or that particular parental source. And they might perhaps, as the Prophet did, present a dream as further support for the proposal:

Narrated Aisha:

Allah's Apostle said (to me), “You were shown to me in a dream. An angel brought you to me, wrapped in a piece of silken cloth, and said to me, ‘This is your wife.’ I removed the piece of cloth from your face, and there you were. I said to myself. ‘If it is from Allah, then it will surely be.’ ” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 7, Book 62, Number 57)

In the Prophet's case, it is quite likely that he indeed had such a dream, albeit only with its origin – vital or subconscious – coming into question, for though the Prophet had multiple dreams in which ‘angels’ came to visit and guide him, he also had frequent contact with Aisha through his friendship with her father, and his aberrant desire for her could easily have developed as a perversion in the waking consciousness then transmitting itself into his subconscious material, later to emerge in the form of a dream he foolishly mistook for ‘Divine’ guidance or prophecy. That he understood this dream as - if not an infrarational revelation – an indicator of Allah's sanction, displays once more the fundamental problem with Mohammed – his lack of discrimination or even rational thinking. For though occult figures need to be judged by the discriminatory powers of the seeker or the light of the Guru, ordinary dreams are extremely unlikely to be a life-altering ‘prophecy’ or ‘truth’. And as a sadhak aspires to

overcome lust, the true seeker of the Divine approaches any sort of sexual dream with equanimity, refusing to take it as an impetus for indulging one's desire.

But Mohammed was not in pursuit of Conscious Union with the Supreme, raised as he was in an Arab world heavily influenced by both the Abrahamic faiths and the type of Polytheists who, while certainly more accepting of diversity in worship, did not have the widespread cultural tradition or ideal of a Unity of Consciousness with God (that was left, in those cultures, to the secret mysteries that by the time of the Prophet were mostly without influence over the general population). And as Mohammed's actual 'spiritual guide' is the shadow of God and Truth, even the most degenerate of sexual crimes were potentially available for explicit 'divine' sanction, as long as it did not hinder the instrument's utility in subjugating and murdering the kuffar. Having judged accordingly, the Asura of Falsehood, like he did for the rape of captives, did indeed offer an infrarational revelation to Mohammed affirming the Muslim male's legal 'right' of betrothal to a girl yet to begin menstruating:

And (as for) those of your women who have despaired of menstruation, if you have a doubt, their prescribed time shall be three months, **and of those too who have not had their courses**; and (as for) the pregnant women, their prescribed time is that they lay down their burden; and whoever is careful of (his duty to) Allah He will make easy for him his affair. (Quran 65:004)

This period of waiting prior to marriage, the *iddat*, is confirmed in an authentic hadith as three months for prepubescent females:

Narrated Sahl bin Sad:

While we were sitting in the company of the Prophet a woman came to him and presented herself (for marriage) to him. The Prophet looked at her, lowering his eyes and raising them, but did not give a reply. One of his companions said, "Marry her to me O Allah's Apostle!" The Prophet asked (him), "Have you got anything?" He said, "I have got nothing." The Prophet said, "Not even an iron ring?" He said, "Not even an iron ring, but I will tear my garment into two halves and give her one half and keep the other half." The Prophet; said, "No. Do you know some of the Quran (by heart)?" He said, "Yes." **The Prophet said, "Go, I have agreed to marry her to you with what you know of the Qur'an (as her Mahr)." 'And for those who have no courses (i.e. they are still immature).' (65.4) And the Iddat for the girl before puberty is three months (in the above Verse).** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 7, Book 62, Number 63)

Though the infrarational communication (65:4) is in that surah pertaining to divorce and the *iddat* for women after their divorce, it nevertheless sanctions the marriage and subsequent rape of very young girls, with prepubescent girls almost casually included among the list of potential *divorcees* – thus if Islam considers them old enough to be married off and sexually violated, divorce becomes irrelevant in comparison, whether or not their marriage has even lasted to the ripe old age of puberty. With this verse and the greatest man of history, Mohammed, as support, the Muslim male cannot be questioned – at least among his community or in predominantly Islamic lands – when seeking to indulge an obscene lust for prepubescent girls. This Asuric endorsement of a grotesque practice, combined with the declaration that no Quran verse can be altered or *ignored*, is what separates the Islamic 'religion' from the rest of religions and nations and even the vast majority of ideologies, because though the rapes and sexual abuse of children certainly exist as a gruesome reality in all nations, it crucially does not arrive in the latter with the type of eternal, 'divine' justification provided by Islam.

It is this lack of a 'divine' mandate that allows for non-Islamic societies to progress above such barbarism, as long as they have the will for it, because there is no final 'Word' of 'God' obstructing them from doing so. Islam encourages an opposite regression, as anything attached to the 'last Word', including the heinous rape of children, carries an inevitable added weight and importance, for Allah did

not comment upon every single human issue yet chose to offer sanction for child rape. Thus the Prophet had no second thoughts – nor should the modern believer – about marrying and then raping a child. In lieu of this he was, unsurprisingly, unconcerned with his child bride's handling of his soiled clothing, with Aisha recollecting, “I used to wash the semen off the clothes of the Prophet and even then I used to notice one or more spots on them.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 1, Book 4, Number 233) In a different hadith, she reports, “I used to wash the traces of Janaba (semen) from the clothes of the Prophet and he used to go for prayers while traces of water were still on it (water spots were still visible).” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 1, Book 4, Number 229) Post-rape, Aisha reported that “The Prophet and I used to take a bath from a single pot of water after Janaba.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 1, Book 5, Number 263) It was just one of many sexual rituals that the Prophet had, with Aisha also noting another one along with bathing after ejaculation:

The Prophet and I used to take a bath from a single pot while we were Junub. During the menses, he used to order me to put on an Izar (dress worn below the waist) and used to fondle me. While in Itikaf, he used to bring his head near me and I would wash it while I used to be in my periods (menses). (Sahih Bukhari Volume 1, Book 6, Number 298)

The need for bathing after sexual intercourse is a ritual explicitly ordered by Allah's Apostle, according to Abu Huraira:

The Prophet said, “When a man sits in between the four parts of a woman and did the sexual intercourse with her, bath becomes compulsory.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 1, Book 5, Number 290)

Indeed such is this ritual's importance to the religion that a record of Mohammed's specific steps was obtained and placed in the Hadith:

Narrated Maimuna:

(the wife of the Prophet) Allah's Apostle performed ablution like that for the prayer but did not wash his feet. He washed off the discharge from his private parts and then poured water over his body. He withdrew his feet from that place (the place where he took the bath) and then washed them. And that was his way of taking the bath of Janaba. (Sahih Bukhari Volume 1, Book 5, Number 249)

While the process of this supposed purification is given an exalted position in Islam through its association with the Prophet and frequent mention, from the perspective of real purification and sexual activity in general, it is of absolutely insignificant positive value – indeed by emphasizing this ‘purification’, sexual matters are paradoxically given undue scope. For the sex impulse, including any discharge, is in actuality neutral in character, especially for the ordinary mortal who is not seeking Conscious Union with God. What is of fundamental importance is the psychological nature – between both parties - of the sexual act, with rape the type of crime that one might naturally expect a religion to censure. In Islam however, the content of the sexual indulgence, including the rape of children and kuffar captives, is irrelevant as long as the absolution ritual takes place afterwards. It is in reality a lower vital sort of ‘purification’, one more concerned with the repetitive pattern of indulgence followed by robotic ritualistic performance, instead of the transformation of the action or psychology behind the act. As it only propagates a cycle, the Islamic rituals, like the majority of similar patterns whether agnostic or religious, do nothing for spiritual growth, something that can only emerge out of a psychological purification that combines a change in outward behaviour (for instance, an elimination of deviant sexual acts) with the clearing of associated thoughts and impulses. The Islamic method of absolution does nothing to transform, with its machine-like nature often heightening the importance of the sex impulse on a subconscious level. Similarly does the potential requirement of fasting subsequent to waking up in the state of Janaba, which one might take as an appropriate ritualistic response after

reading the Hadith, further exaggerate the importance of sex within the religion:

Narrated Abu Bakr bin Abdur-Rahman:

My father and I went to Aisha and she said, "I testify that Allah's Apostle at times used to get up in the morning in a state of Janaba from sexual intercourse, not from a wet dream and then he would fast that day." Then he went to Um Salama and she also narrated a similar thing. (Sahih Bukhari Volume 3, Book 31, Number 153)

Fasting, let us recall, is a practice used in numerous religions to signify something important, and though the seminal discharge is considered 'impure' (but only due to its uncleanness, instead of an impurity in relation to the rapes sanctioned) by Islam, by providing multiple rituals for 'purification' afterwards, Islam only succeeds in keeping the consciousness concentrated upon the matters of the lower vital, ironically magnifying the importance of ejaculation. But that is the inevitable outcome of a religion confusing the base ego and lower vital for the Divine, because mental obsessions present to the superficial vital mind, a region also characterised by a propensity for strict obedience to external rules, whether from the 'Divine' or created by humans. Because of this exaggeration of the lower vital and its associated mental patterns, rules related to ejaculation are far from the only ones the believers are to heed, with the female menstrual cycle also finding a prominent position:

...Abdullah bin Umar told him that he had divorced his wife while she was in her menses so Umar informed Allah's Apostle of that. Allah's Apostle became very angry at that and said, "Ibn Umar must return her to his house and keep her as his wife till she becomes clean and then menstruates and becomes clean again, whereupon, if he wishes to divorce her, he may do so while she is still clean and before having any sexual relations with her, for that is the legally prescribed period for divorce as Allah has ordered." (Sahih Bukhari Volume 6, Book 60, Number 431)

The obsession with menses (this hadith additionally helping to confirm the previously cited verses on *iddat*) and its cleanliness again indicates the particular emphasis of the religion, with the material uncleanness of the monthly female discharge considered almost sinful, whereas the horrific psychological impetus behind rape is completely ignored. Likewise were the abnormal sexual patterns of the Prophet not even recognized as aberrant, with Aisha on the one hand noting the ritualistic element to Mohammed's wanton fondling during menses, yet astonishingly claiming he had the sexual impulse under "control":

Narrated Abdur-Rahman bin Al-Aswad:

(on the authority of his father) Aisha said: "Whenever Allah's Apostle wanted to fondle anyone of us during her periods (menses), he used to order her to put on an Izar and start fondling her." Aisha added, "None of you could control his sexual desires as the Prophet could." (Sahih Bukhari Volume 1, Book 6, Number 299)

Of course, to Aisha's rudimentary mind, the placement of the Izar prior to the fondling of his girls and women was enough "control" for her. But that is in reality a minor detail - like closing the blinds or removing one's trousers prior to coitus - that has no relation to genuine control, which at the very least must involve some restraint on the outward sexual action, not the peripheral minutiae surrounding it. Better yet is the internal control, with either the active dismissal of sexual desires or the disengagement from them paramount. With the techniques involved in the latter type of control, one is more likely to move away from sexual preoccupation or the other obsessions of the superficial vital mind, instead of partaking in their excessive indulgence. The Prophet, unfortunately, took the path of least resistance, impressing his mindset upon his companions, who in their recollections note an inordinate amount of time spent remembering the details of his bodily discharges and ordinary daytime habits - his

preoccupations becoming theirs. Likewise does his sexual deviancy impart itself upon his modern followers, whether by example or through his direct advice:

The Prophet said, “Where are you going?” I Said, “I have married a widow.” He said, “Why have you not married a virgin to fondle with each other?” I said, “My father died and left daughters, so I decided to marry a widow (an experienced woman) (to look after them).” He said, “Well done.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 3, Book 38, Number 504)

Though the narrator Jabir bin Abdullah married the widow, the Prophet's words only serve to reinforce the practice of marrying young girls for perverse sexual enjoyment, with the primary justification ultimately obtained from the exalted infrarational revelations. In a similar fashion, other statements of Allah's Apostle help to ingrain the ideology of the Asura of Falsehood, including the “right” of the Muslim male to his wife's genitals:

Narrated Uqba:

The Prophet said: **“The stipulations most entitled to be abided by are those with which you are given the right to enjoy the (women's) private parts (i.e. the stipulations of the marriage contract).”** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 7, Book 62, Number 81)

It is, as one would expect, a rule inspired by the Quran, from which we already know Allah to have told the believers that their wives are tilth to be cultivated. Women, including the believing wives (whether forcibly converted or not), are through these declarations relegated to the status of a sexual object, confirming the ‘Word’ of the only deity Allah, who without reservation assigned half of his creation the duty of submitting to the select ruling class of Muslim males, who as we know are allowed to beat and whip their women if the latter “rebel” against their wishes, including the sexual urges. Though the degradation of women is mostly unconditional, the Prophet did, in a small divergence from the Asuric revelation confirming the ‘Divine’ option of beating one's women, make the slight distinction between physically attacking one's wife versus one's sex slave - at the same time injecting another ritualistic element to the partaking in conjugal relations post-assault of one's wife:

The Prophet said, “None of you should flog his wife as he flogs a slave and then have sexual intercourse with her in the last part of the day.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 7, Book 62, Number 132)

The believer might thus lightly “flog” his wife, at least to the extent of decreasing her resistance to his sexual demands – by altering his flogging intensity, he can still be allowed to indulge the sex impulse instead of having to wait until the next day. And if she refuses, it remains his “right”, after all, to rape her – the marriage, through such stipulations, serving strictly as a legal contract rather than a psychological union between man and woman, with the terms entirely favourable to the Muslim male. Nevertheless, even with this ‘Divine’ sanction to coerce the sexual activity out of her through force, common sense often prevails, with the male choosing to restrain himself or, through his God-given “right” to sexually violate multiple slaves, find an outlet with a female of even lower standing. Though the wife might avail herself from a beating under such *relatively* benign circumstances, she will yet face another form of punishment for causing her husband so much distress:

Narrated Abu Huraira:

Allah's Apostle said, “If a husband calls his wife to his bed (i.e. to have sexual relation) and she refuses and causes him to sleep in anger, the angels will curse her till morning.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 54, Number 460)

This Islamic attempt at an aphorism is very important to observe, as it accurately depicts the primitive psychological foundation of the religion, one of desire and spite, without consideration for the needs of

the other – including the person refusing to acquiesce to the pious Muslim's lower vital demands. For the religion is in reality the most extreme of ego aggrandizements, near perfectly reflecting its maker, the Asura of Falsehood who has no Psychic and thus no effective connection to others - a fact that, when combined with his distinct opposition to the Truth-Consciousness, leaves him callously indifferent to the basic needs or suffering or opinions of others, especially if they are in the way of the chaos he or his instruments desire. While the Asura is not concerned with the sex impulse specifically, he will at times – so that they continue to obey him - require his instruments to have access to the lower vital pleasures: Thus his consent to the outrageous declaration of his slave-prophet that the angels will curse females for not allowing their husband to conjugate with them, a statement unbefitting a purported agent of God.

An actual angel or similar subliminal emanation linked to an immortal deity - whether at the level of the Overmind Gods or the Psychic - will not resort to the spiteful cursing native to the primitive lower vital, where bitterness and jealousy lead to vindictiveness when desires are rejected or fail to materialize. Ishvara is above such inconsequential desires, as He is *Everything* and thus simply cannot experience vital unfulfilment: no agent of his will consent to the cursing of another for a conscious choice regarding an act that should be a mutual decision. But as we know Islam's true origin, we begin to comprehend the Asura of Falsehood's, or 'Allah's', adjudications on the female gender. For this, we return again to the cardinal Asuric value of separation, emerging out of a consciousness that believes itself distinct from God and even greater than the Supreme. As it does not believe in the Divine principle of samata, the terrestrial place is one to be divided into permanently superior and inferior individuals and groups reflecting the Asura's own delusion that he is eternally separate from, and greater than, God and all other entities.

Thus does the female gender become an easy target for the Asura to exercise his machinations upon the material plane, capitalizing on an elementary facet of Prakriti providing certain physical advantages to males over females. From these basic tendencies, including the responsibility of childbirth – and the likely concurrent decrease in the female's external power due to child-rearing demands -, males in most societies are usually better placed than their female companions. It is via these objective elements that the Asura of Falsehood can go about his chicanery, mostly through influencing the pervading atmosphere and appealing to the lower vital vanity of males, telling them that as they are physically bigger and stronger, as they have more power, then women are naturally inferior and should be subservient. Though such a mentality does not necessarily lead to rape or physical abuse of females, even its casual acceptance poses the risk of a slackening attitude by society to the crimes in question – exactly what the Asura wants, for this lack of vigilance promotes the rigid separation of consciousness that forms the basis of his power.

The prevalence of misogyny in most nations is thus the subtle atmosphere being permeated by the Asuric ideology, not to the extent of causing the majority of males to proceed with violence and rape, but enough to where such criminality is often difficult to eliminate in advanced nations with laws decidedly against these crimes. Even a nation like India, the rare land where the Goddess is worshipped, continues to have problems with misogyny and crimes against women, for though it possesses a fine ancient heritage, all mortals are at least susceptible to the general Asuric influence (rather than possession) of which misogyny emerges. Unsurprisingly for a nation that, until the most recent time period, was in decline, we find that its ancient past did indeed have a better placement for the female gender, if not economically and politically, then at least in the more important spiritual sphere, in which we find historic Rishikas, female Seers and Self-Conscious. But as India continued in its gradual fall, the view of the female pursuit of such activities became coloured in the separative character, and the practice became (until recently) predominantly male – if the spiritual pursuit was so affected, it was inevitable for gender restrictions to percolate into India's ordinary life.

And during its decline, like with any other nation or civilization finding itself in that portion of the nation-cycle, India's populace became predisposed to the lower rajasic or even the tamasic inertia, helping to explain its temporary defeats to outside powers and the increasing, if often casual, misogyny. For the lower vital, if it doesn't fall into outright passivity, is prone to the Asuric idea of 'strength', which the Lord of Falsehood mistakes for the imposition upon those 'weaker' than oneself, of whom women represent a readily available target for the ordinary male who might be physically stronger. Again, this is not the same as an Asuric possession, which is extremely rare; nevertheless, it – his influence on the group thought - is the usual means by which the Asura of Falsehood exerts his power. In the case of the male attacking the female, the Asuric aspect is via the rationalization process used by the male to justify his actions. Of course, not all attacks on females can be considered Asuric, for the ideological element is not always at play and the crime may simply be occurring out of a Pishachic or Rakshasic impulse or overwhelming primitive energy.

As India continues to work herself out of its relatively recent baggage, residual outbreaks of the primitive lower tendencies will continue to emerge, but as long as her leaders and public maintain their concentration and will to progress, such eruptions can serve – by the resultant pressure – to create a society increasingly based upon the Truth, sattvic and vigilant to the base perturbations from which the lower vital crimes spring forth. For the Hindus are not beholden to rigid external laws governing their existence, and there is no 'divine' approval for misogyny: indeed the Knowledge is God as both feminine and masculine, and yet beyond both – thus for the male to assert a supposed inherent dominance over the female based upon earthly parameters is a classic example of at least the Ignorance. Scriptural and revelatory fluidity – or the lack thereof - remains the most crucial of differences, the one we return to time and again, between the followers of Islam and those of the Sanatana Dharma – the final infrarational revelations versus an Eternal and fluid Consciousness. The latter has neither the sanction for misogyny nor any declaration that one particular scripture (or to be precise, the shastra) or time period represents the *sole* guidance. Thus progression is assured for Hindu society in matters such as dignity of women, *but only if* the aspiration for it remains. Islam, unfortunately, will never be able to progress from its rampant misogyny, as the authorization for rape and violence towards women is provided by the 'one true god', who declared his 'last' and only 'Word' the unalterable and mandatory rules for mankind to follow. Similarly did his instrument, the "exemplar" or greatest idol for all mortals, make numerous declarations expressing his hatred for women; of course, his view of the gender was heavily shaped by his contact with the Asura of Falsehood, who went to the extent of fashioning a vision of hellfire most certain to confirm base misogynistic tendencies:

Narrated Usama:

The Prophet said, "I stood at the gate of Paradise and saw that the majority of the people who entered it were the poor, while the wealthy were stopped at the gate (for the accounts). But the companions of the Fire were ordered to be taken to the Fire. **Then I stood at the gate of the Fire and saw that the majority of those who entered it were women.**" (Sahih Bukhari Volume 7, Book 62, Number 124)

As with the unbelievers, the 'wisdom' that women are worthy of the eternal and painful chastisement helps to strengthen a belief in their inherent and invariable inferiority – in this case, a group who genuinely recite that Allah is the only god and Mohammed is the final prophet. If that, the fundamental basis of belief according to Islam, is not enough for the female gender to obtain relief in Paradise, then women must by their very nature be defective and unworthy of equality. 'Learning' that the majority of Satan's afterlife companions are of the female gender, the Muslim will only naturally begin to view them with contempt, taking further criticism of them by the Prophet as definitive:

Narrated Ibn Abbas:

The Prophet said: “I was shown the Hell-fire and that the majority of its dwellers were women who were ungrateful.” It was asked, “Do they disbelieve in Allah?” (or are they ungrateful to Allah?) He replied, “They are ungrateful to their husbands and are ungrateful for the favours and the good (charitable deeds) done to them. If you have always been good (benevolent) to one of them and then she sees something in you (not of her liking), she will say, ‘I have never received any good from you.’” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 1, Book 2, Number 28)

These are hardly the comments of someone supposedly in contact with the sole deity, as we would expect such an individual to be above the simplistic denunciations described, as not only are they far from - implied in the hadith – a justification for the hellfire, but also equally as applicable to the husbands who are ungrateful to their wives and casually divorce and replace them. Yet did the Prophet provide more pearls of Islamic ‘wisdom’ demeaning women, including his warning that “After me I have not left any affliction more harmful to men than women.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 7, Book 62, Number 33) Abdullah bin Umar recalled the Prophet relegating them to a perilous augury, with Allah's Apostle having said, “Evil omen is in the women, the house and the horse.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 7, Book 62, Number 30) In an even worse description of women, the Prophet left no hope that they might ever be anything other than an eternally damned swath of humanity:

Narrated Abu Huraira:

Allah's Apostle said, “The woman is like a rib; if you try to straighten her, she will break. So if you want to get benefit from her, do so while she still has some crookedness.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 7, Book 62, Number 113)

With the greatest man to have ever existed, the one placed on a pedestal with Allah, declaring half of the planet to be incapable of change, the Muslim male's contempt for women can only be - slightly – surpassed by his ingrained scorn toward the disbeliever. For the kuffar females, a double hatred emerges, helping to further justify their capture and rape. By depicting women in this manner, the impetus to control them is further strengthened, because if they are incapable of ‘straightening’, they must remain under the control of the patriarchy that already has the ‘Word’ of Allah to support its actions. This is a division that deviates from the truth of samata, in which all of creation has an inherent unity, in which all beings with a Psychic are capable of making the external progress so emphasized by ordinary mortals. The Prophet, as a result of his subservience to the Asura of Falsehood, did not believe in the possibility of evolution, and created individual edicts to reflect his diminutive consciousness:

Narrated Abu Huraira:

Allah's Apostle forbade (1) the meeting of the caravan (of goods) on the way, (2) and that a residing person buys for a Bedouin, (3) **and that a woman stipulates the divorce of the wife of the would-be husband**, (4) and that a man tries to cause the cancellation of a bargain concluded by another. (Sahih Bukhari Volume 3, Book 50, Number 887)

That a Muslim female cannot expressly demand a divorce is only an extension of the Prophet's opinion on their capacity for legal matters, which in Islam must naturally be based upon the legislator's understanding of the Islamic religion and the presumed mental ability of the individual. In both departments, women are found wanting according to Mohammed:

Narrated Abu Said Al-Khudri:

Once Allah's Apostle went out to the Musalla (to offer the prayer) of Id-al-Adha or Al-Fitr prayer. Then he passed by the women and said, “O women! Give alms, as I have seen that the majority of the dwellers of Hell-fire were you (women).” They asked, “Why is it so, O Allah's Apostle?” He replied, “You curse frequently and are ungrateful to your husbands. **I have not seen anyone more deficient in intelligence and religion than you.** A cautious sensible man

could be led astray by some of you.” **The women asked, “O Allah's Apostle! What is deficient in our intelligence and religion?” He said, “Is not the evidence of two women equal to the witness of one man?” They replied in the affirmative. He said, “This is the deficiency in her intelligence. Isn't it true that a woman can neither pray nor fast during her menses?” The women replied in the affirmative. He said, “This is the deficiency in her religion.”** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 1, Book 6, Number 301)

The infrarational constitution of the religion is completely on display here, with no real evidence provided as to why a female's intelligence is half that of a males; or, regarding her religion, faulty ‘proof’ that her menses leads to a deficiency. After all, the ruling that she cannot pray or fast during menses is an arbitrary one, and confuses the ordinary biology with religious matters when the two can easily be taken as distinct. There is only one ‘logical’ basis for an ideology like Islam, and it belongs to the dictates of the most powerful individual or figure, with the masses not needing to think or formulate their own laws based upon societal experience. Thus the ‘Word’ of Allah is all that is needed to understand the intelligence of *all* women, especially when Allah has decreed eternal laws specific to them, including their testimony in contractual matters as equal to half that of males:

O you who believe! When you deal with each other in contracting a debt for a fixed time, then write it down; and let a scribe write it down between you with fairness; and the scribe should not refuse to write as Allah has taught him, so he should write; and let him who owes the debt dictate, and he should be careful of (his duty to) Allah, his Lord, and not diminish anything from it; but if he who owes the debt is unsound in understanding, or weak, or (if) he is not able to dictate himself, let his guardian dictate with fairness; and call in to witness from among your men two witnesses; **but if there are not two men, then one man and two women from among those whom you choose to be witnesses**, so that if one of the two errs, the second of the two may remind the other; and the witnesses should not refuse when they are summoned; and be not averse to writing it (whether it is) small or large, with the time of its falling due; this is more equitable in the sight of Allah and assures greater accuracy in testimony, and the nearest (way) that you may not entertain doubts (afterwards), except when it is ready merchandise which you give and take among yourselves from hand to hand, then there is no blame on you in not writing it down; and have witnesses when you barter with one another, and let no harm be done to the scribe or to the witness; and if you do (it) then surely it will be a transgression in you, and be careful of (your duty) to Allah, Allah teaches you, and Allah knows all things. (Quran 2:282)

In a different and more specific crime, in which the evidence required involves the calling of witnesses, justice for the female gender is again prevented through the disproportionate importance granted to the male opinion. Here we are referring to Islamic jurisprudence on the matter of rape, something that cannot exist when considering sexual contact between the Muslim male and non-Muslim female, yet in theory might be a possible between male and female believers, especially if the latter is not married to the former, since as we know, within the marriage the female is obligated to sexually serve the male. And although the Asura of Falsehood *did* forbid sexual activity with certain believing women, he did not provide an infrarational revelation clearly outlining the earthly punishment for disobeying – including by way of coercion - the commandment. Thus it has been left to Islamic scholars to fashion a punishment for ‘unlawful’ activity involving the crime of raping a believing Muslim woman, an odd development when we recall Allah to have declared his ‘Word’ as final and complete, yet without comment on the punishment for one of the most severe of crimes – besides, of course, the inverted sanctioning of it in relation to the kuffar, making it impossible to be a crime when the ‘victim’ is a non-Muslim woman. And when it comes to the only instance in Islam where rape is actually rape, the Imams have traditionally used certain verses and hadith on the crime of *adultery* to create laws

pertaining to rape, with the particular verses emerging out of a unique event that occurred during Mohammed's jihad. It was explained in detail by Aisha, beginning with her account of a curious night in which she vanished from the marauding Muslim army's convoy:

(the wife of the Prophet) “Whenever Allah's Apostle intended to go on a journey, he would draw lots amongst his wives and would take with him the one upon whom the lot fell. During a Ghazwa of his, he drew lots amongst us and the lot fell upon me, and I proceeded with him after Allah had decreed the use of the veil by women. I was carried in a Howdah (on the camel) and dismounted while still in it. When Allah's Apostle was through with his Ghazwa and returned home, and we approached the city of Medina, Allah's Apostle ordered us to proceed at night. When the order of setting off was given, I walked till I was past the army to answer the call of nature. After finishing I returned (to the camp) to depart (with the others) and suddenly realized that my necklace over my chest was missing. So, I returned to look for it and was delayed because of that. The people who used to carry me on the camel, came to my Howdah and put it on the back of the camel, thinking that I was in it, as, at that time, women were light in weight, and thin and lean, and did not use to eat much. So, those people did not feel the difference in the heaviness of the Howdah while lifting it, and they put it over the camel. At that time I was a young lady. **They set the camel moving and proceeded on. I found my necklace after the army had gone, and came to their camp to find nobody.** So, I went to the place where I used to stay, thinking that they would discover my absence and come back in my search. While in that state, I felt sleepy and slept. Safwan bin Mu'attal As-Sulami Adh-Dhakwani was behind the army and reached my abode in the morning. When he saw a sleeping person, he came to me, and he used to see me before veiling. So, I got up when I heard him saying, “Inna lil-lah-wa inn a ilaihi rajiun (We are for Allah, and we will return to Him).” He made his camel knell down. He got down from his camel, and put his leg on the front legs of the camel and then I rode and sat over it. Safwan set out walking, leading the camel by the rope till we reached the army who had halted to take rest at midday. (Sahih Bukhari Volume 3, Book 48, Number 829)

Having disappeared without any explanation, only to return a day later with a male not connected to her through blood or marriage, she inevitably fell under suspicion, with the more malicious elements of the Prophet's party describing a decidedly different encounter:

(Because of the event) some people brought destruction upon themselves and the one who spread the Ifk (i.e. slander) more, was Abdullah bin Ubai Ibn Salul. Urwa said, “The people propagated the slander and talked about it in his (i.e. Abdullah's) presence and he confirmed it and listened to it and asked about it to let it prevail.” **Urwa also added, “None was mentioned as members of the slanderous group besides (Abdullah) except Hassan bin Thabit and Mistah bin Uthatha and Hamna bint Jahsh along with others about whom I have no knowledge, but they were a group as Allah said. It is said that the one who carried most of the slander was Abdullah bin Ubai bin Salul.”** Urwa added, “Aisha disliked to have Hassan abused in her presence and she used to say, ‘It was he who said: My father and his (i.e. my father's) father and my honour are all for the protection of Mohammed's honour from you.’”

Aisha added, “After we returned to Medina, I became ill for a month. The people were propagating the forged statements of the slanderers while I was unaware of anything of all that, but I felt that in my present ailment, I was not receiving the same kindness from Allah's Apostle as I used to receive when I got sick. (But now) Allah's Apostle would only come, greet me and say, ‘How is that (lady)?’ and leave. That roused my doubts, but I did not discover the evil (i.e. slander) till I went out after my convalescence.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 5, Book 59, Number 462)

Mohammed, by then quite dependent upon Gabriel's communications to make decisions, at first waited

to try and hear what the 'angel' had to say on the matter. But the infrarational inspiration was delayed in arriving, and the Prophet, betraying personal doubts over his child bride's fidelity, called forth a couple of his companions – as documented in the same hadith as above, which is narrated by Aisha - to gather their opinion on divorcing her:

“When the Divine Inspiration was delayed, Allah's Apostle called Ali bin Abi Talib and Usama bin Zaid to ask and consult them about divorcing me. Usama bin Zaid said what he knew of my innocence, and the respect he preserved in himself for me. Usama said, ‘(O Allah's Apostle!) She is your wife and we do not know anything except good about her.’ Ali bin Abi Talib said, ‘O Allah's Apostle! Allah does not put you in difficulty and there are plenty of women other than she, yet, ask the maid-servant who will tell you the truth.’ On that Allah's Apostle called Barira (i.e. the maid-servant) and said, ‘O Barira! Did you ever see anything which aroused your suspicion?’ Barira said to him, ‘By Him Who has sent you with the Truth. I have never seen anything in her (i.e. Aisha) which I would conceal, except that she is a young girl who sleeps leaving the dough of her family exposed so that the domestic goats come and eat it.’” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 5, Book 59, Number 462)

Convinced by their arguments – for he had yet to receive an infrarational revelation by the Asura of Falsehood on the matter –, the Prophet took to the pulpit and demanded the blood of the slanderers:

On that day Allah's Apostle ascended the pulpit and requested that somebody support him in punishing Abdullah bin Ubai bin Salul. Allah's Apostle said, “Who will support me to punish that person (Abdullah bin Ubai bin Salul) who has hurt me by slandering the reputation of my family? By Allah, I know nothing about my family but good, and they have accused a person about whom I know nothing except good, and he never entered my house except in my company.”

Sad bin Mu'adh got up and said, “O Allah's Apostle! by Allah, I will relieve you from him. If that man is from the tribe of the Aus, then we will chop his head off, and if he is from our brothers, the Khazraj, then order us, and we will fulfil your order.” On that Sad bin Ubada, the chief of the Khazraj and before this incident, he had been a pious man, got up, motivated by his zeal for his tribe and said, “By Allah, you have told a lie; you cannot kill him, and you will never be able to kill him.” On that Usaid bin Al-Hadir got up and said (to Sad bin Ubada), “By Allah! you are a liar. By Allah, we will kill him; and you are a hypocrite, defending the hypocrites.” On this the two tribes of Aus and Khazraj got excited and were about to fight each other, while Allah's Apostle was standing on the pulpit. He got down and quietened them till they became silent and he kept quiet. (Sahih Bukhari Volume 3, Book 48, Number 829)

Though he demanded retribution, Mohammed could never be entirely sure of Aisha's innocence without any confirmation from Gabriel. Accordingly, tension remained, with Mohammed informing Aisha that Allah was the ultimate appraiser of her fate:

“A month had elapsed and no Divine Inspiration came to him about my case. Allah's Apostle then recited Tashah-hud and then said, ‘Amma Badu, O Aisha! I have been informed so-and-so about you; if you are innocent, then soon Allah will reveal your innocence, and if you have committed a sin, then repent to Allah and ask Him for forgiveness for when a slave confesses his sins and asks Allah for forgiveness, Allah accepts his repentance.’ ...In spite of the fact that I was a young girl and had a little knowledge of Quran, I said, ‘By Allah, no doubt I know that you heard this (slandorous) speech so that it has been planted in your hearts (i.e. minds) and you have taken it as a truth. Now if I tell you that I am innocent, you will not believe me, and if confess to you about it, and Allah knows that I am innocent, you will surely believe me. By Allah, I find no similitude for me and you except that of Joseph's father when he

said, ‘(For me) patience in the most fitting against that which you assert; it is Allah (Alone) Whose Help can be sought.’ Then I turned to the other side and lay on my bed; and Allah knew then that I was innocent and hoped that Allah would reveal my innocence. But, by Allah, I never thought that Allah would reveal about my case, Divine Inspiration, that would be recited (forever) as I considered myself too unworthy to be talked of by Allah with something of my concern, but I hoped that Allah's Apostle might have a dream in which Allah would prove my innocence.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 5, Book 59, Number 462)

She did not even have to wait for the Prophet to fall asleep, for as soon he rose from his seat, Gabriel seized him:

“But, by Allah, before Allah's Apostle left his seat and before any of the household left, the Divine inspiration came to Allah's Apostle. So there overtook him the same hard condition which used to overtake him, (when he used to be inspired Divinely). The sweat was dropping from his body like pearls though it was a wintry day and that was because of the weighty statement which was being revealed to him. When that state of Allah's Apostle was over, he got up smiling, and the first word he said was, ‘O Aisha! Allah has declared your innocence!’ Then my Mother said to me, ‘Get up and go to him (i.e. Allah's Apostle).’ I replied, ‘By Allah, I will not go to him, and I praise none but Allah.’ So Allah revealed the ten Verses: ‘Verily! They who spread the slander Are a gang, among you...’” (24.11-20) (Sahih Bukhari Volume 5, Book 59, Number 462)

Within the ten infrarational revelations concerning Aisha's predicament, a specific requirement was demanded by Allah in order to prove the accusation of adultery:

Lo! they who spread the slander are a gang among you. Deem it not a bad thing for you; nay, it is good for you. Unto every man of them (will be paid) that which he hath earned of the sin; and as for him among them who had the greater share therein, his will be an awful doom. Why did not the believing men and the believing women, when you heard it, think well of their own people, and say: “This is an evident falsehood?” **Why did they not bring four witnesses of it? But as they have not brought witnesses they are liars before Allah.** And were it not for Allah's grace upon you and His mercy in this world and the hereafter, a grievous chastisement would certainly have touched you on account of the discourse which you entered into. (Quran 24:11-14)

Because of this unabrogated Asuric revelation, establishing the crime of adultery requires the need of four witnesses. It is a ‘divine’ law that is now imposed upon all Islamic nations, without any recourse for changing circumstances, as the omniscient Allah has deemed it final, even if the declaration arose out of the details of a particular slander, related to the group accusing Aisha of adultery, though they clearly had failed to *witness* the event in question. There is no other basis for the requirement of four witnesses other than the decree of Allah made on a specific incident in time, who additionally communicated a punishment for failing to meet his criteria:

And those who accuse free women then do not bring four witnesses, flog them, (giving) eighty stripes, and do not admit any evidence from them ever. And these it is that are the transgressors, Except those who repent after this and act aright, for surely Allah is Forgiving, Merciful. And (as for) those who accuse their wives and have no witnesses except themselves, the evidence of one of these (should be taken) four times, bearing Allah to witness that he is most surely of the truthful ones. And the fifth (time) that the curse of Allah be on him if he is one of the liars. And it shall avert the chastisement from her if she testify four times, bearing Allah to witness, that he is most surely one of the liars; And the fifth (time) that the wrath of Allah be on her if he is one of the truthful. (Quran 24:04-09)

Free women, of course, are only among the believers, as non-Muslim women are always fair game for kidnapping and slavery and rape, because they are not privileged enough to receive the scraps afforded to Muslim females. This is a law that can also be easily manipulated, since all the male has to do is simply line up four of his friends to help him ‘convict’ the woman of adultery, an act that while detrimental to a marriage and grounds for its dissolution, is quite reasonably argued as unworthy of a ‘crime’ requiring the attention of lawyers and a judiciary. Adultery, after all, implies the volitional decision of adults engaging in a natural act. Rape, on the other hand, is an explicitly distinct violation of one person's physical domain, which is why nations have progressively sought, after growing awareness of the harm caused by it, to punish the act. This is the transformation that, in Islam's case, will never occur, for though there will always exist a slight hope that *Muslim* victims of rape might eventually receive justice resulting from changes to the law, any possible alteration faces two major difficulties, with the first involving the weight of historic Islamic jurisprudence on the matter of rape, with previous laws based – for once – on an *interpretation* by Islamic scholars who did not have for assistance clear decrees of Allah. After all, the initial basis for the law is a verse concerning the protection of Islamic women – well, one in particular – against *slander* (a rare case where Islamic law attempts to support women, but only because the female happened to be the Prophet's favourite wife), requiring the accusations to arrive with four actual witnesses to the act instead of four exponents of hearsay. That previous Imams could take communications concerning adultery and then apply it to rape – making its proof dependent upon four witnesses testifying to the assault - is yet further evidence of the falsehood of a final ‘Word’, as one would expect that God, Conscious of the fluidity of his creation, would allow a more natural decision making process to emerge instead of leaving mortals to create the law with only a paltry amount of decrees for guidance.

God in His Truth will never declare that *everything* must be based on the scripture, for then there would be no purpose to other aspects of human life like experience, intuition, logic, and *circumstance*, all of which should be considered, perhaps along with scripture, when enacting a jurisprudence claiming to be comprehensive in outlook and punishment. Though it may appear easier to make decisions based off of one text, refusing to adjust laws and societal choices to the incessant changes of Prakriti will only lead to an internal discord that – unless externalized upon the kuffar – will result in the withering of Muslim society; for if a more equitable form of justice is not granted upon earth, if the rape of women cannot at least be acknowledged for what it is, the aftermath of the crime will yet still manifest itself through the inevitable demoralization of the female, transmitting itself through generations and irreparably stunting any chance of progress. The punishment and, crucially, ensuing prevention of the criminal from further victimizing other members of society is paramount to providing a community with the confidence and security needed to uplift itself and remain strong; thus the interpretation to require four witnesses for rape is a severe detriment to the pivotal female gender by initially preventing justice and potentially applying further injustice to them. For if they cannot provide the four witnesses they have thus admitted guilt to adultery and the associated punishment and stigma, a double punishment as they have failed to even obtain an acknowledgement of their suffering.

Because of the requirement that the law of Muslim countries follow the Islamic scripture, we cannot presuppose a malicious intent behind the decision of numerous Imams to create such stringent requirements for the proof of rape, by their use of a law meant for adultery. For the Imams, like their flock, consider themselves true believers and genuinely wished to penalize the rape of “forbidden” Muslim women based upon their understanding of the scripture. Unfortunately, this law has only served to provide a convenient cover for rape, as the rapist knows that it is next to impossible for the woman to come forth with the required witnesses, and knows that the law – though based upon an interpretation – is unlikely to be changed in most nations following Sharia, since there is a history behind it and a modicum of justification within the scripture. That this law continues to remain with only a partial authority from the important Islamic works, is testament to the extreme rigidity of Islam

demanding by the Asura, one leading to a dependency of the believers on an decidedly limited number of words and commandments. Thus as soon as a passable adjudication on a crime is found by scholars of the religion, it quickly takes hold of the leaders of Islamic society, continuing on through the centuries based upon repetition and the return to the particular scriptural justification.

It is again a major reason why religious or spiritual decrees should *not* be codified for eternity, as even laws *interpreted* out of a 'last Word' become very difficult for society to extricate themselves from – the extreme rigidity of Islam completely impairs the fluidity needed for societal evolution, something which if present should lead to individuals within it becoming aware of their inner being and its intuitive and discriminatory faculties, which in turn can help improve the community or national consciousness beyond the intermediary phases of rationalism and logic towards a suprarationality markedly contrasting the infrarationality of Islam, a religion of a limited psychological state in which decisions are based primarily upon the dictates of the Asura of Falsehood to a supplicant Mohammed. Nowhere in the Hindu scripture do we find specific demands that *only* this word or that text be followed – indeed the very experience of Avatars arriving in different epochs negates any possibility of a 'Last Word'. Thus even if the current climate in India is *relatively* difficult for the female gender, the evolution of society remains a distinct possibility, because there is no *ultimate* dictate otherwise, and the enlightened awareness of its leaders can transmit down into the mass, helping to improve society through multiple changes including the assignment of appropriate punishment for rape.

In Islam - which has neither the explicit guidelines for defining rape appropriately, or legislating against it - however, the punishment for rapists of the Muslim female faces the second difficulty of – having acknowledged the historic punishment as being a *sincere* interpretation and discounting any consciously malicious motive to double punish Muslim women – eternal 'revelations' and important hadith that damn the female gender, or at least the vast majority of it. For when Islam authorizes 'divine' permission to capture and rape non-Muslim females, that alone – irrespective of the minor concessions provided to Muslim women – opens the *entire* gender to the most sinister of possibilities, as the endorsement of savage behaviours can never be subsequently restricted to certain groups, *especially* when Islam also acknowledges that pretenders exist within its ranks. Thus if initially the permitted rape is directed towards the officially-identified kuffar, eventually – and this is most likely when the majority of the nation becomes nominally Muslim – the primitive impulse will direct itself toward Muslim females who must provide four witnesses for proof, with the religious self-justification – if needed – by the rapist that the woman he is assaulting is a hypocrite of some sort. The 'divine' approval for rape of *any* female will by eventually permeate itself into the Muslim males overall mentality towards women, including his 'sisters', especially when he also considers other infrarational revelations reducing a woman's testimony to half that of a male's, his right to divorce them at will in contrast to their respective inability, and Allah's command that the Muslim's wives are "tilth" to him and that their sexual pleasuring of him is fundamental to the marriage contract. The Asuric revelations, along with Mohammed's marked misogyny, invariably creates the same mentality in the male Muslim (as opposed to a hypocrite "Muslim") mass.

It subsequently becomes inevitable for laws based on the *interpretation* of the Quran and Hadith to yield, as in the requirement of four witnesses to prove a rape, decisions extremely unfavourable to women. As their opinions are null and void, as the *non-Muslim* women function best as rape slaves, as there can be no such thing as the rape of a Muslim *wife*, the select few females who might – per Islamic definitions – be subject to "forbidden" sex, face the most stringent of requirements to prove it as a crime. The refusal to call the rape of kuffar women for what it actually is, leads to difficulty accepting its occurrence when among the believers, especially if a woman is the one making the accusation against a male. The latter aspect is a great example of how the infrarational nature of the revelations, degrading the female gender and their perspective, helps foster *human* infrarational justifications based

upon the native prejudices of the individual and the limited 'wisdom' shaped by the Quran. Thus the lower egoistic tendency for chauvinism finds support in the Islamic scripture, leading to both the blithe dismissal of female claims that they have been raped, and the enactment of minimal punishment for the crime in question, with the Muslim legislator supported through the Prophet's example:

Narrated Zaid bin Khalid:

Allah's Apostle ordered that an unmarried man who committed illegal sexual intercourse be scourged one hundred lashes and sent into exile for one year. (Sahih Bukhari Volume 3, Book 48, Number 817)

While this penalty was likely for the 'crime' of consensual but non-marital sexual intercourse, because the rape of the specifically "forbidden" Muslim females also falls under the category of the poorly defined illegal intercourse, one can easily envision, in a Sharia state, this proverbial slap on the wrist handed out for Muslim rapists of Muslim females. That the Muslim at worst will face being whipped and spending a year in exile or – in the modern equivalent – prison for one of the most horrendous of crimes against women establishes a lenient punitive pattern, failing to function as a deterrent and emboldening the rapist to commit further assaults. But that is not of concern to the Asura of Falsehood, who indeed prefers the opposite, sanctioning - through his outrageous claim to be the mouthpiece for God – as he did, the rape of captives. It was a ploy to motivate his subalterns into fulfilling the Islamic objective of conquering the world, for captives and the rape of them can only be obtained if one wages jihad and massacre "in the land", and as males are often susceptible to lust, Gabriel knew that the promise of completely subservient slave girls for perverse sexual satisfaction would be effective in spurring on the Muslims. Thus the history of Islam is littered with concubines and harems, especially for the rulers, along with a prominent slave trade throughout its regions of conquest⁴. It is a pattern still seen in modern times, if the necessary element of a standard Islamic army fighting in Infidel lands is in place, with the most horrific recent outcome, as we shall review in the next chapter, occurring in 1971 East "Pakistan".

Even if the army is not organized or strong enough to pillage and rape, the crude enjoyment of kuffar women can still take place for Muslims living as minorities in Dar-ul-Harb. It usually involves more subtlety, with taqiyah playing a prominent role – hence the "love jihad" and the like, with the non-Muslim girl usually expecting commitment and love but often only finding herself converted or at least humiliated. Of course, in some instances there are gangs of Muslims – Asurically justified in their actions by Allah's declarations – preying on non-believers, including underage girls, without any sort of pretence other than sexual conquest⁵. In either case, they have the unequivocal – by an absence of any contravening communications - message of Allah telling them that the concept of rape *does not exist in the case of non-Muslim women*. It is an Islamic doctrine that is at the very least consistent with other dictates of the creed, including an idea that sex between master and slave can be consensual or beneficial because the slave ideally is to be manumitted. But in an ideology of the Asura of Falsehood, the ludicrous is considered wisdom, falsehood is purported to be truth, incessant war is deemed as peace, and rape becomes love.

This was the discourse between Mohammed and his false Lord – an endeavour in perverting the natural inclination of mankind towards his inner Soul and higher Truth, inverting knowledge to exalt ignorance and evil. Infinitesimal in scope was this intermittent interaction between Mohammed and the Asura, a penumbra to the dialogue between Sri Krishna and Arjuna on the battlefield of Kurukshetra, where the former, while encouraging – though not ordering – Arjuna to resume battle and vanquish the champions of adharma, nevertheless illustrated a way of life and ultimate aspiration superior to the escape from fear and hellfire outlined in Islam. Nowhere in the Bhagavad Gita do we find a record of – nor at any point, after having read merely a few lines of this particular Divine Word, would one expect to encounter - Sri Krishna sanctifying rape, as that would have been a call to the type of demonic action

he strongly discouraged. While the historic votary of Falsehood, Gabriel, did not literally direct his Muslim believers to proceed forth and rape (as in using the actual word “rape”), he did explicitly order that captives could only be obtained through jihad, and that, along with his specific sanctioning of ‘sex’ with female slaves, is enough for the most ‘Supreme’ of exculpations, meaning that the Asura simply *eliminated the possibility* that a Muslim male could rape a non-Muslim female. That he did so provides further confirmation of his nature and Islam's origin, since the confirmatory call to rape would be an acknowledgement that rape is wrong – the Asura of Falsehood on the other hand, perverts or inverts knowledge, with the removal of the very concept of rape and other wrong actions the inevitable denouement. Though the resultant rationalization of infrarational rape into normal sexual activity may certainly appeal to the Muslim male's desire for conscience-free enjoyment of resisting kuffar females, it is an acceptance done at one's peril, for if one allows the brutal vital impulses to run amok after a conscious decision to *not* reject their call, one will eventually either be swallowed by them or destroyed by a force far greater in strength and character.

* * * *

That the Asura of Falsehood has approached his rulership of earth through multiple ideological vessels and human instruments comes as no surprise when we consider how, unlike with his creation of Islam - a religion of strict and rigid definitions, without any possible flexibility -, the Asura himself is not so restrained, having the ability to effect different individuals – and subsequently, their nations – in different regions, at the same time if he chooses. Thus the presence of a Hitler and a Stalin upon earth during the same era, with the Asuric influence – rather than direct contact – also extending over Winston Churchill during that time period, given his callous refusal to provide grains to famine-stricken Indians during the 1940's, a conscious choice distinctly Asuric in nature, with the rationales of eugenics and racism emerging again⁶. While the number of mediums the Asura has taken, along with the groupings swayed by his distorted principles invading the intellectual atmosphere, is numerous, not all of the instruments possessed, or national thought processes entirely corrupted, have had the ability to dominate the entire world. For though he frequently grabs hold of individuals and nations, there are often enough counter-acting forces to prevent the Asura of Falsehood from using them to destroy the world.

But it is in that particular *possibility*, however, that we again return to the two most notorious examples – at least in the last couple of millennium – of the Asura of Falsehood's designs; both with ambitions powerful enough to permanently impede the higher aspirations of humanity and all progression of consciousness into the Supreme in Multiplicity. Though the two creations of the Asura have unique characteristics, the differences are only in surface details and the Asura's need to adjust his ‘teachings’ to the natural tendencies of the respective nations he was usurping, Arab and German. It is an unfortunate affiliation for the two lands, with one having been freed of its possession by outside powers, the other continuing to follow the old lines. Nevertheless, they both bear the mark of the Shadow, the ‘fallen’ emanation initially of Truth, soon to forget his Origin, unable to see beyond his own power to the Puissance of the Lord he delusionally attempts to supplant. The shared heritage between the two was evident to many during the ascent of the Fuhrer, including the superbly perceptive Carl Jung:

Hitler's religion is the nearest to Mohammedanism, realistic, earthy, promising the maximum of rewards in this life, but with a Moslem-like Valhalla into which worthy Germans may enter and continue to enjoy themselves. Like Mohammedanism, it teaches the *virtue* of the sword. Hitler's first idea is to make his people powerful because the spirit of the Aryan German deserves to be

supported by might, by muscle and steel. ...Incidentally, it occurs to me that the “religious” character of Hitlerism is also emphasized by the fact that German communities throughout the world, far from the political power of Berlin, have adopted Hitlerism. Look at the South American German communities, notably in Chile. (Diagnosing the Dictators, *C.G. Jung Speaking: Interviews and Encounters*, 1978, p.124)

The philosophy, if we will, of strength above all else, is indeed a shared element in the two Asuric creations, with the principle explicitly articulated in Nazism – Islam on the other hand presents all of its components without literally announcing that strength alone is the basis of existence. In the latter, for instance, we have the incessant demands to fight the non-Muslims, with Muslims finding numerous examples of the Prophet doing so in the Hadith, including the genocide of entire towns; present as well is the exaltation of the tendency for the physically stronger in society, men, to impose themselves through rape and slavery, upon the female gender and children; the call to kill apostates or anyone thinking differently; the very nature of a ‘religion’ desiring world conquest through violence or subterfuge, an ambition that automatically leads to results – and the need for strength to obtain the results – superseding higher psychological qualities in importance, something disturbingly seen in the strategy of *taqiyah*. Though the Islamic “peace”, like its Nazi counterpart, is one of endless war and characterized – when Islam becomes the majority religion – by the strong devouring the weak, we do not observe in the Quran or Hadith the type of exposition on this principle that we find in Hitler's autobiography:

He who would live must fight. He who does not wish to fight in this world, where permanent struggle is the law of life, has not the right to exist...If Nature does not wish that weaker individuals should mate with the stronger, she wishes even less that a superior race should intermingle with an inferior one; because in such a case all her efforts, throughout hundreds of thousands of years, to establish an evolutionary higher stage of being, may thus be rendered futile...History furnishes us with innumerable instances that prove this law. It shows, with a startling clarity, that whenever Aryans have mingled their blood with that of an inferior race the result has been the downfall of the people who were the standard-bearers of a higher culture. (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 223)

The very name of Hitler's book, “My Struggle”, offers yet another illustration of the origin of both creeds, with the Islamic *jihad* more appropriately translated as “struggle”; the former against a predetermined racial ‘other’, the latter against an ‘other’ defined by the non-corporeal elements of thought and belief. It is here that we find perhaps the primary superficial difference between the two Asuric creations, with the Nazis obsessed with the physical form, the idealized blue-eyed and blond haired “Aryan”; Muslims more preoccupied with uniformity of belief and thought. It is not to say that the Nazis were without attachment to mental and emotional patterns, or that Islam is without a certain emphasis on appearance (to be reviewed later), but these were not *emphasized* as much as the other respective components. Thus if the Nazis did demand a rigid adherence to thoughts and activity designed to exalt their mythical “Aryan” conception, it pales in comparison to Islam, in which ‘God’ has warned his followers to obey a specific book without altering or selectively choosing certain components to the ‘Word’ - at the risk of murder and hellfire if failing to comply.

At play in the different manifestation of the same Asuric origin is the respective natural tendencies and contemporary cultures, with the Arab much more emotionally vital, their religion of Mohammed's time corrupted by the ego, the German of Hitler's time not *as* preoccupied with religious considerations, taking heed the predominant vital mentalization of contemporary Europe, mixing it with a prideful national conception based on its history of internecine tribal conflicts and frequent – and successful – struggles against a hostile Roman Empire. Because of this latter resistance against the half-light of Roman conquest, the latent possibility of a mass vital aggrandizement was always there, confident as

they were of their warring abilities. It was the egoistic mentalization of European culture, including its pseudo-science of eugenics, that provided an academic veneer to what at heart was a barbaric vital impulse, a superficial intelligence that helped *organize* the Asuric urges. And though it hid itself in the fields of literature, history and science, it was a fragile cover, one easily unmasked by those outside the fervent atmosphere of the times:

We do not know whether Hitler is going to found a new Islam. **He is already on the way; he is like Muhammad. The emotion in Germany is Islamic; warlike and Islamic.** They are all drunk with wild god. That can be the historic future. (Collected Works of Carl Jung, Volume 18: *The Symbolic Life*, p. 281)

Jung's perception of the inflamed climate captures the earthly intrusion of the Vital world in all of its turbulent quality, drunk and warlike, ready to strike at the group judged to be the 'other'. These are conditions precariously close to outright chaos, reflecting the reality of the lower vital worlds that have infected the host, a reality that is completely devoid of the great mortal check of rationalism. While neither Islam or Nazism were of a rational, *many-sided*, character, the latter did adopt the *pretence* of rationalism, as it was a more mentalized creed than Islam, which after all strictly defines itself as a religion. Unlike the "religion of peace", which the Asura founded upon worship, Nazism is based on illogical ideas of race, cosmetically intellectualized whereas Islam's strength revolves primarily around feelings and sentiment related to Allah and Mohammed. While Nazism is centred around a vital *idea* (though one can argue that the Germans *believed* in the idea), and Islam a vital *belief* (though it does indeed have a holy book providing a framework for the thought structure along with 'proof' of the Muslim's belief), both share the same result of an aggrandized, extremely – group – egoistic vital power imposing itself on the 'other'.

And it is in the – initial - organization of the group or nation where the Asura of Falsehood can find his most terrifying vessel for hatred and destruction. We find in Nazism's racial alignment, along with Islam's religious grouping, a shared priority – after the emergence of the possessed individual centre – to keep the masses uniform in action and thought, with the Asura craftily using the suggestibility of the ordinary mortal to mass popularity, along with the latter's *fear* of being left behind the communal 'wisdom' or trend. The tactic was adeptly outlined by Hitler, who as previously cited understood his assemblies as useful contrasts to the individual's fear of isolation, with "the picture of a great community which has a strengthening and encouraging effect on most people", whereupon "he submits himself to the fascination of what we call mass-suggestion". (*Mein Kampf*) While the principle of the assembly power was best articulated by Hitler, the practice of it was better solidified in Islam, for it falsely attached the congregational prayer directly to 'God', with the Asura revealing, "Establish worship, pay the poor-due, and bow your heads with those who bow (in worship)." (Quran 2:43) Beyond linking it to the 'Word' of Allah, this particular Asuric demand also attached the congregation to a superior quality of prayer, with Abu Said Al-Khudri recalling that "the Prophet said, '**The prayer in congregation is twenty five times superior to the prayer offered by person alone.**'" (Sahih Bukhari Volume 1, Book 11, Number 619) Part of the reason for the group prayer's superiority is the alleged presence of the angels during them:

Narrated Ibn Al-Musaiyab:

Abu Huraira said, "The Prophet said, 'A prayer performed in congregation is twenty-five times more superior in reward to a prayer performed by a single person. The angels of the night and the angels of the day are assembled at the time of the Fajr (Morning) prayer.'"

Abu Huraira added, "If you wish, you can recite: 'Verily! The recitation of the Qur'an in the early dawn (Morning prayer) is ever witnessed (attended by the angels of the day and the night).'"

(17.78) (Sahih Bukhari Volume 6, Book 60, Number 241)

In another hadith the Prophet further explains the benefit of the angelic involvement in congregation prayers, with the believers gaining reward and losing sin with each stride he takes toward his brethren worshipping *in* the mosque:

Narrated Abu Huraira:

Allah's Apostle said, **“The reward of the prayer offered by a person in congregation is twenty five times greater than that of the prayer offered in one's house or in the market (alone).** And this is because if he performs ablution and does it perfectly and then proceeds to the mosque with the sole intention of praying, then for every step he takes towards the mosque, he is upgraded one degree in reward and his one sin is taken off (crossed out) from his accounts (of deeds). When he offers his prayer, the angels keep on asking Allah's Blessings and Allah's forgiveness for him as long as he is (staying) at his Musalla. They say, ‘O Allah! Bestow Your blessings upon him, be Merciful and kind to him.’ And one is regarded in prayer as long as one is waiting for the prayer.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 1, Book 11, Number 620)

That the ‘angels’ and Allah would so reward the congregational over the solitary prayer lends credence – in the mind of the Muslim - to Mohammed's declaration of the former as twenty-five (in different hadith, it is twenty-seven – see Sahih Bukhari Volume 1, Book 11, Number 618 and Sahih Bukhari Volume 1, Book 11, Number 621) times superior. Thus the believer has both a positive and negative – the removal of sin may help them escape the hellfire – reason for joining the assembly at the mandated times. But like everything else in Islam, the looming violence springs forth alongside the apparent ‘mercy’, with the exemplar of mankind, whose practices the entire planet are supposed to imitate, declaring those failing to attend group prayers as apostates, with their houses – and persons – to be burned down for failing to answer the call to congregational prayer!

Narrated Abu Huraira:

The Prophet said, “No prayer is harder for the hypocrites than the Fajr and the Isha prayers and if they knew the reward for these prayers at their respective times, they would certainly present themselves (in the mosques) even if they had to crawl.” The Prophet added, “Certainly I decided to order the Muadh-dhin (call-maker) to pronounce Iqama and order a man to lead the prayer **and then take a fire flame to burn all those who had not left their houses so far for the prayer along with their houses.**” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 1, Book 11, Number 626)

Of course, since these are apostates, guilty of the grave ‘crime’ of refusing to pray to Allah with their fellow Muslims, their murder is legal, a ‘Divine’ retribution enacted by his most pious of mortal followers. Either pray with us or be burned alive for heresy, is the Islamic doctrine, even for those genuinely believing in Allah, though perhaps preferring the solitude of prayer in a quiet place like the household. But worship at home is a dangerous thing, at least from the Asura's point of view, because it promotes a type of individuality that may lead to too much flexibility or innovation, with the ‘believer’ lapsing into a religious practice that might involve the incorporation of other religions, or a failure to adhere to certain Islamic principles. Thus the extreme importance placed upon attending the congregation by way of making the failure to do so punishable by death, was done by the Asura for the specific purpose of control. For as the Asura of Falsehood seeks to intensify the habits and movements of the lower ego, he knows that mass-suggestion, as Hitler would describe it, represents an excellent avenue for his ambitions, because humans are prone to the desire to ‘belong’, to feel as if they are a member of a ‘superior’ group. Thus as long as the crowd appears enthused over what they are hearing, so will further individuals brought into the mass begin to fashion themselves towards the group opinion being formulated by the central leader, under the delusion that if the multitude is following something it must by default have merit, with – in the case of Islam – the Asuric message aggregating, helped by the frequent mandatory daily prayers used for repetition of the message, indoctrinating Muslims into an

unthinking obedience to the Quran and the tradition of the Prophet. This is how the Asura gains *control*, for he has at the head of the flock select Imams well-versed in the contents of the Islamic scripture, skilled at implanting the Asuric ideology onto an obedient crowd: In other words, brainwashing.

Though the group ego is not by itself a mechanism of Falsehood, because of humanity's general lack of advancement beyond a vital ego of mixed truth and ignorance, the promotion of congregational prayer as a *divine decree* will only lead to the exaggeration of the contents of said prayer, which in Islam involves the Quranic hatred, paranoia, calls to jihad and other falsehood. This is precisely what the Asura wants, as it better serves his desire for world conquest through the mechanism of the group takeover by war or other means. Better that the Muslim groupthink at the loss of his unique mental patterns, helping him to remain organized and capable of attacks on the Infidel when directed by the Imam. It is this need of groupthink that provides the fundamental difference, when compared to Hinduism, between Islam's use of the individual centre in relation to the mass; in the latter, the individual leader seeks to have his followers think and believe exactly like himself, with his own thoughts already strictly arranged by the Islamic scripture. For unlike the falsehood promoted by Islam with regards to the leader-follower principle, in the Sanatana Dharma the relationship between the Guru and Sadhak is one characterized by fluidity, with the disciple not told that he will be burned alive for failing to heed the Guru's instructions.

The disciple has choices to make, whether based upon intuition or feeling or ordinary thinking; the Guru can only assist. The sadhak is also allowed to follow the lines of his own unique dispensation, and does not *need* to do exactly what the Guru instructs – indeed, ‘Gurus’ that claim such rigid obedience at the threat of severe punishment immediately expose themselves as charlatans. For the Guru - God Self-Realized in the individual unit - is, by His very nature, at Peace, without any *desire* for followers, though God certainly will accept devotees arriving volitionally. Indeed, the mandatory groupthink and groupbelief is what sets Islam apart from even the secular Leader-Citizen relationship, the latter of which only asking for adherence to basic laws and a requirement against *actions* of treason toward the state, without any expectation of uniformity to *thought* and *belief*. The frightening conformity asked of Muslims must, as one might expect, revolve around the interpretation of the Quran, the source of Muslim automatons. It is a homogeneity reinforced by Mohammed, who demanded that his followers make sure of their unison in recitation *and* understanding:

Narrated Jundab bin Abdullah:

Allah's Apostle said, “Recite (and study) the Qur’an as long as your hearts are in agreement as to its meanings, but if you have differences as regards its meaning, stop reading it then.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 92, Number 467)

Another authentic hadith provides a necessary caveat – “for the time being” - to the principle at play:

Narrated Jundab bin Abdullah:

Allah's Apostle said, “Recite (and study) the Quran as long as you are in agreement as to its interpretation and meanings, but when you have differences regarding its interpretation and meanings, then you should stop reciting it (for the time being.)” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 92, Number 466)

The believers are to make sure that their understanding, their thought process and *opinion*, their expression of what they are reading, are all completely monotonous. These are the hadith that also contradict the “moderate Muslim” claim that there are many types of Muslims, different versions of Islam that by definition accounts for varying interpretation and meaning. Real Islam is to be strictly one interpretation, one meaning, one action, one thought, one belief. Muslims are not supposed to even continue reading their scripture if they fail to meet the criteria of robotic likeness, such is the extreme

importance stressed on uniformity. Just as the Muslim is menacingly urged toward praying inside the mosque, the prayer must also be among his 'brothers', a state that cannot help but discourage, through the group atmosphere, unique individual prayers that might help one closer to the Purusha within. For unlike the throng at the temple, where no *dire* warnings are made to enact a *rigid* order - whether of thought, physical position, or action - to what should naturally be a fluid affair, the prayer at a mosque is characterized by a military precision in appearance to the expected – but unverifiable – homogeneity of the internal content:

Narrated Anas bin Malik:

The Prophet said, "Straighten your rows as the straightening of rows is essential for a perfect and correct prayer." (Sahih Bukhari Volume 1, Book 11, Number 690)

This, as we know, is both an absurdity and a falsehood (because of its exaggeration into an eternal law through the "exemplar"), a ritual rather than a sincere (the purified psychology is what accounts for the quality of the worship) prayer, because the latter comes from within, and never *has* to be linked to external appearances. The military precision of the lauded Islamic congregational prayer, the one that Muslims are told is twenty-five times greater than the – presumably – meeker individual prayer, the one they must attend daily, on multiple occasions, at the risk of apostasy and being burned alive within earth and then hell if they fail to participate, has no relation to the spirituality that we would expect a religion to espouse. For as the sincerity of a prayer – the actual measure of its 'correctness' - can only be determined from within, the Islamic 'truth' of the congregational prayer's superiority is but another falsehood, another sign of the Asuric hand behind this dangerous creed, an example of his skill at distracting men from their internal pursuits by providing them with the anxiety of perfecting their external solidarity.

The Asura of Falsehood, after all, does *not* want true spirituality, preferring the lower vital glorification and imposition – over the 'other' - that Islam's soldierly organization helps cultivate, with the religion's restrictions on prayer, of all the things a *faith* could demand, helping to spark – with the able assistance of the congregational leaders – the mob mentality, the – especially in modern times - street-level military unit ready to strike at the evil kuffar. Indeed, the finely tuned group's ability, like that of any professional army, to wage war at the perceived enemy is again a major factor, besides the obstruction of the internal quests, behind the Asura of Falsehood's exaltation of the lower vital group ego. It is a ploy also seen in the especially effective Islamic reproductive jihad, a strategy patiently awaiting the necessary numbers before bringing forth the primary tenets of Islam on the unsuspecting Infidel populace unprepared for the violence. And though this particular method was only *implied* in his religious creed, it was more explicitly outlined in the Asura's racial creed:

Only when the Germans have taken all this fully into account will they cease from allowing the national will-to-life to wear itself out in merely passive defence, but they will rally together for a last decisive contest with France. And in this contest the essential objective of the German nation will be fought for. Only then will it be possible to put an end to the eternal Franco-German conflict which has hitherto proved so sterile. Of course it is here presumed that Germany sees in the suppression of France nothing more than a means which will make it possible for our people finally to expand in another quarter. **Today there are eighty million Germans in Europe. And our foreign policy will be recognized as rightly conducted only when, after barely a hundred years, there will be 250 million Germans living on this Continent, not packed together as the coolies in the factories of another Continent but as tillers of the soil and workers whose labour will be a mutual assurance for their existence.** (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, pp. 514-15)

As the only way to quickly triple one's racial population is by way of simple reproduction, we find in

Hitler's expansionist drive a mirror to the Islamic reproductive jihad, one recognizing the power of the mass through the game of numbers and demographics, with the Asura calculatedly and coldly using swaths of men for his purpose, ready to discard them at any point in time. But little is the Muslim understanding of his own usage by the Shadow, because he is clouded by the multiple Islamic duties. Though that is not a term frequently used by the religion, it is precisely what is demanded of Muslims by their Lord: obedience to a defined set of rules, including who and where they pray toward; the verbalized content of their prayers; the physical arrangement during mandatory prayer sessions; who they socialize with (fellow believers only); mandatory calls to engage in jihad; and of course, how they think. Muslims have a duty to follow these dictates and others demanded of them by Allah, including the most important of all, that they remember that the 'Word' of Allah is *unchangeable*, and thus not engage in selectively choosing which edicts they follow.

If they fail to observe this most important of commands or even the lesser ones, they are worthy of the hellfire for partaking in apostasy – better for them to strictly think and behave as a real Muslim. As this involves groupthink and groupbelief, the possibility of true individuality – of even a non-Self Realized variety - is eliminated in Islam, because the Muslim *must*, at the risk of death in the life and fire in the afterlife, obey his Islamic duties, which are likely to go against the lines of his essential law or internal nature. For instance, not all men are born with the inherent law of the warrior, and thus the command that *all* men must participate in non-defensive battle is, by default, antithetical to Dharma. The Psychic chooses births to get unique experiences, ones more befitting the actual nature of the human, whereby the internal pathways are opened and the Psychic can more easily lead the potential adhar towards the Ultimate Consciousness. The performance of mandatory 'religious' dictates, like in Islam, only directs the unit toward a spiritual impasse which then leads to an internal violence predicated on this very deviation away from the internal quests, which are replaced by Islamic rituals and ambitions of world conquest. Indeed, for the subcontinental Muslims, the obedience to Islam's false message of hatred, separation and violence is a divergence from their real cultural inheritance, with the svadharma of the subcontinent attempting to syncretize or integrate all religious or spiritual thought, including the attempted Indicization of Allah.

But Islam does not allow for the integrated harmony of diverse worship, and Muslims must eventually fall in line with the flock if they wish to be considered genuine believers. It is a degradation of individuality whereby the particular mortal becomes an imitator of the appointed leader, instead of a growing Psychic Being. Similar to Nazi Germany, the particular ruler is not in fact an individual, but rather a vassal, a puppet, a slavish mask of the Asura of Falsehood. Capitulating and consequently living under the possession of a vital emanation (or its scripture) not of oneself is quite the opposite of what we intuit to represent individuality. Indeed the very fact that Muslims – like Nazi Germans – base their lives on a puppet helps eliminate any possibility that a pious Muslim can be anything other than a group-thinking, group-believing automaton. They become reflections of an instrument of the Shadow of Truth-Existence, with the only possible distinction they can achieve determined by their contribution toward jihad - the results arriving in the particular gradation of Paradise they are allegedly to find themselves in after death.

It is hardly an individuality based upon the Purusha, the True Person, the Source of all, one evidently seen in the unique or great personalities of the world, who if not of the Self-Realized subgroup and subsequently having a nature containing qualities of the ego, nevertheless remained psychologically far superior to the debased aggrandizement of ego specific to Asuric creeds, especially the intensification of the group consciousness that leads to the destruction of individualism, with any inward movements isolated and cleansed in order to exaggerate the group-thought and group-belief that fawns upon the central puppet through which the Asuric qualities are channelled to the ordinary public. In Islam the destruction of individuality proceeds in rapid fashion, superbly enabled by the scripture that helps

formulate a rigid separative group ego that, if not attacking a defined 'other', turns on itself to construct a new one, with the 'more pious' purging itself of the 'less pious'. Indeed, this submerging of the solitary ego into the group, for the specific sake of an Asuric ideology, is in fact a mechanism to inhibit the inherently useful means Prakriti has for the individual ego, the organizing apparatus necessary for the mortal to arrange the thoughts, emotions and sensations entering his receiving structure.

From there, the element – granted by Prakriti to each of her units – of the individual's own Free Will allows them to make decisions from the relatively limited amount of options, including the selection of that which fosters the growth of the Psychic, whether the pranamayapurusha or manomayapurusha aspects of it. This is the ego framework that facilitates the necessary coherence for development; otherwise mental disorganization and the possession by hostile vital forces can occur. It is in the latter that we find the practical denouement of the real Muslim rigidly adhering to the Asuric commands of the Quran and Hadith. And though such an aggregate of the Islamic group ego might appear organized, it is *only* because the Asura has use for them, such as in countries Islam has yet to conquer – once the Muslims have achieved his goal, the fratricidal self-devouring through *takfir* can proceed unabated. This, the Asuric finger in the dyke holding back the flood of Vital world chaos, is similar to his prevention of Mohammed's suicide – his instrument remained useful, so there was no need to discard him: Hitler, on the other hand, could hardly be expected to effect Asuric chaos with his army falling all around him, and his neck was snapped as the Asura of Falsehood moved on to other vassals and nations of the time.

It is a precarious decision to live by an Asuric ideology, for of all the Vital emanations, the Asura provides no lasting benefit to any mortal adhering to his principles or possessed by him – after the vital intoxication and power wears off, all is left in ruins, with no benefit at all to the Psychic, which withdraws if the native is under Asuric possession or influence. The temporary power obtained is but a reflection of the fleeting nature of falsehood itself, encapsulated in both Islam and Nazism through the extreme emphasis on the superficial idea of separateness and the formulation of the 'other', in truth a transient perception of reality, one that *covers* or obscures the fundamental and inseparable unity of all existence. As the Asuric group consciousness of Islam is based on the brittle organization of the cold, calculating, fickle Asura of Falsehood, its frail psychology engendered by an easily fractured Possessor-Medium relationship based strictly on external commands (whereby the initial clear-headed direction immediately disappears when the Possessor becomes bored or has no use of his instruments), it helps to explain why the Islamic religion cannot handle the smallest of disruptions, especially those deemed to be insults. For anything going against the 'truth' of Islam must be met with, if favourable numbers are present, a – sooner than later - violent response, as there is no Psychic stability able to calmly handle minute tribulations, and as there is plenty of scriptural support to let the savage emotional outbursts emerge after the deemed insult, especially against the sacred Prophet Mohammed.

Though the finale is dreadful and the loss is profound, the Asura of Falsehood will still find individuals and nations willing to do his bidding, with the pathway created by Islam the easiest of all for him, associated as it is with 'God' and the fear of hellfire, rather than Hitler's strict racial guidelines. In both however, the lure of earthly power – or the derived spoils obtained after helping the leader or the task of conquest – is a tantalizing draw, with the instrument's power, temporary as it may have been, even drawing appreciation from enemy quarters, a phenomenon noted by Jung in his comments on Hitler:

He voices the unconscious feelings of many English and French people. Some Czechoslovakians are dead against him but they, like many others, may feel a kind of admiration for him at the same time. They say: "Look what he is doing. Isn't he a devil!" **In a sense they admire his power.** (Diagnosis the Dictators, *C.G. Jung Speaking: Interviews and Encounters*, 1978, p. 137)

That Hitler voiced the unconscious – but mostly the conscious opinions – of the English and French of

the time was in no small part related to his propagation of Indologist fabrications and the eugenics movement, the latter 'science' heavily influenced by Western Europeans of all branches. Indeed it explains why his rise went unchecked for so long, and helps us to partially understand why "moderate" Muslims are unable or unwilling to eliminate "extremists" – for they have *affinity* for what the "extremists" voice and implement, with the Nazis comparable to the literalist Muslims as the inevitable, though ugliest, manifestation of a climate tolerating the Asuric influence. Though the "moderate" Muslims are distinguished from Nazi Germany's European contemporaries in that the former have the specific doctrine of *taqiyah* to also explain their silence on "extremist" activity, both parties, like the majority of mankind, are – were in the case of pre-War Europe - prone to admire the externally powerful among them. But the power of a Hitler or a Mohammed, or those heeding the Asura's call through the two men's respective ideologies, is of an illusory nature, for as the reality of men like Hitler or Mohammed is that of a medium with no true individual power, the power associated with the Asura of Falsehood can only be temporary, without the eternal source of the Soul to stand upon. Real individual power comes from the Psychic within, the eternal battery reviving mankind through all of his lives; the source of light, knowledge, self-sustaining power and energy. It was this lack of the Psychic influence that led Jung, after viewing Hitler in person along with Mussolini, to comment on the former's lack of apparent *strength*:

Hitler is entirely different. **His body does not suggest strength.** The outstanding characteristic of his physiognomy is its dreamy look. I was especially struck by that when I saw pictures taken of him during the Czechoslovakian crisis; there was in his eyes the look of the seer.

There is no question but that Hitler belongs in the category of the truly mystic medicine man. **As somebody commented about him at the last Nurnberg party congress, since the time of Mohammed nothing like it has been seen in this world.**

This markedly mystic characteristic of Hitler's is what makes him do things which seem to *us* illogical, inexplicable, curious and unreasonable. (Diagnosing the Dictators, *C.J Jung Speaking: Interviews and Encounters*, 1978, p. 117)

Like Hitler, weaknesses were apparent in Mohammed, though mostly of a psychological variety, including his obsessive fear of Jinns and committing errors against Allah's decrees. Fear, let us recall, is precisely the opposite of what Brahma wants in his potential adhar, and the heroism the Divine prefers, the quality which leads to a profound Puissance, can only arrive from the Psychic influence within, the extension of the Eternal Purusha. Yet they both, as Jung described, were of the rare "mystic medicine man" type, with Jung seeing in Hitler the eyes of a seer. Of course, if we are to describe Hitler or Mohammed as seers, it must be with the more specific title of *infrarational* seer. For the two Asuric puppets were oceans apart from the luminous Vedic Rishi, the latter privy to the glorious truths of the superconscious planes, truths they became harmoniously united with through the Realization of Satchitananda. The difference is fundamental, for the revelation or inspiration of the Rishi's, and the Self-Realized Yogin in ensuing millennia, belongs to them in Identity, as they are Consciously One with the Creator: Hitler and Mohammed, on the other hand, could only blindly follow the orders of an occult being not *of* them, consciously separate to them.

As the two were not Self-Realized, they were completely dependent upon the "voice" of an external – although located in the occult plane – Asura of Falsehood, whereas the Yogin, *living* as the Purusha or Atman, often does not even need to wait for a *suprarational* revelation when deciding a matter, as they may have already effected the *descent* of the Supramental or Dynamic aspect of Satchitananda – which is originally *above* the Golden Lid and the highest regions of the mind where intuition, discrimination, revelation and inspiration are the predominant qualities guiding many mystics – to transform the mental regions, making it fully functional according to that Supramental. And even if the Overmind or the Intuitive level is the primary base of consciousness for the mystic (having yet to be transformed even

after a Self-Realization that while making Brahma now accessible and United with, means that the Self-presentation of Brahman still proceeds *according* to the grooves of the Overmind or Intuitive mind), suprarational *revelation* alone need not be *the* determinant for their decision making – indeed, suprarational *intuition* is a likely mechanism for Divine action in the Yogi who has not yet brought the Satchitananda down to utterly transform the adhar. And if there are verbal commands, it is through the Voice of the Soul, *the actual Person*, Who by the very fact that It is One with the eternal Voice, will not seek to use or abuse Itself. Thus the suprarational revelations of the Yogi are for the *benefit* of the adhar who is United with the Self-Conscious God, whereas the infrarational Asuric command is only for the latter's ulterior motive, with the infrarational mystic a separate entity and eventually discarded by the hostile Asura.

As both were dependent on commands *external* to their central consciousness', Hitler and Mohammed often spent days, weeks or months waiting for the return of their master. One recalls, in Hitler's example, his retreat for days before 'deciding', without explanation, to withdraw from the League of Nations, an act quite similar to Mohammed's remarkable confidence in the Treaty of Hudaibiya, one which obviously led his companions to severe hardships; both were the 'decisions' of a separate slave following the orders of an occult master, not the result of a Soul that immediately intuitively discerns a course of action *emerging from Itself*. Though Hitler was a slightly better instrument than Mohammed, with the former having absolutely no Psychic element and the latter a few minor spasms of a departing Psychic Being, the practical manifestation of both were ideologies specific to the Asura, with falsehood masquerading as truth, in Islam as a religio-political formation with the Asura of Falsehood worshipped according to the name "Allah", Nazism a politico-national construct with the Asura in practicality worshipped as the "race" and Hitler functioning as the Nazi Prophet.

Indeed, as Islam is an Asuric concoction masquerading as a religion, the prayer of a Muslim will often, unknowingly, be toward said Asura of Falsehood. While that is of course dependent on the psychological content of the particular prayer, the very fact that Islam forces its followers to pray in congregation, at multiple mandated points in a day and inside a mosque, with the prayers uniform according to infrarational revelations that incite hatred and destruction and torture and imposition upon the kuffar, makes it more likelier than any other religion for its prayer's psychological quality to be Asuric, the form of the prayer as the manifestation of the revealer's degraded consciousness. Nevertheless, although the Islamic 'God' is indeed the Asura of Falsehood, certain sincere prayers of the Muslim, prayers unrelated to the desire for conquest and spoils, or the call to hatred and paranoia enshrined in the Quran and Hadith, will always be answered by God, Who as we know may answer to *any* name mortals call Her by, far above is She to the petty divisions of humans that include arguments and warfare over Her name. Yet will He also, on occasion, decide to favourably answer the *Asuric* prayers emerging at times – when the Imam guides the believers to the specific scripture – from the Muslim, as the Inscrutable Supreme might see it fit to allow an Islamic victory at that particular juncture, or perhaps the Islamic opponent did not call for Divine favour in the particular battle. Or He might decide to, on the surface, positively answer the Asuric Islamic prayer, with the stage set for an ironic, comprehensive finale to arrive later - for instance the prayer for a pure Islamic country, created through the blood of the kuffar, granted by Brahma yet resulting in the most dystopian of outcomes.

Muslims, after all, are not the only set of mortals calling upon the Creator, and though He might, in his Infinite Wisdom, have implicitly granted the ascent of the Prophet, the inevitable outcome for an ideology of Falsehood is its own destruction, an unravelling of its pretences, with the truths it was covering emerging more luminous than before. That Asuric Islam remains, while Nazi Germany was quickly disposed of, is only a matter of the relative threat of the latter, capable as it was of vanquishing Europe and obtaining access to her global colonies – an astonishingly quick pathway to subjugating the 'non-Aryan' races and killing all hopes of Prakriti's evolution. While Islam has certainly enslaved,

raped, tortured and killed its way throughout many centuries and lands, it has not, perhaps until recently, been capable of actually accomplishing the global conquest declared by the Asura of Falsehood to be its ultimate conclusion. Indeed, even in India, where for five centuries it savagely lorded over much of the nation, it was strictly in the ruling class that significant amounts of Muslims were found – only in the last couple of centuries has the reproductive jihad begun to bear its poisonous fruit.

But failure is its destiny, this Asuric creation that purports to knowledge it does not have, that speaks of things it in actuality completely perverts - including the very concept of falsehood, which in Islam is entirely reversed, the reality declared unfounded, the falsehood alleged to be truth. Indeed this inversion of reality was the justification for Mohammed's pillage of Polytheist statues at the Ka'ba – that the very notion of Polytheism was a falsehood:

Do you not see that Allah makes the night to enter into the day, and He makes the day to enter into the night, and He has made the sun and the moon subservient (to you); each pursues its course till an appointed time. And that Allah is Aware of what you do? This is because Allah is the Truth, and that which they call upon besides Him is the **falsehood**, and that Allah is the High, the Great. (Quran 31:29-30)

In another example, the Asura proclaimed, “That is because Allah is the Truth, **and that what they call upon besides Him - that is the falsehood**, and because Allah is the High, the Great.” (Quran 22:62) That an elementary truth of existence, the diversity of thought and belief manifesting in multiple *forms*, is described as a “falsehood”, is the hallmark of the Asura of Falsehood, representing a clear transmutation of *wisdom* into falsehood, the supplanting of the latter above the former. In a different type of Islamic ‘knowledge’ presented, the disputation of the Asuric message, possibly by way of sound arguments of the rational mind along with Polytheism, is presented as a falsehood:

Ha Mim. The revelation of the Book is from Allah, the Mighty, the Knowing, The Forgiver of the faults and the Acceptor of repentance, Severe to punish, Lord of bounty. There is no god but He, to Him is the eventual coming. The people of Noah and the parties after them rejected (prophets) before them, and every nation purposed against their messenger to destroy him, and **they disputed by means of the falsehood** that they might thereby render null the truth, therefore I destroyed them. How was then My retribution! And thus did the word of your Lord prove true against those who disbelieved that they are the inmates of the fire. (Quran 40:01-06)

These examples, as we have seen, are only a fraction of the Asuric degradation of wisdom in the Quran and Hadith, the inevitable aftermath of an occult entity that believes *itself* to be ultimate sovereign of the planet, greater than even God. It is why his slavish mediums spoke of things they did not really understand – Hitler commenting on “reason” and “culture”, Mohammed egregiously describing “God”. Similarly does the Islamic mass confuse the purpose of the multiplicity, lauding the egoistic group, surrendering their egos not upon God but onto the Asura and his need for an army of aggression and chaos. It is a systematic aspect of Islam similar to Hitler's false, though more intellectually articulated, elevation of efficiency and man as the machine, with the ideal Islamic mass, one thinking and acting the same way, expected to enact the utopia on earth prior to the Judgement Day. As with everything else the Asura of Falsehood distorts, this systematic nature does indeed have a hint of reality, with Prakriti having set up the mortal, like all other beings in her creation, to have a certain rhythm or predictability. The difference between Prakriti's system and the Asura's, however, is that the former is a mere foundation from which great individuals and stupendous advances in consciousness emerge from.

Islam and Nazism on the other hand, by nature of their falsehood, claim that the heights of consciousness have already been reached in their respective formulations of existence, with the system of automaton Muslims or “Aryan” efficiency the earthly summit of Time. Both – implicitly in Nazism

and explicitly in Islam – demand uniform thought and belief, a clear deviation from Prakriti's systemic formulation of which the unpredictable Free Will is a permanent element, one that Islam assiduously seeks to destroy through fear and punishment by death, for the 'crime' of apostasy in Islam is in actuality the assertion of free will in a tyrannical religious environment. And even if we consider the systemic nature of Mind and Vital, both of which Islam seeks to monotonize through control of thought and belief, Prakriti's system does not include the *repetition* of precise thoughts and beliefs, something that Islam desires yet is unnatural, if for the very fact that Prakriti has allowed for countless distinct languages, with the very nature of their differences leading to varying specifics to patterns of thought (including tenets or philosophical outlooks on life) and belief. What her systematic nature does create are *similarities*, with the very fact that the mortal creation is limited and death-bound by default restricting the wideness and heights emerging from the *foundation* of free will and the mental, vital and physical sheaths provided to each individual.

Similarities or rhythmic patterns are inequivalent to the Islamic or Nazi demand for mass *uniformity*, as the latter dictate fails to facilitate the transformation that Prakriti has also *systematically* allowed through her delegation of free will to the mortal, the element that if only providing a limited amount of options at each significant juncture in the mortal's life, is nevertheless a superior example of fluidity to the stultifying confines of Asuric Islam. Indeed the element of free will includes the individual's option of surrendering his or her thoughts, desires and actions to the Supreme Consciousness, a choice that is completely *volitional*, unlike the type of surrender ordained by the Asura in his creation of Islam, with the principle of surrender, like other higher elements of life, being usurped by the Asura to become a tool of Falsehood. For in the Sanatana Dharma the sublime and sincere surrender of ego onto God is done strictly for the aspiration of Conscious Unity with the Soul or Self, not for individual gains or the strategic objectives of the group ego or the Asura – it is for spiritual progression and the growth of the Psychic, rather than for group or individual earthly spoils, that the sadhak surrenders his thoughts, actions and desires to the Supreme Mother.

Nor is the surrender done for the separative consciousness of Paradise, which though in itself not a falsehood, is an example of how Islam entrenches a foundation of *avidya* or Ignorance, raising elements of the separative ego consciousness to become the ultimate aspiration. Included in this is the dislike of, and rigid distinction from the 'other'; a desire for spoils that should be transcended; the exaggeration of egoistic emotions like fear; and an emphasis on rituals and obsessive thinking. From this firmly established base (or ceiling, looking at it from another perspective) the descent into Falsehood becomes much easier, the dislike turning into hatred, the rigid distinction proceeding to merciless calls to kill the 'other' and 'heretics', the begrudged acknowledgement of diversity to actively seeking its destruction, and of course the outright inversion of reality, such as the inability to call rape for what it actually is. By creating the pivotal idea of permanent separation when Mohammed was weaker militarily, the Asura was taking the first initial step, as he did with European academics like Dubois and Muller, Chamberlain and Grant, to first obstruct the truth before later proceeding to something far more sinister.

Both the impediment to the truth and the aftermath required the necessary function of a solitary unit, a dwarf slave whose minuscule subtle body mirrors the concentration of his energies on the lower vital ephemeral qualities of ignorance and falsehood. Indeed, the power assigned to these mediums, as in the example of Hitler, is but a magnification of the most contemptible of human reality, as close to the base inconscient as possible. Hitler, like Mohammed before him, was an archetype for this manifestation of the brutal elements of the Vital:

Like the rest of the world, they did not understand wherein Hitler's significance lay, that he symbolized something in every individual. **He was the most prodigious personification of all human inferiorities. He was an utterly incapable, unadapted, irresponsible, psychopathic**

personality, full of empty, infantile fantasies, but cursed with the keen intuition of a rat or a guttersnipe. He represented the shadow, the inferior part of everybody's personality, in an overwhelming degree, and this was another reason why they fell for him. (Carl Jung, *The Fight With the Shadow*)

Though Jung's description of Hitler's unadaptability, infantilism and general emptiness, along with his raw ambition and hatred, accurately represent the lower vital elements marking him, the reason for their magnification and his external procurement of the power he desired (as opposed to say, the ordinary man whose ambitions fail quite early on) lies not in his mere representation of the Shadow, but his actual possession by the Asura of Falsehood. It was an enslavement explaining his emptiness, for it is the Psychic (withdrawn from Hitler after the Asuric capture) that provides life and unique personality to the individual, with the psychopathic personality only the manifestation of the grotesque and hostile vital emanation, whose direct commandments led to the superficial impression that Hitler or Mohammed had the “guttersnipe intuition”, when it was in fact a powerful infrarational *entity* that commanded them through the lowest type of occult revelation. This was the frightening prospect felt – although not entirely perceived – by Jung in his criticism of the attribution of ordinary personal circumstances to the rise of dictators like Hitler or Stalin:

It is a great mistake to think that a dictator becomes so on account of personal reasons, such as that he had a strong resistance to his father. There are millions of men who resisted their fathers just as strongly as say, Mussolini or Hitler or Stalin, but who never became dictators or anything like dictators.

The law to remember about dictators is: “*It is the persecuted one who persecutes.*” The dictators must have suffered from circumstances calculated to bring about dictatorship. (Diagnosing the Dictators, *C.J Jung Speaking: Interviews and Encounters*, 1978, pp. 124-125)

While the first portion is entirely true, with the ascent of the *globally* menacing despot requiring an extraordinary occult intervention unseen in the typical stories of local tyrants (because the latter is only harmful to the relatively limited population under their command), the second part of his comments, on the other hand, cannot fully explain either all dictators or the extremes of a Hitler, Mohammed or Stalin. For there have been countless persecuted individuals throughout the history of time, with the vast majority failing to even come close to obtaining any political power – indeed most spend their lives struggling with the damaging aftermath of their suffering. While the law of the persecuted becoming the persecutor is certainly evident in some, it is usually more of a mindset of persecution than genuine suffering, for nowhere do we find Hitler being tortured, and in Mohammed we almost entirely encounter insulting comments presented as evidence of his *personal* (as opposed to a handful of his companions) ‘persecution’. Also, many dictators, while certainly evil, do not persecute others due to personal experiences of torture – rather, it is simply for the continuation of their power and a lack of Psychic check to their use of sickening types of punishment.

As it was only because of a distorted perception that Hitler and Mohammed felt they were persecuted – with the belief helpful in unleashing a reactionary drive of ‘justified’ vengeance -, the circumstances referred to by Jung are again not a result of the assumed ‘persecution’, but instead a possession by the Asura of Falsehood, a capture that emerged after direct occult encounters, in both of their cases. In others without the infrarational mystic capacity, it is a lesser type of possession that can emerge after an Asuric intellectualization that consequently proceeds to eradicate all remaining Psychic elements in the individual. The latter pathway, as we are aware, is more effective in the mass than the individual puppets of the Asura who often require an overt command - from someone the instrument assumes to be either God or an agent of the Divine – when undertaking crucial decisions, because the infrarational mystic is only a vessel and does not have his own intuitive capacity to elect a course of action. The mass then follows the presumed leader, especially if they are, like the Germans of yesteryear, prone to

the exaltation of the group ego:

The onslaught of primitive forces was more or less universal. **The only difference lay in the German mentality itself, which proved to be more susceptible because of the marked proneness of the Germans to mass psychology.** Moreover, defeat and social disaster had increased the herd instinct in Germany, so that it became more and more probable that Germany would be the first victim among the Western nations – victim of a mass movement brought about by an upheaval of forces lying dormant in the unconscious, ready to break through all moral barriers. (Carl Jung, *The Fight With the Shadow*)

While the “moral barriers” mentioned by Jung may indeed be of use to prevent a torrent of primitive and hostile vital forces (whether Asuric, Rakshasic or Pischachic), the conception of morality is itself fraught with various interpretations, some of which potentially facilitate the entry of hostiles into, or their overriding influence over, the mental and vital domains. It becomes a question as to what is considered moral, because in some nations the Quran is considered the bastion of morality, with paranoia and wanton violence against the non-Muslims a ‘righteous’ path to heaven. It is not a vague morality then, that can be the defence against the Asura’s machinations; only the Psychic qualities practised by mankind, whether they be called “morality” or “humanism” or “dharma”, can truly prevent the permeation of Asuric Falsehood. Indeed, certain activities associated with morality, such as the self-control or self-discipline of the Nazi or Muslim, are indeed often subverted by the Shadow as a means for an Asuric tapasya. The first step then, for the majority, is not *necessarily* the organization or control associated with morality, but the identification with the right psychological qualities.

It is a wisdom that can be obtained by the ordinary human methods, which means that education, whether that happens in schools, the household or the community, is paramount to recognizing the Asuric influence (since the direct occult contact is rare and unlikely to be experienced) and preventing the descent into chaos and misery. It starts at an early age, with the message encouraging friendship and harmony, along with developing the ability to take into account the emotions and opinions of others – this latter capacity a glimmer of the profound samata underlying all of existence. During these impressionable times the concept of svadharma – though not necessarily described by that word or even associated with spirituality or religion – must also be taught, though perhaps lightly, helping the individual to begin formulating an understanding of their subjective elements, as it leads to their consciousness growing in proximity to the Psychic or Purusha. Childhood and adolescence should also involve the engagement with activities, purified as much as possible, of beauty, pursuit of the natural lines of knowledge, healthy enjoyment, for all of these things are important reflections of Satchitananda, and even the participation in limited earthly manifestations of Satchitananda can lead to significant growth.

To maintain as much purity in youthful endeavours, there must also be a corresponding discipline, not to the extent of an extreme tapasya, but enough to where inherent right and wrong thoughts and actions are recognized, especially with regards the question of strength, the facet of life the Asura especially likes to distort through his promotion of a lust of power, and the vital imposition upon others, above other considerations. This is especially important to fight against, as it leads to exaggerated vital ambition and narcissism, qualities that considerably cloud the presence of samata, for they divert one towards an increased ego consciousness at the expense of the Psychic. Even at this stage, the battle is primarily against the exaltation of *avidya* rather than a direct fight against the Asura of Falsehood – because the negative qualities can be acknowledged as part of the mixed human consciousness, yet still be taught as things to improve upon, focusing on the positive aspirations above the Ignorance instead of entirely defending against hostile vital influences that might manifest. By preventing the idolization of psychological qualities of *avidya*, something we know to be permanently enshrined in Islam, no ceiling is attached to the earthly endeavours or aspirations of humans, helping to at least protect against

degeneration into an outright Asuric takeover.

If such basic preventative measures either fail to serve as a foundation for a society based on the Psychic principles, or if – as in the political state known as “Pakistan” – lies and falsehood, hatred and violence, are actually integral to a perverse ‘education’ providing an intellectual foundation for a community or group to propagate and forcefully impose the Asura of Falsehood's ideology on others, then the methods used to fight the Asura of Falsehood must begin to take a more dynamic turn. For it is nearly impossible, once the Asuric ideology – whether that be Islam, Nazism or something else – is entrenched in the minds of a captured group, to then rationally persuade the group of their Falsehood, because the Asura has already convinced the group that its Falsehood is the ‘truth’, *and* glorified its ‘strength’ and military prowess, the means by which the group is to conquer the ‘other’ and bring them that ‘truth’. When matters have reached this stage, the counter-strategy, after the – internal to the nation *targeted* by the Asuric group - education as to what and *who* the group in question actually stand for, naturally involve the use of politics and counterforce, necessitating a buildup of a military power and an eventual invasion when the time is right.

For the matter of Asuric “nations”, or political groups entirely under the Shadow, cannot be simply resolved through wars that only maintain the status quo. This is because the wars incited by the Asura of Falsehood are unique in their ideological motivation, not driven – as in the majority of wars – by primary considerations of loot and fiefdom. The spoils are secondary, because the first ambition is to fulfil the ‘religious’ command to conquer the Polytheists and other unbelievers, or to – for the Nazis – subjugate the ‘non-Aryans’, all as a matter of principle. Thus merely losing a war will not end the conflict for that particular state, because as long as they are alive they will persist with the ambition – Asuric individuals and nations do not have the necessary balance to accept a loss in war and strictly focus on internal matters. It is the same loss of balance, something often curtailed by a proper education, which the Asura by nature of his lack of a Purusha (from which equilibrium comes from, as the quality is a human reflection of the sheer Unity of Existence that the Asura denies) does not have, that returns us again to another reason for his tacitly approved existence.

We are referring once more to the use of the Asura in a sadhana, in which the Divine has allowed the former's occult presence to secretly function as a stern examination of the spiritual seeker's fidelity to Psychic principles, his or her sincerity in rejecting all notions of ambition (especially in being viewed as a great spiritual figure), narcissism, lust, hatred, egoistic selfishness, fondness for personal power, and overall egoistic desire. As sadhana is paramount to the continued earthly progression, with individuals becoming Self-Realized and then – conceivably – literally engaging in Divine work upon earth to help continue the global evolution toward each individual's Purusha, the seeker must be able to pass certain tests during his or her journey. Yet it is in this most glorious of pursuits that we arrive at the ultimate means of preventing the Asuric possession and influence: a concentrated and sincere aspiration for the Soul that begins with the following of svadharma, leading into sadhana and the necessary sacrifice of desire and other forms of avidya and falsehood that are impediments to the Soul's uncovering by the growing consciousness.

This is the profound Reality that *all* mortals have the innate capacity to access, though they might not either believe in it or lack the guidance to discover their true Person – the very fact that the Purusha is within each human means that the Soul's Realization is *always* a potential outcome. It is an outcome that can occur irrespective of the external appearance, or what religious, racial, linguistic, ethnic or other grouping the individual is superficially categorized in. For it is their subjective psychology, sincerity and aspiration that counts, with the possibility existing that even those not consciously partaking in sadhana, not even aware of the existence of the Soul or that It is something that might be experienced in the lifetime, can yet become Self-Realized. That such unorthodoxy is appreciated by Hinduism is because of the central truths comprising it, including the fundamental principle - known

and first articulated by the Rishis - of multiple pathways to God, diverse means by which the Purusha can present Itself to the individual. Similarly is this diversity then reflected by the multiple forms of worship that includes the infinite amount of names that God is called by, a reality that is secretly hinted at in the Islamic texts, including the previously cited verse, "Allah - there is no god but He. His are the very best names." (Quran 20:08) There are also hadith mentioning this theme, with Allah reported to have at least ninety-nine names:

Narrated Abu Huraira:

Allah's Apostle said, "Allah has ninety-nine names, i.e. one-hundred minus one, and whoever knows them will go to Paradise." (Sahih Bukhari Volume 3, Book 50, Number 894)

These names, as already mentioned, are meant to signify differing characteristics of Allah, with Abu Huraira narrating elsewhere, "Allah has ninety-nine Names, i.e., one hundred minus one, and whoever believes in their meanings and acts accordingly, will enter Paradise; and Allah is Witr (one) and loves 'the Witr' (i.e., odd numbers)." (Sahih Bukhari Volume 8, Book 75, Number 419) This is not, as we will discuss in the next chapter, an endorsement of Polytheism, but it certainly has an element of reality scarcely found in the Islamic scripture, and presents an avenue – taken by many "Muslims" in Islam's history, as we shall see - for transgression from genuine Islam. Of course, a scriptural discrepancy like this one is an example of the conspicuous hypocrisy – the non-Islamic definition of the word – found in many Islamic declarations, including its damnation of an 'idolatry' it incessantly practices. That this lack of consistency is so obviously present is directly related to the very falsehood of Islam claiming to be the one solitary truth, with anything outside of its narrow walls branded as false, whether that be the truth of multiple Gods or forms of worship, or even the truth that the Supreme might send down revelations or inspiration in different time periods or individuals or nations. The contradictory nature of the Islamic religion is perhaps best seen in the reality of the Quran's frequent abrogation, a characteristic previously mentioned, one with support from the Quran itself, in which the Islamic Plurality communicates, "And when We put a revelation in place of another revelation." (Quran 16:101) In the hadith we find that this revision of a text that in other verses is described as "unchanging", was a quite frequent affair:

Narrated Aisha:

Once Fatima came walking and her gait resembled the gait of the Prophet. The Prophet said, "Welcome, O my daughter!" Then he made her sit on his right or on his left side, and then he told her a secret and she started weeping. I asked her, "Why are you weeping?" He again told her a secret and she started laughing. I said, "I never saw happiness so near to sadness as I saw today." I asked her what the Prophet had told her. She said, "I would never disclose the secret of Allah's Apostle." **When the Prophet died, I asked her about it. She replied, "The Prophet said, 'Every year Gabriel used to revise the Qur'an with me once only, but this year he has done so twice. I think this portends my death, and you will be the first of my family to follow me.'** So I started weeping. Then he said, 'Don't you like to be the mistress of all the ladies of Paradise or the mistress of all the lady believers?' So I laughed for that." (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 56, Number 819)

Since it is unlikely that Gabriel specifically waited until one particular date to provide infrarational revelations that superseded previous ones, as the need for the revelations was variable and dependent upon Mohammed's circumstances (for instance, if Mohammed needed a revelation during an ongoing battle to supersede a previous one, Gabriel was not going to wait until later to provide it if the matter was urgent), the revisions referred to in this particular hadith assume a *heretical* quality. For if we consider the Islamic boast of a pure, unadulterated, 'last Word', we find the matter of yearly *revisions* – like one might find with a school textbook – a questionable practice. After all, fixed revisions imply

that “Allah” *knew* that what he had initially sent down to Mohammed - whether in the phrase of turn or particular wordings, or even specific verses that he no longer wanted in the finalized scripture – was *imperfect*. The need for revision speaks to an ordinary process of trial and error, preliminary draft and final editing, that while certainly understandable even in works of actual Divine origin – where the human *adhar* might later receive Supramental inspiration he intuitively to be more appropriate to what he previously received -, effects an ‘idolatrous’ turn in Islam, a religion in which Allah is supposed to have only needed one instrument and one lifetime to present the entire ‘truth’ to mankind. Why then, would this supposedly omniscient god have to frequently make changes in that *same* lifetime, having simultaneously declared himself to *not* need any other time periods to revise his scripture?

It is a question that simply cannot be answered through a theological or even intellectual basis, a paradox ignored by Muslims as part of their infrarational brainwashing, with any possible answers for it displaying their unthinking acceptance. And if, as mentioned previously, the Asura of Falsehood had an important strategic need of abrogation – to allow, depending upon the Muslim military capacity, for the application of different verses at different times – it still promotes an uncoupled mindset among even the believers conscious of its necessity for taqiyyah. They are, after all, persistently engaging in the dark art of deception, deliberately presenting one face to the Kafir while secretly believing in and practising the opposite ideology. Though one might be consciously aware of the dichotomy, the eventual weight of the contradictions often becomes too much, the inevitable loss of balance occurring, with rampant irrationality and disorganization settling in – a prelude to one's demise, whether that be through self-destruction or through the composed hand of the ‘weak’ Other. It is an irrationality, inevitable by way of the Muslim's belief in Asuric Islam, that brings about extraordinary examples of irony, with the Muslim accusing others of crimes or behaviours that he is himself entirely guilty of. Yet is he unaware of the irony behind the indictments coming from his own mouth, immersed as he is in the cult of Islam, following in the footsteps of his Prophet Mohammed who, without the slightest trace of reflection, declared the “worst” of humans to be those appearing to be one thing to some people, another thing to different people:

Narrated Abu Huraira:

Allah's Apostle said, “You see that the people are of different natures. Those who were the best in the pre-Islamic period, are also the best in Islam if they comprehend religious knowledge. You see that the best amongst the people in this respect (i.e. ambition of ruling) are those who hate it most. **And you see that the worst among people is the double faced (person) who appears to these with one face and to the others with another face (i.e. a hypocrite).**”
(Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 56, Number 699)

Thus if a Muslim is cognizant of his dissimulation against the Infidel, for whom he is to present a ‘peaceful’ and ‘tolerant’ face divergent from the ugly reality within, he is then arguably, according to the great Mohammed, the worst among people. Indeed Mohammed himself is guilty of the same charge, for he was willing to accept the humiliations of Hudaibiya to present an illusion of peace, an arrangement to be broken as soon as he was powerful enough. It should come as no surprise then to find his followers proceeding forth with double dealings, adopting the platitudes of love, peace, truth, and fraternity, until the time is right when the wolf can emerge from the sheep's cloth and devour the prey. That the believer might intellectualize away his sinister interactions with the kuffar by the simple reason of the latter's Islamic status as untermensch, nevertheless has no bearing on the reality of his deceitful behaviour, one far removed from the sattvic samata, the pure movement of the Psychic endorsing as much honesty – a human reflection of the Truth – as possible with fellow mortals. And if the hypocrisy (according to its usual definition) of Mohammed and his followers is presented in the previous hadith through another example of the small man's self-analysis – the projection of one's own reality upon others -, we soon discover yet further hypocrisy, albeit not in his characterizations of

others, but in his demands of them:

Narrated Abu Huraira:

Allah's Apostle kissed Al-Hasan bin Ali while Al-Aqra bin Habis At-Tamim was sitting beside him. Al-Aqra said, "I have ten children and I have never kissed anyone of them." **Allah's Apostle cast a look at him and said, "Whoever is not merciful to others will not be treated mercifully."** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 8, Book 73, Number 26)

Once more we find an incredible irony in the record of Mohammed, a prolific murderer, rapist, slaveholder and committer of genocide, a spiteful man who constantly 'warned' unbelievers of the torture they were sure to receive in hellfire, yet who at the same time dared to tell someone else to practice mercy! Asuric Islam, as we know, is without benevolence towards the Hindus and other disbelieving non-Muslims, to the extent of the religion even frowning upon – at the risk of one becoming labelled a heretic for violating the infrarational revelations - natural friendship between the Muslim and the Infidel. A religion based on rigid separation and the cruel culling of the 'other' cannot, by a *normal* definition, be anywhere near to what one expects of a merciful ideology, as to have that quality, one needs to have the vision or intuition to recognize superficially separate forms as secretly having an inherent unity. Yet are the principles of "mercy" and "tolerance" the hypocritical (again, the normal meaning of the word) demands of Muslims when they live as minorities within non-Muslim confines, or with their demands of a non-Muslim neighbour militarily stronger than itself.

It is the most obvious of hypocrisies, especially among the scripturally aware Muslims who know their religion to desire subjugation of the hated disbeliever. For if the Muslim is incessantly calling for equal or superior "rights" while living as a minority, we would expect him to live by what he preaches instead of mentally preparing for the time when he might impose himself upon the non-Muslim. Of course, as the Muslim's Psychic qualities disappear with his continued indoctrination and practice of the real, *literal*, Islam, so does the sense of balance that predisposes one to treating others the way they would want themselves treated. It is this deficit of proportion and common sense in the faithful that explains their incomprehension at kuffar responses to their verbal and physical provocation, including the infidel's sheer knowledge of what Islam commands the believers to do (the Muslim is taught that the unbeliever's eyes and ears are supposed to be covered). When faced with a religion seeking to destroy them, an Asuric ideology that has already terrorized them, it is completely normal for non-Muslim groups to take actions - whether reactive or proactive - designed to protect themselves and prevent future depraved manifestations of Asuric Islam. Muslims, after all, cannot be expected to be treated with their distorted application of mercy – whose ordinary formulation they expect to only be implemented by the unbeliever *toward* the believer, and not in the opposite direction -, when the kafir is aware of their demonic commands to enslave, rape and murder non-Muslims.

Yet will the Muslims continue to cry out at the 'injustice' when faced with appropriate Infidel actions towards their crimes *and* their future ambitions to subjugate, because as they are unable to recognize the irony behind some of their pronouncements or the actual hypocrisy to their actions, and as they are ordained by Gabriel to achieve the Islamic doctrine without regards to a genuine consistency, they must persist with their farcical patterns of thought and action. Indeed, the dictates of Islam make quite a mockery of its practitioners and the very concept of religion, with Gabriel leading Muslims to believe the most extravagant of absurdities, including the idea that the most pious in heaven will look down into hell to mock the disbelievers, who are tortured yet still able to survive another day for more sadism, their very skin taunting them. Life on earth itself becomes a farce, reduced to a simple goal of conquest and living in fear of a mythical "Judgement Day", with Allah jotting down their misthoughts and misdeeds - the partaking of which might well earn them death through apostasy prior to the fateful encounter - in stenographical fashion.

That the Asura of Falsehood ridicules his followers, leading them to irrational violence and ‘traditions’, convincing them that they are the guardians of ‘truth’ while actually promoting his False ideals, is both a sign of his sheer disdain for mortals and his understanding that these indoctrinated internal schisms, this demand that Muslims lead a life of discordant absurdities, creates the necessary inner strife useful for release into bloodshed and chaos against the ‘other’. Far different is this internal process to the straightforward path espoused by the Sanatana Dharma, which actively promotes self-awareness, with the self in this case the relatively limited ego. It is a self-awareness that helps one to understand the divergent strands of one's nature, facilitating a harmonious integration of the mental, vital and physical patterns composing the outward and inner natures, including the peculiarities to the individual internal law, the fluid and evolving svadharma unique to each person. That Islam doesn't help to facilitate this inner journey is one sign out of many of its Asuric origin, with the reward of an escape from the hellfire a paltry outcome to the Illimitable Bliss one will find if he or she takes the next step from dharma into moksha.

But to allow for svadharma would go against the very nature of the Asura, because svadharma moves toward harmony and fluidity, progression and inner expansion, qualities at the other end of the spectrum to Islam's separation and hatred, fear and obscurantism. As dharma is the individual foundation for a profound liberation into the Totality of Consciousness, it by its very proximity to the Illimitable must *always* remain flexible, adjusting to both the developing inner nature and the multiple paths to moksha. It is an element – to healthy spirituality – of subtlety absent in any creed or religion touched by the Asuric hand, because the Asura of Falsehood is only conscious of his separate vital ego, and believes himself superior to God, the ultimate of falsehoods that leads to a constant impetus to fight against someone or something, whether it be the Asura comically trying to usurp God, infighting with competing Asuras, or directing his instruments to exterminate the ‘other’. The latter is of course the cardinal Asuric tenet, perhaps most directly articulated by Hitler when describing his intentions towards the Jews:

Emperor William II was the first German Emperor to offer the hand of friendship to the Marxist leaders, not suspecting that they were scoundrels without any sense of honour. While they held the imperial hand in theirs, the other hand was already feeling for the dagger. **There is no such thing as coming to an understanding with the Jews. It must be the hard-and-fast ‘Either-Or.’** For my part I then decided that I would take up political work. (Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, pp. 165-66)

The same paradigm is found in the Asura's previous creation, Islam, where the Hindu faces an “either-or” option of conversion, subjugation or death. There is no need for the Muslim to arrive at a genuine “understanding” with them, as they are untermensch who obstruct the infrarationally revealed Islamic conquest, who will soon assume their position in Hell as fuel for the fire. As the Islamic ‘Lord’ is not an entity of reason, the Muslim perspective is that of ‘all or nothing’, without any need for rationality when they already have for ‘evidence’ the infrarational revelations. The Muslim, befitting the mentality of the Asura of Falsehood, does not look at things from all sides, as that is the function of the thinking mind, not the vital mentality of the Asura that promotes a primitive ideology of barbaric imposition upon others. And as Asura insidiously commandeered the name of God, attaching it to his falsehoods, setting up the unconscious and nearly exclusive idols of Mohammed, the Quran and the Ka’ba to cement Muslim obedience, this perpetual need to demarcate and liquidate the enemy will proceed with a belief that one is performing the work of ‘Allah’.

While the projection of the profane lower vital ego upon the Divine is fundamental to the Asuric nature of Islam, the other equally crucial factor, the component just as important in making Islam a more effective Asuric tool than Nazism, is the aforementioned tenet that the ‘Word’ of the Quran is unalterable, unmodifiable, with no choice granted to the believers of selectively following certain

verses instead of the entire book. Like the commands to wage war against the kuffar, Muslims must, with regards to the *entirety* of Islamic scripture, 'take it or leave it' – and if they depart, they are to then be killed as apostates. This clever peculiarity to Islam, one not actually seen in Nazism, is what has allowed it to last longer and in more regions of the world (aided of course, by its lack of emphasis on physical race), because the 'real' Muslims are given explicit and 'Divine' instructions to murder if someone decides to leave the cult. By this simple rule, the Asura of Falsehood provided an organized method to identify and eliminate the rebellious "Muslims", sending a message of fear to others who dare to try and escape the seraglio of thought and belief afforded them.

It is due to this particular rule, more so than *anything* else in the Quran and Hadith, even including the calls to rape and murder and forcibly convert, that Islam will always remain recalcitrant to the traditional Hindu method - that of syncretizing - when encountering thought or belief foreign to him. For the Hindu, governed by the fluid and inherent law, does not immediately reject anything that comes his way, especially that declaring itself the ultimate truth, as Islam boasts. Such an instant rejection – at least in the style of an intellectual dismissal - would, unless the result of a sublime intuition not privy to most, be the result of the superficial lower vital ego that obstinately opposes the drive to change that must naturally include trial and error phases. However, this does not mean that the Hindu is looking to convert when he or she seeks to learn about Islam – the goal is rather to try and see if it might help with their self-development, approaching Islam from a perspective natural to his or her own law and culture, whereby Islam – or anything else considered 'foreign' – is to be integrated into a continuously evolving svadharma, potentially helping him or her in some sort of fashion to proceed beyond dharma to moksha. The same process occurs in a cultural sense, with Islam ideally to be absorbed into the free-flowing Indian religious life that prefers to have an *infinite* array of options available for its spiritual seekers.

But this attempted integration cannot continue forever, with a time arriving in which the unfortunate reality of Islam must be acknowledged and effectively addressed. For though a society or culture can evolve itself upwards from primitive human impulses and actions *loosely* influenced by the Asura or different hostile beings of the Vital world, there are always limitations to the syncretizing of ideologies explicitly endorsing such barbarisms, especially if the thing attempting to be integrated either does not *want* to, or *cannot*, harmonize with other ways of life. And since Islam has unequivocal doctrine resisting *any* modifications to its Asuric tenets, the 'Word of Allah' will always supersede arguments suggesting that a "Reformation" is what Islam needs, or that Muslims should practice a relaxed version of religion, gently following certain verses instead of rigidly adhering to every line of the Quran and every daily habit of Mohammed presented in the authentic hadith. While these changes would certainly encourage svadharma among the Muslim population, it will eventually be rejected when Muslims learn that such plasticity *contravenes* Allah's message, with their idea of 'God' a superior entity to that conceived of by the apostate or non-Muslim mortals offering a different way.

Out of this irresistible degradation of Muslim thought and belief, from a natural inclusiveness downward into the religion's real Asuric source, a historic pattern or cyclical rhythm will emerge again to bring about the inevitable demise of another of the Asura of Falsehood's ideological constructs, with Truth prevailing over the sanctified falsehood - in Islam's case a destruction related to the religion's specific danger to Prakriti's evolution. It is a cycle that India is familiar with, for as it is a nation allowing a variety of occult or spiritual experimentation, one that at the same time holds Self-Realization and the dissolution of the separative egoistic consciousness to be the ultimate aspiration, it naturally attracts more than its fair share of hostile vital emanations, whether Asuric or otherwise, as these hostiles are both secretly used by God to test the resoluteness of the adhar, and *in their own limited consciousness* seeking to obstruct the growth of anything that aspires to a way of living progressively Divine, because the aspiration for the descent of Satchitananda into the material existence

would naturally signal the end to the reign of the Asura of Falsehood and similar depraved elements.

While the death of Islam is already contained within the Quran itself, thanks to its rigid demand for the believers to practice adharma by following verses antithetical to their own inherent law, its explicit call for self-devouring through the culling of apostates, and a self-fulfilling prophecy imagining non-Muslim intrigue against them (leading to unnecessary provocations against the infidel that forces the latter to take action against the pious), because Islam is not the first Asuric construct to meet its destined demise, it remains imperative for humanity to secure permanent lessons and psychological growth out of the cycle of Islam, helping the global consciousness transcend the usual rhythm or pattern periodically enacted by the Asura of Falsehood's machinations upon earth. The ability to recognize distortions of falsehood, whether projected upon God or any other aspect of life, should be the initial step; but there must also emerge an understanding that the Supreme Consciousness and the pursuit of that Self-Realization should be the ultimate aspiration for the individual, with the principles surrounding the quest, especially the practice of svadharma, continuing to spread globally.

What must not occur, if humanity is to prevent or at least minimize future Asuric cycles, is a return to non-Indic Polytheism, or at least the type of West Asian Polytheism – rather than the *names* of the Gods used – practised in the period closer in time to the rise of the ‘monotheistic’ religions. The Western classical civilizations, let us recall, lost their initial connections or *direct* openings to the Supreme Consciousness, a link that was found in their early Mysteries and other similar schools that later devolved to the point where they were, at best, only capable of intermediate occult access, having lost the experience of the individual uniting with the Creator - the Self. It was a failure proven by the fall of the ancient non-Indian Polytheism in the face of forces far inferior in strength and persistence to the foreigners who temporarily subjugated India, as the Indian spiritual traditions remained alive even under the severest of oppressions against decidedly hostile forces. For the ultimate aspiration of Self-Realization was always taught in India, even during the time of Shankara when the earthly life was rejected by some as illusory: simply allowing for the quest of this greatest of human openings helped to keep alive the possibility of national regeneration.

Indeed, this perpetual aspiration for Self-Realization in India, in modern times with a growing integration of karmayoga and the bringing of the Divine Consciousness into all aspects of life, is the primary distinction between the Polytheism that developed in India versus that which *finalized* elsewhere (in antiquity). For without this sublime aspiration that seeks to expand one beyond the boundaries of the mental, vital and physical consciousness, an inevitable demise occurs, as mankind is not given a path beyond the general grooves of an ordinary nature fraught with avidya, the Ignorance that while not evil in itself, can lead to it if there is not the aspiration to go *beyond itself*. Thus in the history of Europe and West Asia we find the devolution from a culture that for a brief period of time had men searching for an Illimitable, to one that while relatively more harmonious to the ‘monotheism’ that followed it, nevertheless displayed a descent into the separative consciousness of vital egoism, the gods degraded to the point where they were allegedly fighting each other! In actuality, what they were exalting was a *vital* formulation of the ‘gods’ (which are in reality non-Divine Nature-forces) instead of the Overmind Gods and Goddesses who know themselves to contain all the other Gods and Goddesses within them, who know themselves to be One in Consciousness with Ishwara.

Thus there emerged very different ideas on the gods during that time, with even the Asura of Death described as such in those classical civilizations. While such beliefs were also present in India, the negative effects were minimized as the spiritual summit remained the eternal aspiration for Self-Realization of the Complete Unity sustaining existence. As the Unity sought for is without limits, the destined outcome is a Reality beyond the separative ego that marked the failure of ancient non-Hindu Polytheistic traditions, where at best the ideal of heaven was eventually postulated as the culmination of existence. It was this avidya, one that could not outgrow the limited egoistic sense of self, that

opened it to a more severe corruption through hostile vital forces, seen in Arabia in its predominant acknowledgement of the Jinns, in ancient Germany the experience of *Ergriffenheit* or seizure through unrefined vital forces. In Europe, these propensities never really went away with the ascent of Christianity, who just like their “Pagan” ancestors advanced Heaven – a separative afterlife phenomenon - as the ultimate aspiration, which meant there could be no overriding drive to eliminate the lower vital elements of earthly life, especially as they were often *invoked* in Christian struggles to destroy different religious faiths.

As neither their non-Dharmic Polytheism, one that devolved into a rampant egoism leading to the idea of ‘one god’ triumphing over others, nor this subsequent ‘monotheism’, sought a reality above the separative ego or engaged in a comprehensive transformation of the vital ego from a foundation of Satchitananda, the lower ego remained a region easily manipulated by the Asura, through which he incessantly exerted his influence on these nations and in some cases overtly captured them through the possession of select individuals. Thus if the nations still predisposed to vital aggrandizements, albeit not to the extent of Islam's rigidity, are to progress from their current ‘monotheism’, they must become inclusive of other types of religious worship *and* involve an aspiration beyond the ordinary arc of human life or the *consciously* separative existence of Heaven. For that should be the destiny of any spirituality or religion worth its name, to try and break through the ceiling distinguishing the manifestation from the Unmanifested. It is a ceiling under which the Heavens and Hells and Swargas and Patalas are found, and the future course of humanity must aspire towards a different sort of Realization upon Earth, one Aware of the Purusha within all, beyond the separation of consciousness superficially delineating humanity from God.

Without that aspiration, individuals or groups will always run the risk of falling to the seductive Asuric call of vital power and strength above all else, for if there is no directive towards something taking humanity beyond its usual arc, then the aggrandizement of the vital ego increasingly becomes the most appealing, leading to ruin. And as Islam deems the aspiration of Self-Consciousness in the Multiplicity to be irreligious and worthy of death and hellfire because of a belief in it, and additionally combines that with the poisonous ideas of a permanent separation, a dehumanization of apostates and disbelievers, a fear of a vengeful ‘God’, a paranoia toward the kuffar, a demand to practice adharma, a quick arrival of violence to resolve disputes and obtain conversions, and a belief that the proof of Allah's exclusivity and superiority lies in the amount of people following it or if Islam is expanding its territory, then the vital glorification enacted becomes the ultimate perversion of belief, and hatred becomes the quality that Muslims are truly worshipping. As the revulsion toward the ‘other’ eventually turns inward, the process of self-devouring heralds the final stage of the Asuric cycle, with the scene set for the outside power to arrive and complete the annihilation, beginning a different cycle in the perpetual work towards the profound transformation of the planet.

Footnotes:

1. *Per Tafsir Ibn Kathir regarding Quran 9:49*: [Allah says, some hypocrites say to you, O Muhammad, (Grant me leave), to stay behind, (and put me not into trial), if I go with you and see the women of the Romans. Allah, the Exalted, replied, (Surely, they have fallen into trial) because of the statement they uttered. Muhammad bin Ishaq reported from Az-Zuhri, Yazid bin Ruwman, Abdullah bin Abi Bakr, Asim bin Qatadah and several others that they said, “The Messenger of Allah said to Al-Jadd bin Qays from Bani Salimah, (‘Would you like to fight the yellow ones (Romans) this year) He said, ‘O Allah's Messenger! Give me permission (to remain behind) and do not cause Fitnah for me. By Allah! My people know that there is not a man who is more fond of women than I. I fear that if I see the women of the yellow ones, I would not be patient.’ The Messenger of Allah turned away from him and said, (I give you permission.) In Al-Jadd's case, this Ayah was revealed, (And among them is he who says: “Grant me leave and put me not into trial.”) **Therefore, Allah says that the Fitnah that he fell into because of not joining the Messenger of Allah (in Jihad) and preferring his safety to the safety of the Messenger is worse than the Fitnah that he falsely claimed to fear.** It was reported from Ibn Abbas, Mujahid and several others that this Ayah was revealed in the case of Al-Jadd bin Qays, who was among the chiefs of Bani Salimah.] A

different tafsir: [Some of the hypocrites, who were requesting the Holy Prophet to give them leave to stay behind on one pretext or the other, were so impudent that they were inventing excuses of a religious or moral nature for refraining from jihad in the Way of Allah. One of these was Jad-bin-Qais, who, according to traditions came to the Holy Prophet and said. "I am a lover of beauty and my people know that I am very weak in regard to women: therefore I am afraid to go forth lest the beauty of the Roman women should beguile me into sin. Therefore '.... do not expose me to temptations.'" Though they wanted exemption, they had already fallen a prey to the temptations of telling lies, of double dealings and hypocrisy. They deluded themselves that they would be considered pious people, if they would put forward the fear of temptations to avoid Jihad, when, in fact; they had already fallen into the greatest possible temptation of refraining from Jihad in the conflict between Islam and kufr.]

2. *Tafsir Ibn Kathir on (Quran 9:38-42)*: From here begins the discourse (vv. 38-72) which was sent down at the time when the Holy Prophet was engaged in making preparations for the Campaign to Tabuk...A general rule of the Islamic conduct has been derived from "If you chastisement." **When the Muslims are commanded to go to Jihad by a public proclamation from their leader, it becomes an obligatory duty for those who are called upon to do Jihad, whether they belong to any particular group or region. So much so that the Faith of those who do not go for Jihad without a genuine excuse becomes doubtful.** ...That is, "Allah's work does not depend on you and will be accomplished only if you do it. It is Allah's grace and bounty that He is affording you the golden opportunity of serving the cause of His Way. Therefore if you miss this opportunity because of any foolish assumption, Allah will raise another people and bestow on them the opportunity and capability of doing His work, and you will be losers." ...This refers to the occasion when the disbelievers had decided to assassinate the Holy Prophet, and the very night fixed for his assassination he had left Makkah for Al-Madinah. By that time most of the Muslims had migrated to Al-Madinah in twos and threes and only a few helpless ones had remained behind in Makkah. As he was sure that he would be pursued, he took only Hadrat Abu Bakr with him and went southward instead of following the northern route to Al-Madinah and remained hidden in the Thaur Cave for three days. In the meantime the blood thirsty enemies had begun to make a thorough search for him all around Makkah and some of them reached the very mouth of the Cave where he was hidden. On this critical occasion Hadrat Abu Bakr naturally felt alarmed lest they should peep into the Cave, and see them. But the Holy Prophet remained as calm as before and reassured his Companion, saying, "Be not distressed: indeed Allah is with us." ..**The words "...whether you are light or heavy..." have a very comprehensive meaning: "When it is enjoined to march forth for Jihad, you must go forth anyhow, whether you like it or not: whether you are in a state of prosperity or indigence: whether you are well-equipped or ill-equipped: whether the circumstances are favourable or adverse: whether you are young and healthy or old and weak."**

3. See Kohlberg, Etan; Amir-Moezzi, Mohammed Ali, eds. *Revelation and Falsification: The Kitab al-qira'at of Ahmad b. Muhammad al-Sayyari: Critical Edition with an Introduction and Notes*. 2009.

4. An example includes the Sultan Mahmud of Ghazni, after defeating the Hindu King Jaipal during one of his many raids into the subcontinent, receiving "an amount of booty as was beyond all bounds and all calculation, including five hundred thousand slaves, beautiful men and women." *Tarikh Yamini* of Abu Nasr Muhammad ibn Muhammad al Jabbaru-l Utbi. Extracted from *The History of India as Told by its own Historians. The Posthumous Papers of the Late Sir H. M. Elliot*. 1956, vol. 1, p. 23

5. The Rotterdam, UK scandal is one example.

6. see Madhusree Mukerjee, *Churchill's Secret War*.

III

The Land of the Impure

(and the Intermediate Dangers of Sufism)

Like the sweeping epics that define the history of the subcontinent, out of which the most luminous of truths emerged in the face of seemingly irreversible collapses, the unwinding of the struggle between India and “Pakistan” has not been one to be rushed. Since their dual inception, it appeared on multiple occasions as if the final act had commenced, that the hostilities between the two would finally conclude; yet three traditional land wars and innumerable skirmishes later, the conflict continues, having outlasted the lifetimes of many born with the two states. But the possibility of a traditional war still persists, irrespective of the countless peace initiatives or, crucially, the resounding losses experienced by one of the parties. Indeed, the three emphatic defeats suffered by “Pakistan” in 1947, 1965 and 1971, with the latter involving the humiliation of 90,000 prisoners of war taken by the Indian army, failed to result in a determination for peace on the part of the Pakistani aggressor, who after a period of rehabilitation decided upon a different strategy, one of a “death by a thousand cuts” through terrorism in multiple regions of India.

That only the means changed, with the psychology supporting it increasingly baser in quality, should be of no surprise when we consider the very origin of “Pakistan”, beginning with the idea that emerged in the solitary mind of a subcontinental Muslim who had, ironically, spent most of his adult life in England. It was there that Chaudhry Rahmat Ali would conceptualize this “nation”, one yet to be articulated in detail by the other subcontinental Muslim leaders of the time, who though of the belief that the Hindus and Muslims were distinct nations, had nevertheless, from a political standpoint, failed to express a demand specifically naming their state and desired territory, with Muhammad Iqbal (another well-known Indian Muslim politician of the time) thought by some to have been fine with a majority Muslim province in a federalist Indian setup. But this was unsatisfactory to the Cambridge, England resident Rahmat Ali, who put forth his counter proposal in a 1933 pamphlet entitled “Now or Never”, which begins, as one might expect, by detailing the name and components to the proposed nation:

At this solemn hour in the history of India, when British and Indian delegates are laying the foundations of a Federal Constitution for that Sub-continent, we address this appeal to you, in the name of our common heritage, and on behalf of our thirty million Muslim brethren who live in PAKISTAN by which we mean the five Northern units of India viz: Punjab, North-West Frontier Province (Afghan Province), Kashmir, Sind, and Baluchistan. And we ask for your sympathy and support in our grim and fateful struggle against political crucifixion and national annihilation. (Chaudry Rahmat Ali, *Now or Never*, 1933)

While there was a certain logic to these particular parts to his “Pakistan”, connected as they were geographically and with their sizeable Muslim populations, there also remained the issue of the substantial Hindu community within these regions, whom Rahmat Ali – like the rest of the Islamic leadership - viewed as a separate nation, their religion entirely different to Islam – a significant matter as religion, according to Rahmat Ali, was not meant to remain a private or subjective practice:

It is preposterous to compare, as some superficial observers do, the differences between Muslims and Hindus with those between Catholics and Protestants. While both the Catholics and the Protestants are part and parcel of one religious system Christianity, the Muslims and the

Hindus are the followers of two essentially different religious systems. Moreover, **religion in the case of Muslims and Hindus is not a matter of private opinion as it may be in the case of Christians**; but on the contrary it is a Civic Church, which lays down a most comprehensive code of conduct to be observed by its adherents from birth to death. (Chaudry Rahmat Ali, *Now or Never*, 1933)

In his premise that the Hindu religion is a matter of public, rather than private opinion, we find the initial appearance of a deep-rooted bias, one projecting upon the Hindu the Islamic demand for loud, congregational and externally organized displays of the faith. The Hindu, on the contrary, cannot be restricted to displays of worship at the temple, for it is the inner temple that matters first, because prayer or meditation in a public setting is not going to yield the aspired consciousness without the internal work paving the way. As there is no threat, unlike with Islam and its mandated assembly prayers in the mosque, against the Hindu for practising his religion away from the temple, it is simply false to imply that the Hindu religion is *not* a matter of private opinion, when we know its primary theme to be the pursuit of the Soul or Self within, rather than world conquest and the decimation of the 'other'. Along with his erroneous presumptions on the Sanatana Dharma, we find in the previous selection the source of Rahmat Ali's momentous decision – a simple difference in religious belief. That a Muslim might view nationhood according to this most elementary of principles is hardly a surprise, given Islam's strict demand of separation that includes rejecting friendship with the disbelievers. That the natural manifestation of this ideology is the desire for a separate political state nevertheless does not confirm its inherent validity, as the root of the ambition comes from the incessant message of a false framework of permanent separation. But this Islamic tenet was not the only fallacy advocated by Rahmat Ali in his conception of nations:

India, constituted as it is at the present moment, is not the name of one single country; nor the home of one single nation. It is, in fact, the designation of a State created by the British for the first time in history. It includes peoples who have never previously formed part of the Indian nation at any period of its history, but who have, on the contrary, from the dawn of history till the advent of the British, possessed and retained distinct nationalities of their own. (Chaudry Rahmat Ali. *Now or Never*. 1933)

That he unquestioningly accepted the great British lie - India's alleged lack of nationhood - is at least superficially understandable, because just as he confused an individual's religious identity with that of the nation, so too did he follow the British manipulation that arrived from the assumption that a lack of political unity (although quite a few Indian Raj's came close to achieving it historically) meant that the nation never actually existed. For nationhood, especially in Bharat, is more subtle than that, as a nation does not need to restrict itself to specific thought patterns comprising 'monotheistic' beliefs; nor does it *require* a constitution confirming its existence, as words on a paper can always be ignored or dismissed, making it a superficial means to confirm a nation. Though the formation of genuine countries will always take into account the triple-aspect of nature, from the physical component of geographical boundaries, to the vital and mental patterns emerging from a common language, what must absolutely be present is an inherent unity, often the result of an internal national law or nature predominantly present among the group comprising the real nation.

It is this reason, along with the sublime belief of many Hindus that Bharat is a Nation-Soul – a Conscious aspect of the profound Reality sustaining the triple sheaths and even the inherent plastic law of Dharma –, that accounts for India having always existed as one nation, even if politically different kingdoms, languages, spiritual paths and even tribes existed within the same nation. The fluid law of svadharma, the gateway to the Source of all vitality and strength, to only be abandoned when seeking to finally transcend the mortal boundaries *into* that Source, has served as the fundamental integer supporting the outward parts so confusing to previous barbarian invaders and their descendants. Thus

India, like England previously (politically divided into seven kingdoms mere centuries prior to her global empire), easily assumed its status as an independent geopolitical entity in 1947 – because the nation was already present, inherent and true, ready to adorn itself with the political clothing of a constitution and a Prime Minister, beginning the process of externally organizing what was eternally seeking to manifest.

It was thus a lie for Rahmat Ali to state that the sub-nations within India had never formed part of the Indian nation, that it took foreigners to conceive of the reality of India. For the truth of India is beyond politics, because statehood is a different concept to nationhood, superficial to the latter with its stress on passports and external laws and borders, rather than the inherent national dharma. Similarly is the exaggerated emphasis on a particular type of religious worship, or an exclusive name of God, also false as the primary basis in defining a nation, because the diversity of subjective belief observed in the entire planet can similarly be reflected in the sub-unit of the nation. But the falsehood of one particular type of worship comprising a nation is precisely what Ali advanced; and in typical Islamic fashion, his proposal of the chimera of “Pakistan” arrived with the psychology of fear – although in this case, not of the hellfire – prominent:

They have accepted, without any protest or demur and without any reservation or qualification, a constitution based on the principle of an All-India Federation. **This acceptance amounts to nothing less than signing the death-warrant of Islam and of Muslims in India...** Let us make no mistake about it. The issue is now or never. Either we live or perish for ever. The future is ours, if we live up to our faith. It does not lie in the lap of the gods: it rests in our own hands. We alone can make or mar it. The history of the last century is full of open warnings to us, and they are as plain as were ever given to any nation. Shall it be said of us that we ignored all those warnings, betrayed our ancient nationhood into the Indian Federation, and let our Islamic heritage perish throughout the Sub-continent of India? (Chaudry Rahmat Ali, *Now or Never*, 1933)

The traditional Muslim cry of “Islam is in danger”, of the ‘persecution’ of having to live in a pluralistic nation where they are equals with the Infidel, was now the anxiety driving the “Pakistan” concept. But as Islam promotes the ‘truth’ that the Infidel’s only choices are to be converted, raped, killed or placed in economic subjugation, one begins to understand how the delusion might emerge in which Muslims *unable* to partake in such barbarity begin to imagine themselves as ‘persecuted’. The situation was even worse for subcontinental Muslims of the time, closer as they were to the Islamic past of ruling most of India for five centuries, part of the converts who nevertheless believed themselves descendants of those rulers who engaged in genocidal campaigns against the Hindu populace. Indeed the idea that Muslims living as a minority in an Indian Federation amounted to a “death-warrant” represents a subconscious projection upon the Hindu of Islam’s Asuric practices towards the unbelievers, which as we shall see were quickly continued soon after the advent of “Pakistan”. Yet though these traditional Islamic designs lurked underneath, Chaudry Rahmat Ali’s pamphlet was marked by a striking confusion:

This Muslim Federation of North-West India would provide the bulwark of a buffer state against invasion of India either of ideas or of arms from any quarter. And the creation of such a Federation would not materially disturb the ratio or the rights of the Muslim and Hindu populations in the rest of India. It is, therefore, clearly in the interest of British and Hindu statesmanship to concede our demand for this Federation, and to have as an ally our free, powerful, and contented Muslim nation, possessing a constitution similar to, but separate from, that which is being enacted for India. For, nothing but a separate Federation of our homelands will satisfy our people. (Chaudry Rahmat Ali, *Now or Never*, 1933)

As we know, actual alliances between Muslim and Polytheistic states are only temporary, designed to help the Muslims create space and respite to prepare future attacks on the non-Muslims – that is the

demand of their Asuric religion. Thus for Rahmat Ali to propose such cooperation with the hated Infidel speaks either to a confused understanding of Islam's ambitions, or a deliberate sop to the 'Hindu statesman', trying to convince the latter that a Northwest political entity for Muslims would be useful to the Hindu. Though quite possibly his motivation, it remains difficult to ascertain if Ali's offer was related to *taqiyah* or not; consequently, we must examine the likelihood that an elementary confusion – *of the actual nature of Islam* – formed the rationale behind his offering of "Pakistan" as a buffer state. His probable error is just one example of an unawareness pervasive to Muslims of the subcontinent, a type of basic ignorance involving two primary strands, with the first only found in a minuscule minority containing the likes of Chaudry Rahmat Ali and the *official* founder of "Pakistan", Muhammad Ali Jinnah.

This particular group (in Jinnah and Rahmat Ali we find multiple similarities, from their legal profession to their significant time abroad in England) is notable for their conscious, *intellectual* contact with non-Islamic ideas, whether emerging from interaction with Western thinkers or time spent at Western universities, or even through an intellectual understanding of the basic principles of the Sanatana Dharma (this understanding need not have arrived through the study of Hindu scripture, as the universal law can be deduced without that element). It was a civilizational meeting that produced – and continues to with some modern Muslims (albeit with dwindling numbers as austere Islam increases its grip) - in Jinnah and Rahmat Ali the very curious mixture of a Muslim nationalism infused with inclusive and universal ideals, with the latter most prominently articulated in Jinnah's presidential address to the Constituent Assembly of Pakistan on 11th August 1947:

I sincerely hope that with your support and your co-operation we shall make this Constituent Assembly an example to the world. The Constituent Assembly has got two main functions to perform. The first is the very onerous and responsible task of framing the future constitution of Pakistan and the second of functioning as a full and complete sovereign body as the Federal Legislature of Pakistan. We have to do the best we can in adopting a provisional constitution for the Federal Legislature of Pakistan...**You will no doubt agree with me that the first duty of a government is to maintain law and order, so that the life, property and religious beliefs of its subjects are fully protected by the State...**

You are free; you are free to go to your temples, you are free to go to your mosques or to any other place or worship in this State of Pakistan. You may belong to any religion or caste or creed that has nothing to do with the business of the State...We are starting in the days where there is no discrimination, no distinction between one community and another, no discrimination between one caste or creed and another. We are starting with this fundamental principle that we are all citizens and equal citizens of one State...Now I think we should keep that in front of us as our ideal and you will find that in course of time Hindus would cease to be Hindus and Muslims would cease to be Muslims, not in the religious sense, because that is the personal faith of each individual, but in the political sense as citizens of the State.

As the battle for the creation of "Pakistan" had already been won at the time of his speech, there was no pressing necessity for Jinnah to indulge in such non-Muslim ideals for the sake of *taqiyah*; thus we find in Jinnah's speech a betrayal of Allah's 'Word', because the Quran and Hadith have specifically identified Polytheists like the Hindu as guilty of *shirk*, the grave 'crime' against Allah that is punishable with genocide in the life and hellfire afterwards. As we know, Islam makes clear distinctions between the Muslim and non-Muslim, and any deviation from the 'Word' of Allah marks one as an apostate, whose murder is legal. Consequently, no "Muslim" leader should *ever* offer equality between citizens whose belief in God varies from the Islamic demand that the human strictly worship Allah; nor should the Islamic ruler forget that by Allah's infrarational law, the unbelievers are to be subjugated by

taxation, or slaughtered if they refuse subjugation or conversion. The equality that Jinnah espoused, based on the neutrality of the “State”, was a *secular* one obtained from his interaction with the West, where religion, after the dark ages, was to be kept distinct from the affairs of government.

Yet for Jinnah to apply this non-Muslim ideal, one without any scriptural support, to a purported Islamic state, represents the grave error of *bid'ah* or *bidat*, with the innovation of equal rights between religious groups fundamentally opposed to Islam's rigid hierarchy between the Muslim and non-Muslim. Let us recall again that as the Quran is final, any innovation to Islam's *religious* tenets (alterations to minor details like the ever-changing weapons of warfare are permitted), establishes a transgression against the pristine ‘Word’. Thus, while Jinnah believed himself a “Muslim” nationalist, his actual beliefs and desires for the newly formed Islamic state represent the turn of a Kafir; a non-Muslim who desired to keep Islam a personal matter when we know Mohammed to have demanded that those not participating in group congregational prayer have their houses burned down; an Apostate wishing for the Hindus to be left to live in peace when Mohammed, the idol for all Islamic leaders posthumous to him, repeatedly mentioned that Allah wanted *him* to “fight” unbelievers until they stated that Allah was the only God:

Narrated Abu Huraira:

Allah's Apostle said, “I have been ordered to fight with the people till they say, ‘None has the right to be worshipped but Allah,’ and whoever says, ‘None has the right to be worshipped but Allah,’ his life and property will be saved by me except for Islamic law, and his accounts will be with Allah, (either to punish him or to forgive him.)” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 52, Number 196)

Even with the significant power bestowed upon Jinnah by his status as leader of the state, he was *unwilling* to use the state machinery towards fighting the deviant Hindu Polytheists. He was thus guilty of only *partially* following Islam, practising a separative consciousness to the extent where he viewed the Muslims and Hindus as divided nations, yet unwilling, when having ample opportunity, to actually call for jihad and the massacre of Hindus when there was no need, at the stroke of independence, to dissimulate his intentions. It was an apostasy that Rahmat Ali was also likely guilty of, as seen in another part of his pamphlet in which he wrote of Hindus and Muslims living as “friendly neighbours” – friendship between the Muslim and non-Muslim, we recall, is a sin in the holiest of books. In the passage in question, we find alongside the call for friendship the idea that the “ancient fire” of Islam, the one advocating a strict separation of humanity and death toward non-Muslims, would be beneficial to the future of the planet:

May we ask also all those people - Muslim, British, and Hindu - who are supporting the Federal Constitution, if it is really desirable to make us sacrifice our nationhood in order to make India one nation? Does humanity really stand to gain by this stupendous sacrifice? **We dare to say that in our nation the ancient fire of Islam still glows and promises much for the future of mankind, if only they would let it live.** Can they not realize that, while in Europe, excluding Russia, in about the same area as that of India and with about the same population, there live and prosper no fewer than twenty-six nations, with one and the same religion, civilisation and economic system, surely it is not only possible but highly desirable for two fundamentally different and distinct nations, i.e., Muslim and Hindu, to live as friendly neighbours in the Indian Sub-continent. It is a pity that even our leaders have not the courage to take their stand upon that truth and to insist upon its application to India and thereby secure the minimum for our national salvation. (Chaudry Rahmat Ali, *Now or Never*, 1933)

Accounting for Rahmat Ali's decades spent in the United Kingdom, his elite education at the University of Cambridge, and the similarities he held with contemporaries of his time, one can envision his ideal

for “Pakistan” to have included egalitarian concepts of equal rights for minorities, its citizens living in harmony, only differentiated from Western states by the name of the religion professed by the majority of the population. However, by specifically demanding the state to be built under the “ancient fire” of Islam, to emphasize so strongly the religious character of the state, Rahmat Ali displayed an undeniable attachment and desire for his confused, yet triumphant, version of Islam: and like many things lusted after by mortals, sometimes the wish granted is more dangerous than the desire unfulfilled. Indeed, an important element to Rahmat Ali's fancy of “Pakistan” included a double-meaning to the name, with the aforementioned acronym identifying the geographical areas accompanied by the literal meanings of the words “Pak” and “Stan”, which in the Urdu and Persian languages defined this incipient Muslim state as the “Land of the Pure”. Thus Rahmat Ali's creation, one can infer, was to become a state for “pure” Islam, the “ancient fire” to glow brightly for mankind, bringing peace and perhaps enlightenment to the planet, with its citizens admired throughout.

But the Asura of Falsehood's idea of “purity” and “peace” are quite different to the confused and mixed conception of Rahmat Ali, and by repetitively invoking the glory of Islam and the ‘danger’ faced by Muslims in a Indian Federation, his colleagues and he set about unleashing the most malignant of historic beasts, one for whom they were unsuited to handle. For by obtaining their desire of a pure Islamic state, they were indeed setting the stage for an Asuric purification, a wish ironically affirmed by God so that the real truth of what they were demanding emerged naked and undeniable, with the confused, artificial, Asuric construct of “Pakistan” upon the ancient land of Bharat methodically ‘purified’, so that the lessons could be experienced and learned by mortals; that they might realize the precariousness of - as done by Jinnah and Rahmat Ali and Iqbal - exalting an avidya that easily descends into falsehood and barbarism; that Man might exercise caution in his desires and ambitions, for their exaggeration is the path away from the Purusha; that he similarly begin to see the superficiality of political formations as crucial to defining nationality or establishing genuine unity; that humanity understand that the concept of a geopolitical “nation” based upon the enforced monotony of thought and belief, whether that be a Caliphate or “Pakistan”, is doomed to perish; and most important of all, that this farcical state function to expose Islam as a bastion of Falsehood, an infrarational religion failing mortals in their secret quest for truth and the expansion of consciousness beyond their circumscribed dwelling.

* * * *

Though Rahmat Ali, Jinnah, Iqbal and other like-minded leaders were guilty, as a result of the vivisection of India, of the gravest of adharmic actions, the artificial construct of “Pakistan” was an inevitable likelihood, moved by an Asura of Falsehood for whom the likes of Ali, Jinnah and Iqbal were relatively easy to manipulate, mixed as their mentality might have been with non-Islamic egalitarian concepts. All the Asura had to do at the time was to convince, through his mere *influence* instead of an occult possession, enough Muslim leaders of the presumed greatness of the Muslim “nation”, and the need for its independence from non-Muslims. That the minds of the Muslim leaders were mixed with some amount of higher values was only a minor obstacle, for once the Asura had achieved the opening in which the “ancient fire” of Islam became the Muslim calling-card, the austerity of the Quran and Hadith was sure to resurface irrespective of the opinions of those leaders. And with that, of course, arrives the infrarationally revealed demands to kill or subjugate the unbelievers, *initially* leaving society and religion only for those who recite the shahada.

Indeed, having been lured to propagate its creation through the fantasy of a tolerant Islam, the leaders of “Pakistan” were to become quickly disillusioned after the Partition of 1947 resulted in some of the

worst subcontinental violence for generations, with upwards of a quarter million, at minimum, estimated to have been killed. This was only the beginning of the ancient fire's awakening, a foreboding of even worse to come, of which the freshly victorious Muslims of "Pakistan" would fail to recognize. That is because the first victims of Islam's resurgent "glow" were the obvious ones, the Hindus: the Hindu population in the Northwest of the subcontinent plummeted by the time of the 1951 census from 20% to 2%, with millions of Hindus having fled in 1947. The census of 1951, however, still had the overall Hindu population of "Pakistan" at 22%, with the additional numbers arriving from the component to this subcontinental Muslim state not initially outlined by Rahmat Ali: East "Pakistan". Ali had instead preferred that the area comprising East "Pakistan" should form its own state, that of Bangistan, for Bengali Muslims. But as the very concept of the two-nation theory was that Muslims and Hindus were separate nations, the Muslim leaders who had political power pressed forward with a version of "Pakistan" that included the geographically separate - with the Indian Gangetic plain in between - Northwest and Bengal.

Islam was to bind this twin-headed state, the holy book keeping the unity between multiple linguistic groups, ones with distinct natures and tendencies, bringing the utopian world presumed to have existed during the Prophet's ascent. It was an illusion soon to be shattered, with the petty egoism driving the worst of mortal behaviour quick to surface in the new Pakistani state, the first fissure belonging to Urdu's elevation above East Pakistan's Bengali language, with the political domination of the West Pakistanis – and subsequent financial exploitation of the East –, including their refusal to accept a democratically elected East Bengali, the crucial motivation for the East's drive for independence. The 1971 schism, occurring a mere twenty-four years after the creation of "Pakistan", not even half the lifetime of an individual, brutally exposed the failure of Islam's imagined ability to unify different groups of Prakriti, dispelling once more the myth of Islamic brotherhood, breaking the theory that religion alone is enough to define a nation, with the two components to the Muslim "nation" unable to co-exist even though both sides had desired the initial departure from Hindu majority India.

But the failure of "Pakistan" and the irreparable separation of its two segments was not to materialize without the Asura's hallmark mayhem, one notable for the continuation of the fundamental theme to his exalted Muslim state, that of 'purification'. For having already eliminated the 'other', the Hindu population in the West, the Asura of Falsehood set about making sure that the 'truth' of Islam, or at least the reality of its depraved desire to kill non-Muslims, would find its "ancient fire" in the East, even if the state of "Pakistan" and the myth of Muslim unity ceased to exist afterwards (at least for those honest enough to accept the obvious conclusion). It was under the spectre of this inevitable demise that the West Pakistani military establishment resorted to genocide as the "solution", with the additional, yet superficial, argument found in an early 1971 mutiny of East Bengali soldiers (the West Pakistanis were previously aware that this was going to take place, and preferred to let it be an infrarational justification for their ensuing despicable acts) and their murder of those deemed friendly to the West Pakistani overlords:

The West Pakistani soldiers are not the only ones who have been killing in East Bengal, of course. On the night of March 25 - **and this I was allowed to report by the Pakistani censor - the Bengali troops and paramilitary units stationed in East Pakistan mutinied and attacked non-believers with atrocious savagery.**

Thousands of families of unfortunate Muslims, many of them refugees from Bihar who chose Pakistan at the time of the partition riots in 1947, were mercilessly wiped out. Women were raped, or had their breasts torn out with specially fashioned knives. Children did not escape the horror: the lucky ones were killed with their parents; but many thousands of others must go through what life remains for them with eyes gouged out and limbs roughly amputated. More than 20,000 bodies of non-Bengalis have been found in the main towns, such as Chittagong,

Khulna and Jessore. The real toll, I was told everywhere in East Bengal, may have been as high as 100,000; for thousands of non-Bengalis have vanished without a trace. (Anthony Mascarenhas, *Genocide*, The Sunday Times of London, 13 June 1971)

The Bengali troops, fellow “Muslims”, had thus broken a cardinal rule of the Islamic scripture, re-cited below – a violation that offered a scriptural justification for the West Pakistanis to fight the transgressors:

And if two parties of the believers quarrel, make peace between them. **But if one of them acts wrongfully towards the other, fight that which acts wrongfully until it returns to Allah's command.** Then if it returns, make peace between them with justice and act equitably; surely Allah loves those who act equitably. (Quran 49:9)

Thus the Pakistanis, as first presented to the world by Anthony Mascarenhas in The Sunday Times, had a sound Islamic foundation for including supposed Muslims in their genocidal rampage, as East Bengali “Muslim” intellectuals and soldiers had acted wrongfully in word and deed toward them and other Muslims, and thus they had to be fought:

The pogrom's victims are not only the Hindus of East Bengal - who constitute about 10% of the 75 million population - but also many thousands of Bengali Muslims. These include university and college students, teachers, Awami League and Left-Wing political cadres and **every one the army can catch of the 176,000 Bengali military men and police who mutinied on March 26 in a spectacular, though untimely and ill-starred bid, to create an independent Republic of Bangla Desh.** What I saw and heard with unbelieving eyes and ears during my 10 days in East Bengal in late April made it terribly clear that the killings are not the isolated acts of military commanders in the field. (Anthony Mascarenhas, *Genocide*, The Sunday Times of London, 13 June 1971)

Mascarenhas, writing less than three months into the genocide, cited the ambition of establishment figures, one clearly *predating* the mutiny of Muslim Bengali soldiers given the efficiency of the genocide (and as we shall see, the existence of lists of people to target), to kill millions as part of a “cleansing” process:

The government of Pakistan has let the world know about that first horror. What it has suppressed is the second and worse horror which followed when its own army took over the killing. West Pakistani officials privately calculate that altogether both sides have killed 250,000 people — not counting those who have died of famine and disease. Reacting to the almost successful breakaway of the province, which has more than half the country's population, General Yahya Khan's military government is pushing through its own “final solution” of the East Bengal problem.

“We are determined to cleanse East Pakistan once and for all of the threat of secession, even if it means killing of two million people and ruling the province as a colony for 30 years,” I was repeatedly told by senior military and civil officers in Dacca and Comilla. The West Pakistan army in East Bengal is doing exactly that with a terrifying thoroughness. (Anthony Mascarenhas, *Genocide*, The Sunday Times of London, 13 June 1971)

It was a “cleansing” referenced on more than one occasion, especially in the context of exterminating the Hindus:

Annihilation of Hindus

The bone-crushing military operation has two distinctive features. **One is what the authorities like to call the “cleansing process;” a euphemism for massacre. The other is the**

“rehabilitation effort.”

This is a way of describing the moves to turn East Bengal into a docile colony of West Pakistan. These commonly used expressions and the repeated official references to “miscreants” and “infiltrators” are part of the charade which is being enacted for the benefit of the world. Strip away the propaganda, and the reality is colonisation - and killing. The justification for the annihilation of the Hindus was paraphrased by Lt. Gen. Tikka Khan, the Military Governor of East Pakistan, in a radio broadcast I heard on April 18. He said: “The Muslims of East Pakistan, who had played a leading part in the creation of Pakistan, are determined to keep it alive. **However, the voice of the vast majority had been suppressed through coercion, threats to life and property by a vocal, violent and aggressive minority, which forced the Awami League to adopt the destructive course.**” (Anthony Mascarenhas, *Genocide*, The Sunday Times of London, 13 June 1971)

The Bengali Muslims of Tikka Khan's mind were subservient to a cunning minority of Hindus, unable to think for themselves and counter the suggestions of the Hindu. It speaks to a marked paranoia of all things Hindu, perfectly reflecting the Quran injunctions of scheming and plotting unbelievers, a paranoia providing the basis for creating a persecution fable, of which the next ‘justifiable’ course of action is to begin a “cleansing process” - not a euphemism as described by Mascarenhas, but something more sinister. For a euphemism implies that someone understands their description to be a nicer way of saying something else - we cannot really say then, that it applies to the “Pakistan” military, as their world-view was, and is, clouded by the infrarational teachings of the Quran and Hadith. Thus they, knowing the ‘Word’ to demand the Polytheist either be converted, killed or forced to pay the *jizya*, understanding the Quran to have *three* specific Asuric revelations that Islam will conquer all of the other religions, believing the Islamic tenet that the only ‘true religion’ before Allah is Islam, and having read the verses describing the kuffar as unclean, had no shame in describing their genocidal mission as a cleansing process, a drive for purification. The Pakistani idea of purity, of course, is a clear perversion of wisdom, a natural outcome of believing in the Asura of Falsehood's Islam. As they were secretly ‘inspired’ by the same emanation, it is no surprise to see the similarities between the Pakistani rationale for genocide and the “racial hygiene” practices of the Nazis. It is the Asuric falsehood that leads men to believe that exterminating an entire population – note that the *entire* Hindu population was to be killed, while select Bengali Muslims were sought for elimination – on the basis of thought and belief is the ‘truth’, some sort of lofty spiritual endeavour: Consequently, 1971 East Bengal became the scene of one of history's most horrific genocides, with the ‘pure’ Pakistani Muslims, beginning in March of that year, attempting to kill the Hindu population in record time:

When the army units fanned out in Dacca on the evening of March 25, in pre-emptive strikes against the mutiny planned for the small hours of the next morning, **many of them carried lists of people to be liquidated.**

These included the Hindus and large numbers of Muslims; students, Awami Leaguers, professors, journalists and those who had been prominent in Sheikh Mujib's movement. The charge, now publicly made, that the army was subjected to mortar attack from the Jaganath Hall, where the Hindu university students lived, hardly justifies the obliteration of two Hindu colonies, built around the temples on Ramna race course, and a third in Shakrepati, in the heart of the old city.

Nor does it explain why the sizeable Hindu populations of Dacca and the neighbouring industrial town of Narayanganj should have vanished so completely during the round-the-clock curfew on March 26 and 27. There is similarly no trace of scores of Muslims who were rounded up during the curfew hours. **These people were eliminated in a planned operation.** (Anthony Mascarenhas, *Genocide*, The Sunday Times of London, 13 June 1971)

The initial thrust of the genocide was also recorded by the American consulate in Dhaka, relayed back to Washington in secret cables:

1. Here in Decca we are mute and horrified witnesses to a reign of terror by the Pak[istani] Military. Evidence continues to mount that the MLA authorities have list of AWAMI League supporters whom they are systematically eliminating by seeking them out in their homes and shooting them down.
2. Among those marked for extinction in addition to the A.L. hierarchy are student leaders and university faculty. In this second category we have reports that Fazlur Rahman head of the philosophy department and a Hindu, M. Abedin, head of the department of history, have been killed. Razzak of the political science department is rumoured dead. Also on the list are the bulk of MNA's elect and number of MPAs.
3. **Moreover, with the support of the Pak[istani] Military, non-Bengali Muslims are systematically attacking poor people's quarters and murdering Bengalis and Hindus. Streets of Dacca are aflood with Hindus and others seeking to get out of Dacca.** (U.S. Consulate (Dacca) Cable, *Selective Genocide*, March 28, 1971, Confidential, 2 pp. Source: Record Group 59, Subject Numeric File 1970-73, Pol and Def, Box 2530)

In another cable, consulate officials reported that "The number of casualties in the old city where army troops burned Hindu and Bengali areas and shot occupants as they came tumbling out is also difficult to estimate." (U.S. Consulate (Dacca) Cable, *Extent of Casualties in Dacca*, March 31, 1971, Confidential, 2 pp. Source: Record Group 59, Subject Numeric File 1970-73, Pol and Def, Box 2530) A cable sent on the same day in March again indicated the discriminate attention paid to the Hindus:

Disturbing aspect of current situation is that wanton acts of violence by military continuing in Dacca. As case previous nights, scattered firing heard throughout night from various parts of the city. **Hindus undeniably special focus of military brutality. Several large fires witnessed night of March 30-31. Shots hear emanating from one burning area. Congen locals say most of these areas predominantly Hindu. One FSL reported Hindu temple area on his street set on fire by army this morning.** (U.S. Consulate (Dacca) Cable, *Sitrep: Army Terror Campaign Continues in Dacca; Evidence Military Faces Some Difficulties Elsewhere*, March 31, 1971, Confidential, 3 pp. Source: Record Group 59, Subject Numeric File 1970-73, Pol and Def, Box 2530)

American Senator Edward Kennedy, visiting some of the affected areas during the genocide, would also record, **"Hardest hit have been members of the Hindu community who have been robbed of their lands and shops, systematically slaughtered, and, in some places, painted with yellow patches marked "H". All of this has been officially sanctioned, ordered and implemented under martial law from Islamabad.** America's heavy support of Islamabad is nothing short of complicity in the human and political tragedy of East Bengal." (Edward Kennedy, *Crisis in South Asia, Report to the U.S. Senate*, 1971) Kennedy, having spoken to many victims and witnesses during his visit, noted again how the Hindus were specifically hunted, with the Muslims and Christians of East Bengal well aware of the fact, to the extent that the two communities marked their own houses according to their respective religions in the hopes of avoiding death:

In some areas, according to eyewitness reports in the late summer, Pakistan troops were painting large yellow "H" signs on Hindu shops, so as to identify the property of the minority which had become a special target. To show they were not Hindus, members of the Muslim majority - although not fully exempt from the army's terror - were painting signs saying "All Muslim House" on their homes and shops. In turn the small community of Christians were putting crosses on their doors and stitching crosses in red thread on

their clothes. Not since Nazi Germany were so many citizens of a country publicly marked with religious labels and symbols.

To cement further the mark put on Hindus, additional reports to the Subcommittee have stated that the bank at Barisal was instructed at one point to freeze Hindu deposits. **Moreover, when units of the Pakistani army later arrived in Barisal, eyewitness accounts say soldiers drove through the streets with loudspeakers announcing a 25 rupee reward for information as to the whereabouts of Hindu residents.** (Edward Kennedy, *Crisis in South Asia, Report to the U.S. Senate*, 1971)

Marking Hindu property with the yellow “H” and offering small cash rewards were not the only ways the Pakistani army went about identifying the kuffar, as since the Bengali Muslims and Hindus are of the same physical race, it remained easy for the Hindu to appear to be a Muslim, and vice versa. Thus the need for a “medical inspection” of all potential victims when the area being ravaged was not obviously – like what one might find in a major city - a Hindu quarter:

This lanky Punjabi officer liked to talk about his job. Riding with Iftikhar to the Circuit House in Comilla on another occasion he told me about his latest exploit.

“We got an old one,” he said. “The bastard had grown a beard and was posing as a devout Muslim even called himself Abdul Manan. **But we gave him a medical inspection and the game was up.**”

Iftikhar continued: “I wanted to finish him there and then, but my men told me such a bastard deserved three shots. So I gave him one in the balls, then one in the stomach. Then I finished him off with a shot in the head.” (Anthony Mascarenhas, *Genocide*, The Sunday Times of London, 13 June 1971)

The medical inspection involved checking the “short-arm” of the male - euphemisms for examining whether or not the male in question was circumcised:

For six days as I travelled with the officers of the 9th Division headquarters at Comilla I witnessed at close quarters the extent of the killing. **I saw Hindus, hunted from village to village and door to door, shot off-hand after a cursory “short-arm inspection” showed they were uncircumcised.**

I have heard the screams of men bludgeoned to death in the compound of the Circuit House (civil administrative headquarters) in Comilla. I have seen truck loads of other human targets and those who had the humanity to try to help them hauled off under the cover of darkness and curfew. I have witnessed the brutality of “kill and burn missions” as the army units, after clearing out the rebels, pursued the pogrom in the towns and the villages.

I have seen whole villages devastated by “punitive action.” And in the officers' mess at night I have listened incredulously as otherwise brave and honourable men proudly chewed over the day's kill.

“How many did you get?” The answers are seared in my memory.

All this is being done, as any West Pakistani officer will tell you, for the “preservation of the unity, the integrity and the ideology of Pakistan.” It is, of course, too late for that. The very military action that is designed to hold together the two wings of the country, separated by a thousand miles of India, has confirmed the ideological and emotional break. (Anthony Mascarenhas, *Genocide*, The Sunday Times of London, 13 June 1971)

Mascarenhas would also include a specific example of the circumcision check - the man in question

was found to be a Muslim:

We had been racing against the setting sun after a visit to Chandpur (the West Pakistan army prudently stays indoors at night in East Bengal) when one of the jawans (privates) crouched in the back of the Toyota Land Cruiser called out sharply: "There's a man running, Sahib." Major Rathore brought the vehicle to an abrupt halt, simultaneously reaching for the Chinese made light machine-gun propped against the door. Less than 200 yards away a man could be seen loping through the knee-high paddy.

"For God's sake don't shoot," I cried. "He's unarmed. He's only a villager." Rathore gave me a dirty look and fired a warning burst.

As the man sank to a crouch in the lush carpet of green, two jawans were already on their way to drag him in. The thud of a rifle butt across the shoulders preceded the questioning.

"Who are you?"

"Mercy, Sahib! My name is Abdul Bari. I'm a tailor from the New Market in Dacca."

"Don't lie to me. You're a Hindu. Why were you running?"

"It's almost curfew time, Sahib, and I was going to my village."

"Tell me the truth. Why were you running?"

Before the man could answer he was quickly frisked for weapons by a jawan while another quickly snatched away his lungi. The skinny body that was bared revealed the distinctive traces of circumcision, which is obligatory for Muslims. (Anthony Mascarenhas, *Genocide*, The Sunday Times of London, 13 June 1971)

The soldiers told Mascarenhas that while they would have normally killed the tailor without even a circumcision inspection, because of his presence, Bari's life was spared. But when the journalist asked why they were specifically executing civilian Hindus, he was met with a stern reprimand accompanied by the paranoid 'explanation' that the Hindus were trying to "destroy" Pakistan:

Like thousands of other people in East Bengal, he had made the mistake - the fatal mistake - of running within sight of a Pakistani army patrol. He was 24 years old, a slight man surrounded by soldiers. He was trembling, because he was about to be shot.

"Normally we would have killed him as he ran," I was informed chattily by Major Rathore, the G-2 Ops. of the 9th Division, as we stood on the outskirts of a tiny village near Mudafarganj, about 20 miles south of Comilla. "But we are checking him out for your sake. You are new here and I see you have a squeamish stomach."

"Why kill him?" I asked with mounting concern. "Because he might be a Hindu or he might be a rebel, perhaps a student or an Awami Leaguer. They know we are sorting them out and they betray themselves by running."

"But why are you killing them? And why pick on the Hindus?" I persisted. "Must I remind you," Rathore said severely, "how they have tried to destroy Pakistan? Now under the cover of the fighting we have an excellent opportunity of finishing them off." (Anthony Mascarenhas, *Genocide*, The Sunday Times of London, 13 June 1971)

That the Northwest-subcontinental Muslims could not share power equitably with the East Bengalis, that they could not respect a democratically elected East Bengali Muslim, apparently had no bearing on the cause of the East Bengali rebellion. Like all groups ideologically captured by the Asura of Falsehood, the Pakistani army exposed their source of infrarational inspiration with their limited analysis of blaming the 'other' instead of searching within for their own faults. With such Asuric 'knowledge' for motivation, the Pakistanis went about their "disposal" in carefree fashion,

systematically hunting the Hindus down:

Touring Dacca on April 15 I found the heads of four students lying rotting on the roof of the Iqbal Hall hostel. The caretaker said they had been killed on the night of March 25. I also found heavy traces of blood on the two staircases and in four of the rooms. Behind Iqbal Hall a large residential building seemed to have been singled out for special attention by the army. The walls were pitted with bullet holes and a foul smell still lingered on the staircase, although it had been heavily powdered with DDT. Neighbours said the bodies of 23 women and children had been carted away only hours before. They had been decomposing on the roof since March 25. **It was only after much questioning that I was able to ascertain that the victims belonged to the nearby Hindu shanties. They had sought shelter in the building as the army closed in.**

THIS IS GENOCIDE conducted with amazing casualness. Sitting in the office of Major Agha, Martial Law Administrator of Comilla city, on the morning of April 19, I saw the off-hand manner in which sentences were meted out. A Bihari sub-inspector of police had walked in with a list of prisoners being held in the police lock-up. Agha looked it over. Then, with a flick of his pencil, he casually ticked off four names on the list.

“Bring these four to me this evening for disposal,” he said. He looked at the list again. The pencil flicked once more. “...and bring this thief along with them.” (Anthony Mascarenhas, *Genocide*, The Sunday Times of London, 13 June 1971)

In these statements we find the face of the Asura; the ultimate degradation of mortals, individuals with Souls, to the category of rubbish, their killings undertaken in the cold mentality of the Lord of Falsehood devoid of genuine light and mercy. Thus if the Hindus did not run fast enough, they met their “disposal” through the bullet or, in other circumstances, a pit of fire:

A dispatch from Faridpur district, published in The New York Times on September 23, describes the continued violence as follows:

***Nira Pada Saha, a jute trader in Faridpur District told of a reprisal against a village near his that had sheltered and fed the guerillas. Just before he fled five days ago, he related, the army struck the village, first shelling it then burning the huts.

“Some of the villagers didn't run away fast enough,” he said. “The soldiers caught them, tied their hands and feet and threw them into the flames.”

There were about 5,000 people in the village, mostly Hindus, Mr. Saha said, and not a hut is left. (Edward Kennedy, *Crisis in South Asia, Report to the U.S. Senate*, 1971)

Though this sort of punishment - the killing of Infidels by fire - was in an aforementioned hadith disapproved of by Mohammed due to it being Allah's punishment, in different hadiths it is seen to be quite nonchalantly used to kill the unbelievers, a reflection of both its centrality to Islamic punishment and the ease by which it can kill scores of people in quick time. Fire's importance to Islam, let us recall, is such that Mohammed, the prime idol for Muslims worldwide, described hellfire as the “Truth”:

Narrated Ibn Abbas:

Whenever the Prophet offered his Tahajjud prayer, he would say, “O Allah, our Lord! All the praises are for You; You are the Keeper (Establisher or the One Who looks after) of the Heavens and the Earth. All the Praises are for You; You are the Light of the Heavens and the Earth and whatever is therein. You are the Truth, and Your saying is the Truth, and Your promise is the Truth, and the meeting with You is the Truth, and Paradise is the Truth, **and the (Hell) Fire is the Truth.** O Allah! I surrender myself to You, and believe in You, and I put my trust in You (solely depend upon). And to You I complain of my opponents and with Your Evidence I argue.

So please forgive the sins which I have done in the past or I will do in the future, and also those (sins) which I did in secret or in public, and that which You know better than I. None has the right to be worshipped but You.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 93, Number 534)

It is of course an extreme perversion of “Truth” to describe the sadistic punishment for diversity in belief as such; indeed such a “Truth” is at most a superficial, phenomenal, transient one often ‘seen’ by those obsessed with hellfire to the point where they create such a world for themselves through the incessant pressure of their daily thought. Or they might, after having spent a lifetime mentally fearing the hellfire, find themselves experiencing it after the life is over. But the actual hell is a vital world *formation* that will subside; it is not a permanent reality, and it is certainly not the destination of those who merely practice diversity in belief. For the Pakistani army, however, the use of fire fit their narrative of jihad against the kuffar, of which Mascarenhas was privy to first hand accounts describing the hunting and extermination of Hindus:

PRODDED by Major Rathore, Iftikhar then went on to describe vividly how after much searching in Hajiganj he had discovered twelve Hindus hiding in a house on the outskirts of the town. These had been “disposed of.”...Major Iftikhar was one of several officers assigned to kill and burn missions. They moved in after the rebels had been cleared by the army with the freedom to comb-out and destroy Hindus and “miscreants” (the official jargon for rebels) and to burn down everything in the areas from which the army had been fired at. (Anthony Mascarenhas, *Genocide*, The Sunday Times of London, 13 June 1971)

By the time he filed his article, the “job” was yet to be completed, with Mascarenhas writing, “The agony of East Bengal is not over. Perhaps the worst is yet to come. **The army is determined to go on until the “clean-up” is completed. So far the job is only half done.** Two divisions of the Pakistan army, the 9th and the 16th, were flown out from West Pakistan to “sort out” the Bengali rebels and the Hindus.” (Anthony Mascarenhas, *Genocide*, The Sunday Times of London, 13 June 1971) It was a systematic policy of genocide that, as presented to Mascarenhas by the Command Headquarters in Dacca, began with the “cleansing” of Hindus by their death or flight into India, after which the “Muslims” of East Bengal would be both re-educated and provided with some of the spoils of genocide, just the Prophet Mohammed was granted spoils after massacring his non-Muslim enemies (Quran 8:67):

In one sentence, the government is too far committed militarily to abandon the East Bengal operation, which it would have to do if it sincerely wanted a political solution. President Yahya Khan is riding on the back of a tiger. But he took a calculated decision to climb up there. So the army is not going to pull out. **The government’s policy for East Bengal was spelled out to me in the Eastern Command headquarters at Dacca. It has three elements:**

- (1) The Bengalis have proved themselves “unreliable” and must be ruled by West Pakistanis;**
- (2) The Bengalis will have to be re-educated along proper Islamic lines. The “Islamisation of the masses” - this is the official jargon - is intended to eliminate secessionist tendencies and provide a strong religious bond with West Pakistan;**
- (3) When the Hindus have been eliminated by death and flight, their property will be used as a golden carrot to win over the under-privileged Muslim middleclass. This will provide the base for erecting administrative and political structure in the future.**

This policy is being pursued with the utmost blatancy. (Anthony Mascarenhas, *Genocide*, The Sunday Times of London, 13 June 1971)

Before we discuss the second point, the most crucial with regards to the existential course of “Pakistan”, we must examine in detail the horrific outcome to the third. In Kennedy's report one section

describes both the anguish and genocide of the Hindus, along with a mention of their extortion and finally the fruit of the evil Pakistani labour, with the Bengali Muslims now tilling some of the previously Hindu fields:

As the Pakistan army moved out into the countryside to “crush the Awami League,” all evidence - including the simple fact that the bulk of the refugees in India are Hindu - suggest this objective was coupled with a policy of terror directed primarily at the minority Hindu population. The following eyewitness field account - filed with the Subcommittee in August and repeated again and again in the Subcommittee files - graphically describes the plight of Hindus in recent months.

***The next village where we stopped was Mirakati in Barisal district. Our guide, a Hindu, showed us his house, a mound of burned out rubbish from which nothing could be saved. **Everything had been burnt to the ground. Every other house in the village was burned out. When we arrived in this village there were no signs of life.** However, after a time our guide made signals to a very frightened women who then emerged. She told us that she had seen her husband and child killed and that she is now left alone with one remaining child. **Eight days ago the army had came asking her for 100 rupees as payment so that they would leave her alone and unharrassed.**

At this village there was a brick and cement school that was still standing but everything inside had been burned out. There are supposedly a hundred survivors from this village who are hiding out in the surrounding villages and who are afraid to come out lest they be caught, or shot, or suffer other reprisals. **Village after village we passed was totally in ruins. Sometimes a frame of a house could be seen and at other times every thing was burned to the ground.** One of the villages that we passed was known by the name of Jagadishpur. One of our mission had visited this village previously just after the army's reign of terror. In one of the tanks of ponds he counted about 100 heads of persons who had been killed and whose bodies were thrown into the tank.

*** **Of the 36 Hindu villages in the area we visited, they estimated that the maximum number of former inhabitants who have still remained in the area, even though they may be in hiding, would not go beyond 20% to 25%...At present it is the Muslims who are working the Hindu-owned lands. But everywhere we went on the trip the rice fields were unattended. The only exceptions were these Muslims farming Hindu land. In one village, the original population was about 1,500, of which 100 were killed, 100 remain in hiding in the surrounding area, and the rest have fled.** (Edward Kennedy, *Crisis in South Asia, Report to the U.S. Senate*, 1971)

That the majority of fields previously belonged to the Hindus, the predominant group in the areas visited, did not matter as all kuffar land should belong to the ‘true believers’, who are granted by Allah the “right” to tax – or extort as the above example makes clear - unbelievers simply for their disbelief in Allah as the sole deity. The Pakistani calculation was only working for some of the fields, because many of the areas did not have many Muslims, and thus neither they, nor the fleeing Hindus, were available to work the land. The extent of the Pakistani terror in East Bengal was such that close to ten million refugees arrived in India within the span of 200 days, with three million alone registered by India in the *month* of May 1971:

A traveler today in eastern India cannot help but see, smell, and feel this misery. It is etched in the faces and lives of refugees in countless ways. It is the malnourished child hanging limply in its mother's arms - one child out of a half million who, in a matter of hours or days, can easily die from the lack of protein and adequate medical care. It is a young girl, quivering in a refugee

camp in Tripura, still in a shock after seeing her mother and father slaughtered by Pakistani troops. It is a 14-year-old boy in Jalpaiguri hospital, whose face is contorted from the pain and anguish that he has experienced since he saw his family shot before his eyes and since he received a bullet wound in his spine which has paralyzed him for life. And it is the expression of hundreds of thousands of refugees living in sewer pipes on the outskirts of Calcutta, while overworked relief officials struggle to provide some food and shelter and hope for a needy and hopeless people. **To drive the roads of West Bengal is to tour a huge refugee camp.** For miles along the old Jessore road north of Calcutta toward the border of East Bengal, literally millions of people sit huddled together waiting for food, or line up in endless queues for refugee registration cards, or simply encamp on the roadside under hastily constructed lean-tos. And each day their number continues to grow.

A. THE REFUGEE FLOW

The continuing flow of refugees into India is without parallel in modern history. In less than 200 days - from April 1 to mid-October - more people have found it necessary to flee their homes and lands in East Bengal than the total number of refugees generated by the Indochina war, or the millions displaced by the natural disasters which have struck East Bengal over the past decade. **In this short period, 9,544,012 refugees have been officially recorded as having crossed into India, and additional hundreds of thousands have been uprooted and victimized within East Bengal.**

Since March 25th a constant stream - sometimes a flood - of refugees has crossed each day into India. The average daily influx of new refugees, according to official reports, has been 48,000 - with peak periods in May and June exceeding well over 100,000 new arrivals each day. In May alone, for example, a total of 2,820,922 new refugees were registered by Indian officials. (Edward Kennedy, *Crisis in South Asia, Report to the U.S. Senate*, 1971)

Reflecting the religious group targeted within East Bengal, Kennedy noted the percentage of Hindus among the refugees - a disproportionate 80% of the total when their representation in East Bengal prior to the West Pakistani genocidal mission was less than 20%:

To avoid communal (religious) clashes, the government, where possible, has tried to keep Hindus and Muslims in separate camps... Reflecting the communal representation of the refugees generally, an approximate grouping in many camps, however, is 80 percent Hindu, 15 percent Muslim, and 5 percent Christian and other. (Edward Kennedy, *Crisis in South Asia, Report to the U.S. Senate*, 1971)

Cables from the U.S. Consulate in Dhaka also noted the predominant Hindu composition of refugees fleeing into India, with 90% of them Hindu by May of 1971, the proportion likely a reflection of the growing awareness in East Bengal that they were the primary targets:

The Pakistani Army is now concentrating on killing the Hindu population. At first the refugees crossing into India were in the same proportion of Hindu and Muslim as in the whole East Pakistani population. Now, 90% are Hindus. (*Memcon Kenneth Keating, Henry Kissinger, and Harold Saunders* June 3, 1971, (4:00 P.M.). Attached to Cover Sheet Dated June 21, 1971, Secret /NODIS, 6 pp. Source: Nixon Presidential Materials Project (NPMP), National Security Council Files Country Files: Middle East, Box 596)

It was in these camps where the bulk of the genocide deaths would occur, for though the number killed within East Bengal territory may have only been, according to some, in the hundreds of thousands, plenty more would perish within the refugee camps, having arrived knowing that they faced certain death back in their homeland. The countless number of Hindus dying in refugee camps was particularly

emphasized by a comment made to Kennedy by the director of one of the refugee camps:

Most of the refugees, however, are poorly educated villagers - the people who make up the bulk of the population in East Bengal. We talked with dozens of such people on the Boyra-Bongaon Road north of Calcutta, on a day when at least 7,000 new refugees had crossed the border. Nearly all were farmers. **Most were Hindus**, from districts south of Dacca, on the fringe of the area affected by last fall's cyclone. Many of these people are still in visible stages of shock, sitting listlessly by the roadside or wandering aimlessly. They told stories of atrocities, of slaughter, of looting and burning, of harassment and abuse by Pakistani soldiers and their collaborators... **When I asked one refugee camp director what he would describe as his greatest need, his answer was "a crematorium."** He was in charge of one of the largest refugee camps in the world. **A camp which was originally designed to provide low-income and middle-income housing for Indians, but has now become the home for some 170,000 refugees.** (Edward Kennedy, *Crisis in South Asia, Report to the U.S. Senate*, 1971)

Kennedy would also note that the number of dead Hindus decomposing in open air, a direct product of the lack of crematoriums, was yielding a significantly unsanitary environment – a factor that certainly contributed to the millions of Hindus killed:

The disposal of dead bodies has posed a serious sanitation problem. In the Hindu community it is customary for the dead to be cremated, but under the circumstances - including a lack of fuel and crematoriums - this has been almost impossible. In some camps local health authorities regularly remove bodies. In others, however, the disposing of bodies is left in the hands of the families involved...bodies are simply left to decompose in a ditch along the road or at the edges of the camps. (Edward Kennedy, *Crisis in South Asia, Report to the U.S. Senate*, 1971)

With around 8 million total Hindu refugees, an inordinate amount of whom were dying out in the open, the true loss of life far exceeded the estimated 100,000 to 1,000,000 killed within the geographical area of East Bengal. The number of Hindus killed is best approximated through their abrupt decline in the East Bengal or Bangladeshi census, which though for the overall population went from a total of 5,52,22,663 to 7,63,98,000 from the period of 1961 to 1974 (Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics, Population Census Wing), for the Hindus went from a percentage of 18.5% to 13.5% (Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics, Population Census Wing) during the same time, from 1,02,16,193 to 1,03,13,730 when there should have been a much higher rise to their total population - *close to 4 million more* if their increase had mirrored the overall increase of the Bangladeshi population. Of course, that would assume the Hindu birth rate to have equalled the Islamic one, which was not the case. Nevertheless, if circumstances were normal, one would expect a significantly greater increase than the paltry 97,537 between the two census. Even a reduction of 1% of its share of the total population would still have resulted in a total Hindu population of 1,33,69,650 in 1974, a 3 million increase that most certainly would have occurred if not for the genocide that included the deaths of Hindu refugees *inside* Indian land. And it cannot be argued that their disappearance from the census was related to them remaining in India, because the Indian policy to all East Bengali refugees was one of only temporary acceptance, with Indian Prime Minister Indira Gandhi stating, **"I am just going to send them back. I am determined to send them back."** (The Statesman, 18 June 1971) Indeed one of the reasons the Indian Army entered the war was due to the stress the refugees were causing India and the desire to repatriate them. Consequently, the United Nations High Commission for Refugees documented that the "vast majority" of refugees were returned after India's military victory over "Pakistan" late in 1971:

With an estimated 10 million people leaving what was then East Pakistan for India between April and December 1971, this became the largest single displacement of refugees in the second half of the century. **Remarkably, traumatic though these events were, the vast majority of**

these people returned within a year to what became the independent state of Bangladesh, in the largest repatriation operation of the post-Second World War era. (UNHCR, *The State of the World's Refugees. 2000: Fifty Years of Humanitarian Action*, Chapter 3, Page 1)

Thus the disappearance of Hindus in the Bangladesh census was directly related to the genocidal campaign by the Asuric Pakistanis, with the number dead entering the millions - though not all killed *directly* by the hands of the pious Muslim jihadis. For those not killed by the gun or burned in a pit of fire, another Asuric fate, that of suffering through starvation and disease, awaited them. It was an end casually accepted by the West Pakistanis, a mindset reflected in their Agricultural Development Bank Chairman's reaction toward an East Bengal famine that occurred soon after the "cleansing" began:

Discussing the problem in his plush air-conditioned office in Karachi recently the chairman of the Agricultural Development Bank, Mr. Qarni, said bluntly: **"The famine is the result of their acts of sabotage. So let them die. Perhaps then the Bengalis will come to their senses."** (Anthony Mascarenhas, *Genocide*, The Sunday Times of London, 13 June 1971)

Mr. Qarni was only adopting the 'rationale' of his idol, the Prophet Mohammed, who as we recall prayed to Allah that a famine might fall upon his non-Muslim enemies. Similarly did the pious Muslims have Mohammed's example when it came to the matter of Bengali women, who were – so it was claimed - to be magnanimously spared slaughter, as one soldier told Mascarenhas:

"Of course," he added hastily, "we are only killing the Hindu men. We are soldiers, not cowards like the rebels. They kill our women and children." (Anthony Mascarenhas, *Genocide*, The Sunday Times of London, 13 June 1971)

Though certainly killing lakhs of women in their Asuric rampage (justified, as we have mentioned, by certain authentic hadith declarations of Mohammed), the pious Muslims also had another Mohammedan purpose in mind for the women – *both* Hindu and "Muslim" - of East Bengal: Rape. Although that would be the kafir definition of the West Pakistani actions, because the sexual slavery and rape of unbelieving women, or those women deemed to be apostate, cannot be considered "rape" according to Islamic 'knowledge', and at any rate the pious Muslims of West Pakistan were, similar to Hitler's use of rape in Eastern Europe, seeking to improve the genetic pool, as author Saadia Toor mentioned in a conversation to Bangladeshi writer Naeem Mohaiemen:

There was cultural prejudice of course - basically the idea that East Bengali Muslims were culturally too "in thrall" to Hindu culture. But the Pakistani army's own discourse was more explicitly racist. It had inherited the ideology of the "martial races" of the subcontinent expounded by the British and the latter's contempt for the "effeminate" Bengali. **During the army operation in 1971, this racism found its most explicit expression in the idea of Bengalis being an "inferior" race whose gene-pool must be "fixed" by the forcible impregnation of their women.** Commentators from the 1970s onwards have spoken about this attitude being rife within the military and within certain parts of the upper echelons of liberal society in West Pakistan. (Naeem Mohaiemen, *Flying Blind: Waiting for a Real Reckoning on 1971*, Economic & Political Weekly XLVI (36): p. 47)

Mohaiemen's article also includes a passage from one of Pakistani author Tariq Ali's books, with the citation highlighting the mass rape of Bengalis as part of a Pakistani eugenic strategy understood throughout the different ranks of the military:

The soldiery had been told that the Bengalis were an inferior race, short, dark, weak (unlike the martial races of the Punjab) and still infected with Hinduism. Junior and senior officers alike had spoken of seeking, in the course of their campaign, to improve the genes of the Bengali people. Fascist talk of this character gave the green light for the mass

rapes suffered by Bengali women regardless of class or creed. (Tariq Ali, *Can Pakistan Survive? The Death of a State*, 1983, p. 91)

The junior and senior officers were going to obtain 'lawful' sex slaves, indulging their depravities while infrarationally inspired by both the Asuric 'knowledge' of their superior genetics and Mohammed's command to refrain from coitus interruptus:

Narrated Abu Said Al-Khudri:

That during the battle with Bani Al-Mustaliq they (Muslims) captured some females and intended to have sexual relation with them without impregnating them. So they asked the Prophet about coitus interruptus. The Prophet said, "It is better that you should not do it, for Allah has written whom He is going to create till the Day of Resurrection." Qaza'a said, "I heard Abu Sa'id saying that the Prophet said, 'No soul is ordained to be created but Allah will create it.' " (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 93, Number 506)

In their policy of mass rape of Bengalis we find a distinct Asuric element to the rapes, because the sexual violation of lakhs of Bengalis in the span of a few months was not simply the matter of a sudden mist taking hold of individual Pakistani soldiers. This was premeditated rape, *intellectualized*, though its type of intellectualism is an inversion of knowledge. The Asuric turn was to first cloud the fact that they were engaging in rape, normalizing it through the helpful Islamic scripture, then integrating Western eugenic ideas into a narrative already distorted by an extreme Muslim narcissism. And though the rapes of Hindu Bengali women were easily 'explained' by the cause of genetic benevolence and *religious* inheritance, the rapes of countless Muslim Bengalis had to be rationalized through the scriptural 'truth' of *takfir* or excommunication, with the Muslim Bengalis ripe for the label of apostasy due their tolerance - "in thrall" - of their Hindu neighbours. Indeed it was this *takfir* that more accurately accounts for the killings of Bengali Muslim males, for they were not really Muslim – at least the ones killed, because as we know the entire Muslim populace was not hunted down like the Hindus were. Nevertheless, even when Bengali Muslims themselves spewed forth rabble-rousing speeches against the Hindus and obvious *munafiqun* like the Awami League (the party rebelling against their fellow Muslims of the Northwest subcontinent), they were *still* viewed with distrust, their vocalization of Islamic piety only increasing West Pakistani suspicion!

Mr. Mahbub-ur-Rahman was pushed forward to make the address of welcome to the army. He introduced himself as "N.F. College Professor of English and Arabic who had also tried for History and is a life-time member of the great Muslim, League Party."

Introduction over, Mahbub-ur-Rahman gave forth with gusto. "Punjabis and Bengalis," he said, "had united for Pakistan and we had our own traditions and culture. But we were terrorised by the Hindus and the Awami Leaguers and led astray. Now we thank God that the Punjabi soldiers have saved us. They are the best soldiers in the world and heroes of humanity. We love and respect them from the bottom of our hearts." And so on, interminably, in the same vein.

After the "meeting" I asked the Major what he thought about the speech, "Serves the purposes," he said, "but I don't trust that bastard. I'll put him on my list." (Anthony Mascarenhas, *Genocide*, The Sunday Times of London, 13 June 1971)

That Rahman was suspected of being a kafir should come as no surprise when we recall the great Mohammed's declaration that certain "Muslims" will express superbly Islamic words, but their faith will not "go beyond their throats". As they, like Rahman, do not have 'true' belief, they are – per Mohammed's instructions – to be killed:

Narrated Ali:

Whenever I tell you a narration from Allah's Apostle, by Allah, I would rather fall down from the sky than ascribe a false statement to him, but if I tell you something between me and you (not a Hadith) then it was indeed a trick (i.e., I may say things just to cheat my enemy). No doubt **I heard Allah's Apostle saying, "During the last days there will appear some young foolish people who will say the best words but their faith will not go beyond their throats (i.e. they will have no faith) and will go out from (leave) their religion as an arrow goes out of the game. So, where-ever you find them, kill them, for who-ever kills them shall have reward on the Day of Resurrection."** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 84, Number 64)

The Pakistani Major was thus justified, according to multiple authentic hadith, in placing Rahman on his list – he would be, after all, only performing a sacred Islamic duty by killing such an apostate. That he could not truly ascertain Rahman's thought content to determine if the latter was indulging in *shirk* or different non-Muslim activities did not matter, as there was enough scriptural support, along with the generally tolerant Bengali Muslim practices, to proceed with Rahman's 'cleansing'. The Major was not, after all, killing a Muslim, as that is an impossibility, a crime against Allah, and the Pakistanis knew prior to beginning their genocidal campaign in East Bengal that they had the appropriate scriptural foundation for annihilating the Bengalis – Hindus *and* "Muslims". In doing so, they were only fulfilling a destiny hinted at in their very name, "Pakistan". For it was Asuric purity they were engineering in East Bengal, through mass murder and rape and the improved genetics of war babies. The Asura of Falsehood's shadow loomed over the entire farce, from the very name of the genocidal mission, Operation Searchlight - itself a complete inversion of the principle of light and the type of values associated with a higher light -, to the Pakistani perversion of purity, one allowing it to kill "Muslims" as well as Hindus. It was a corruption of truth best articulated by another Pakistani Major in a conversation with Mascarenhas:

Or take Major Bashir. He came up from the ranks. He is SSO of the 9th Division at Comilla and **he boasts of a personal body count of 28**. He had his own reasons for what has happened. **"This is a war between the pure and the impure," he informed me over a cup of green tea. "The people here may have Muslim names and call themselves Muslims. But they are Hindus at heart. You won't believe that the *maulvi* (mulla) of the Cantonment mosque here issued a *fathwa* (edict) during Friday prayers that the people would attain *janat* (paradise) if they killed West Pakistanis. We sorted the bastard out and we are now sorting out the others. Those who are left will be real Muslims. We will even teach them Urdu."** (Anthony Mascarenhas, *Genocide*, The Sunday Times of London, 13 June 1971)

That the Northwest subcontinental Muslims had to engage in this holy war for 'purity' speaks to the failure of "Pakistan" at inception; the failure of Islam to prevent Bengali Muslims from demanding a separate state when the illusion of Muslim brotherhood should have been enough to maintain the utopia of 7th century Arabia; and the utter bankruptcy of the intellectualized and European-influenced Muslim leaders, without foresight or understanding as to what they were about to unleash in the first half of the twentieth century. For though the latter may have sought to establish a state on the basis of ideas superficially opposed to the hatred and division of the Quran, by using the emotional cry of Islam's ancient glory and its current danger, the seed of Pakistan's destruction was planted, for the unregenerate Vital, when exaggerated as in Asuric Islam, easily triumphs over mere intellectual calls to harmony. Yet that destruction of the original "Pakistan" was not to have been so readily predicted by its proponents in the initial phase of its existence, even after losing two wars to India by 1965, because there remained the memory – if not the actual presence – of one factor to help bind together the decrepit coalition: the Hindus. For in 1947 – at least in the West – the mere accomplishment of obtaining territory at the expense of the Hindu Polytheists was enough to mask the major problems of the new state, especially as the Hindus were, for the most part, killed or expelled. In 1971 as well, although the pious Muslim

army would capitulate in record time to a predominantly Hindu Indian army, a victory of sorts had still been obtained prior to the humiliation of having close to one lakh Pakistani troops held as prisoners of war, since the “pure” had done their part in exterminating as many disbelievers as possible. The intoxication of this Asuric victory, however, left the rump Pakistanis unaware of *their* impending fate.

For with such a rabid appetite for culling the Hindus, there would naturally emerge a time when the “pure” Muslims would face a reality where they were surrounded by only an inconsequential amount of Hindus, diminished to the point in which the latter ceased to function as a rallying cry to maintain the facade of *internal* stability. It is here that the actions of the West Pakistanis toward some of the Muslims of 1971 East “Pakistan” represent the mere *beginning* of the real Asuric purification, one in which the death of the Hindus is only a prelude. For as the Asura of Falsehood is the point of consciousness farthest away from the Purusha, and as the latter is in reality the ultimate source of all human manifestations of unity, by taking the irreversible path, as Pakistani politicians and generals did in 1971, of systematically raping and murdering a designated ‘other’, *and* by refusing to acknowledge their crimes and create a more enlightened polity in the aftermath of their military humiliation, the Asuric pattern of division followed by extermination was forever established as the fragment state's prevailing principle.

Thus the significance of what Major Bashir said - the Bengali Muslims as *munaḥiqun*, at heart Hindus and guilty of transgression from the final infrarational revelations of Allah - assumes a prophetic character, an epitaph even. But though it may not have seemed likely at the time, with the more pious Northwest subcontinental Muslims pillaging Bengal in full jihadi righteousness, the Muslims of the Pakistani army and much of the rump Pakistan from which they were recruited, were ironically ripe to be declared as *munaḥiqun* themselves, with a harder, ‘purer’ form of Islam emerging to confront those who had apparently done so well in following the example of Mohammed and his companions by slaughtering and raping non-Muslims and hypocrites. Indeed, one finds in the Major's declaration that the Bengalis would be taught Urdu, a sign of the danger to come, a pertinent example of the impurities and heresies which fragmented Pakistan, even as it boasts of an Islamic purity, remains littered with. For Urdu, after all, is a hybrid language partially originating from Sanskrit, the mother tongue of Hindu languages and their scripture.

For the Major to then lionize Urdu as something to help ‘purify’ the Bengali masses on Islamic lines, when Arabic was infrarationally revealed as the language that Allah, the ‘only true god’, chose to disseminate his message to Mohammed, betrays a confused mindset, one clearly not Islamified enough, irrespective of his Asuric prowess in killing and raping innocent civilians. And with the Hindus no longer available to distract the exceptionally pious from the internal contradictions to much of the rump Pakistani population's religious beliefs and practices, with the military unable to defeat its neighbour in war and keep the populace occupied with war booty, the elements were in place for the old Asuric pattern to re-emerge, sooner rather than later, though the elite Pakistanis of the time could hardly imagine themselves as the hunted party, accustomed as they were to their bizarre concoction of Islamic narcissism and tenets sharing space with decidedly non-Muslim practices. But as we shall see, the predominant assumptions in “Pakistan” of what Islam is, have been justifiably met with a ruder, correcting force, with the resulting war for ‘purity’ set to define the final act of its existence.

* * * *

The disintegration of remnant Pakistan, inevitable as the flow of the Sindhu into the ocean, was never going to occur as rapidly as the dissolution of the original manufactured “nation”, because the current

vestige has a few factors working to keep it afloat for longer than the measly 24 years its previous incarnation survived. For one, it is a geographically whole political entity - all of its components directly connected by land. It also has the relative advantage – at least for improving its survival probability over the original “Pakistan” - of the dominant cultural group, the Punjabis, not being close to equalled by a rival group, which in the original state were the correspondingly populous Bengalis. Along with the linguistic dominance secured after 1971 – via the Punjabi choice of Urdu (rather than the pristine Arabic of their religious superiors) as the enshrined national language – came the consolidation of power through Feudal and Military centres, a power structure that while clearly not the best for long-term benefit to the masses, at least gave a broken state a glimmer of stability in the years after its capitulation.

Yet during this time of relative tranquillity, even after the extermination or expulsion of millions of Hindus, the quest for purity continued in the “Land of the Pure”, for though the Hindus were no longer present, their culture was, pervasive and blamed for the countless imperfections found in rump Pakistan, just as the Hindus of East Bengal were blamed for the political instability of the original state. Everywhere the Pakistani looked, he continued to see evidence of an ancient Hindu heritage, a gnawing reminder of a history that conflicted with the supposed supremacy of Islam. Since anything contradicting the final ‘truth’ of Islam is both an affront to Muslim narcissism and a possible avenue for deviance into apostasy, the Pakistanis, just as they did with corporeal Hindus, sought to cleanse other remnants of the Hindu, especially if the vestiges left a positive impression. To this end, a significant focus was placed on primary education, infusing the curriculum with a decided Asuric turn, through textbooks filled with lies, omissions and distortions. It was a process, though accelerated after the humiliation of 1971, that was nevertheless present to a degree in the textbooks previous to the genocide, as documented by the Pakistani historian K.K. Aziz:

Mu’ashrati Ulum: West Pakistan Textbook Board, Lahore, 5th edition April 1969...The real gem of the book appears on p. 139 in the Chapter on India, where it is stated that “previously it was part of our country.” Was Pakistan a part of India before 1947, or India a part of Pakistan? The author and the textbook board alone can answer this question. (K.K. Aziz, *The Murder of History*, 1998, p. 24)

This particular Asuric prevarication served, and continues to serve, the twin-fold function of concealing the brutal history of Muslim conquests in India, and providing motivation for future attempts at invading India, since the Muslim Pakistanis would only be seeking to conquer what allegedly belonged to them. But before we address this peculiar whitewashing of the Islamic invasions of India, we must briefly examine ‘facts’ in the textbooks almost verbatim to the alleged source – as told by Pakistani soldiers to Mascarenhas in the following excerpt – of pre-genocide East Bengali perfidy:

Others, speaking privately, were more blunt in seeking justification.

“The Hindus had completely undermined the Muslim masses with their money,” Col. Naim, of 9th Division headquarters, told me in the officers’ mess at Comilla. “They bled the province white. Money, food and produce flowed across the borders to India. In some cases they made up more than half the teaching staff in the colleges and schools, and sent their own children to be educated in Calcutta. It had reached the point where Bengali culture was in fact Hindu culture, and East Pakistan was virtually under the control of the Marwari businessmen in Calcutta. We have to sort them out to restore the land to the people, and the people to their Faith.” (Anthony Mascarenhas, *Genocide*, The Sunday Times of London, 13 June 1971)

It is a “history” that is still found in Pakistani textbooks to this day, with a 2005 review of them, edited by AH Nayyar and Ahmed Salim – a document examining more recent textbook editions along with the older ones researched by K.K. Aziz –, exposing a narrative of 1971 that appears as if it had been

written by Colonel Naim:

Another textbook puts it this way: “There were a large number of Hindus in East Pakistan. A large number of them were teachers in schools and colleges. They continued creating a negative impression among the students...The Hindus sent a substantial portion of their earnings to Bharat, thus adversely affecting the economy of the province.” (AH Nayyar and Ahmed Salim, *The Subtle Subversion: The State of Curricula and Textbooks in Pakistan*, 2005, p. 75)

Though the cited textbook was published in the 1990's, most academic textbooks are editions continuously updated, and if this type of passage was absent from the textbooks of the 1960's (although something similar was likely present, judging by the attitude of Colonel Naim), there were certainly enough established anti-Hindu diatribes for it to seamlessly fit the overall vindictiveness, forming the opinions of the likes of Colonel Naim. It is a ‘historical’ consistency found in another citation of Nayyar and Salim's, with their personal comments in the brackets:

Muslims were not eligible to vote. Hindu voters never voted for a Muslim, therefore...[A sheer distortion, and a blatant lie that the Muslims were ineligible to vote]

...Hindus declared the Congress rule as the Hindu rule, and started to unleash terror on the Muslims...

The Hindus always desired to crush the Muslims as a nation. Several attempts were made by the Hindus to erase the Muslim culture and civilization...

[The Muslims] were not allowed to profess their religion freely...

After 1965 war India conspired with the Hindus of Bengal and succeeded in spreading hate among the Bengalis about West Pakistan and finally attacked East Pakistan in December 1971, thus causing the breakup of East and West Pakistan. (AH Nayyar and Ahmed Salim, *The Subtle Subversion: The State of Curricula and Textbooks in Pakistan*, 2005, pp. 22-23)

As one can see, nefarious Hindu designs against the Muslims were apparently ongoing for centuries prior to the 1970s, with their recent conspiracy leading up to the 1971 war only an extension of their unceasing behaviour. Indoctrinated in this fashion from birth, the Pakistani soldiers in 1971 could only view the Hindus as plotters against the ‘pure’ Muslims, with such enemies deserving death and torture according to the austere principles of the Quran and Hadith - the Asuric books of hatred supplemented by a state education offering a concomitant ‘history’ and a distorted characterization of the Hindus, with the lies stretching all the way back to the ancient Hindus:

The Hindus treated the ancient population of the Indus very badly. They forcibly occupied their land. They set fire to their houses and butchered them. **After defeating the ancient people of the sub-continent the Hindus started fighting amongst themselves...The Hindus did not believe in one God but worshipped the numerous idols in their temples.** (AH Nayyar and Ahmed Salim, *The Subtle Subversion: The State of Curricula and Textbooks in Pakistan*, 2005, p. 80)

These particular distortions are inspired of course, by the European falsehood of both a physical “Aryan race” who “invaded” the subcontinent, with the fabricated European narrative fitting well with Muslim biases such as the supposed “worship” of “idols”, religious statues made as an expression of beauty and used for concentration. In a summary of Pakistani Social Studies, History, Civics and Urdu textbooks, the *Subtle Subversion* authors note further libel against the Hindus:

A thorough examination of the present Pakistan Social Studies, History, Civics and Urdu textbooks reveal that the Hindus are portrayed as backward and superstitious in them...In their social studies classes, students are taught that Islam brings peace, equality and justice to the

subcontinent and **only through Islam could the sinister ways of the Hindus be held in check. In Pakistani textbooks Hindu rarely appears in textbooks without the use of adjectives ‘conniving’ or ‘manipulative.’** (AH Nayyar and Ahmed Salim, *The Subtle Subversion: The State of Curricula and Textbooks in Pakistan*, 2005, p. 69)

Conniving, as one might expect from those indoctrinated with Islam, is hardly the most denigrating of labels assigned to the Hindu:

In ‘Civics of Pakistan’, as Rubina Saigol identifies, several statements are of the same nature...Fear of the Hindu Raj is created; **democracy is equated with Hindu rule**; throughout history is presented in communal terms. (Page 17)...Very negative terms are used for the Hindus; **derogatory terms designed to create demonic images of all of them.** (Page 21) (AH Nayyar and Ahmed Salim, *The Subtle Subversion: The State of Curricula and Textbooks in Pakistan*, 2005, pp. 72-73)

But the Hindus must by default be demonic, because the Quran has such “idolaters” in league with the evil Satan, a ‘fact’ resulting in the curious paradox of a so-called Islamic nation having to use unorthodox derogatory terms to create a demonic presentation, instead of just outright calling the kuffar Hindus by the applicable *terms of the ‘Holy’ Quran*. Rather than using the austere and infrarationally revealed descriptions of the Islamic scripture, the remnant Pakistan textbooks prefer to indulge in projection, with – in one example – the claim made that the Hindu leaders of the Indian Congress, prior to Partition, demanded that all Muslims convert or else leave the nation:

The Hindus had the upper hand in the Congress and they established good relations with the British. This party tried its best to safeguard the interests of the Hindus. Gradually it became purely a Hindu organization. Most of the Hindu leaders of the Congress were not prepared to tolerate the presence of the Muslims in the Subcontinent. **They demanded that the Muslims should either embrace Hinduism or leave the country.** (AH Nayyar and Ahmed Salim, *The Subtle Subversion: The State of Curricula and Textbooks in Pakistan*, 2005, p. 21)

There is absolutely no evidence that the political Hindu leaders of the time demanded such conversions, a fact supported by the historical trend of neither Hindus nor their organizations, bar a handful of non-governmental cases, actively seeking conversions of non-Hindus. That the Muslim Pakistanis feel the need to include this lie speaks to a subconscious projection of their own desire to obtain conversions, by compulsion if necessary. It also represents a means to foster the infamous Islamic persecution complex, ‘evidence’ of a claim that ‘Islam is in danger’ through the nefarious aims of the Hindus and their leaders, who in another textbook are declared to have wanted to “subjugate” Muslims:

English Class VIII, Punjab Textbook Board, Lahore March 2002...The Congress was trying very hard to project the image of united India, which was actually aimed at the extermination of the Muslims from the Indian society.

The two Hindu organizations [Congress and Mahasabha] were determined to destroy the national character of the Muslims to dominate and subjugate them perpetually. (AH Nayyar and Ahmed Salim, *The Subtle Subversion: The State of Curricula and Textbooks in Pakistan*, 2005, p. 62)

This of course, is in actuality the Asuric design of Islam, to dominate and subjugate the Infidels through the *jizya* taxation and the procurement of non-Muslim slaves, “right hand possessions” who can be abused physically and raped daily. But in the Pakistani textbooks, it is the Hindus who desire to enslave Muslims, with no mention, curiously enough for a “Muslim” state, of the Islamic scripture's approval of enslaving non-Muslims:

Urdu Class IX-X, Punjab Textbook Board, Lahore, March 2002...When the rule of the British

was established, Hindus were quick to learn the English language...continued to foster their traditional hatred towards Muslims. **And this way they prepared a plan to make Muslims their slaves for ever.** (AH Nayyar and Ahmed Salim, *The Subtle Subversion: The State of Curricula and Textbooks in Pakistan*, 2005, pp. 53-54)

These are absolutely laughable prevarications, currently shown to be false by the Muslim population of India, whose percentage of the population has increased since partition, who enjoy perks not granted to different religious groups, such as the ability to have multiple wives, along with taxpayer sponsored subsidies for the Haj pilgrimage, and tax benefits to Mosques that are unavailable to Hindu temples. These things, however, are never enough for the followers of Islam, especially when living as a minority among unbelievers, at the mercy of a democratic mandate that might go against the commands of Islam. Indeed, for the Pakistani Muslims – who let us recall, are simply a subdivision of Indian Muslims -, the mere presence of a Hindu majority would effect the ability of Islamic tenets to breathe, and thus the textbooks of “Pakistan” teach that its creation was the culmination of an unusual type of freedom movement:

Urdu Class V, PTB, Lahore, May 2002, p 108...**They [Muslims] knew that the Hindus have always been their enemy. If they get to rule here, then the Muslims will not be able to live free in accordance of the tenets of Islam.** (AH Nayyar and Ahmed Salim, *The Subtle Subversion: The State of Curricula and Textbooks in Pakistan*, 2005, p. 54)

In another lesson for Class IV Pakistani Urdu students, a poem exalting jihad against the kuffar is imparted upon impressionable young minds – at last, a more direct teaching of Islam's message!

Class IV, PTB, Lahore March 2002...Lesson 23: O’ Quaid-e-Azam: A poem that talks of defeating *kafirs*, Jinnah as *mard-e-mujahid* who worked for Islam. (AH Nayyar and Ahmed Salim, *The Subtle Subversion: The State of Curricula and Textbooks in Pakistan*, 2005, p. 57)

Although an unabashed glorification of waging battle against the kuffar, linking it to Jinnah again brings about, as we will explore in depth later, a confusion and corruption of the ‘pure’ Islamic message one might expect from a textbook of a state created in the name of Islam. But at least the textbooks are able to correctly identify that only Muslims should rule, that every law should be in “accordance with the Quran”:

Urdu Class IV, Punjab Textbook Board, Lahore, March 2002...p36-39 Lesson: The Story of Minar-e-Pakistan. Quotes (a) After winning their freedom, they [Muslims] wanted to establish a government in which they could live in accordance with Islam, where every law would be in accordance with the Quran. But they knew that the Hindus were in a majority in India. After the British leave, they would not let an Islamic state be established here....(b) They feared that after getting rid of the slavery of the British, they would become slaves of the Hindus. (c) **The Muslims wished to have a true freedom, in which only Muslim would rule, there would be the rule of Allah.** (AH Nayyar and Ahmed Salim, *The Subtle Subversion: The State of Curricula and Textbooks in Pakistan*, 2005, p. 53)

This freedom, in which *only* the Muslims can rule, is not really a freedom, but merely an Asuric desire to oppress ones fellow brethren, leading to a psychological bondage when the aim of life should be a spiritual liberation based on a recognition of samata, a principle allowing for each to express his inner law while transforming the egoistic qualities of desire, hatred, permanent separation and abuse of fellow creations. It is also a wish that should have been carefully considered, because a government in complete accordance with the Quran and the rule of Allah arrives with cruelties and punishments for those calling themselves Muslim, tribulations that the pious of “Pakistan” continue to believe themselves immune from, a fate they only associate with the Hindu victims of the Islamic invaders of the subcontinent, with said raiders described in Pakistani textbooks in a much more benign fashion to

their actual nature:

Secondary Level: Mu'ashrati Ulum: Punjab Textbook Board, 3rd reprint March 1989...Lesson No. 17 (pp 85-93) is entitled "History." The word invasion is avoided scrupulously in the case of all Muslim conquerors from Muhammad Bin Qasim to Ahmad Shah Abdali (p. 88) (K.K. Aziz, *The Murder of History*, 1998, p. 21)

For to describe it as an invasion would bring facts into the topic, including the ugly reality that the sub-nations comprising rump Pakistan were at the forefront of the West and Central Asian Muslim invasions and resulting brutality. By avoiding the use of the word invasion, Pakistani 'educators' seek to prevent a truer understanding of Muslim Pakistani heritage, which is that of the doubly defeated, having both lost to the invader and having acquired the usurper's religion: That knowledge might, in turn, lead to a feeling of shame and the questioning of continuing on with the invader's mission. Thus the *psychological* need to avoid mention of actual descriptions like invasion when the historical accounts of the likes of Bin Qasim – the following written by his contemporary Kazi Ismail - clearly depict their 'arrival' in that fashion:

Muhammad Kasim now determined to march to Brahmanabad. Between Dawar and that city there were two fortresses called Bahrur and Dhalila which contained about sixteen thousand fighting men. **When Muhammad Kasim reached Bahrur he besieged it for two months. After the war had been protracted so long, Muhammad Kasim ordered that part of his army should fight by day and part by night.** They threw naphtha and plied their mangonels so that all the warriors of the adverse party were slain, and the walls of the fort thrown down. **Many slaves and great plunder were taken.** They put the fifth part of it into the public treasury. When the news of the capture of Rawar and Bahrur reached Dhalila, the inhabitants knew that Muhammad Kasim possessed great perseverance, and that they should be on their guard against him. The merchants fled to Hind, and the men of war prepared to defend their country. At last, Muhammad Kasim came to Dhalila, and encamped there for two months, more or less. (*Chach-na'ma*. translated into Persian by Muhammad Ali bin Hamid bin Abu Bakr Kufi. In *The History of India as Told by its own Historians. The Posthumous Papers of the Late Sir H. M. Elliot*, John Dowson, 1956, vol. 7, p. 77)

War, sieglements, fighting, slaves, rape, plunder, massacred civilians and slain warriors were all part of the Islamic invasions of the Indian subcontinent, but some of the Pakistani textbooks would have one believe the Islamic rulers to have arrived on a "visit":

Mu'ashrati Ulum: Punjab 2nd edition April 1989...One lesson, No. 12 (pp. 67-74) is on history. It begins with the invasion of Muhammad Bin Qasim, attacks the Hindu religion, and describes the Muslim advent as a visit ("when the Muslims came to the subcontinent") but the British arrival as a forcible seizure of power from the Muslims. (K.K. Aziz, *The Murder of History*, 1998, pp. 16-17)

In another textbook, Bin Qasim is more accurately described as having "occupied" Sindh and Multan, a half-truth accompanied by the lies that this established Muslim rule *and* the very state of "Pakistan"!

A textbook of Pakistani studies states: "...as a matter of fact, Pakistan came to be established for the first time when the Arabs under Muhammad-bin-Qasim occupied Sindh and Multan in the early years of the eighth century, and established Muslim rule in this part of the South Asian Sub-continent. Pakistan under the Arabs comprised the Lower Indus Valley." (AH Nayyar and Ahmed Salim, *The Subtle Subversion: The State of Curricula and Textbooks in Pakistan*, 2005, p. 70)

That "Pakistan" never existed as a political entity until the twentieth century is patently obvious, but

the hidden lie is of bin Qasim securing Muslim rule during his invasion, for it is at best a half-truth, since Sindh was recaptured by the Hindus soon after his death. While he was the first Islamic invader, he only set the stage for the – centuries later - establishment of Islamic rule in parts of India, with another raider, Sultan Mahmud of Ghazni, also playing a significant role a century prior to Mahmood of Ghori's capture of Delhi, upon which the Delhi Sultanate commenced. Ghazni, though also unable to establish long-lasting rule over Indian territory, was quite effective as a raider and destroyer, plundering and taking slaves, as any 'good' Islamic leader should be doing. The Muslim account of Ghazni's 'exploits' certainly highlight his Asuric piousness, with one example of many, the raid of Tanesar as described by Ghazni's secretary, illustrating his life work and Islamic heritage:

The Sultan learnt that in the country of Tanesar there were large elephants of the Sailaman (Ceylon) breed, celebrated for military purposes. **The chief of Tanesar was on this account obstinate in his infidelity and denial of God. So the Sultan marched against him with his valiant warriors, for the purpose of planting the standards of Islam and extirpating idolatry.** He marched through a desert which no one had yet crossed, except birds and wild beasts, for the foot of man and the shoe of horse had not traversed it. There was no water in it, much less any other kind of food. The Sultan was the first to whom God had granted a passage over this desert, in order that he might arrive at the accomplishment of his wishes.

Beneath it flowed a pure stream; the bottom was covered with large stones, and its banks were precipitous and sharp as the points of arrows. The Sultan had reached this river where it takes its course through a hill-pass, behind which the infidels had posted themselves, in the rear of their elephants, with a large number of infantry and cavalry. The Sultan adopted the stratagem of ordering some of his troops to cross the river by two different fords, and to attack the enemy on both sides; and when they were all engaged in close conflict he ordered another body of men to go up the bank of the stream, which was flowing through the pass with fearful impetuosity, and attack the enemy amongst the ravines, where they were posted in, the greatest number. The battle raged fiercely, and about evening, after a vigorous attack on the part of the Musulmans, the enemy fled, leaving their elephants, which were all driven into the camp of the Sultan, except one, which ran off and could not be found. The largest were reserved for the Sultan.

The blood of the infidels flowed so copiously, that the stream was discoloured, notwithstanding its purity, and people were unable to drink it. Had not night come on and concealed the traces of their flight, many more of the enemy would have been slain. The victory was gained by God's grace, who has established Islam for ever as the best of religions, notwithstanding that idolaters revolt against it. The Sultan returned with plunder which it is impossible to recount. Praise be to God, the protector of the world, for the honour he bestows upon Islam and Musulmans! (*Tarikh Yamini*, Abu Nasr Muhammad ibn Muhammad al Jabbaru-l Utbi. In *The History of India as Told by its own Historians. The Posthumous Papers of the Late Sir H. M. Elliot*, 1956, vol. 1, p. 36)

The Asuric brutality, infrarationally inspired by the Quran and Hadith, including the verses declaring Islam to be the best of all religions, the religion to conquer the others irrespective of Polytheist aversion, is clear to see in this solitary example among his many horrific raids. Islam was *the* significant motivator to the plunderers, just as it is to the modern Pakistani jihadis, for spoils of war alone are not enough to incessantly motivate someone to keep going to war *after they have lost multiple times*, as in the case of the latter group. It also allows – at least for the creators of the textbooks and subsequent indoctrinated children – them to ignore the fact that their ancestors, especially in the case of the Northwest of the subcontinent, bore the brunt of the killings, forced conversions, enslavement and rapes perpetuated by the Islamic invaders. The savage invaders are instead glorified in the textbooks, with bin Qasim and Ghazni used as prime examples for imparting on schoolchildren the

glory of jihad and martyrdom:

a. Objectives, Contents and Activities...Activity 4: To make speeches on *jehad* and *shehadat*...Important personalities: contents: Muhammad Bin Qasim, Mahmood Ghaznavi. (AH Nayyar and Ahmed Salim, *The Subtle Subversion: The State of Curricula and Textbooks in Pakistan*, 2005, p. 84)

Instead of the reality that the vast majority of Pakistanis are descendants of the doubly defeated, they have decided to identify with the Asuric invaders, to the extent that over the course of the Pakistani state's existence, there has been less and less mention of the Hindu heritage to the Sapta Sindhu region - history apparently beginning with the first Muslim step on the subcontinent:

Children are presently taught Pakistani studies as a replacement for the teaching of history and geography as full-fledged disciplines. In the first 25 years of Pakistan, this was not the case. Children at the time were taught the very early history of South Asia, including the pre-historic times. The books describe in detail the ancient religious mythology of the region, the early and great Hindu and Buddhist Kingdoms of the Mauriyas and Guptas, the Muslim conquests and establishment of Muslim Sultanates in North India. This long historical perspective of our region is absent in more recent textbooks. **Instead, children are now taught that the history of Pakistan starts from the day the first Muslim set foot in India.** (AH Nayyar and Ahmed Salim, *The Subtle Subversion: The State of Curricula and Textbooks in Pakistan*, 2005, IV)

While this narrative, that "Pakistan" began when Muhammad bin Qasim first appeared on subcontinental soil, appears to have been absent in the country's initial phase of existence, the murder of history has progressively worsened in "Pakistan", whose Muslims have done their best to completely identify with barbaric invaders, a process yielding mixed or inconclusive results. As part of their edification, the Muslim Pakistanis contort themselves into 'proving' their Islamic lineage, to the extent that many groups in "Pakistan" claim descent from the Prophet Mohammed himself. They of course forget the truth of the Bhagavad Gita, that it is better to follow one's own inherent law than imitate that of another, which if applied to the sub-national group consciousness, makes it better to identify as the descendants of a *temporarily* defeated culture than the lineage of an invader and his harem - the manner in which they would have acquired the actual genetic inheritance claimed by so many. But as they must - by nature of their religion and its Asuric stranglehold on them - strictly identify with the jihadis of medieval times, taught as they are that everything pre-Islamic is of darkness, they have no choice, if they want to do their best imitation, to reject all links to such history, including any acknowledgement of their ancestral defeat. This latter mechanism however, comes with it the debilitating reflex to return, time and again, to the need to whitewash historical results, for having done so in the face of volumes of contemporaneous historical accounts of the invader's atrocities, so do the Pakistanis present a farcical version of the results of their *own* wars - in one example, India is depicted as begging the United Nations for peace to end the 1965 Indo-Pakistani war!

India, frightened of the Pakistan army and the people of Pakistan, sued for peace (Punjab, class 4). When India was on the point of being defeated she requested the United Nations to arrange a ceasefire (Punjab, class 5). (K.K. Aziz, *The Murder of History*, 1998, p. 184)

No evidence exists at all that India was at the point of being defeated, and the standard perspective is that India had gained around 500 square kilometres of territory by the time a ceasefire was declared; hence the quick Pakistani signature of the Tashkent Agreement, whereby both sides withdrew to pre-war territorial markings. Yet even more troubling for certain Pakistanis than this particular fabrication, is the respect that this narrative affords the United Nations, an obviously *non-Muslim* entity, although not of the Hindu variety. It is a paradox that brings about the most crucial of questions: Why did this so-called Islamic Army of Pakistan, having brought Infidel India to the point of defeat, subsequently

accept the writ of the similarly kuffar United Nations? But that is a disturbing question only for the adolescent and adult Muslim males raised in rump Pakistan, as the outsider easily understands that the Pakistanis have simply lied about the outcome of the war, with the lies and omissions continuing in their tale of the 1971 Indo-Pakistani war:

Secondary Level: Mu'ashrati Ulum: Punjab Textbook Board, 3rd reprint March 1989...In the same chapter wars with India are mentioned in patriotic not historic terms. In 1965, "the Pakistani Army conquered several areas of India, and when India was on the point of being defeated she requested the United Nations to arrange a ceasefire...After the 1965 war India, with the help of the Hindus living in East Pakistan, instigated the people living there against the people of West Pakistan, and at last in December 1971 herself invaded East Pakistan. The conspiracy resulted in the separation of East Pakistan from us. All of us should receive military training and be prepared to fight the enemy." (p. 93) (K.K. Aziz, *The Murder of History*, 1998, p. 21)

That the democratic election of an East Pakistani political party is deemed part of a conspiracy, part of an instigation against the West Pakistani people, one abetted by the reliable kuffar Hindu villains, is the obvious lie. The multiple sins of omission include the refusal to acknowledge their genocide of Hindus in present-day Bangladesh, another paradox when we consider the gloating over Hindu victims found in the medieval Muslim invader's accounts of their 'activities' in the subcontinent – it is as if the Pakistani educators are wary of disapproval from non-Muslim *untermensch* who might review their curriculum! The other significant omission includes the nature of the 1971 separation, with the Indian invasion mentioned – though without the context of the genocide and one crore refugees – but the Pakistani army's capitulation excluded. In another selection, the Pakistani army is said to have fought with India, for two weeks, with East Pakistan becoming Bangladesh. Neglected here is the account of Pakistan's military *defeat*, a void of history left for the young Pakistani mind to fill with all sorts of fantasies:

Secondary Level: Mu'ashrati Ulum: NWFP...The 1971 breakup of the country is dismissed in 4 atrociously distorted lines: "India engineered riots in East Pakistan through her agents and then invaded it from all four sides. Thus Pakistan was forced to fight another war with India. This lasted two weeks. After that East Pakistan seceded and became Bangladesh." (p11) (K.K. Aziz, *The Murder of History*, 1998, p. 19)

From the multiple distortions presented, we find again the Islamic desire to have it both ways, in this case a refusal to admit defeat yet at once blaming others for their loss; the need to perpetuate the paranoia of the Quran and Hadith yet also its mythology of the indestructible Muslim jihadi infrarationally revealed to have the strength of ten Infidel warriors. It is a discrepancy that feeds the warped teachings in state Pakistani schools, with the authors of *The Subtle Subversion* noting the profound effects such education has on the functional ability of the state itself:

The distortion of history has increasingly warped Pakistan's view of both self and others for decades. Each generation has twisted further the facts it possesses to the next. This has served to create a particular world view that is removed from reality and confound efforts to understand and properly resolve important social, national and international problems. (AH Nayyar and Ahmed Salim, *The Subtle Subversion: The State of Curricula and Textbooks in Pakistan*, 2005, p. 6)

Indeed, an inability to accurately recount history, *especially* a recent history of wars fought with one's neighbour, prevents a legitimate understanding of the present, and the reasons for any particular failings or deficiencies observed. Then again, if "Pakistan" is indeed to represent 'pure' Islam, not only should history be shaped along traditional Islamic narratives, but any failings and deficiencies simply

represent a lack of *Islamic* purity rather than other impediments. Thus the continued erosion of a well-rounded education reflects, as Nayyar et. al. mention, an attempt at this type of purification, something the authors note to be a result of “one particular school of Islamic thought”:

For orthodox Islamists, non-Muslims in an Islamic society that is governed by Islamic laws are *dhimmis*, liable to be levied protection money, *jizyah*, absolved of any military duty, *Jihad*, and doomed to live in an environment of limited rights. Within this belief system, therefore, national identity can be denied to religious minorities in Pakistan. **The education process in the form of curricula and textbooks reinforces this denial.**

The program of study that was designed under Islamization was in keeping with the philosophy of education of one particular school of Islamic thought which asserts that the entire source of knowledge is what was revealed by Allah and that the worldly knowledge has to be in the context of the revealed knowledge. (AH Nayyar and Ahmed Salim, *The Subtle Subversion: The State of Curricula and Textbooks in Pakistan*, 2005, p. 10)

But the author's implicit critique of this Islamization, however well-intended, speaks to the fundamental confusion of elite Muslim Pakistanis (including the authors), those attempting to straddle triumphant Islam while incorporating non-Islamic teachings, including the very idea that multiple ‘schools of thought’ are permitted by Islam. This is a fallacy we have already documented, as Allah has demanded his followers to refrain from sects, which by default includes ‘schools of thought’, and as Mohammed urged his followers to be uniform in both interpretation and vocalization of the Quran. From this ‘culture’ came the inevitable – as outlined by the authors – emergence of repetitive Islamic themes found in Pakistani textbooks:

Four themes emerge most strongly as constituting the bulk of the curricula and textbooks of the three compulsory subjects.

1. That Pakistan is for Muslims alone; 2. that Islamiyat is to be forcibly taught to all students, whatever their faith, including a compulsory reading of the Quran; 3. that the ideology of Pakistan is to be internalized as faith, and hate be created against Hindus and India; 4. and students be urged to take the path of Jihad and Shahadat. (AH Nayyar and Ahmed Salim, *The Subtle Subversion: The State of Curricula and Textbooks in Pakistan*, 2005, p. 10)

These are indeed, other than the actual existence of a political state known as “Pakistan”, themes quite consistent with Islam, a religion in which the Asura of Falsehood declares *Allah* to “hate” the unbelievers; in which all of the planet is to belong to Islam, however the Polytheists may be averse; in which jihad is mandatory for all able-bodied males, even if it leads to martyrdom. These Islamic themes of the curriculum completely reinforce, as noted by the authors, Muslim bigotry and violence:

Pakistani nationalism is repeatedly defined in a manner that is bound to exclude non-Muslim Pakistanis from either being Pakistani nationals or from even being good human beings...It seems clear unless there is a much greater priority given to a fundamental change in curriculum and textbooks, Pakistani children will continue to be educated in bigotry, violence and hate. (AH Nayyar and Ahmed Salim, *The Subtle Subversion: The State of Curricula and Textbooks in Pakistan*, 2005, II, pp. 4-5)

Though the main elements of the educational policy are consistent with Allah's commandments, the authors note an ironic, and self-inflicted, obstacle produced by the incessant message of hatred toward Hindus and India:

They contain omissions, inaccuracies and use of a polemical style which results in students hating Hindus and becoming too chauvinistic and militaristic. They also contain material glorifying war and violence which tends to make the young people value war and violent, rather

than peaceful, solutions to problems. Islam too has been used to sanctify this policy of creating an anti-Hindu, anti-India, pro-war and chauvinistic mentality. Such a mentality makes it impossible for the government to be flexible. **One obvious problem is that if the government wants to adopt moderate policies or avoid an armed conflict with India on Kashmir, then it will find it difficult to do so because public opinion, shaped in school as well as outside it, will consider it a betrayal of principles.** (AH Nayyar and Ahmed Salim, *The Subtle Subversion: The State of Curricula and Textbooks in Pakistan*, 2005, p. 124)

The point is quite perceptive, as the rigidity to public opinion indeed actually hurts jihadi aims towards India, because it creates a climate where even the use of dissimulation becomes mistrusted, presumed to be the result of a softening toward the Hindu, a display of friendship when we know the Quran to forbid the taking of Infidel friends. The ordinary public may not have the mental suppleness for the art of taqiyyah and, indoctrinated to believe that Pakistan has never lost a war, are liable to be perpetually frustrated that their rulers, commanders of an army known to have hundreds of thousands of soldiers, have not implemented an all out jihad against India. After all, the same ‘educated’ public, at least the ones enrolled in state schools, are from their very youth instructed that along with bigotry, war - jihad specifically – is paramount:

(Summary) Our analysis found that some of the most significant problems in the current curriculum and textbooks are: Inaccuracies of fact and omission that substantially distort the nature and significance of actual events in our history. Insensitivity to the existing religious diversity of the nation. Incitement to militancy and violence, including encouragement of Jihad and Shahadat. Perspectives that encourage prejudice, bigotry and discrimination towards fellow citizens, especially women and religious minorities, and other nations. **A glorification of war and the use of force.** Omissions of concepts, events and material that encourage critical self-awareness among students. (AH Nayyar and Ahmed Salim, *The Subtle Subversion: The State of Curricula and Textbooks in Pakistan*, 2005, Summary)

Regarding the glorification of war, at least the Pakistani textbooks are doing a reasonable job of emulating the content of the Quran in which, as we recall, turning back from war is deemed a form of apostasy, punishable by death. While neither the authors of *The Subtle Subversion*, nor K.K. Aziz, note the corresponding scripture to be mentioned in the curriculum, one can at least say that the Pakistanis, by glorifying war, are moving somewhat in the right direction – except for the fact that, as the existence of Polytheist Hindus (to be killed or subjugated by glorious jihad) has always been tantalizingly close to The Land of the Pure, as India continues to grow stronger and increasingly resilient towards attacks, and as the “Pakistan” army has not marshalled its sizeable forces for jihad in decades, the elite of “Pakistan” can be rightly accused of *failing to match word with action*, just like the *munafiqun* “Muslims” of Mohammed's time. However, the Pakistani military is not alone in their difficulty in following actual – literal – Islam, which by the final ‘Word’ involves rigidly adhering to all of the revealed scripture and eliminating the Hindu past from their minds and lives. Indeed, in *The Subtle Subversion*, the editors quote a Tariq Rahman evaluation of Pakistan textbooks, which beyond his summation of its bigotry toward Hindus, its omission of Pakistan military losses and subjugation of the Bengalis, and its outright lies over the results of the 1948, 1965 and 1971 wars, also notes its refusal to acknowledge Muslim society's “borrowing” from Hindu culture:

First, the non-Muslim part of Pakistan is ignored. **Second, the borrowing from Hindu culture is either ignored or condemned.** Third, the Pakistan movement is portrayed mostly in terms of perfidy of Hindus and the British and the righteousness of the Muslims. After the partition, in which Hindus are reported to have massacred Muslims, while Muslims are not shown to have treated Hindus in the same manner, India is portrayed as the enemy, which is waiting to dismember Pakistan. The separation of Bangladesh in 1971 is portrayed as proof of this Indian

policy rather than the result of the domination of the West Pakistan over the East Bengal. Above all, the 1948, 1965 and 1971 wars are blamed entirely on India, and Pakistan is showed to have won the 1965 war. The armed forces are not only glorified but treated as if they were sacrosanct and above criticism. (AH Nayyar and Ahmed Salim, *The Subtle Subversion: The State of Curricula and Textbooks in Pakistan*, 2005, pp. 66-67)

Borrowing is an incorrect description; inheritance is much more appropriate - it is a reality flowing from history and the respective contents of the religions: the Hindu past existing millennia prior to the Asura of Falsehood's imposition from the North and West of the subcontinent: the Islamic religion restricted to one infrarationally revealed scripture, contrasted with the Hindu 'religion' flexible to the point of accepting the atheist path – the Hindu's variety of worship naturally leading to diverse cultural traditions from which even the pious Muslims 'borrow'. It is an outcome, though disconcerting to the Imams, that is inevitable to a closed religion in which no further revelations are possible, in which all are expected to follow the traditions of a solitary person from one specific time, without any recourse to experiment or make additions. Thus if that ideology or religion has no specific pronouncements on certain aspects to life, as one might expect of a time-limited creation, then "borrowing" from other cultures should be expected, especially if the culture is one that grew organically and established its roots long ago.

Nevertheless, the pious Muslims of "Pakistan" have, since its inception and proceeding at an ever faster rate in recent decades, sought – after the actual Hindus were expelled or slaughtered - to eliminate activities and physical signs of their ancient Hindu heritage, in some cases through the historic method of destroying Hindu temples and the artefacts or "idols" inside, an iconoclasm observed elsewhere throughout the Islamic world, including the notorious example of the Afghan Taliban's destruction of the Buddhas of Bamiyan. While these are certainly helpful in the attempted 'purification' of "Pakistan", perhaps more useful are the bans on festivals and activities with obvious Hindu origins, with the most infamous example involving the "extremist" pressure on authorities to abolish the Basant festival that primarily took place in "Pakistan" Punjab. Basant, from the Sanskrit *vasanta*, is the historic celebration of spring, with the Hindu celebration of Vasanta Panchami both heralding the onset of spring and offering prayers (puja) to the Goddess Saraswati – thus some sub-cultures celebrate it as Saraswati Puja.

Though the Muslim version of the Basant festival, most prominently celebrated in Lahore, did not invoke the Goddess Saraswati, it did include secular activities also seen in the Hindu festivals, most famously the flying of kites. Nevertheless, nowhere in the Quran or authentic hadith do we see a celebration of spring, nor its associated kite flying or fairs, let alone the outrageous *shirk* of Goddess worship. Consequently, even the propagation of this festival without the official blemish of Hinduism would still be questionable, with the revellers exposed to the accusation of apostasy, because the Basant festival obviously derives from a Hindu tradition including worship of a deity not named Allah – the mere association is enough to confirm the charge of *shirk* according to the dictates of Islam. We can hardly fault the "extremists" then, for their successful elimination of an 'impure' activity that many "Muslims" were engaging in. They are only, after all, following the command of the Prophet Mohammed, who informed mankind that Allah hates those who believe that pre-Islamic traditions - like Basant - belong to Muslim culture:

Narrated Ibn Abbas:

The Prophet said, "The most hated persons to Allah are three: (1) A person who deviates from the right conduct, i.e., an evil doer, in the Haram (sanctuaries of Mecca and Medina); (2) **a person who seeks that the traditions of the pre-Islamic Period of Ignorance, should remain in Islam** (3) and a person who seeks to shed somebody's blood without any right." (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 83, Number 21)

Though the Muslims of Lahore and elsewhere who celebrate or celebrated Basant do not consider themselves anything but proper followers of Islam, they are in actuality of the hated ones, certainly not worthy of Allah's "mercy" (required for their attempt to escape the hellfire). That Allah hates them speaks to their heresy, because the only 'truth' is what is contained in the Quran and in Mohammed's tradition (authentic hadith), and any differing religious principles added from before or *after*, is blasphemy. While the "extremists" are certainly correct in eliminating Basant and similar Hindu-origin activities, the irony of their purification campaign is nevertheless lost on them, because the tradition of the Prophet Mohammed is littered with customs taken from the Polytheists, including the aforementioned Tawaf and kissing of the Ka'ba, along with other traditions such as the prescribed days for fasting:

Narrated Aisha:

During the pre-Islamic Period of ignorance the Quraish used to observe fasting on the day of 'Ashura', and the Prophet himself used to observe fasting on it too. But when he came to Medina, he fasted on that day and ordered the Muslims to fast on it. When (the order of compulsory fasting in) Ramadan was revealed, fasting in Ramadan became an obligation, and fasting on 'Ashura' was given up, and who ever wished to fast (on it) did so, and whoever did not wish to fast on it, did not fast. (Sahih Bukhari Volume 6, Book 60, Number 31)

Indeed the inability of the idol Mohammed to have completely released himself from pre-Islamic customs only fuels the insecurity of the pious of "Pakistan", as their claim to be of the pure is contradicted by the obvious hypocrisies of the great leader. Yet instead of a calm reflection on the religion's contradictions, the unease is repressed, transformed into a destructive force by which they might, forever unsuccessfully, find their Islamic utopia. Since the religion does not allow for flexibility to thought, the only recourse for the pious is more and more Islam, whose Asuric solution to the neurosis is underpinned by violence, something implicit in the recent drive to end Basant. Indeed even the practice of keeping a moustache¹ is fraught with danger, for it speaks to a forbidden non-Islamic past, with the partaking "Muslim" transgressing from the Prophet's tradition:

Narrated Nafi:

Ibn Umar said, "**The Prophet said, 'Do the opposite of what the pagans do. Keep the beards and cut the moustaches short.'**" Whenever Ibn Umar performed the Hajj or Umra, he used to hold his beard with his hand and cut whatever moustaches. Ibn Umar used to cut his moustache so short that the whiteness of his skin (above the upper lip) was visible, and he used to cut (the hair) between his moustaches and his beard. (Sahih Bukhari Volume 7, Book 72, Number 780)

It was not enough for the Prophet to simply order his followers to maintain beards and trim their moustaches – he wanted the grooming to *specifically* distinguish them from the hated Polytheist. But the Idol of Islam proceeded much further, declaring the shaving of beards to be a sign of apostasy!

Narrated Abu Sa'id Al-Khudri:

The Prophet said, "There will emerge from the East some people who will recite the Quran but it will not exceed their throats and who will go out of (renounce) the religion (Islam) as an arrow passes through the game, and they will never come back to it unless the arrow, comes back to the middle of the bow (by itself) (i.e. impossible)." **The people asked, "What will their signs be?" He said, "Their sign will be the habit of shaving (of their beards)."** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 93, Number 651)

That the Idol of Islam mentioned that these people will emerge from the East (of Arabia) only adds to the unease of the subcontinental Imams, who see many "Muslims" adopting the grooming patterns of Hindu society, in which males often maintain a moustache and shaven beard. Their idol's hatred of the

Polytheist, to the point where one cannot even *look* like them, explains the facial grooming of many of the “radical” or “extremist” leaders in remnant Pakistan², the ones exhorting their flock to jihad, their unkempt features a result of their beliefs instead of laziness or a natural antipathy toward beauty in life. Returning to Mohammed's stance on grooming, we find that as there were no infrarational revelations on the topic, he at times simply imitated the disbelievers:

Narrated Ibn Abbas:

The Prophet used to copy the people of the Scriptures in matters in which there was no order from Allah. The people of the Scripture used to let their hair hang down while the pagans used to part their hair. So the Prophet let his hair hang down first, but later on he parted it. (Sahih Bukhari Volume 7, Book 72, Number 799)

Yet even though we do not have record of any specific ‘divine’ order concerning grooming, because Mohammed was immured in an Asuric world of hatred, division and violence, he took measures in accordance to his petty and impoverished nature, demanding certain appearances strictly out of spite:

Allah's Apostle said, “The Jews and the Christians do not dye (their grey hair), so you shall do the opposite of what they do (i.e. dye your grey hair and beards).” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 56, Number 668)

In another example, the use of wigs is denounced as a habit of the Jews, with Sa'id bin Al-Musaiyab narrating, “When Muawiya bin Abu Sufyan came to Medina for the last time, he delivered a sermon before us. He took out a tuft of hair and said, ‘I never thought that someone other than the Jews would do such a thing (i.e. use false hair). The Prophet named such a practice, ‘Az-Zur’ (i.e. falsehood),’ meaning the use of false hair.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 56, Number 694) Present in this recollection is another distortion of knowledge – that Falsehood is something defined by minor habits such as the use of fake hair, when any understanding of Falsehood, at least for those without occult or mystic experience, must begin with an evaluation of the psychology. From that foundation, along with the Psychic's progressive development of an inherent discrimination between Truth, Ignorance and Falsehood, it becomes quite clear that anything written in a textbook or scripture that purports to ‘truth’ and ‘falsehood’ - even if not directly stated in those terms - cannot be taken on superficial appearances alone. Yet is this basic proposition difficult for those inculcated with repetitive messages from early childhood, as the lies and omissions serve to restrict the range of their psychological growth, preventing the emergence of either an intellectual many-sidedness or a Psychic discrimination to determine falsehood from higher knowledge. With a paucity of alternatives available to escape the stultifying environment, Pakistanis have arrived at same fate – as described by Jung – of the Nazi Germans, accepting well-couched lies as truth:

A more accurate diagnosis of Hitler's condition would be *pseudologia phantastica*, that form of hysteria which is characterized by a **peculiar talent for believing one's own lies**. For a short spell, such people usually meet with astounding success, and for that reason are socially dangerous. **Nothing has such a convincing effect as a lie one invents and believes oneself, or an evil deed or intention whose righteousness one regards as self-evident...The pseudo-scientific race theories with which it was dolled up did not make the extermination of the Jews any more acceptable, and neither do falsifications of history make a wrong policy appear any more trustworthy.** (Carl Jung, *After the Catastrophe*)

For the Pakistanis, Islam-inspired textbook lies take the place of pseudo-scientific theories (albeit with some exceptions, such as the Western pseudoscience of eugenics infrarationally inspiring the rape of Bengali women to ‘improve’ their genetics), with – as in Nazi Germany – the succinct and limited (as evident by the four general themes of the textbooks) nature of the education imparting on their students dangerous convictions, because their minds, through the very limitation of the themes and the overall

falsification of history mirroring the ‘education’ of Nazi Germany, attach a crude vital emotion and force to the particular ‘knowledge’ they receive, due to its limited scope *and* the incessant textbook glorification of war. Indeed, a comprehensive tutelage is a means to help prevent the precarious vital aggrandizement, as it trains students to seek knowledge from multiple different angles, helping to minimize the vital attachment that can occur when only a limited number of thoughts and beliefs are learned, and to also develop a self-reflecting inner mind that is far more accommodating than the less evolved vital mind.

It is also an often successful avenue by which the student may begin to understand him or herself, to live by svadharma, the way for the individual to eventually reach the point where svadharma can be abandoned and spiritual liberation obtained. The Pakistani curriculum is, like the source of its derivation, the antithesis of this, restricting the mental space of its students to the lilliputian trinity of division, hatred and war, with their enslavement ensured by the obfuscation of reality. But although the state educators and Imams may continue to fight it, the past and the truths of the land will always remain, submerged yet not destroyed, inactive yet latent; its reminders inescapable, irrespective of the physical destruction and banning of Hindu-origin activities. Just the mere existence of the Sanatana Dharma and the constant stress placed on ‘reclaiming’ India is enough; a secret memory of the heritage couched in an aggressive posture, with the pathological obsession placed on it an unconscious means to highlight the falsehood. For “Pakistan” is simply a portion of India, the latter a Nation-Godhead among many in the world, the secret reality irrespective of how decidedly undivine things may be among its populace, just as Mahapurusha is the Source and Upholder of all manifestation, even if It only remains behind the thick veil between the phenomenal and eternal realities. As the Soul is the immortal and embodied portion of Brahma, as It is Satchitananda, Falsehood can only live as an imposition, with any inverted ‘purification’ only submerging or covering, but never destroying either the Truth-Consciousness or the Truth in the Multiplicity found in the Nation-Godheads. Thus the national Reality of the land named “Pakistan” will re-emerge, even if more darkness is yet to fall upon it.

* * * *

What we are currently seeing in “Pakistan” is only the initial ripening of a dark and destructive fruit, the seed of which was planted decades ago by men who failed to understand the significance of their invocation. If they were guilty of anything, it was forgetting the ancient adage of exerting caution over one's desires, which led to an illusionary Islamic triumph whose precise fate they could not foresee. They did not comprehend that the call to a ‘pure’ Islamic state could not, and will not, cease with the removal of Hindus, the obvious target. Little did they know that what they presumed, at the time, to be a thorough culling, completed in 1971 through the genocide of East Pakistani Hindus and the subsequent vivisection of the original Pakistani state, was only the opening salvo. For what follows the initial ‘purification’ involves a slightly more meticulous application of Allah's ‘Word’, a transition from the Polytheists onto the Hypocrites and Apostates. There have long been many of these transgressors in “Pakistan”, and the pious Muslims, now with only a negligible amount of Hindus to target, unable to breach the armed Indian defences with the exception of rare and insignificant (as far as conquering India) terror attacks, can only satiate their bloodlust in the practice of *takfir* - the excommunication of, and assigning of punishment to, Apostates and Hypocrites. It is a crime for which, we recall, the most severe of endings meets the guilty:

Narrated Ikrima:

Ali burnt some people and this news reached Ibn Abbas, who said, “Had I been in his place I

would not have burnt them, as the Prophet said, ‘Don't punish (anybody) with Allah's Punishment.’ **No doubt, I would have killed them, for the Prophet said, ‘If somebody (a Muslim) discards his religion, kill him.’**” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 52, Number 260)

But this most appropriate – for swaths of remnant Pakistan's population - Islamic penalty was not something to be seen immediately after the eradication of Hindus, because the primitive vital satisfaction emerging from their actions was enough to mask the impurities within “Muslim” society, at least to the extent of austere Islamic justice being handed out to the guilty. Indeed, in the years after the 1971 war, the only significant actions taken towards obtaining Islamic purity was the classification of a previously Muslim subgroup as kuffar. This was the result of a 1974 Parliamentary amendment declaring the Ahmadiyya sect to be non-Muslims; the subsequent 1984 Ordinance XX enacting a state law barring them from self-identifying – including on their passports - as Muslims. That they have from that point on become systematically persecuted is quite ironic, because the Ahmadiyyas played a prominent role in the partition of India, with the most notable example, Zafarullah Khan, credited by some³ as the author of the 1940 Lahore Resolution officially demanding a separate Muslim state out of India.

Much later would another Ahmadiyya, the theoretical physicist Abdus Salam, emerge on the world stage for his contributions to both his field and the Pakistani nuclear weapons programme. Yet is his life perhaps the perfect example of the extreme importance on ‘pure’ Islamic principles above all else, because his great contributions were ignored after the passage of the 1974 amendment, and Abdus Salam himself left the country in protest against that law. That he subsequently continued to help its nuclear ambitions is irrelevant, in so much as a Hindu hypothetically assisting with either Pakistan's creation or development would likewise not spare him from his assigned place in Islam. Thus a greater indignity awaited Abdus Salam after his death, when a local magistrate ordered that his tombstone be removed of all reference to his claim to be a Muslim. One can understand, however, the judge's directive, both constitutionally and in the far more important matter of scriptural accuracy. For it is very easy to argue the Ahmadiyyas as non-Muslims when we return to one of the most crucial of Islam's infrarational revelations:

Mohammed is not the father of any of your men, but he is the Messenger of Allah and the Last of the prophets; and Allah is cognizant of all things. (Quran 33:40)

The “Last”, or the “Seal” (depending upon the translation), of the prophets cannot have anyone arrive afterwards claiming to also hear the ‘Word’ of Allah. It is a very simple proposition, yet the Ahmadiyyakuffar brazenly violate it through the exaltation of the 19th century founder of their apostate faith, who declared himself the “Promised Messiah” (Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, *Tadhkirah*), a ‘divine’ prophet brought to earth to restore Islam and bring grandeur to the world, protecting Muslims through his earthly activities from the disastrous consequences Allah has for many on Judgement Day. While Mirza Ghulam Ahmad committed numerous relatively minor blasphemies, including writing a book declaring Jesus (Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, *Jesus in India*) to have escaped death from the cross and travelled to India, it was his self-declaration as a “Prophet” that permanently marked himself, and his followers, as apostates:

The fact is that in the Divine revelations of which I am the recipient, words such as ‘Messenger’, ‘Apostle’ and ‘Prophet’, appear not once, but hundreds of times. (Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, *A Misconception Removed*, p. 1)

This is, of course, in utter contradiction to the Quran's eternal ‘Word’ that Mohammed was the seal of prophetdom, the *final recipient* of ‘Divine revelations’. Thus Ghulam Ahmad and his followers, simply through this one sacrilegious claim, are kuffar, joining the Hindus, whose predominant problem is the practice of *shirk*. Though a necessary step in Pakistan's ‘purification’, the isolation of the

Ahmadiyyakuffar represented a low hanging fruit, as they were already a small percentage of the population during the nineteen-seventies, and today number slightly more than two million (*Pakistan: The situation of Ahmadis, including legal status and political, education and employment rights; societal attitudes toward Ahmadis*, Canada: Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada, 2006 - Nov. 2008, 4 December 2008). Though this is a large absolute number for an infidel group in an Islamic nation, especially as they are not required to pay the *jizya*, it is nevertheless only about one percent of the total population. The Shia sect of Islam, on the other hand, remain a substantial blemish on the Pakistani drive for 'cleanliness', as they comprise anywhere from 10 to 20 percent of the population, their total numbering an enormous twenty to forty million.

The Shi'ites, we recall, dare to claim the Quran an incomplete document, rashly add Ali to the shahada, and most egregiously of all, believe that 'divinely' ordained – as opposed to rulers *without* any supernatural features - leaders are to appear after Mohammed, with the most prominent Shia group, the Twelvers, holding that 12 such Imams will appear on earth. The last of them is known as the *Mahdi*, who the majority of Shia believe has already been born but has gone into hiding, a belief known as The Occultation. Both the idea of a divinely powerful *Mahdi* whose purpose is similar to Christ's resurrection, and the belief that his *Mahdi* has supernaturally kept himself alive and hidden for centuries, are entirely against the original teachings of Islam - in which Mohammed is the last Prophet or other type of *divinely appointed* human, and that he was a human with only human capabilities. Indeed, Shi'ite beliefs are quite polytheistic, hinting at a type of reincarnation or divine inspiration that per Islam, is unnecessary after the infrarational revelation of the final 'Word', the Quran. They are also clear examples of the dreaded *bid'ah*, or innovation, in religion that Mohammed strenuously opposed:

Narrated Aisha:

Allah's Apostle said, **"If somebody innovates something which is not in harmony with the principles of our religion, that thing is rejected."** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 3, Book 49, Number 86)

Innovations are *haram* (forbidden), unacceptable for the pious Muslim, and the Twelver teachings, to which the majority of Shia adhere, are indeed innovations that the Prophet warned about. And like all deviations from the austere scripture, Mohammed also reminded his companions that bidah leads to apostasy:

Abu Huraira narrated that the Prophet said: "On the Day of Resurrection a group of companions will come to me, but will be driven away from the Lake-Fount, and I will say, 'O Lord (those are) my companions!' It will be said, '**You have no knowledge as to what they innovated after you left; they turned apostate as renegades (reverted from Islam).**'" (Sahih Bukhari Volume 8, Book 76, Hadith 585)

To innovate is to blaspheme, and the Shia adhering to a posthumous creation of twelve divinely ordained Imams arriving to guide the believers, cannot be allowed in a religion that is already fixed, in which the 'Word' is final and consequently closed to adaptation. It is thus understandable for the most pious to be especially outraged by the Shia fantasies, especially as they claim themselves as Muslim. For in addition to the 'Word' of Allah and the tradition of the Prophet, the most pious, ironically enough for the Shia, can turn to the tradition of *Ali* when they declare the Shia *takfir*:

Narrated Ibrahim At-Tamimi's father:

Ali delivered a sermon saying, **"We have no book to read except the Book of Allah and what is written in this paper which contains verdicts regarding (retaliation for) wounds, the ages of the camels (given as Zakat or as blood money) and the fact that Medina is a sanctuary in between Air mountain to so-and-so (mountain). So, whoever innovates in it a**

heresy or commits a sin or gives shelter in it, to such an innovator will incur the Curse of Allah, the angels and all the people, and none of his compulsory or optional good deeds of worship will be accepted. And whoever (freed slave) takes as his master (i.e. befriends) other than his real masters will incur the same (Curse). And the asylum granted by any Muslim is to be secured by all the other Muslims, and whoever betrays a Muslim in this respect will incur the same (Curse).” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 53, Number 397)

The Shi’ite, per the word of Allah, Mohammed and even Ali, are innovators of religion and thus non-Muslim, dumped with the rest into the flames of hell. Though innovation in religion seems to many, including those calling themselves Muslim, as something benign, a byproduct of life and its constant change, Islam holds it to be a sin, equal to the *shirk* of the Hindus. Religion, however, should reflect both God and life; the former innately capable of existing as One *and* as multiple Gods, Godheads and Souls; the latter defined by perpetual motion and evolution. Islam, as any Asuric ideology is destined, fails in both regards, with its ‘true’ believers desperately attaching themselves to rigid thought and belief structures that also, paradoxically, increases the belief that their religion is in danger, even after they have slaughtered millions of the enemy. As that paranoia is enshrined in the religion, and as the scripture shapes the psychology of the faithful, outward manifestations like the genocide of Hindus will fail to resolve the fear of Islam's danger *or* the impurity of its adherents, because the religion teaches Muslims to assume constant plotting against Islam and Muslims, and incessantly informs them that heretics abound. Thus as the state of “Pakistan” moved away from its real cultural heritage, a transition accelerated by making Islam its only reason for existence, which in turn produced a greater allegiance to the Quran and Hadith over ancient customs, the increased study of the Quran and Hadith has led to a better identification of the less than obvious enemies of Islam - the apostates within.

It is an Asuric development marking the life arcs of prominent individuals of the leftover “Pakistan”, including the glamorous politician Benazir Bhutto, the daughter of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, who himself was the Prime Minister of “Pakistan” from 1973-77 and had been educated – as the elite in “Pakistan” are often – in the United Kingdom at Oxford. Though the similarly stylish Zulfikar was well-known for his western and secular sensibilities, he was nevertheless unwilling, just as Jinnah before him, to *sincerely* stamp down upon the desires and ambitions of the literalist Muslims. He chose instead – partially because of politics - to inflame these dangerous tendencies, as evident by the anti-Ahmadiyya legislation passed *during* his rule. Similarly did his daughter Benazir, like her father educated in the West (at Harvard University), foolishly proceed to exalt the “extremist” viewpoint, especially in her first term as Prime Minister (from 1988 to 1990), during which she publicly exhorted the Muslims of Indian Kashmir to jihad against the Hindu kuffar located in that province:

The people of Kashmir do not fear death because they are Muslims. The Kashmiris have the blood of the mujahideen because Kashmiris are the heirs of Prophet Mohammed, Hazrat Ali, and Hazrat Omar. And the brave women of Kashmir?

They know how to fight and also to live. And when they live, they do so with dignity. From every village only one voice will emerge: freedom; from every school only one voice will emerge: freedom; every child will shout, “freedom, freedom, freedom.” (Shyam Bhatia, *Goodbye Shahzadi*, p. 130)

Ill-advised was this decision on the part of Benazir to invoke the evil force of jihad, which by nature only knows how to devour. For like her father, she failed to realize that she was also a worthy recipient of jihad's blood-lust, and the two of them, having danced with the Asura of Falsehood, so to speak, found themselves killed by the very force they thought was on their side, the force they deluded themselves into thinking they might control. For both of them, raised in the Shi’ite tradition, could hardly claim themselves bastions of Islamic purity (even if we ignore their similarly heretical Western secular education), guilty as they were in their belief that innovations were acceptable to Islam. Benazir

additionally faced the formidable defect of belonging to the female gender, whom the Prophet has informed us represent the majority of Islamic Hell:

Narrated Imran bin Husain:

The Prophet said, "I looked at Paradise and found poor people forming the majority of its inhabitants; and I looked at Hell and saw that the majority of its inhabitants were women." (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 54, Number 464)

As the hell-bound are intrinsically associated with the Polytheists - guilty of *shirk* - who reside there, this alone would have been enough for Benazir's jihadis to oppose her. But they had further, and more precise, justification in assassinating this uniquely powerful of "Muslim" women:

Narrated Abu Bakra:

During the battle of Al-Jamal, Allah benefited me with a Word (I heard from the Prophet). When the Prophet heard the news that the people of the Persia had made the daughter of Khosrau their Queen (ruler), he said, **"Never will succeed such a nation as makes a woman their ruler."** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 88, Number 219)

Thus as both a Shiakafir and a woman, the jihadis whom Benazir supported in Kashmir - where the jihad brought about the expected consequence of the cleansing of Hindus from the Kashmir valley, many of whom continue to live in refugee camps within India – justifiably turned against her when she attempted to re-enter the remnant Pakistani political scene in 2007. Her gruesome departure arrived soon after her return from exile back to "Pakistan", when she was killed in an assassination and bombing attack by the same jihadis – of greater 'purity' to her - she had previously sought to embolden. It is an ironic finale befitting the fate of her father, who had been executed on the order of General Zia Ul-Haq, a more pious believer whom Zulfikar had promoted above other generals. Both Benazir and her father were brought down by their own arrogance, believing themselves capable of having it both ways, choosing to mix non-Muslim beliefs and practices with a select few Islamic beliefs they held, using jihad to strike at India and Hindus yet believing themselves capable of escaping the wrath that real Islam assigns to *munafiqun* like themselves.

Their fate would have likely befallen Mohammed Ali Jinnah had he lived long enough to see to fruition what the invocation of Islam brings about. For he too was of the Shi'ite faith, a kuffar group claiming to be Muslim; also was he – like the Bhuttos and any of the other elected officials in the state's history – the proponent of a different type of innovation: the Secular Democracy. It is a concept not recorded in Islam, in which the rules of the Islamic nation are defined principally by the Quran, secondarily by the authentic hadith – nowhere is there any mention of democracy or the separation of religion and state. Indeed the Islamic religion *is* the nation, an infrarational theocracy preoccupied with war and rape and conquest. All is primarily determined by the 'Word' of Allah, and since the Asura did not mention secularism or democracy, Muslims should *not* be practising these clearly non-Islamic principles. Yet "Pakistan", this self-professed "pure" Islamic creation, continues to persist with this innovation to Islam, a vulgar insult to the sanctity of the Islamic scripture, especially seen in the uncorrected existence of a different type of document: the Constitution of Pakistan.

It is a document that, while providing sops to the pious through the likes of ordinances against Ahmadiyyas, nevertheless should be immediately discarded in a "nation" alleging itself to be an example of pure Islam. While it certainly, in its initial construction, voiced a generic sort of pride in Islam, the constitution's inadequacy was plainly evident, and led to General Zia's so-called shariasation process of the 1980's, in which the Hudood Ordinances were enacted to try and infuse the constitution with Sharia law. Naturally, this brought about punishments considered by many to be archaic and excessive, including the Quran injunction against theft: "As for the thief, both male and female, cut off

their hands. It is the reward of their own deeds, an exemplary punishment from Allah. Allah is Mighty, Wise.” (Quran 5:38) Along with amputations, the ancient penalty of flogging revived itself in an ‘Islamic’ state which at that point had practised a fair imitation of British penal code. Yet one can understand the motivation behind Zia's drive for Islamification, as the use of whipping – in the following as punishment to fornicators – has been infrarationally revealed by Allah to be the righteous type of justice:

(As for) the fornicatress and the fornicator, flog each of them, (giving) a hundred stripes, and let not pity for them detain you in the matter of obedience to Allah, if you believe in Allah and the last day, and let a party of believers witness their chastisement. The fornicator shall not marry any but a fornicatress or idolatress, and (as for) the fornicatress, none shall marry her but a fornicator or an idolater. And it is forbidden to the believers. (Quran 24:02-03)

But even the Hudood Ordinances – ignoring for a moment the fact that subsequent legislation has attempted to amend Zia's shariasation process – failed in taking “Pakistan” to its appropriate destiny – if it is to actually be considered an Islamic state – of outright Sharia law. After all, the Pakistan Penal Code, derived from laws established by the disbelievers of the British Empire, was *not* repealed by Zia; as a consequence, there continues to exist in impure “Pakistan” the Western legal concepts of due process, an adversarial court procedure, and the use of previous legal cases to determine future jurisprudence. As none of this is found in the Quran or authentic hadith, it should already – seven decades into Pakistan's creation! – have been eliminated, at least if Pakistanis genuinely wish to claim themselves a pure Islamic state. As opposed to that Asuric inversion of purity, what “Pakistan” continues to barely function as, drifting as they are from failure to worsening failure, is a bizarre Frankensteinian concoction - part Islamic, part secular, even part polytheistic to a degree – that infuriates its most pious members.

It is a geopolitical state that continues to – partially or perhaps, half-heartedly - wage jihad against India, yet shockingly accepts the notion of parliamentary democracy, granting power to elected officials when power should solely belong to the Imams. That they use the innovation of a constitution, one derived from nations practising secular democracy, to in turn politicize religion through acts such as declaring the Ahmadiyyas kuffar, fails to protect them from also becoming labelled as infidels, because they gravely err in equating non-Muslim law with Sharia, just as the Polytheists dare to equate other gods with Allah. And for the most pious, parliamentary democracy is a reminder of the decidedly *non-Islamic* origin of the Pakistani state, originating as it did from the contact Jinnah and his peers had with British higher education and legal ideas. Indeed, many Islamic scholars contemporary to the likes of Rahmat Ali and Jinnah were actually opposed to the very creation of Pakistan, including the highly influential Abul Ala Muadudi, whose arguments against “Pakistan” are summarized in K.K. Aziz's book:

Abul Ala Muadudi...Nationalism was incompatible with Islam. (*Process of an Islamic Revolution*) Islam forbade the process of imitation, and the adaptation of Western nationalism was nothing but imitation. “ ‘Muslim nationalist’ is as contradictory a term as ‘chaste prostitute’.” (*Nationalism and India*)...Neither the executive, nor the legislature, nor the judiciary can issue orders or enact laws or give judgements contrary to the *sunnah*...“No doubt the Islamic state is a Totalitarian state.” (*Political Theory of Islam*) It is prohibited in Islam to be a member of assemblies and parliaments...which are based on the demographic principles of the modern age. It is also prohibited to vote in elections to such bodies. (*Rasail-o-Masail*, Vol. I) (K.K. Aziz, *A Murder of History*, pp. 203-204)

Though Aziz would proceed to disagree with Muadudi, one can appreciate, understanding as we do the *haram* of innovation, the latter's distaste for parliaments and executive branches and non-Sharia judiciaries, or even of a style of nationalism infused with *regional* qualities instead of a strict adherence

to the one global nation of the Muslim community, who are of course in permanent conflict with the disbelievers. None of what he criticized, nor what the rump Pakistanis conversely follow, are actually approved of by the ‘Word’ of Allah, and as these principles are forbidden within the hallowed confines of the Quran or authentic hadith, and as they would alter the core tenets of the religion, they are prohibited by their status of bidah. The elite of “Pakistan” however, attempt to portray these *munaifiq* innovations as pious through the inclusion of Islamic elements with the non-Islamic, a process seen in the textbook's illegal fusion of Islamic teachings with non-Muslim concepts of “citizenship” and “constitutional development”:

National Curriculum CIVICS for classes IX-X, Government of Pakistan, Ministry of Education, Curriculum Wing, Islamabad, March 2002...

p13 Chapter V: Citizen and Citizenship. To explain Islamic teachings which provide the principles of citizenship.

p14 Chapter VI: Rights and Responsibilities. To analyse rights and responsibilities in constitutional and Islamic perspective

p16 Chapter VIII: Constitutional Development in Pakistan. To discuss about the Islamic provisions of the 1973 constitution...To develop an urge to implement Islamic provisions of constitution. (AH Nayyar and Ahmed Salim, *The Subtle Subversion: The State of Curricula and Textbooks in Pakistan*, 2005, pp. 49-50)

The confused Pakistani forgets that citizenship is associated with the political state, whereas Islam assigns only two nations or states to humanity: believers and unbelievers. They also forget that Islam already has a – superior – equivalent to a constitution in its austere scripture: thus there should be no need for the pure believers to require a heretical document outlining governance. And heretical it is, for though the ruling class of Pakistan believes the two can co-exist, because the constitution establishes laws that go against, that interfere with, the infrarational word of Allah, it becomes a form of religious innovation by crossing into the territory where *only* the Quran and authentic hadith should reign. Also, the presence of a constitution – or even state textbooks – present competitors to the Quran and Hadith in the domains of law and learning, areas for which *only* the Islamic scripture should be the source, with anything else comprising the hated innovation. That the Pakistani elite has failed to make the necessary corrections and remove these innovations, even after seven decades, is a sign of their hopelessly intransigent apostasy, one that can no longer be corrected through debate. Indeed even the self-proclaimed Islamists of the elite class have not taken the ultimate step to entirely disband the constitution, preferring to try and Islamicize it while declaring the original creators of the Constitution *munafiqun*:

What the textbook has done is to paint in the blackest of colours all the founding fathers of Pakistan, called them enemies of Islam, ascribed “despicable objectives” to them, and characterized their presence in the Constituent Assembly as “the greatest misfortune” for Pakistan – all this to truckle to a ruling general, Ziaul Huq. And this libel is being fed to B.A. Classes. (K.K. Aziz, *The Murder of History*, 1998, p. 181)

In another passage from Aziz's book, the members of the assembly are accused in the textbooks of wanting to make “Pakistan” an irreligious state, an ironic charge when we consider that these men sought to create a state for the Muslim religious group!

The overwhelming majority of the Constituent Assembly wanted to make Pakistan a *ladini* [irreligious] state; unfortunately, after the establishment of Pakistan the country was full of elements and forces which did not want to see Pakistan as an Islamic society. The greatest misfortune was that these elements succeeded in entering the first Constituent Assembly of the

country, where they tried their best to achieve their despicable objectives (private, Lahore, B.A.) (K.K. Aziz, *The Murder of History*, 1998, p. 180)

Though we read about the irreligious nature of the founding assembly, at no point do we encounter a discussion on the decidedly non-Islamic nature of the *constitution*. Nowhere do we find the textbooks advocating the rejection of a document based on Infidel law. And that is even *with* the changes made by Zia, who failed to recognize that the Islamification of a constitution, by default, places the very concept of a constitution above that of the Quran or authentic hadith. The ongoing failure to correct the fundamental impurity of the state – the mixing of Islamic with non-Islamic political ideals – has led to an extraordinary paradox where, to use another example, a ‘pure’ Muslim state teaches its children to respect a constitution which protects the “legitimate” interests of minorities:

Article 36 of the Constitution of Pakistan, which says, “36. The State shall safeguard the legitimate rights and interests of minorities...” (AH Nayyar and Ahmed Salim, *The Subtle Subversion: The State of Curricula and Textbooks in Pakistan*, 2005, p. 16)

That Article 36 has not been abolished – along with the rest of the heretical Constitution of Pakistan – and replaced with the *jizya* is a sign of its infidel inspiration, for the minorities should have no “rights” or “interests” - that is the privilege of the believers. That the constitution also declares the Ahmadiyyas as non-Muslims speaks to the confusion that characterizes the state and its people (especially the elite), who are unable to fully ‘purify’ themselves, wanting both the advancements – that arose out of increasing tolerance and diversity - of non-Muslim societies and the ‘purity’ of an Islam that rejects innovation or modernization as a matter of religious principle. It is a confusion reflecting the fact that “Pakistan” still has a modicum of Psychic influence left, even if the Grace is withdrawing ever faster. The contradictory nature of the state is exemplified by the following analysis of its textbooks, in which the “ways” of Islam - which as we know denigrates non-Islamic beliefs and people – are deemed the best of all, yet other religions are somehow still to be respected!

Thus all non-Muslim students in the mainstream educational system are forcibly taught Islamic religious studies. In fact, when the most recent national curriculum document clearly vows “To make the Qur’anic principles and Islamic practices as an integral part of the curricula so that the message of the Holy Qur’an could be disseminated in the process of education as well as training...a. Must have belief in the Unity of God, and know that Allah is the creator of the universe. b. **Must regard Islamic ways as the best of all.** c. Must have reverence for all the Messengers of God, Prophet Mohammed, His family members, His companions, the Imams and the leaders, and must try to know their teachings and adopt their ways...e. **Must respect the leaders, books, places of worship of other religions...** (AH Nayyar and Ahmed Salim, *The Subtle Subversion: The State of Curricula and Textbooks in Pakistan*, 2005, pp. 14-15)

The message to respect different religions is betrayed by the inexplicable – especially for “Muslim” educators - lack of awareness of “Islamic ways”, with that very need to regard Islamic ways as the best of all ironically the seed for their – and their nation's - destruction, one that will eventually eliminate state classes in favour of madrassas where – as one should expect of ‘pure’ Muslims – only the Islamic scripture is taught. For that is the end result when the Quran and Islamic ways are idolized, when those reading it are identified as the “good”:

A book lists *Acchi baten* (good deeds). Among them: Good people are those who read the Qur’an and teach the Qur’an to others. (AH Nayyar and Ahmed Salim, *The Subtle Subversion: The State of Curricula and Textbooks in Pakistan*, 2005, p. 12)

Once the student begins to study the Quran and Islamic ways, he realizes that the majority of his state education is *munafiq*, praising non-Islamic innovations or ideas that should be eradicated in a pure Islamic country. The very survival of the state is thus endangered through the instructions of ‘more

Islam', which rails against its benefactor, grabbing hold of young minds who will turn against a dithering state without the courage of its convictions, unable to let go of non-Muslim principles yet boasting of its Islamic purity, as if its name automatically establishes it as an actual exemplar of Islam. Then again, 'more Islam' *should* be the ultimate manifestation of a state that literally defined itself accordingly; one that nevertheless fails to meet the criteria of a real demonstration of Islam, with the Constitution, mixed Islamic and non-Islamic curriculum, the Parliament, the sheer presence of Shiakuffar, all just some of the more obvious indignities for the pious to suffer through. Smaller and hidden insults also abound, with, in one instance, the preponderance of homosexual activity, outlined in a British Broadcasting Corporation article:

Pakistan is not the kind of place that most people would associate with gay liberation. But some say the country is a great place to be gay - even describing the port city of Karachi as "a gay man's paradise."

Underground parties, **group sex at shrines** and "marriages of convenience" to members of the opposite sex are just some of the surprises that gay Pakistan has to offer. Under its veneer of strict social conformity, the country is bustling with same-sex activity.

Danyaal, as he's asked to be known, is a 50-something businessman who lives in an affluent part of Karachi, and uses his smartphone to organise Karachi's gay party scene.

"One of the first things I did online, maybe 12 years ago, was type in G - A - Y and hit search. Back then I found a group and made contact with 12 people in this city," he says.

"These days there are smartphone apps that use GPS to tell you how close you are to another gay person with an online profile. There are thousands of gay men online in Pakistan at any one time."

The party scene is big - so big, he jokes, that he rarely gets time to himself.

"If you want sex too, it's a gay man's paradise. If you want a relationship, that may be more difficult." (Mobeen Azhar, *Gay Pakistan: Where sex is available and relationships are difficult*, 26 August 2013)

Even though homosexual activity is hidden from public view, the pious naturally desire a pure Islamic state to follow *all* of Allah's teachings in public *and* privately. For to publicly practice one thing – including a homosexual's marriage to a woman – while privately going against the teachings of Islam is, we recall, hypocritical and punishable by death. And the practice of homosexuality is certainly forbidden, by the Quran no less:

And (We sent) Lut, when he said to his people: "What! Do you commit indecency while you see? What! **Do you indeed approach men lustfully rather than women? Nay, you are a people who act ignorantly.**" But the answer of his folk was naught save that they said: "Expel the household of Lot from your township, for they (forsooth) are folk who would keep clean!" But We delivered him and his followers except his wife; We ordained her to be of those who remained behind. And We rained on them a rain, and evil was the rain of those who had been warned. (Quran 27:54-58)

Thus the homosexuals of "Pakistan" are pretend Muslims, disobeying Allah behind closed doors, arrogantly assuming – because the remnant Pakistani state refuses to punish them according to austere Islamic doctrine - that Allah or the 'most pious' will grant them reprieve, when the eternal 'Word' has already warned them of their fate, when the most pious are tasked with fulfilling that 'Word'. While these daily abominations must certainly needle the Muslims of advanced piety, the parties of greater blasphemy are of more pressing concern, with the Shi'ite and Constitutionalists joined in recent

decades by a surprising group: the Military. For as already mentioned, the initial phase of “Pakistan” involved three outright wars with India, the engagement of which was a somewhat reassuring sign – to the pious – of the state's potential ‘purity’, especially in comparison to its exaltation of democracy and varied types of ‘Islamic’ worship. While the consecutive defeats would certainly have discouraged both the pious and the soldiers, the former would still have expected the military to proceed again in their attempts to conquer Hindu India.

For that is the ‘Word’ of Allah, that the believers are to emerge victorious over the kuffar, no matter the aversion of the latter. And it is the unquestionable, religious, obligation of Muslims to wage jihad - to kill, convert or subjugate the *untermensch* Polytheists. Instead of obeying this commandment, the rump Pakistani military has for the most part chosen to remain rooted to their garrison towns and – for the generals at least – palatial residences. Rather than a direct confrontation, the military has taken the route of engaging India through proxy war, using “freedom fighters” and “militants” against India, whether to try and instigate an uprising in Kashmir, or for terrorist attacks that they later deny involvement with. They are able to do this by only allowing a handful of military personnel to take part in training or terrorist attacks or infiltration, to better give themselves “plausible deniability” by labelling the individuals involved as “rogue agents”. Yet though there is certainly a useful – in the short-term – advantage to a feigned ignorance of what their proxies - the terrorists they've trained who do not officially belong to the military - are doing, the problem for the army is that the proxies they have chosen to use are “fundamentalist” Muslims, the most pious among men. These are the genuine believers who believe in the infrarational Islamic word, who understand that all able-bodied Muslims must engage in war against the kuffar and should never, as we have previously documented, “turn back” from jihad:

Those who are left behind will say when you set forth for the war booty, “Allow us (that) we may follow you.” They desire to change the decree of Allah. Say: “By no means shall you follow us; thus did Allah say before.” But they will say: “Nay! You are jealous of us.” Nay! They do not understand but a little. Say to those of the dwellers of the desert who were left behind: **“You shall soon be invited (to fight) against a people possessing mighty prowess, you will fight against them until they submit. And if you obey, Allah will grant you a good reward, and if you turn back as you turned back before, He will punish you with a painful punishment.”** There is no harm in the blind, nor is there any harm in the lame, nor is there any harm in the sick (if they do not go forth). And whoever obeys Allah and His Messenger, He will cause him to enter gardens beneath which rivers flow, **and whoever turns back, He will punish him with a painful punishment.** (Quran 48:15-17)

Jihad, as we have noted, is specifically described as being “ordained” or “prescribed” for Muslims, even if they dislike that particular religious obligation:

Warfare is ordained for you, though you dislike it. But it may happen that ye hate a thing which is good for you, and it may happen that ye love a thing which is bad for you. Allah knoweth, ye know not. (Quran 2:216)

Such is the importance of jihad that those physically able to fight, yet consciously deserting the cause, are judged to be worthy of execution for their ‘crime’ of apostasy:

What is the matter with you, then, that you have become two parties about the hypocrites, while Allah has made them return (to unbelief) for what they have earned? Do you wish to guide him whom Allah has caused to err? And whomsoever Allah causes to err, you shall by no means find a way for him. They desire that you should disbelieve as they have disbelieved, so that you might be (all) alike; therefore take not from among them friends until they flee (their homes) in Allah's way. **But if they turn back, then seize them and kill them wherever you find them,**

and take not from among them a friend or a helper. (Quran 4:88-89)

This particular infrarational revelation, we remember, was directed against the “Muslims” who set out to Uhud for battle, only to return prior to fulfilling their obligation:

Narrated Zaid bin Thabit:

When the Prophet set out for (the battle of) Uhud, some of those who had gone out with him, returned. The companions of the Prophet were divided into two groups. One group said, “We will fight them (i.e. the enemy),” and the other group said, “We will not fight them.” So there came the Divine Revelation: ‘(O Muslims!) Then what is the matter within you that you are divided into two parties about the hypocrites? Allah has cast them back (to disbelief) Because of what they have earned.’ (4.88) (Sahih Bukhari Volume 5, Book 59, Number 380; see also Sahih Bukhari Volume 3, Book 30, Number 108)

At least the ancient *munafigun* initially dared to join the Prophet on his ghazwas, only to later renegade from Islam. The majority of the fragment Pakistan military, on the other hand, do not even bother to join the irregulars on attempted missions into India. That they provide the holy Muslim warriors weapons and explosives expertise is arguably not good enough, because the infrarational revelations demand that able-bodied Muslims – and soldiers certainly fall within that category – must fight the unbelievers. The Pakistani military instead prefers to place the ultimate responsibility of jihad on the volunteers of religious organizations; if the latter succeed in undermining Indian growth or national integrity, then perhaps the military will eventually ride the coattails of this hypothetical jihadi success. It is this posture that gravely irks the most pious of all, the mujahideen, who follow the pure ‘Word’ of Allah while the hypocrite Pakistani military fails to match their words with actions. For the mujahideen know the holy scripture contains more than just the shahada recited by the Pakistani soldiers, and recognize in the Pakistani military a type of apostasy mentioned in the following verse:

Do not think those who rejoice for what they have done and love that they should be praised for what they have not done - so do by no means think them to be safe from the chastisement, and they shall have a painful chastisement. (Quran 3:188)

The authentic hadith provide us with the context to the specific hypocrisy worthy of the painful punishment:

Narrated Abu Said Al-Khudri:

During the lifetime of Allah's Apostle, **some men among the hypocrites used to remain behind him (i.e. did not accompany him) when he went out for a Ghazwa and they would be pleased to stay at home behind Allah's Apostle. When Allah's Apostle returned (from the battle) they would put forward (false) excuses and take oaths, wishing to be praised for what they had not done.** So there was revealed: “Think not that those who rejoice in what they have done, and love to be praised for what they have not done..” (3.188) (Sahih Bukhari Volume 6, Book 60, Number 90)

This is the tale of the Pakistani military, who delude themselves with the belief that their tactical use of proxy militants somehow earns them favour in the eyes of Allah, when in fact it marks them as the worst of the apostates, proclaiming themselves the champions of Islam yet failing to adhere to the commandment of the ‘one true god’ by actually fighting the ‘holy’ war. Though the army might consider itself clever by avoiding direct blame for attacks on India, the pious view it as “turning back” from their religious obligation, marking them as pretend Muslims. The mujahideen, often of an impoverished background, held their anger for years at the hypocritical behaviour of the military, primarily due to the latter's access to resources and tactical training the real Muslims did not have at the time. It was a relationship, eventually used to foment an insurgency in Kashmir throughout the 1990's,

that was forged by the Cold War, during which the mujahideen were used as a fighting force against the Soviets in 1980's Afghanistan. The Pakistani military and its Directorate for Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI) were aided by the American Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) for an aim that served both groups - defeating an American enemy that was also against Islam.

The victory against the Soviets is what gave the Pakistanis the clever idea to use the literalist and genuine Muslims against India in its only Muslim-majority state of Kashmir, through which the military might set off a chain of events leading to India's downfall and an unimpeded march upon Delhi, taking the spoils of war off the sacrifices of the cannon-fodder mujahideen. But the strategy – still in play after all these years – has failed to yield the desired result, and extraneous factors have emerged to dampen its effectiveness, with its early strength derived in part from the propaganda that Kashmir is not integral to India, a fallacy opposite to the truth that ties *all* of the partitioned lands back to its real nation. Like with any superficial propaganda, its vitality began to wane over the years, during which the successful launch of Indian nuclear weapons provided a further deterrence against Pakistani military misadventures. And if the concept of mutually assured destruction (subsequent to Pakistan's own successful nuclear program) did not stop the Pakistani use of proxies in the 1999 Kargil war, that particular failure was notable for the insignificant – in comparison to the previous outright wars – amount of Pakistani troops used, as the primary burden was – as in Afghanistan - placed on the mujahideen. The offensive, like the three previous wars, met with failure, and while it is hypothetically possible that the military might decide again to genuinely attack India per the dictates of the Quran, the pious mujahideen, the ones emboldened and trained by the Pakistani army and ISI, simply do not believe their previous masters capable of actually practising the Islamic religion. They have for evidence the forty plus years following the 1971 defeat, with the brief war in 1999 the only flicker of Islam offered by the Pakistani armed forces.

The reality, of course, is that even with its element of irrationality – found in the grooming of terrorists not under the usual command structure that all armies need -, the rump Pakistan army has a logical understanding of its limitations; hence the decision to engage India in an unorthodox fashion. It is an awareness forged by the humiliation of 1971, with its two-week loss and subsequent mass imprisonment of Pakistani soldiers; one later reinforced by the continued Indian refusal to yield on Kashmir or any other inch of its political boundary – in fact Kashmir now holds lakhs of Indian troops, a formidable amount that is only a portion of the million plus soldiers India has. With their enemy much stronger in numbers, the army has somewhat justifiably chosen to try and weaken India through “a thousand cuts”. But the religion they profess to believe in, the holy war they claim to be fighters for, is *not* a rational one, as it claims that the ‘truth’ of all existence has already been decided, and that all aspects of life must conform to the law of the Quran. And as Islam has specific pronouncements on war, the self-declared Muslims of the Pakistani military are duty bound to follow them. Yet have they failed to fulfil the cardinal order to wage jihad without turning back; nor should they take for an excuse the rational analysis of numerical strength, because Allah, as we know, has already told the faithful that one Muslim soldier is worth ten non-Muslim ones, and that eventually the discrepancy will be reduced to one to two odds:

O Prophet! Exhort the believers to fight. If there be of you twenty steadfast they shall overcome two hundred, and if there be of you a hundred (steadfast) they shall overcome a thousand of those who disbelieve, because they (the disbelievers) are a folk without intelligence. Now, Allah has lightened the hardship for you, and He knows that among you is weakness. **So if there are from you one hundred steadfast, they will overcome two hundred.** And if there are among you a thousand, they will overcome two thousand by permission of Allah. And Allah is with the steadfast. (Quran 8:65-66)

The differential between India and “Pakistan” is actually less than two to one, let alone ten to one, so

the Pakistani army have an infrarational revelation to fight that specifically accounts for numerical considerations. That they then do not directly fight India must mean, in the minds of the real Muslims, that they do not *believe* in the particular Asuric revelation, choosing instead to put their faith in military strategy instead of the 'Word' of Allah. The Quran, as we recall, is an infrarational word that cannot be selectively chosen from, contrary to the delusion of the "Pakistan" military:

Surely those who disbelieve in Allah and His messengers and (those who) desire to make a distinction between Allah and His messengers and say, "We believe in some and disbelieve in others," and desire to take a course between (this and) that. These it is that are truly unbelievers, and We have prepared for the unbelievers a disgraceful chastisement. (Quran 4:150-51)

The remnant Pakistani armed forces are of the disgraceful, entirely unsuccessful in their attempts to defeat the Indian army; and worse, unwilling to try. They have disbelieved in the infrarational revelations ordering them to fight, and have outsourced the scriptural obligation of all able-bodied Muslims to the ordinary rank and file of the religious organizations. In addition to that, the rump Pakistani military has actually joined forces with an army actively fighting against – *and killing* - Muslims throughout the world: America. That they have allied with the Americans in the latter's war against the mujahideen is another ironic development, because the two are now *nominally* united against the same fighting force they championed together in the 1980's, with the Americans, after the end of the Cold War, deciding that they had no further use for the jihadis, at once withdrawing their support for the soldiers of Allah; the rump Pakistani military elite, on the other hand, decided that the mujahideen were still of benefit to the territorial ambitions of Kashmir to the Northeast and Afghanistan to the Northwest of "Pakistan".

The latter region, absent of any great power after the Cold War ended, soon found itself besieged by the Pakistan-backed Taliban group, who would eventually fight their way to power in Afghanistan, taking control of the capital Kabul by the mid-1990's. It was here that the mujahideen were able to finally secure a connection to the utopian world of 7th century Arabia, establishing a Sharia free of innovations like constitutions or English common law. Yet if the Taliban were busy fulfilling some of their religious obligations in Afghanistan by enacting Sharia, the Pakistani *munafiqun* arrogantly refused to join the Islamic revolution they helped foment in their vassal state, as if they were *too good* to practice the actual faith, preferring instead to maintain their religious innovations and blasphemy of selectively applying Islamic tenets. But the Afghan Taliban, while certainly aware of the heretical nature of their benefactor, were also exposed – at the time – to elements of appropriate behaviour by the Pakistanis, who actually sent tens of thousands of soldiers to help the Taliban, unlike in Kashmir where they remained in the background.

The Taliban were also, at the time, in practicality a colony of the Pakistani military and ISI by whom they subsisted, who funded and armed them, who helped them to defeat multiple warring Afghan factions on their way to conquering the country in 1996. The Pakistanis needed Afghanistan as its colony as part of the concept of "strategic depth", whereby in case of an invasion by India they might retreat and regroup to the Northwest. But that is only the defensive aspect to strategic depth, with the positive facets emerging from the sheer control – by proxy – of an extended territory and the potential economic benefits the Pakistani overlords can theoretically obtain from it. All of this however, was shattered a mere five years after the Taliban's rise to power, and as a direct consequence of their sheltering Osama Bin Laden and Al Qaeda within Afghanistan. We refer, of course, to the 9/11 attacks by Al Qaeda upon American targets, a spectacular victory perhaps, but the most pyrrhic since the Pearl Harbor attacks. The Taliban had, up until that point, received widespread international criticism, but had not faced any sustained military campaign against it. That was to change in an instance, with the Americans immediately bombarding Afghanistan and setting up bases in their – most loudly declared – objective to eliminate Al Qaeda and Bin Laden. While this certainly represented an unpleasant outcome

for Al Qaeda and the Taliban, as they both lost a previously uncontested territory, the former had the ability to relocate to another Islamic land and can at any rate be replaced by a different group drawing from the same scriptural source, and the latter was already partially based in the southern part of Afghanistan, giving them a geographical advantage to the foreign Americans, because they had nowhere to go while they patiently waited for the Americans to tire.

The Pakistanis, on the other hand, faced the worst of all scenarios, since they impurely draw from the scripture, and their colony was not their home; compounding this, in an instance they were presented with a situation of having India on the eastern front along with a potentially adversarial – and superior in power – American army to the west, one demanding the Pakistanis cooperate in their fight against a Taliban created by the Pakistanis and an Al Qaeda *allowed* to operate within a Pakistani colony. Indeed it is a curious matter that the Americans did not attack the controllers of their identified enemy, since it would have been unlikely for Al Qaeda to have planned such a daring attack without the knowledge of their imperial masters: the sinister nature of the Pakistani relationship with Al Qaeda was further corroborated when Bin Laden was found – and killed by the Americans – mere miles from the Pakistani military academy nine years later. That the Pakistanis have gotten away with both housing Bin Laden and somehow allowing – under the nose of the controlling ISI – the 9/11 attacks to be planned within their Afghan colony, speaks to an impressive ability to play a double game, even when their duplicity is obvious to all. Indeed, the Pakistanis have extracted billions of dollars from the Americans since the beginning of the so-called War on Terror; it is a relationship opening them to accusations from the pious of functioning as American servant-boys, which the military tries to counter by funnelling some of the money into the religious organizations supporting jihad. The problem for them however, is that it is a difficult balancing act to appease both a great military power *and* an Asuric force directly opposed to that power. For in order to placate one, the other has to inevitably suffer, leading to recriminations that the Pakistanis are picking the other side.

Yet the Pakistanis persist with the double game, believing that they can control the Asuric rage of the pious to eventually target *only* those – the Hindus - whom the Pakistanis want them to fight. The major problem with this doctrine, for the confused rump Pakistanis, is that there exist many more infidels than the Hindus, and warfare against the Americans certainly fulfils the religious obligation to fight unbelievers. The Pakistan military and ISI, however, have arrested and even *killed* certain - though not all as the example of Bin Laden demonstrates - jihadis who were simply doing their Islamic duty by attacking the Americans: the Pakistanis committed these blasphemies to try and keep the Americans paying them money and happy, potentially content enough to leave Afghanistan as they had declared they would, allowing the Pakistanis to then fill the power-vacuum like they did in the 1990's. Although the military had reason enough to do this, the fact they were – and continue to be - so accommodating to the great Kafir power indicated to the most pious that the army was unfaithful to the commands of the Quran demanding the believers to fight the kuffar even if the odds are significantly against Muslims.

The military's continued cooperation with the kuffar in the immediate years following 2001 built up a simmering anger on the part of the pious toward their heretical behaviour, one that inevitably erupted beyond the control of the clever duplicity of the Pakistani military and ISI. The awaited schism took place in 2007, albeit not as a result of a particular action against the Taliban; instead, mujahideen anger skyrocketed after the Lal Masjid siege in 2007. It was an action undertaken by President Pervez Musharraf, the military ruler at the time; the mosque in question was considered “radical” for demanding the imposition of Sharia in a supposedly “Muslim” state! The army response came after violent demonstrations the masjid's members engaged in, with the resulting siege leading to over 150 deaths. This was the military action that really initiated the war between the fully pious and partially pious of “Pakistan”, for though the army had in previous years engaged in battles against Al Qaeda and

Taliban-loyal mujahideen in the mountainous Northwest where the organizations had re-established themselves, the aftermath of the Lal Masjid siege resulted in the dissolution of a ceasefire against those forces and, most importantly, heralded wave after wave of attacks within *all* of “Pakistan”.

These bombings, previously unimaginable but now commonplace, have not only targeted the ISI and military, but have left thousands of “innocent” - at least according to the non-Muslim formulation of innocence - civilians dead or maimed, including countless numbers of schoolchildren. These are acts decried by the local and international media as “senseless” and “depraved”, committed by “extremists” and “monsters” and – on occasion by the more paranoid of the remnant Pakistan media – agents working for India. While the terrorist attacks within “Pakistan” can certainly be defined by that particular term, there is also an ideological structure towards particular targets beyond those belonging to the state apparatus, an outlook that includes even the killing of women and children. The ideology, as one would expect, is strictly based on the Quran and Hadith, with the latter providing strong support for the “senseless” killings, the Prophet having – as we previously cited - deemed women and children as perfectly acceptable victims:

Narrated As-Sab bin Jaththama:

The Prophet passed by me at a place called Al-Abwa or Waddan, and was asked whether it was permissible **to attack the pagan warriors at night with the probability of exposing their women and children to danger. The Prophet replied, “They (i.e. women and children) are from them (i.e. Pagans).”** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 52, Number 256)

While Allah's Apostle was directing his – and Allah's – ire toward the Polytheists of medieval Arabia, the Pakistani *takfiri* can easily extrapolate permission to kill *munafiq* women and children, since the fate of apostates and polytheists are the same in the eyes and ‘Word’ of Allah. Thus the deaths of “innocent” women and schoolchildren continue in “Pakistan”, with some attacks specifically targeting them, others leaving them dead as a byproduct of different tactical aims like the punishment of Ahmadiyyas and Shi’ites for their sheer existence in the land of the impure. By parcelling out the minority *munafiq* groups who consider themselves “Muslim” yet are more obviously ‘unclean’, the pious Muslims cleverly avoid antagonizing the majority of “Pakistan” who identify as Sunni, allowing them to grow complacent and incapable of providing resistance when the pious eventually become capable of striking against the hypocrites of mainstream Sunni “Pakistan”. The pious also use their assertion to be champions of real Islam as another means by which to continue terrorizing with minimal impediment from the ordinary citizens, as Pakistanis are smitten to anything that declares itself authentically Islamic – even a movement so obviously practising hatred against things *they* are fond of.

This is the Asuric rage that the ISI and rump Pakistani military thought they could control as an export alone. But the continued resistance of the Indian army and the imposition of America on Taliban territory turned the frustrated attention of the pious towards the perceived source of the failure - the part-Islamic, part-secular, part-polytheistic, ultimately apostate Pakistani state. That the ISI desires to conquer Hindu India is not enough for the Taliban and similar factions, as merely wishing to do something pales in comparison to the ‘crime’ of turning back from the obligation of jihad. Finding nowhere to release itself, with India blocked off to the east, America entrenched to the North, the ancient fire of Islam unleashed itself inward toward the multiple heretics running around pretending to be Muslims, including the military who allied with unbelieving Americans and failed to put their lives at stake against India, preferring instead to imprison pious Muslims who fought America and implicitly sanction drone strikes against these ‘true’ Muslims, the murders of whom we know to clearly violate the ‘Word’ of Allah:

And whoever kills a believer intentionally, his punishment is hell; he shall abide in it, and Allah will send His wrath on him and curse him and prepare for him a painful

chastisement. (Quran 4:93)

That the Pakistani elite regularly betray the pious Muslim warriors is a clear sign of their apostasy, with the blasphemy, to make matters worse, done at the behest of an unabashed Infidel power that also has soldiers stationed in the ‘holy’ land of Arabia! Indeed, if the Pakistani politicians, Sunni feudal land-owners, military and intelligence agents were genuinely Muslim, they would have instead turned their attention and resources to the apostates within their midst – the Shi’ite, Ahmadiyyas, Secular-Rationalists and others. That they have failed to address these ‘impurities’ speaks to a failure of the elite unimaginable in 1971, when even in defeat the military at least exterminated millions of Hindus and blasphemous “Muslims” of East “Pakistan”. The same killing apparatus exists to facilitate ethnically cleansing the ‘impure’ of the remnant state, yet it curiously has not been utilized. It is as if the powerful in “Pakistan” have failed to honestly study the scripture, to realize that Shi’ites and Ahmadiyyas and the like are just as worthy of genocide – or at least slavery and taxation – as the Hindus, assuming they fail to convert to the real Islam.

Instead, the Pakistani state has allowed a foreign non-Muslim power to kill the pious Muslims *within* the self-declared land of pure Islam. The real Muslims can thus only conclude the Pakistani elite and military to likewise belong to the guilty, the apostates and pretenders, boasting of their “Muslim” faith yet following non-Muslim practices, ideals, and *orders*. The case against the army is easy enough for the most pious of “Pakistan”, as the soldiers have failed to fulfil their Islamic obligation of waging jihad: the true Muslim takes to battle instead of resting in posh army clubs, risks his life to kill the unbeliever rather than indulging in a nightly dance routine at the Wagah border gate. And as the “innocent Muslims” of the state have allowed this non-Muslim cancer to grow at the very top, as these so-called ordinary citizens (at least according to secular terminology) have *also* failed to partake in their religious duty to wage war against the *munaḥfiq* Pakistani state that imposes Western and Hindu influenced innovations upon the pious and regularly kills the truest Muslims, then they are likewise enemies.

After all, why should the Taliban or similar pious militant groups have any remorse in killing fellow “Muslims” when the latter adhere to non-Islamic principles and support a government that kills the pious Muslims? Such supporters are not, consequently, real Muslims, and are just as worthy of the bomb or bullet as the Hindu or Westerner. How many of the able-bodied among them, the mujahideen will wonder, have contributed their lives to the ongoing war against foreign infidels? Or, have they even tried to rise up and kill the pretend Muslims ruling the Pakistani state? If they have not, after multiple decades, then that means they have consented to this ‘impure’ state, its partially secular constitution and heinous mixture of Islamic with non-Muslim ideals. Knowing the state to be ‘impure’, unable to attack the Polytheists to the east and the Crusaders to the north, appalled at the condition of a land that should reflect the ancient utopia of 7th century Arabia, the most pious of “Pakistan” cast their animosity toward both the *munaḥfiqun* ruling “Pakistan” and their masses of supporters who have allowed the former to exist.

These are the people who perpetuate the ‘impurity’ that sprang from the real reason for Pakistan's creation: the *Muslim* collective identity - rather than the Islamic identity assumed by so many to be its basis -, and the group-ego need for the Muslim community to separate itself from the obviously disbelieving Hindu. For in actuality, “Pakistan” emerged as a “Muslim”, instead of an Islamic, state; a homeland for those who considered themselves “Muslim”, whatever that meant. Thus if they believed in prophets after the last Prophet, or later Imams who were ‘divinely inspired’, or worse, it did not matter – as long as they self-identified as, and vocally declared themselves, Muslim. This is the reason why the army could exterminate the Hindus of East Bengal yet fail to cleanse the millions of impure Shi’ites within their own territory, because as long as the Shi’ites declare themselves Muslim, the heretical and indifferent Pakistani establishment will ignore the finer points of Allah's ‘last word’,

accepting at face value the outrageous lies of an apostate group while assuming that massacring the Hindus is enough to ensure Asuric purity.

But as they are ‘unclean’ themselves, the Pakistani establishment cannot be expected to lead the drive toward ‘purification’; that is the work to be achieved by the proper Muslims, to turn “Pakistan” from a deluded and confused nation for “Muslims” into a genuinely pure Islamic state with laws and conduct based on Sharia alone. The process, initiated by the half “Muslim” and thus entirely apostate (by their decision to selectively apply Islamic scripture) Pakistani elite, must now be taken over by the most pious, the ones willing to proceed violently and systematically, having moved beyond Hindus to kill politicians, military personnel, Ahmadiyyas, Shi’ites, and another group calling themselves Muslims yet more heretical than even the Shia, a loosely connected set of adherents who unlike the Shia, derive little of their beliefs from the Islamic scripture. Indeed in these Sufis and their practices, we find items of faith similar to those of the hated Hindu, the ones whom the “Muslims” of Pakistan have so assiduously sought to dissociate themselves from, with the ongoing inability to do so just another breach of faith in a state that constantly boasts of its fidelity to Allah and his ‘Word’.

* * * *

Sufism - and its adherents in the impure land of the pure - presents a more difficult problem to the supremely pious of “Pakistan”, even if the sufi orders, unlike the Shia or the *munafiq* military, have no significant capacity for an *sustained* violent opposition. The obstacle lies in their demographics, with an estimated fifty percent of the population affiliated with one of the sects identifying with Sufism's doctrine; it is for this reason, and this alone, that the sufis have so far been spared a *proportional* targeting by the mujahideen. For though there have been plenty of bombings of sufi religious centres of worship, it has yet to meet the precision found in the wave of bombings against the Shiakuffar, or even that of the ongoing – although at times unsuccessful – killings of military personnel. The sufis have been so far relatively spared due to the preponderance of apostates within the impure “Pakistan” and the logistical inability of the pious, so far, to wage all out warfare on multiple fronts – thus the latter's judicious use of suicide bombings and the like, for even a destructive Asuric force will have an organization to it, at least at the outset.

That the sufis are a target to the mujahideen at all undoubtedly remains a shock to those in the subcontinent, and certainly to most in “Pakistan”, whose citizenry – especially its elite – remain, even after close to a decade of bombings and mayhem, perplexed as to why the “extremist” militants would kill their fellow “Muslims”. The sufi orders, after all, have been prevalent throughout the subcontinent for more than eight centuries, and as so many “Muslims” - rump Pakistani and elsewhere - identify with them, a significant amount of the population cannot fathom why such a historic part of their idea of Islam would be considered *takfir*. Some Hindus as well, used to the deceptively pluralistic appearance of Sufism and often actually worshipping at sufi shrines (and thus taking Sufism to be representative of Islam), find it incomprehensible that people calling themselves Muslim would kill sufi adherents and attack their shrines. But what they fail to understand, is that just because a particular order, or a certain individual, calls him or herself a Muslim, does not make it genuinely so, as that determination can only begin by discovering their fidelity to the scripture.

It is the superficial pluralism of Sufism, seen by some Hindus as accommodating and as a sign of a benign Islam, that accounts for the hazard to *both* the Hindus and Muslims believing a multi-order Islam to be authorized by Allah. While the latter heresy is the one currently establishing “Pakistan” as a tinderbox marching to its cataclysm, the former vulnerability of Sufism is what has, historically,

sometimes functioned to mask the Hindu awareness of what Islam is. Indeed, even the history of the sufi 'saints' in India is clouded by myth and omissions, with Sufism (and its propagators) presented as a benign and harmonious faith preaching tolerance for all religious beliefs, its expansion occurring through the peaceful conversion of some of the Hindu populace. The reality is far different, with the lauded sufi masters of medieval India actively participating in, or at least feverishly encouraging, an austere and Mohammedan jihad against the Hindus. Indeed the sufi advent coincides, as might be expected, with the Islamic military raids and conquests of significant portions of the subcontinent, as noted by S.A.A. Rizvi, author of *The History of Sufism in India*:

In reality, it was the news of Sultan Mahmud's conquest of Multan which prompted sufis to advise their talented and adventurous disciples to settle in that region...the annexation of the Panjab by Mahmud of Ghazna and its incorporation into his empire prompted many sufis to settle in the area. (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, pp. 111-12)

Rather than seeking to stop the atrocities committed by the likes of Mahmud of Ghaznavi, the sufis benefited handsomely from the Islamic imposition upon the Hindu polytheists. Nor did they arrive with peaceful intentions, as the story of Moinuddin Chishti, subcontinental founder of the highly important Chishti sufi order, illustrates. For it was not in the spirit of love, tolerance and openness that Chishti arrived in India from modern day Persia: Indeed the very fact that he arrived with the marauding army of Shihabuddin Ghori should by itself highlight his close association with Asuric violence. But Chishti is recorded as having done much more than simply take advantage of Ghori's military exploits; per multiple sufi records, the famous sufi 'saint' is documented as having *prophesied* Ghori's victory over his Hindu opponent Prithviraj Chauhan:

The Sultanu'l-Masha'ikh (Shaikh Nizamu'd-Din Auliya) believed that when Khawaja Mu'inu'd-Din (Chishti) reached Ajmer, India was ruled by Pithaura Rai (Prithviraj) and his capital was Ajmer. Pithaura and his high officials resented the Shaikh's presence in their city, but the latter's eminence and his apparent power to perform miracles, prompted them to refrain from taking action against him. A disciple of the Khwaja's was in the service of Pithaura Rai. After the disciple began to receive hostile treatment from the Rai, the Khawaja sent a message to Pithaura in favour of the Muslim. Pithaura refused to accept the recommendation, **thus indicating his resentment of the Khwaja's alleged claims to understand the secrets of the Unseen. When Khawaja Mu'inu'd-Din (the spiritual King of Islam) heard of this reply he prophesized: 'We have seized Pithaura alive and handed him over to the army of Islam.'** About the same time, Sultan Mu'izzu'd-Din Muhammad's army arrived from Ghazna, attacked the forces of Pithaura and defeated them. Pithaura was taken alive, and thus the Khwaja's prophesy was fulfilled. (Amir Khwurd, *Siyaru'l-Auliya*, Delhi, 1885, pp 45-7)

The *Akhbaru'l-Akhyar* also contains the same account (pp 22-23), and a large number of medieval and modern scholars confirm the validity of the story and recount fantastic miracles by the Khawaja at Ajmer. (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, pp. 116-17)

While the accounts presented, from *Siyaru'l-Auliya* and *Akhbaru'l-Akhyar*, certainly establish Chishti's status as both anti-Hindu and as a supporter of a foreign invader, it also hints at the deviancy – from Islam - of Chishti and Sufism in general, because no "Muslim" - especially one who did not take up arms - should dare to take credit for the glory of jihad, when that is for Allah alone. Nor, most importantly, should a "Muslim" speak of knowing the "secrets of the Unseen" or an ability to prophesy future events. These major heresies, both of which we will find in numerous sufic examples, are further attributed to Chishti in another, more egregious, record of his encounter with Chauhan:

Some of the anecdotes from the *Jawahir-i Faridi* (Lahore, 1884, pp 155-60) written in 1623 are as follows. Twelve years before the Khwaja's arrival at Ajmer, Pithaura's mother, an expert in

astronomy and magic, had prophesized the Khawaja's arrival. She drew pictures of the Khawaja and the Rai distributed them to his officers to prevent his entry into the kingdom...From there the Khawaja went to Ajmer. At Samana, Pithaura's officials recognized the Khawaja from his picture and requested that he stay in the palace. **But the Prophet Muhammad had warned the Khawaja, during meditation, against the treachery of officials so he left for Ajmer...**Some members of the Khawaja's party went to Anasagar and the others to Pansela Lake for ablutions. There were one thousand temples on the two lakes. The Brahmans stopped the ablutions and the party complained to the Khawaja. He sent his servant to bring water for his ewer. **As soon as the ewer touched the Pansela Lake, all the lakes, tanks and wells around became dry. The Khawaja went to the Anasagar Lake temple and asked the name of the idol. He was told it was called Sawi Deva. The Khawaja asked whether the idol had talked to them. On receiving a negative reply he made the idol recite kalima and converted it into a human being, naming it Sa'di...**The Khawaja's prayers restored water to the lakes, tanks and wells. A large number of people accepted Islam. Jaipal decided to compete with the Khawaja in the performance of miracles. Sitting on his deer skin he flew to the heavens. **The Khawaja ordered his slippers to bring Jaipal back to earth, which they did. On Jaipal's request to show him some miracles, the Khawaja's spirit flew to the highest heaven, where Jaipal also joined him. Getting nearer to the divine presence, on the Khawaja's orders Jaipal accepted Islam in order to gain the full benefit of that spiritual bliss...Pithaura refused to accept Islam and the Khawaja prophesized he would be handed over to the Islamic army.** (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 117 footnote)

From this *Jawahir-i Faridi* account, we find a “Muslim” in direct contact with the Prophet Mohammed, a narrative that – unlike visions of Allah – *might* be deemed unheretical; yet do we also find him making “idols” speak and converting “idols” into human beings, along with making lakes dry - all supraphysical powers not granted to mortals in the Islamic scripture. And while we might surmise that the most outlandish and magical claims - the ones added to the basic history of Chishti converting Hindus, supporting an anti-Hindu Islamic army, demanding that Chauhan convert to Islam, claiming knowledge of the Unseen and prophesying future events when Islam has Mohammed as the last prophet – mentioned are later supplements designed to bolster subcontinent Muslim confidence *and* as a means to obtain Hindu converts, the historical veracity of the more fantastical miracles is much less important than the sufi *belief* in, or tolerance of, such events as belonging to Islam. By allowing the narratives of sufi supraphysical powers – including the scripturally unsupported claim of flying to the highest heaven within the life - to persist, when Mohammed himself was a mere mortal who only *received* infrarational revelations, the sufis already expose themselves as innovators in religion.

But before we delve into the blasphemous nature of Sufism's doctrine, we must further examine the extent of orthodoxy among sufi ‘saints’, an obedience to Islam that is selectively applied to the Hindus while neglecting tenets related to their internal practices and beliefs. Continuing with Chishti, we find the beginning of a *minimal* historic standard in which sufis, if not actually killing the Hindus with their own hands, consistently fail to use their influence to prevent the latter's murder or subjugation. Indeed as Rizvi documents, Chishti was useful as an example of “Muslim” piety to the forcibly converted Hindus; at the same time, he was an inspiration to the mujahideen who were obtaining the forced conversions and looting Indian lands:

It would appear that the Khawaja lived in Ajmer fort and his simple, ascetic life was an inspiration to both the Turkic *ghazis*, **who swelled the Islamic forces through a lust for plunder, and to the Hindus who were forcibly converted to Islam.** His style of living tended to remind both conqueror and vanquished of the social ethics of Islam, as interpreted by sufis, which attached no importance to material power and wealth, stressing only piety, simplicity and

devotion to God. (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 123)

Thus did this famous sufi, the founder of arguably the most important sufic order of the subcontinent, provide his consent to the plunder of Hindu wealth and conversion of Hindus at swordpoint: Similarly will Chishti's descendants orient themselves according to the mentality of their founder, who in turn was merely attempting to live by Mohammed's example. While Chishti's effort, like a significant majority of sufis, was unsuccessful (and thus blasphemous) in following Mohammed's tradition when it came to the latter's pronouncements on occult practices, the great sufi 'saint' certainly took part in other Mohammedan pastimes, including the marriage and rape of forcibly converted non-Muslims:

After finally settling at Ajmer, Khawaja Mu'inu'd-Din, who until then had been celibate, took two wives. **According to tradition he decided to marry in order to imitate all the Prophet's practices...The Khwaja's second wife was a daughter of a local Hindu chieftain who had been seized in war.** (*Akhbaru'l Akhyar*, p 114) (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 124)

Instead of – as would be expected of a 'saint' in a genuinely 'tolerant' religion – allowing his second wife to *at least* return to her original Hindu religion, he submissively followed Mohammed's infamous examples in which the latter married – and kept Islamic - the forcibly converted Sufiya and Juwairiya. With such an enlightened 'saint' for guidance, one can hardly expect modern Chistiyya sufi followers to restrain themselves from – if they desired and had the means to do so – similarly kidnapping and forcibly marrying and converting Hindu women. For as the excerpt indicates, Chishti had been, like a good Muslim should, merely trying to imitate the Idol of Islam, having previously been celibate in a manner more congruent with ancient West Asian spiritual practices than Mohammed's extreme sexual deviancy. As we shall see, this is merely the first example presented of the dangerous sufi obsession with Mohammed that percolates down to the ordinary followers of 'saints'; a fixation both forever disassociating them from the spiritual aspirations of the classical world and, as we shall also see, paradoxically magnifying their apostasy from Islam.

Nevertheless, Chishti considered himself an austere Sunni, to the extent that prior to his arrival in India, he had "left for Sabzwar, where he converted the local Shi'i governor, Muhammad Yadgar, to Sunni orthodoxy." (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 120) That he identified as Sunni, the self-styled truest of Muslims, even while practising blasphemies, further explains why he did not try to reverse the forcible conversions of Hindus to Islam – he instead placed himself in a position to shape these converts to his peculiar heresies. Additionally, he imparted his partially-Islamic knowledge and practices on his disciples, establishing a lineage that would produce many famous sufis, including Nizamuddin Auliya, born around a century after Chishti's arrival. Like Chishti, this sufi's opinion of Hindus was hardly agreeable to Sufism's reputation for tolerance, with Nizamuddin endorsing the Quran's infrarational revelation that the Hindus will only find themselves in Hell due to their disbelief (*Fawa'id al-Fuad, The conversations of Hazrat Khawaja Nizamuddin Auliya as recorded by Khawaja Amir Hasan Ala Sijz*, p. 161). One can understand how Auliya came about this belief, as his daily routine included an incessant recitation of the Asuric Quran:

In the same context he told one further anecdote. "Qazi Hamidad-din Nagauri - may God have mercy upon him - was once circumambulating the Ka'ba. He saw a certain man whom he began to track: Wherever that saintly person would walk, Qazi Hamid ad-din would follow in his footsteps. The Pir, on realizing what was happening, asked Qazi Hamidad-din - may God have mercy upon him: "Why are you practising external conformity? Conform yourself to what I am really doing." "What is that," asked Qazi Hamidad-din. **"Every day," recited the Pir, "I recite the entire Quran 700 times!"** Qazi Hamidad-din was stupefied. To himself he thought, "But it is the meaning of the Quran which he calls to mind and imagines that he is reciting its words!" The Pir craned his head towards the Qazi and remarked, **"I recite literally, not figuratively!"**

(Fawaid ul-Fauid, The conversations of Hazrat Khawaja Nizamuddin Auliya as recorded by Khawaja Amir Hasan Ala Sijz, Assembly 5)

Contrary to what Auliya presumed, the robotic recitation of a scripture is a fine example of an *external* conformity, *especially* when the recitation – as Islam demands – is of a literal quality. Such recitation is a means to fix the thought patterns to the Asuric grooves promoted by the Lord of Falsehood's scripture, with the resultant separation of consciousness leading to, at the very least, a mental coldness, seen in Auliya's belief that Hindus will find themselves in Hell. He could not imagine otherwise, for that is the inevitable conclusion for one practically imbibing the Quran's message – with the natural mental nature repressed under the pressure of the Shadow. While he certainly was heavily influenced by the Quran, Auliya was *occasionally* passive in his approach to the Hindu, at times preferring “pious” example, instead of preaching or jihad, to obtain converts:

A disciple visited Shaikh Nizamu'd-Din Auliya accompanied by a Hindu, and introduced him as his brother. The Shaikh asked the disciple if his brother was inclined towards Islam...But the Shaikh was overcome with sadness, and told his disciple that people remained untouched by preaching as only pious example would result in conversion. (FF, p 196) (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 166)

That the ‘saint’ wanted to acquire conversions by way of his example speaks to his deficit of even the type of spiritual knowledge obtainable to the higher mental regions *well beneath* the Golden Lid separating the mortal from the immortal consciousness. Even the relatively limited higher mind can still acknowledge that a ‘conversion’ between beliefs in God is *not* by itself a necessity as far as spiritual enlightenment, for God is Indescribable, beyond the names and ideas attributed to him by humans. That Auliya thought it necessary to obtain these conversions shows the hold the Quran – which he repeated ceaselessly – had over him, even if he failed to actively participate in jihad like he should have. Instead, Nizamuddin provided moral support for the spread of Islam, often by way of the curious – for a Muslim born subsequent to Mohammed – use of prophecy:

Between 1309 and 1310, the Sultan's general, Malik Na'ib, marched on the Kakatiya kingdom of Telingana and invaded the Warangal fort. The usual method of communication between the army and the capital collapsed, giving rise to considerable anxiety in the city. **Turning to the Shaikh, the Sultan sent messengers requesting assistance. Reassuring him, Shaikh Nizamu'd-Din prophesied victory, at the same time extending hopes for an even greater success in the future.** (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 160)

The Sultan of the time, Alauddin Khilji, had by the time of his assault on Warangal made a name for himself through his frequent massacres of Hindus. His propensity for Islamic ‘justice’, that of carnage and violence and hatred, was chronicled by another famous Indian sufi, Amir Khusraw, who just happened to be a disciple of Nizamuddin Auliya. Khusraw's work describing Alauddin Khilji's bloodlust was entitled *Khazainu-l Futuh*, or *The Treasures of Victory*, itself an indicator as to how this sufi viewed the genocidal campaigns of the Islamic Sultan. Khusraw, befitting the artistic background for which he is famous, added a poetic flourish to the most depraved of Khilji's crimes:

Conquest of Malwa.

On the southern border of Hindustan, Rai Mahlak Deo, of Malwa, and Koka, his Pardhan, who had under their command a select body of thirty or forty thousand cavalry, and infantry without number, boasting of their large force, had rubbed their eyes with the antimony of pride, **and, according to the verse, ‘When fate decrees the sight is blinded,’ had forsaken the path of obedience.** A select army of royal troops was appointed, and suddenly fell on those blind and bewildered men. Victory itself preceded them, and had her eyes fixed upon the road to see when the triumphant army would arrive. Until the dust of the army of Islam arose, the vision of their

eyes was closed. **The blows of the sword then descended upon them, their heads were cut off, and the earth was moistened with Hindu blood.** (*Khazainu-l Futuh*, Amir Khusru. In *The History of India, as Told by Its Own Historians: The Muhammadan Period*, by Sir H. M. Elliot, Vol. III, 1866-177, p. 80)

Continuing on, Khusraw does not hesitate in documenting Khilji's slaughter of 30,000 Hindus immediately after the conquest of Chitor:

On Monday, the 8th Jumada-s sani, A.H. 702, the loud drums proclaimed the royal march from Delhi, undertaken with a view to the capture of Chitor. **The author accompanied the expedition.** The fort was taken on Monday, the 11th of Muharram, A.H. 703 (August, 1303 A.D.). The Rai fled, but afterwards surrendered himself, and was secured against the lightning of the scimeter. The Hindus say that lightning falls wherever there is a brazen vessel, and the face of the Rai had become as yellow as one, through the effect of fear.

After ordering a massacre of thirty thousand Hindus, he bestowed the Government of Chitor upon his son, Khizr Khan, and named the place Khizrabad. He bestowed on him a red canopy, a robe embroidered with gold, and two standards—one green, and the other black—and threw upon him rubies and emeralds. **He then returned towards Delhi “Praise be to God! that he so ordered the massacre of all the chiefs of Hind out of the pale of Islam, by his infidel-smiting sword, that if in this time it should by chance happen that a schismatic should claim his right, the pure Sunnis would swear in the name of this Khalifa of God, that heterodoxy has no rights.** (*Khazainu-l Futuh*, Amir Khusru. In *The History of India, as Told by Its Own Historians: The Muhammadan Period*, by Sir H. M. Elliot, Vol. III, 1866-177, p. 80)

That the famous sufi, belonging to a sect lauded for its supposed tolerance and unity with different religions, was unable to offer a critique of the Sultan's cruelty, *even while witnessing the genocide*, indicates a limited Psychic development, one perhaps agreeable to poetic or musical – as we will highlight when discussing other features of Khusraw – expressions of the wider consciousness, yet unable to empathise with the sufferings of non-Muslims. But that is what Hindus should expect from the sufis, as they are – irrespective of superficial similarities – taught the basic principles of Asuric Islam, tenets outlined by Khusraw in his account of Khilji's conquest of Mabar:

The tongue of the sword of the Khalifa of the time, which is the tongue of the flame of Islam, has imparted light to the entire darkness of Hindustan by the illumination of its guidance; and on one side an iron wall of royal swords has been raised before the infidel Magog-like Tatars, so that all that God-deserted tribe drew their feet within their skirts amongst the hills of Ghazni, and even their advance-arrows had not strength enough to reach into Sind. On the other side so much dust arose from the battered temple of Somnat that even the sea was not able to lay it, and on the right hand and on the left hand the army has conquered from sea to sea, and **several capitals of the gods of the Hindus, in which Satanism has prevailed since the time of the Jinns, have been demolished. All these impurities of infidelity have been cleansed by the Sultan's destruction of idol-temples, beginning with his first holy expedition against Deogir, so that the flames of the light of the law illumine all these unholy countries, and places for the criers to prayer are exalted on high, and prayers are read in mosques.** Allah be praised! (*Khazainu-l Futuh*, Amir Khusru. In *The History of India, as Told by Its Own Historians: The Muhammadan Period*, by Sir H. M. Elliot, Vol. III, 1866-177, p. 90)

The Asuric inversion of knowledge is clear to see, with one of India's most famous sufis believing Islam to be a “light” and a guidance, yet using, for evidence of “light” conquering “Satanism”, the

violent destruction of the temples and the reading of prayers in mosques! Later in Khusraw's chronicle of Mabbar's conquest, we find further Asuric falsehood, with the standard Islamic triple choice between conversion, jizya or death on offer to the Sultan's Hindu opponent:

“The fire-worshipping” Rai, when he learnt that “his idol temple was likely to be converted into a mosque,” despatched Kisu Mal to ascertain the strength and circumstances of the Muslims, and he returned with such alarming accounts that the Rai next morning despatched Balak Deo Naik to the royal canopy, to represent that “your slave Billal Deo is ready to swear allegiance to the mighty emperor, like Laddar Deo and Ram Deo, and whatever the Sulaiman of the time may order, I am ready to obey. If you desire horses like demons, and elephants like *afrits*, and valuables like those of Deogir, they are all present. If you wish to destroy the four walls of this fort, they are, as they stand, no obstacle to your advance. The fort is the fort of the king; take it.” **The commander replied that he was sent with the object of converting him to Muhammadanism, or of making him a *Zimmi*, and subject to pay tax, or of slaying him, if neither of these terms were assented to.** (*Khazainu-l Futuh*, Amir Khusru. In *The History of India, as Told by Its Own Historians: The Muhammadan Period*, by Sir H. M. Elliot, Vol. III, 1866-177, p. 93)

That the Sultan and his sufi-biographer were capable of restraining themselves, is seen in Khilji's magnanimous pardon of “half-Hindus” who were at least able to recite the kalima:

Thither the Malik pursued “the yellow-faced Bir,” and at Kandur was joined by some Muslims who had been subjects of the Hindus, now no longer able to offer them protection. **They were half Hindus, and not strict in their religious observances, but “as they could repeat the *kalima*, the Malik of Islam spared their lives. Though they were worthy of death, yet, as they were Muslims, they were pardoned.”** (*Khazainu-l Futuh*, Amir Khusru. In *The History of India, as Told by Its Own Historians: The Muhammadan Period*, by Sir H. M. Elliot, Vol. III, 1866-177, pp. 95-96)

That the Sultan was so charitable when Allah, Mohammed and even Ali are documented as being harsh and murderous with half-Muslims and other types of apostates, speaks to the subcontinental situation of the time, where the half-Muslims, of which Khusraw and fellow sufis – as we will unquestionably document - ironically belong, were necessary in order to perhaps eventually transition to ‘pure’ Islam. The more pious of the time had to make a strategic decision to tolerate a certain amount of infidelity among people who erroneously called themselves Muslim - hence the survival of numerous medieval sufis guilty of clear blasphemy. There were simply too many Hindus remaining for energy and resources to be concentrated on the half-Muslims. Thus the anti-Hindu yet only partially Islamic Khusraw – who as we shall see, was guilty of a similar lack of strictness - was tolerated and employed, primarily due to his narrative skills, by multiple Islamic despots, from the aforementioned Alauddin Khilji to Ghiyassudin Balban to Jalaluddin Firuz Khilji to Ghiyasuddin Tughlaq, who Khusraw was on murderous expedition with at the time of Auliya's death:

When the Shaikh died, Amir Khusraw was with Sultan Ghiyasu’d-Din Tughluq on his Bengal expedition. The news of his pir's death was a great blow. (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 172)

Auliya and Khusraw, like Chishti before them and numerous sufis afterwards, functioned to perpetuate the genocide of Hindus by, *at the very minimum*, giving it the veneer of sanctity, whether by glorifying the murders through biographical renditions, or by prophesying the victories of the Sultans to help maintain the latter's confidence that Allah was supporting their evil jihad. These particular sufis were in a position to disabuse the Sultans of their urge to kill Hindus; that they failed to offer higher advice than that of the Quran injunctions, shows that these sufis *believed* in the anti-Hindu infrarational

revelations, the Asuric commands antithetical to the Sanatana Dharma. Indeed many sufis went further than the psychological assistance provided by Auliya and Khusraw, with Shaikh Jalaluddin Tabrizi correctly following the articles of Islam by demolishing Hindu temples and converting numerous kuffar in Bengal during his time there in the 13th century:

Shaikh Jalalu'd-Din had many disciples in Bengal. He first lived at Lakhnauti, constructed a khanqah and attached a langar to it. He also bought some gardens and land to be attached to the monastery. He moved to Devatalla (Deva Mahal) near Pandua in northern Bengal. **There a kafir (either a Hindu or a Buddhist) had erected a large temple and a well. The Shaikh demolished the temple and constructed a takiya (khanqah) and converted a large number of kafirs. There is no evidence that they were 'down-trodden and persecuted Buddhists and Hindus,' as a modern scholar writes.** (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, pp. 201-202)

This particular shaikh belonged, for the majority of his life, to the Suhrawardiyya sufi order, whose differences with the aforementioned Chishtiyyas help to partially explain how the confusion over the true intentions – toward the Hindus - of Sufism can arise:

The Suhrawardis...were unhesitating in their enforced conversion of Hindus to Islam. By contrast, the Chishtis believed that only the company of the pious and ascetic Muslims prompted others to accept Islam, and neither the sword nor preaching served any purpose. (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 226)

For the Hindu, what emerges is a mere difference in style of the predator - the Chishtis functioning as wolves in sheep clothing, chronicling and extolling the jihad of other Muslims, while the Suhrawardis actively participate in jihad. Both want Hindu converts and subjugation, yet they pursue the ambition via different methods. Similarly do other sufi saints and orders approach their religious obligation to convert the world to Islam in varying degrees from the proper Islamic tactic of corporeal jihad. For instance, in another Bengal example, we find the sufi Hazrat Shah-Jalal – for whom the largest airport in Bangladesh is named – practising a more austere form of jihad than even Tabrizi:

Amongst the Bengali warrior saints whose career can be traced more accurately is Shaikh Jalal of Sylhet. According to the *Gulzar-i Abrar* Shaikh Jalal was a Turkistani by birth and a *khalifa* of Saiyid Ahmad Yasawi of the *Silsila-i Khwajagan*. **At his request, Jalal's pir blessed him that he might succeed in the lesser jihad or warfare against infidelity in a dar al-harb (Land outside the Islamic oecumene)** in the same way as he had directed him towards success in the higher (spiritual) jihad. The Saiyid ordered his seven hundred...most eminent disciples to accompany the Shaikh. **Their expedition was not an ascetic or peaceful one. Shaikh Jalal would leave various saints along the way to propagate Islam in the newly acquired territories.** When the Shaikh reached Sirhat (Sylhet) he was accompanied by 313 followers... **The entire region fell to Shaikh Jalal who apportioned the land among his followers.** (*Gulzar-i Abrar*, ff 75a-b) (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 314)

Jalal's case shows the practice of genuine Islam, with the exception – as will be discussed – of having a *pir* or spiritual guide instead of an Imam to instruct him. Nevertheless, the so-called “lesser jihad” is the actual Asuric calling of the able-bodied Muslim, and Jalal practised it in full knowledge that forced conversion, *jizya*, or death to infidels refusing to convert, is the triple choice to be offered to the kuffar of Dar al-Harb. Inferior to this appropriate participation in jihad, yet above the *mostly* passive approach advocated by Auliya, we find the example of Nur Qutb-i Alam, who in the fifteenth century used his status as a prominent sufi to urge Sultan Ibrahim Shah Sharqi of Jaunpur to invade Bengal, *in the name of Islam*, so that the Asuric religion might wrest control of Hindu-governed territory:

Shaikh Nur Qutb-i Alam believed in the traditional Perso-Islamic theory of kingship and taught

his followers to obey the Sultan according to the Prophet's Hadis and the advice of leading Chishti saints...A powerful party of Hindus and Muslims, led by Raja Ganesa, a local Hindu chief of Dinajpur in North Bengal began to dominate the government. After the death of Ghiyasu'd-Din Azam Shah, between 1410 and 1415, the Raja acted as king-maker and one after the other three puppets were elevated to the throne. During the reign of the last, Ala'u'd-Din Firuz Shah, Raja Ganesa was defacto ruler of Bengal. **This prompted Nur Qutb-i Alam to write to Sultan Ibrahim Shah Sharqi of Jaunpur urging him to invade Bengal and in so doing restore the glory of Islam. Saiyid Muhammad Ashraf Jahangir Simnani also wrote a similar letter.** (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 259)

The treasonous and anti-Hindu stance of this type of sufi is clear to see, even if they do not fulfil Allah's demand to take up arms and fight the Hindus, preferring instead to request an outside Islamic force to take up the cause of jihad. This particular treason is notable for Saiyid Ashraf Jahangir Simnani's participation, as Simnani was an enthusiastic proponent of the idea of the "Unity of Being", which on the surface would strike one as harmonious with Yogin experiences:

From Pandua (Mir Saiyid Ashraf Jahangir) Simnani went to Sunargaon, visiting the descendants of Shaikh Sharafu'd-Din Tawwama. Bengali **sufis whose beliefs were filled with the idea of the Unity of Being were highly impressed by the Saiyid's lectures on that subject...At Shaikh Nur Qutb-i Alam's request, the Saiyid persuaded Sultan Ibrahim Sharqi to liberate Bengal from the domination of Raja Ganesa.** (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, pp. 267-68)

That this sufi requested an outside invasion of Bengal specifically to restore the glory of Islam, and not for any other reason, helps to provide a solitary instance among countless that show Sufism's "Unity of Being" theory – often used to portray Sufism as open-minded to different religions besides their heretical version of Islam – to be a simulacrum to the Hindu experience of the Unity of Conscious-Existence. But before we scrutinize this supposedly enlightened theory of the sufis, we must continue reviewing their historic support for jihad, this time in Kashmir, where the sufi Mir Sayyid Ali Hamadani played a prominent role in spreading Islam - by force:

The principal centre of the Kubrawiyyas was Kashmir. The order was introduced there by Mir Sayyid Ali Hamadani, who had been initiated by one of Shaykh Ala'u'd-Dawla Simnani's disciples. After travelling through different parts of the Islamic world...the Mir then proceeded to Kashmir...Apparently he reached Srinagar in 1381. The miracles allegedly performed by the Sayyid in order to convert the brahman priest of the Kali temple are reminiscent of those attributed to Khawaja Mu'inu'd-Din Chishti and many other sufis. It is claimed that when the priest flew in the air, the Sayyid threw his slippers at him and brought him down. Ibn Battuta also states that he saw the yogis at Sultan Muhammad bin Tughluq's court fly.

The Kali temple was demolished, and a prayer platform was built there for the Sayyid. **Like Ala'u'd-Dawla Simnani, the Mir was a zealous missionary and encouraged his followers to demolish Hindu temples and convert the Hindus to Islam.** After staying three years in Kashmir, he left Srinagar but fell ill while travelling, dying in January 1385. His dead body was taken to Khuttalan (now in Tajikistan, USSR) and buried. However, a number of his disciples remained in Kashmir. **They had been trained in the futuwwa (chivalric) Irani sufi tradition and resorted to forcible conversion.** They also introduced the *akhi* (brotherhood) spirit of the Anatolian and Iranian dervishes who were either members of or associated with merchant and artisan guilds (*isnaf*). In Kashmir they appear to have found new avenues for promoting their commercial interests. **They also ransacked Hindu temples in order to enrich themselves and their local followers.** (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The Wonder that was India*, Volume II, pp. 248-9)

Hamadani was only following the tradition of the great Mohammed, seizing conversions through force and destroying the “idols” of the Polytheists. After his death, his son was to continue Sufism's role in the Islamification of Kashmir, albeit through – he was helped by Suha Bhatta, a convert to Islam - influencing the Sultan instead of actively attacking the Hindus like his father did:

The arrival of Sayyid Ali's son, Mir Muhammad, in Srinagar in 1393 revived the evangelical spirit of the earlier Irani settlers. Sultan Sikandar (1389-1413) became a disciple of the young migrant...**Under the influence of Mir and Suha, Sultan Sikandar demolished many ancient temples in Kashmir. Many puritanical and discriminatory laws were implemented, and *jizya* was introduced for the first time in Kashmir.** The persecution of brahmans, their exclusion from the top tiers of government, and their replacement by Irani migrants hastened the conversion of the brahman elite, because they were unwilling to give up their superior positions in the administration.

Before long, however, Sultan Sikandar realized the effects of his bigoted policy and, according to the brahman historian Jonaraja, ‘fixed with some difficulty a limit to the advance of the great sea of the Yavanas (Muslims) and abolished turush-kadanda (*jizya*).’ This change in state policy seems to have so disappointed Mir Muhammad that, after staying twelve years, he left Kashmir like his father before him. (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The Wonder that was India*, Volume II, p. 249)

This constant lapse into heresy, these decisions to abandon or limit *jizya* and jihad and other tenets, has plagued Islam in the Indian subcontinent from the time of its ascent to its current confused condition. The orthodox among the sufi ‘saints’ were forefront in the battle against the subcontinental Muslim's habitual apostasy, and in Kashmir around a century later another sufi, Amir Shamsud-Din Muhammad Iraqi, tasked himself - along with introducing the Noorbakshia sufi order to the region - with revitalizing Islam out of the Kashmiri's regression into infidelity (even if Sikandar received praise for his initial work):

The only conspicuous defect and an over-all drawback of Zainu'l-'Abidin was that idolatry and heresy, which had been stamped out in the reign of Sultan Sikandar the Iconoclast – God bless his soul - and of which there had remained no traces in the lands of Kashmir, were revived by him. The customs and practices of the polytheists and the heretics received fresh impetus and were given renewed currency. He ordered that particular days of festivity be celebrated in every town and village, in which innumerable vices and corrupt practices were let loose. In more than one way, these had a deleterious influence on the sharia and Islam brought by the Prophet. The community of infidels and heretics called him the Great King because they flourished under his rule and he was known by the name throughout his kingdom.

With the passage of time, the customs of the Hindus and the infidels and their corrupt and immoral practices attained such popularity that even the ‘ulema, the learned, the Sayyids and Qadis of this land began to observe them without exhibiting even the slightest repugnance for them. There was none to forbid them to do so. It resulted in a gradual weakening of Islam and a decay in its cannons and postulates; idol-worship and corrupt and immoral practices thrived. **It was only after the arrival of Amir Shamsu'd-Din Muhammad Iraqi and through the instrumentality of his generous acts and excellent efforts that those unholy practices were eradicated. Islamic religion and injunctions of the sharia of the Holy Prophet were revitalized under the dispensations of that spiritual guide.** Some of these events will be recorded at their proper place. (*Baharistan-i-Shahi*, 11-16)

Under Iraqi, the revival of Islam in Kashmir was this time done in the name of Shi'ism rather than Sunnism. But like their estranged brother, the Shi'ites are quite familiar with the standard Islamic methods to obtain conversions from non-Muslims like the Hindus:

Shi'ism was introduced to Kashmir by Mir Shamsu'd-Din Iraqi who in 1481 arrived as an envoy of the Timurid Sultan...**the Mir became a disciple of Shaikh Isma'il Kubrawiyya, a revered sufi in Kashmir.**...Musa Raina, an influential government official, became his disciple and the Mir began initiating sufis into the order of Saiyid Muhammad Nur Baksh...In 1505 Fata Shah (1505-14) became Sultan for the second time and appointed Musa Raina his vizier. **The Mir once more returned to Kashmir and an aggressive and discriminatory policy towards Hindus and Buddhists was re-introduced. Temples were demolished, land confiscated and non-Islamic Kashmiris were forcibly converted to Shi'ism. The mask of Nur Bakhshi's doctrines had been removed.** (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, pp. 298-99)

The specifics of the sufi's violent jihad against the Kashmiri Hindus are contained in *Baharistan-i Shahi*:

Persecution of Hindus

[It may be recorded] that the temples of idol-worshippers, which had been destroyed and razed to the ground by the religious-minded and justice-loving Sultan Sikandar - God bless his grave and bless him - had been rebuilt and rehabilitated by Zainu'l Abidin. He had permitted idolaters and polytheists to revive the practices of infidelity and they had propagated heresy (*kufir*) and false religion (*din-i batil*). With the support of some more kings, the infidels had flourished day after day. **But with the support and authority of Malik Musa Raina, Amir Shamsu'd-Din Muhammad undertook a wholesale destruction of all those idol-houses as well as the total ruination of the very foundation of infidelity and disbelief. On the site of every idol-house he destroyed, he ordered the construction of a mosque for offering prayers after the Islamic manner.** The idolatry and heresy which had existed prior to his coming to this place were effectively replaced by his preaching and propagation of Islamic laws and practices. He brought honour to all the infidels and heretics (*zandiqa*) of Kashmir by admitting them to the Islamic faith and bestowed upon them many kinds of rewards and benefactions. **It is publicly known as well as emphatically related that during his life-time, with the virtuous efforts and elaborate arrangements made by the fortunate Malik Musa Raina, twenty-four thousand families of staunch infidels and stubborn heretics were ennobled by being converted to the Islamic faith. It is difficult to compute the number of people who had hitherto indulged in corrupt practices of a wrong (false) faith and dissent and were put on the right track under the proper guidance of Mir Shamsu'd-Din Iraqi.**

In fact the transmitter of (God's) grace (Mir Shams Iraqi) conferred favours upon the righteous Malik Musa Raina and gave him blessings which enabled him to fulfil that cherished task. Indeed, fortunate is one who has been able to become the recipient of such special consideration at the hands of a highly venerable and elderly person like him (Amir Shamsu'd-Din). After Sultan Sikandar - God's peace be upon him - no one among the Muslims who wielded authority over this country rendered as much service to Islam by its propagation and advancement as Malik Musa Raina did. Nobody was able to make as organized an effort as he did towards the advancement and furtherance of the Muhammadan religion. (*Baharistan-i-Shahi*, 11-42)

But conversions precipitated by systematic persecution are hardly done out of genuine fondness for the religion in question, and the return of many Kashmiris back to their ancient Hindu religion was rapid, indeed within the lifetime of Amir Shamsuddin. In response to this, as any proper Muslim *must* do, the sufi went about fulfilling the command of the Quran to kill these apostates, the renegades from the only 'true religion' of Islam. Though at this point in time he was too old to take part in the jihad himself, he was able to convince the Muslim administrators of Kashmir to fulfil their Asuric obligation:

One of the big tasks completed by him and one of the major commands of Amir Shamsu'd-Din Muhammad Iraqi carried out by him was the massacre of infidels and polytheists of this land. It happened like this.

During the government of Malik Musa Raina, all the depraved heretics of this land had been converted to Islam. [But] with the help of some of the chiefs of this land, some of them had reverted to the customs of the infidels and polytheists. These apostates had resumed idolatry. Some of the infidels related that during the hours of offering prayers and worshipping of idols, they would place a copy of the holy Qur'an under their haunches to make a seat to sit upon. Thus idol-worshipping proceeded even while they sat on the divine book. When the news and details of these doing were brought to Amir Shamsu'd-Din Muhammad Iraqi, he summoned Malik Kaji Chak to him. **Accompanied by Malik Ali and Khawaja Ahmad, his two counsellors and administrators, Malik Kaji Chak presented himself before the venerable Amir Shamsu'd-Din Iraqi, who declared to them: "This community of Idolaters has, after embracing and submitting to the Islamic faith, now gone back to defiance and apostasy. If you find yourself unable to inflict punishment upon them in accordance with the provisions of sharia and take disciplinary action against them, it will become necessary and incumbent upon me to proceed on a self-imposed exile and in that case you shall not stand in my way at the time of my departure."**

Since the above-mentioned Malik, prior to his assumption of power and authority, had promised him that he would never deviate from or disregard his wishes and injunctions, therefore, in deference to his wishes, he held consultations with his counsellors and administrative officers, and **decided upon carrying out a wholesale massacre of the infidels.** Their massacre was scheduled for the days of the approaching Ashura. Thus in the year A.H. 924 (A.D. 1518), corresponding to 94th year of Kashmiri calendar, during the Ashura, **about seven to eight hundred infidels were put to death. Those killed were the leading personalities of the community of infidels at that time:** men of substance and government functionaries. Each of them wielded influence and sway over a hundred families of other infidels and heretics. **Thus the entire community of infidels and polytheists in Kashmir was coerced into conversion to Islam at the point of the sword. This is one of the major achievements of Malik Kaji Chak.** (*Baharistan-i-Shahi*, 12-16)

Shamsuddin Muhammad Iraqi was hardly the only sufi to have worked furiously – in his case by way of genocide - in trying to straighten the tail of the subcontinental Muslim; another well known medieval sufi, Sayyid Jalaluddin Bukhari, fought against the inclusion of Hindu elements into Muslim activities – a similar mixing of the religions found in modern-day Basant:

After his death the Suhrawardiyya silsila declined in Multan, but the order became very popular in other provinces and spread from Uch to Gujarat, the Panjab, Kashmir, and even Delhi. It was revitalized by the sufi Sayyid Jalalu'd-Din Bukhari, popularly known as Makhdum-i Jahaniyan (Lord of the World's People). So widely travelled was he that he was called Jahangasht (World Traveller). During Firuz's reign he lived in Uch but frequently visited Delhi. **He was an ardent puritan and strongly objected to the Hindu accretions to Muslim social and religious practices - for example, the celebration of the Shab-i barat festival** which is held in the evening of the middle of Sha'ban, the eighth month in the Muslim calendar, when fireworks are let off and lighted lamps are placed on the newly whitewashed graves, **in obvious imitation of the Hindu Diwali. Only in India, he commented, was there such a blatant disregard of the sharia, for such customs were not found in Ghazni, Iran, or Arabia.** (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The Wonder that was India*, Volume II, p. 241)

The sufi Makhdum, as any genuine follower of Islam should, did much more than bemoan the

accumulation of Hindu customs into Muslim religious practices. This particular ‘saint’ actively sought converts to Islam, and his brother - also a sufi - is in one example recorded as having killed a Hindu for failing to embrace Islam:

It is believed that the Sumirahs of the lower Sind who were Ismailis, adopted Sunnism under the influence of the Saiyid (Jalalu’d-Din Bukhari). A Jat chief of Sind, later named Abdullah, is also said to have embraced Islam through a supernatural feat performed by Makhdum Jahaniyan. He and his brother, Saiyid Raju Qattal, whose real name was Saiyid Sadru’d-Din, **did not have the same success with Nawahun, the *darogha* of Uch.**

The Hindu, Nawahun, visited Makhdum Jahaniyan on his death-bed and while praying for his recovery stated that the **Saiyid was the seal of the saints, just as the Prophet Mohammed was the seal of the prophets. Disregarding the fact that in a previous discourse he had expressed that a formal recitation of the kalima did not make the speaker a Muslim** (*Siraju'l-Hidaya*, f. 32a), **the Saiyid concluded that Nawahun's statement amounted to a protestation of faith. As he was not willing to accept Islam, Nawahun fled to Delhi, and sought refuge with the Sultan, of whom he was a favourite. A few days after the death of Makhdum Jahaniyan, his brother, Shaikh Raju...arrived in Delhi...Nawahun was handed over to Saiyid Raju who again refused to embrace Islam and was executed.** (*Gulshani Ibrahimi*, pp 417-18) (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, pp. 279-80)

The *darogha* was the revenue official keeping financial accounts in Persian, hence Nawahun's initial respite in Delhi with the Islamic Sultan. When the Hindu was forcibly returned, Saiyid Raju did not practice the mythical sufi tolerance that mainstream perceptions of Sufism attribute to it. Instead, we find in this particular sufi, like so many other sufi ‘saints’ throughout subcontinental India, the appropriate application of the Quran and Hadith *towards the Hindus* - in this case the legal murder of a Hindu who refused to convert to Islam. At the same time, their failure to disabuse that particular Hindu of his belief that Makhdum was the “seal of the saints”, a concept absent in the austere Islamic scripture yet believed – to this day - by the majority of sufis, exposes their own heresy, a crime that nevertheless was ignored by the scripturally educated Muslims of the time. For the latter group knew that as long as the half-Muslim sufis continued to coerce the Hindus to adopt the partially Islamic sufi religion, eventually the full manifestation of Islam might emerge in the subcontinent, after which the most pious could turn their murderous attention to the half-Muslims.

At least the vast majority of early subcontinental sufis were Islamic enough to either engage in, or simply advocate conversions of Hindus to Islam under duress, the primary means by which Islam spread in the subcontinent up until the recent reproductive expansion of the past couple of centuries. Forced conversions of Infidels, after all, are actually the most Islamic way of securing converts, at least as far as the examples presented in the Hadith. For though Mohammed may have repeatedly warned the unbelievers of their afterlife fate, there is scant documentation that he obtained many converts through those verbal threats or other methods devoid of the explicit or *implied* physical threat. And even if most of the early sufis did not practice actual Islam (with regards to violent jihad), their rise in India was sufficient to provide an organizational apparatus for ensuing non-violent conversion drives of marginal success: as part of this structure, Sufism in the subcontinent developed ‘spiritual orders’ - the Chistiyya and Suhrawardiyya already mentioned - with established criterion relating to the order's general principles, how to become a Shaykh or Pir (spiritual guide), and other practices. One of these orders, the Naqshbandi, was assisted in its spread throughout the subcontinent by the famous sufi, Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindi, born in late 16th century Mughal India. From Sirhindi's letters to his contemporaries, we find a strong emphasis on the fundamental Islamic tenets:

O our Allah! Make us know the world as it is and place in our hearts the greatness, the importance of the next world! O my clever son! Do not ever fall for the decoration, the

ornaments of the *harams*; do not get deceived by their transient, exhaustible flavours! **Be extra careful so that all your actions, thoughts and behaviour are compatible with the Shariat!** Try to live under its lights! First of all, it is necessary to learn the belief which the Ahl-i-sunnat savants - may Allahu ta'ala give them many blessings for their ceaseless efforts - communicate and write in books, and to correct the *iman* in accordance with it. Then we should learn the rules of *fiqh* [the commands and prohibitions of the Shariat]. We should adhere to doing the *fard* and be careful about the *halal* [permitted] and *haram* [forbidden]. (*The Collected Letters of Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindi*, Volume II, Letter 82)

Sirhindi, as any truly learned scholar of Islam should, sought to perpetuate the pre-ordained thoughts, actions and beliefs expected from genuine Muslims, the slaves of Allah who shed their individuality for the brute glory of the mass. That he confused the adharma of a rigid conformity for “din” (complete way of life), is just another Asuric feature of Islam, because the Lord of Falsehood always couches his depravities – whether through written works or occult visions - with inverted descriptions of “truth” and “light” and “way of life” that are normally conceived according to a finer psychology than what the Asura offers. The sun is another of the higher symbols the Asura and his followers attempt to co-opt, with Sirhindi having prayed for the Islamic sun to spread throughout the world and fulfil the infrarational Quran revelations:

I pray to Allahu ta'ala that the Islamic sun will shine with the help of that great family! May the beauty of the divine rules spread far and near!

And today, when Muslims are so forlorn, the hope of their salvation from this whirlpool of heresy is on the ship of the sons of the Best of Mankind...Strive hard so that you may attain to this great fortune!...This faqir attempted to be honoured with your exalted service in order to say words like these which are useful for strengthening and spreading this true Shariat. (*The Collected Letters of Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindi*, Volume I, Letter 51)

The way this famous sufi proposed going about spreading the false Islamic sun was through the well-supported scriptural method of jihad, which he – unlike other sufis and certain modern day proponents who claim the “greater” or inner psychological jihad to be the primary Islamic jihad – explicitly outlined as involving terrestrial war waged with the overt purpose of expanding the Islamic religion and Allah's name. Such was Sirhindi's belief in the scripture that he also informed another correspondent that the correct psychological motive when participating in jihad is not to extract a *thawab* or reward of a salary – it is instead for the pure intention of spreading Islam and subjugating the non-Muslims:

O my lucky, fortunate brother! Deeds and worship will be valid with the intention. When going out for war against disbelievers one should first check one's intention. After this only will one get the thawab. **One's purpose in going to war should be to spread and exalt Allah's name, din, and to defeat and weaken the enemies of the din. For, we Muslims have been commanded this, and this is what jihad means. One should not deprive oneself of the thawab of jihad by intending for other things.** The Ghazis receiving a salary from the Baytulmal [*treasury of an Islamic State*] does not do away with the jihad or the thawab for jihad. Evil purposes will defile the worship. One should check one's intention, take the salary and go out for the jihad, and then expect the thawab of ghazi and shahid [*martyr*]. I admire you for the state you are in. You have been honoured with your heart's being with Allahu ta'ala and your all limbs performing namaz in jamaat and also performing jihad against the enemies of the din and disbelievers. He who comes back from ghaza alive becomes a ghazi, a mujahid. He who becomes a martyr gets many thawabs, many blessings. I should repeat, however, that these are only after one has purified one's intention. If pure intention will not come to your heart, compel yourself to intend so and pray to Allahu ta'ala earnestly so that such an intention will be inspired

into your heart! (*The Collected Letters of Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindi*, Volume II, 69)

Sirhindi, and his proper and literalist Islamic beliefs, met with a contemporaneous and severe impediment during the rule of Mughal Emperor Akbar Shah (1556-1605), a nominal Muslim who promulgated the most heretical of decrees, including the astonishing – for someone identifying himself as a Muslim – order that any forcibly converted Indian could return to Hinduism without facing the lawful execution for apostasy (Amy Chua, *Day of Empire: How Hyperpowers Rise to Global Dominance - and Why They Fall*, p. 187). Akbar's blasphemy is attributed by many, with some justification, to his marriage to the Hindu Princess Heer Kunwari, or Jodha Bai, in 1562. It was a marriage that heralded a sea-change from the usual practice of Muslim rulers in India, with Akbar's later acceptance of apostates an inevitable conclusion when we consider that, in tolerating his wife's Hindu practices, he in truth had already abandoned the Islamic faith well before his decree on converts:

Perhaps his greatest success in this vein was his marriage to the eldest daughter of the Raja of Amber, one of the fiercely independent Hindu Rajput kings. The practice of a Hindu princess marrying a Muslim sultan was an uncommon but not unknown practice on the subcontinent. Akbar, however, went further. **He allowed Princess Jodhabai to remain a Hindu and to worship at a Hindu shrine within his palace; occasionally Akbar himself participated in the rituals.** This unusual tolerance encouraged other Rajput chiefs to negotiate entry into the imperial elite by offering their daughters as marriage partners for the emperor. (Amy Chua, *Day of Empire: How Hyperpowers Rise to Global Dominance - and Why They Fall*, p. 185)

That he participated in Hindu rituals immediately establishes Akbar as a heretic, because the rituals used in Hindu ceremonies are for the invocation of multiple deities not named Allah – to then participate in religious activities of that nature is, as we know, *shirk* and punishable by death in the Islamic religion. Allowing his wife to remain a Hindu after their wedding was a decision that, on its own, also marked him as an apostate, for in doing so he violated the specific Asuric revelation regarding marriage to unbelievers:

And do not marry the idolatresses until they believe, and certainly a believing maid is better than an idolatress woman, even though she should please you. And do not give (believing women) in marriage to idolaters until they believe, and certainly a believing servant is better than an idolater, even though he should please you. These invite to the fire, and Allah invites to the garden and to forgiveness by His will, and makes clear His communications to men, that they may be mindful. (Quran 2:221)

Having allowed his Hindu wife's religion to flourish in his court, having incorporated *kufir* elements into his own religious habits, it came as little surprise that he would cancel the punishment of death for those reverting from Islam to the Sanatana Dharma. Similarly, he also abolished the enslavement of Hindu women and children captured in war, a common practice of subcontinental medieval Muslim rulers:

One of the glorious boons of His Majesty the Shahinshah which shone forth in this auspicious year was the abolition of enslavement. **The victorious troops which came into the wide territories of India used in their tyranny to make prisoners of the wives and children and other relatives of the people of India, and used to enjoy them or sell them.** His Majesty the Shahinshah, out of his thorough recognition of and worship of God, and from his abundant foresight and right thinking gave orders that no soldier of the victorious armies should in any part of his dominions act in this manner...No soldier, high or low, was to enslave them, but was to permit them to go freely to their homes and relations. (*Akbarnama*, Volume II, Chapter XL)

This particular decision naturally stemmed the tide of forcible conversions to Islam, because enslaved women and children are much more likely to convert under the duress of being held captive and

repeatedly raped or ‘enjoyed’ by a hostile Muslim soldier. While this particular decision, if viewed alone, arguably does not make Akbar a heretic, it is markedly divergent to the scripture, of which dozens of infrarational revelations or hadith grant the Muslims the Asuric “right” to enslave and rape non-Muslims. Indeed, Akbar's choice to abolish enslavement of Hindu captives had nothing to do with Islam, and was instead a natural outcome of a syncretic culture that he actively promoted, one best described in his 1582 letter to Philip II of Spain:

As most men are fettered by bonds of tradition, and by imitating the ways followed by their fathers, ancestors, relatives and acquaintances, **everyone continues, without investigating the arguments and reasons, to follow the religion in which he was born and educated, thus excluding himself from the possibility of ascertaining the truth**, which is the noblest aim of the human intellect. Therefore we associate at convenient seasons with learned men of all religions, thus deriving profit from their exquisite discourses and exalted aspirations. (Cited in Pankaj Mishra, *The First Liberal Imperialist*, New Statesman, 24 March 2003)

The position of Akbar in this letter is of course a violation of the Quran, which rejects the natural tendency of mankind to explore a variety of thoughts and beliefs, and asserts that an unthinking obedience to the Quran and authentic hadith is the ultimate ‘truth’. By the time of the letter Akbar had, through his cancellation of jizya, already committed a different act of treason against Islam: the first occurrence was in 1564 (S.M. Edwardes, H.L.O Garrett. *Mughal Rule in India*, p. 31), a mere two years after his marriage to Jodhabai. Although he reinstated jizya a decade later, he once more banned it in 1579 (Amy Chua, *Day of Empire: How Hyperpowers Rise to Global Dominance - and Why They Fall*, p. 187). In doing so, he yet again disobeyed the narrative of Allah, the ‘one true god’:

Fight those who do not believe in Allah, nor in the latter day, nor do they prohibit what Allah and His Messenger have prohibited, nor follow the religion of truth, out of those who have been given the Book, until they pay the tax in acknowledgement of superiority and they are in a state of subjection. (Quran 9:29)

While this verse was primarily intended toward Mohammed's Abrahamic enemies, it is, as we have discussed, the specific infrarational revelation used to justify jizya against the Polytheist Hindus, and although their conversion or death is technically the most appropriate Islamic course, applying the jizya to the Hindus is a step much closer to Allah's commandments than allowing them to live as equals with the chosen Muslims. Though Akbar, by enacting these heretic laws and through his personal beliefs, distinguished himself from the rest of India's Muslim rulers, he nevertheless also engaged in some of the standard Islamic crimes against Hindus, for it is – as the Shiakuffar have shown us throughout history – quite possible to be both a hypocrite “Muslim” and still attack those consciously identifying as non-Muslims. For even with his more tolerant pronouncements and legislation, Akbar himself indulged in the typical genocide of Infidel civilians historically characterizing Islamic rule in India, contributing to the gargantuan death count through his order to kill Hindu peasants after capturing the Rajput fort of Chittor:

There were 8,000 fighting Rajputs collected in the fortress, **but there were more than 40,000 peasants who took part in watching and serving**. When the standards entered the fort some of the garrison squeezed themselves into the temples, thinking that they were holy places and that the idols would help them, and awaited the sacrificing of their lives. Others awaited their doom in their own houses. A number lifted up their swords and shortened their lances and came forward to face the holy warriors. The latter disposed of those evil-fated ones by their swords and lances. A number of those who were in the temples and in their houses came out on seeing the *ghazis*, but were struck down before they could reach them. (*Akbarnama*, Volume II, 65, Siege of the Fortress of Citur)

Of these forty thousand, thirty thousand were killed due to their “activity”, described in the above paragraph as watching and serving, in the following selection associated with “fighting”. Of note is the previous – and contrasting - clear identification of the separate eight thousand *fighting* Rajputs from the peasants:

From early dawn till midday the bodies of those ill-starred men were consumed by the majesty of the great warrior. Nearly 30,000 men were killed. The reason of so many being killed was that on the former occasion on 3 Muharram 703, 16 August 1303, when Sultan Alaudin took the fort after six months and seven days, the peasantry were not put to death as they had not engaged in fighting. **But on this occasion they had shown great zeal and activity. Their excuses after the emergence of victory were of no avail, and orders were given for a general massacre.** But a large number were made prisoners. (*Akbarnama*, Volume II, 65, Siege of the Fortress of Citur)

When dealing with a marauding Islamic army that views the sexual enslavement and beheading of non-Muslims as a religious *obligation*, it is completely understandable that Hindu peasants would seek to assist their soldiers, because Islam – on both sides of the divide - does not articulate a difference between warriors and civilians. All Muslims are religiously ordered – unless female or disabled – to physically fight the Infidels, and *all* unbelievers are deemed to be enemies of the ‘light’ of Allah. Akbar in his siege of Citur merely continued the traditional Islamic punishment, when he should have been showing true greatness by granting the Hindu peasants reprieve from slaughter. Additionally should he have refrained, after defeating the Hindu King Hemu, from demanding – by way of Pir Muhammad - that Hemu's father convert to Islam in order to escape death:

At this time it came to H.M.'s ears that Haji Khan, a slave of Sher Khan Afghan, who was distinguished for courage, prudence, and skill in collecting troops, was acting independently in Alwar, and also that the father and the wife of the ill-fated Hemu, and his goods and chattels were in that Sarkar. Naşir-al-mulk was appointed to that service along with a number of trusty and devoted followers. Haji Khan was frightened by the strength of the victorious army and fled before its arrival, and Alwar and the whole of Sarkar Mewat came into the possession of the imperial servants. From there they proceeded to Deoti Macari, where was the residence and family of Hemu. The place was strong and there was much fighting, and the father of Hemu was captured and brought alive before the Naşir-al-mulk. The latter called upon him to change his religion. The old man answered, “for eighty years I've worshipped my God, according to this religion. Why should I change it at this time, and why should I, merely from fear of my life, and without understanding it come into your way of worship?”

Pir Muhammad treated his words as if he heard them not, and answered him with the tongue of the sword. (*Akbarnama*, Volume II, Chapter 11, Victory of H.M. The Shahinshah's Army in the Battle with Hemu, His Capture, and His Undergoing Capital Punishment)

Akbar's crimes may pale in comparison to the subcontinent's other Muslim rulers, but they are not without elements of traditional Islamic jihad, and while he can certainly be considered superior to the rest of Islam's evil contribution to the subcontinent, the greatness bestowed upon him is one of a relief from centuries of strain and suffering, a small oasis betwixt the genocidal rule of Islam. Short and brief was his reign – and the limits of his tolerance for different religions was a pattern mirrored in his son Jahangir, who although raised as a Muslim, in general showed a fair amount of respect to various religions, to the point where he ordered his provincial governors to “not force Islam on anyone.” (*Tuzuk-i-Jhangiri*, p. 205). It was a tolerance – and apostasy - inconsistently practised, with Jahangir's most notable act of genuine Islam arriving in the execution of the Sikh Guru Arjan:

In Gobindwal, which is on the river Biyah (Beas), there was a Hindu named Arjun, in the

garments of sainthood and sanctity, so much so that he had captured many of the simple-hearted of the Hindus, and even of the ignorant and foolish followers of Islam, by his ways and manners, and they had loudly sounded the drum of his holiness. They called him Guru, and from all sides stupid people crowded to worship and manifest complete faith in him. For three or four generations (of spiritual successors) they had kept this shop warm. **Many times it occurred to me to put a stop to this vain affair or to bring him into the assembly of the people of Islam.**

At last when Khusrau passed along this road this insignificant fellow proposed to wait upon him. Khusrau happened to halt at the place where he was, and he came out and did homage to him. He behaved to Khusrau in certain special ways, and made on his forehead a fingermark in saffron, which the Indians (Hinduwan) call *qashqa*, and is considered propitious. When this came to my ears and I clearly understood his folly, I ordered them to produce him and handed over his houses, dwelling-places, and children to Murtaza Khan, and having confiscated his property commanded that he should be put to death. (*Tuzuk-i-Jahangiri*, pp. 72-73)

The killing was thoroughly approved of by the sufi Ahmad Sirhindi, who had dreamed of Jahangir destroying infidelity, who in his sufi 'light' desired the imposition of the jizya in order to specifically demean the Hindus - the barbaric impulse to humiliate considered by him to be "life itself"!

These days the accursed infidel of Gobindwal was very fortunately killed. It is a cause of great defeat for the reprobate Hindus. With whatever intention or purpose they are killed – **the humiliation of infidels is for Muslims life itself.** Before this Kafir was killed, I had seen in a dream that the Emperor of the day had destroyed the crown of the head of Shirk or infidelity. It is true that this infidel was the chief of the infidels and a leader of the Kafirs... **The object of levying Jeziya on them is to humiliate and insult the Kafirs**, and jihad against them and hostility towards them are the necessities of the Mohammedan faith. (*The Collected Letters of Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindi*, Volume I, Letter 193)

That Sirhindi so adored Jahangir speaks to the latter's improvement over his father Akbar, for whom the sufi had nothing but disgust. Akbar's initial massacres of Hindus and executions of those refusing to convert were not enough to convince Sirhindi of his Islamic credentials, because the former was adjudged to be guilty of one of the worst of sins, bidah. It was the heresy of innovation that Akbar practised; it was the 'only true religion' that the King of Islam, Jahangir, was reviving:

Today, when the happy tidings of the downfall of the one who was prohibiting Islam, and the accession of the King of Islam, have reached the ears of every high and low, the Muslims have considered it obligatory to assist the King and guide him to promulgate the laws of Shariat and strengthen the faith. This support and furtherance can be achieved either by words or deeds.

All the catastrophes that befell Muslims in the time of Akbar Shah were incurred by such irreligious people disguised as religious men...it was always these wicked men of religion who misguided others under the name of Muslims. If a person who is not known as a religious savant deviates from the right way, this deviation will not spread among others, or it may spread to a very small extent. Also, today's men of tariqat mislead Muslims off the right way. Like the writings of false men of din, these people undermine the faith and belief of younger generations. (*The Collected Letters of Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindi*, Volume I, 47)

Sirhindi correctly observed – as the examples of the dual abolishing of jizya and the death penalty for apostates confirm – that Akbar Shah's reign was notable for the inability of Muslims to actually practice their religion:

During the time of the previous government (the time of Akbar Shah) Muslims were so gharib that disbelievers used to slander Islam openly and make fun of Muslims. They used to express their irreligiousness and praise disbelievers and disbelief in bazars and markets. **It was forbidden for the Muslims to do most of Allah's commandments. Those who performed worships and obeyed the Shariat were being censured and slandered.** (*The Collected Letters of Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindi*, Volume I, Letter 65)

Instead of – as the sufi Sirhindi desired - letting the ‘light’ of Islam humiliate the Kafir, Akbar was busy creating a new religion, Din-i-Ilahi, an outpouring of his internal desire for something greater than the fettered bonds of tradition. Admirable though his concoction may have been, it was most certainly the type of innovation despised by the most pious adherents of Islam, for within Din-i-Ilahi we find the most brazen of rebellious additions to the Islamic religion, including the recitation of the one thousand Sanskrit names for the Sun (*Encyclopedia Britannica, Din-i-Ilahi*), and the explicit celebration of the ancient Hindu festival of Diwali, with *Akbarnama* providing an example of his yearly custom:

By H.M.'s orders his family and household were sent to their native country. Also at this time Khawaja Shamsu-d-din arrived and paid his respects. He was summoned from Lahore in order that Kashmir might be made crown-land (*Khalsa*) for a time, and that by his sympathetic treatment it might be developed. On the 12th the Diwali feast was celebrated, and by orders, the boats, the river banks and the roofs were adorned with lamps. They presented a splendid appearance. (*Akbarnama*, Volume III, Chapter 226)

Akbar's actions and beliefs diametrically opposed the shariat of Islam and Sirhindi, with the Emperor guilty of the three forms of bidat outlined by his sufi opponent:

It is understood that it is necessary to obey the Islam for purifying the heart. Obeying the Shariat means doing the commandments and abstaining from prohibitions and bidats...There are three types of bidat:

- 1 - It is the worst bidat to use things which Islam says are symbols of disbelief.
- 2 - Kinds of belief not conforming with what the Ahl as-sunnat scholars communicate are also bad bidats.
- 3 - Renovations and reforms done as worships are bidats and are grave sins. (*The Collected Letters of Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindi*, Volume I, Letter 42)

With a “Muslim” leader like Akbar, religious innovations became commonplace, and Sirhindi devoted much of his energy to countering the former's heretical influence, in one letter encouraging a correspondent to annihilate bidats:

You write that you have been striving to do away with the bidats that are so widespread. At such a time as this, when the darknesses of bidats are so prevalent, it is a very great blessing to bring about the annihilation of one bidat and to recover one of the forgotten sunnats. Our Prophet ‘sall-Allahu alaihi wa sallam’ states in a sahih hadith: “He who recovers one of my forgotten sunnats will receive as many thawabs as a hundred martyrs will receive!”...Be an example for everybody you know and meet and even all your brothers-in-Islam there by obeying the Shariat and holding fast to the sunnat! Tell everybody about the harms of committing bidat, of disbelief! ...May He give success to those who strive for the spreading of the Islamic din and for teaching it to the youngsters! May He protect us and our children against going astray by being deceived by the enemies of the din and virtue, by those who strive to demolish the Islamic din and steal the iman and morals of the pure youth, and by those who try to deceive the youngsters through lies and slanders! (*The Collected Letters of Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindi*, Volume III, Letter 105)

Sirhindi was not the only one appalled at the extravagant heresy within Akbar's coterie; a separate group of Islamic 'saints' and scholars reported to Abdullah Khan Uzbek, contemporary ruler of the Khanate of Bukhara, that Akbar had strayed from Islam into apostasy. They remarked that Akbar was heavily influenced by the "Jugis" or Yogin of Hinduism:

A group of saints and learned men being distressed by Akbar's heresy arrived at Abdullah's court and reported that, having been led by certain mendicants, Akbar had adopted the religion of Metempsychosis (Tanasukhia) and the behaviour of Jugis and had deviated from the religion of the Prophet. (*Silsilat us Salatin*, pp. 138-39)

This multifaceted deviation – with Akbar's religion including elements of Judaism and Christianity along with Islam and the Sanatana Dharma – is certain, at least according to the Hadith, to have earned Akbar the curse of Allah because of his bidats, with the following selection emphasizing innovations in the holy city of Medina:

Narrated Ali:

We did not, write anything from the Prophet except the Quran and what is written in this paper, (wherein) the Prophet said, "Medina is a sanctuary from (the mountain of) Air to so and-so, therefore, whoever innovates (in it) an heresy or commits a sin, or gives shelter to such an innovator, will incur the Curse of Allah. the angels and all the people; and none of his compulsory or optional good deeds of worship will be accepted." (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 53, Number 404)

While this particular hadith might be considered specific to Medina, different authentic hadith, including the previously cited succinct narration by Aisha, clearly emphasize that changes to the core religious principles of Islam, whether in Medina or elsewhere, are sins, the most evil of affairs:

Jabir B. Abdullah narrated:

When Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) delivered the sermon, his eyes became red, his voice rose, and his anger increased so that he was like one giving a warning against the enemy and saying: "The enemy has made a morning attack on you and in the evening too." He would also say: "The Last Hour and I have been sent like these two." And he would join his forefinger and middle finger; and would further say: "The best of the speech is embodied in the Book of Allah, and the best of the guidance is the guidance given by Mohammed. **And the most evil affairs are their innovations; and every innovation is error.**" (Sahih Muslim, Book 4, Number 1885)

The dangerous sin of religious innovation is why Sirhindi so strongly opposed Akbar, because the famous sufi knew that bidats were antithetical to pure and actual Islam, which dictates rote obedience to the scripture as the only recourse from hellfire, the only way to prevent Islam from disappearing:

The primary advice that I will give you and to the other beloved friends is to hold fast to the sunnat-i saniyya and to refrain from bidats. The Islamic din has been becoming gharib and weak. Muslims are now forlorn. From now on it will go on being gharib, too. This will go so far that there will not be anybody left on earth to say "Allah." It has been said that Doomsday will come when there are no longer any good people on the earth and evil has spread everywhere...The happiest, the most fortunate person is he who recovers one of the forgotten sunnats and annihilates one of the widespread bidats during a time when irreligiousness is on the increase...**To strengthen Islam anytime, especially when Islam has become so weak, it is necessary to spread the sunnats and demolish the bidats. Former Islamic savants, maybe having seen some beauty in the bidats, gave some of them the name of hasana. But this faqir does not follow them in this respect; I do not regard any of the bidats as beautiful. I**

see all of them as dark and cloudy. Our Prophet declared: “All bidats are aberration, deviation from the right way.” During such a time as this when Islam has become weak, I see that salvation and escaping from Hell depends on holding fast to the sunnat; and the destruction of the din is, no matter how, in falling for any bidat. I understand that each bidat is like a pickaxe used to demolish the building of Islam and all sunnats are like brilliant stars guiding you on a dark night. May Allahu ta'ala give enough reason to the hodjas of our time so that they will not say that any bidat is beautiful or permit any bidat to be committed. They should not tolerate bidats even if they seem to illuminate darkness like the rising of the sun! For, the satans do their work easily outside the sunnats. In earlier times, Islam being strong, the darkness of bidats were not conspicuous, but, maybe, along with the world-wide powerful light of Islam, some of the darkness passed as being bright. Therefore, they were said to be beautiful. In fact, those bidats did not have any brightness or beauty, either. **But now, Islam having become weak and disbelievers customs and even the symptoms of disbelief having become settled among Muslims, each bidat has displayed its harm, and Islam, without anyone noticing it, has been slipping away. Our hodjas should be most vigilant in this respect, and they should not pioneer the spreading of bidats by saying, “It is permissible to do so and so,” or “Such and such things are not harmful,” by putting forward old fatwas.** (*The Collected Letters of Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindi*, Volume II, Letter 23)

While the modern view of Sufism perceives it as welcoming to experimentation in religious and spiritual practices, this superficial understanding ignores the core sufi tenets, of which four spiritual stages are to be experienced by the adherent. Of the four, *shariat* comprises the first, and is therefore unquestionably fundamental to the sufi way of life. This means, as one can easily deduce, that the rigid dictates of the Quran and Hadith must be studied and followed by the sufi, including the call to avoid bidats that go against the dogmas of Islam. Consequently, we can see how the Sufism practised by Sirhindi represents the truer – Islam's inverted idea of truth – type, with his constant stress on shariat and the abandonment of the innovations found in the more blatantly apostate forms of Sufism that we will discuss. Indeed, the very fact that shariat is the initial ‘spiritual’ stage indicates that the Asuric poison of Islamic teaching will be planted among even the unconsciously apostate sufis, the ones who renegade from certain unalterable principles found in the Quran and authentic hadith yet still believe themselves proponents of Islam.

Thus although we find certain sufis participating in bhajans or meditating on – as will be discussed – the ‘essential’ oneness of Allah, often in a secluded retreat from the ordinary earthly life, it does not mean that these sufis are friendly to adherents of the Sanatana Dharma, because the falsehoods of permanent separation and hatred, learned through years and years of shariat indoctrination, are very difficult to extricate oneself from – if indeed the sufi actually desires that liberation! By accepting shariat as a mandatory part of spirituality, sufis will assume falsehoods like the slaughter of unbelievers, or the acquisition of sexual slaves, as *necessary* components of enlightenment – at least as far as *believing* in their ‘spiritual’ veracity, even if the sufi does not actually partake in these Islamic ‘truths’. Because of this requirement of shariat, sufis throughout subcontinental history have at the very minimum extolled the virtue of jihad, with a famous Suhrawardi sufi of the 13th century, Saiyid Nuru’d-Din Mubarak Ghaznavi, outlining the appropriate course of action that a genuine Muslim ruler should take against the kuffar:

Another important khalifa of Shaikh Shihabu’d-Din Suhrawardi was Saiyid Nuru’d-Din Mubarak Ghaznawi...by the time he reached Delhi he was at the height of his fame...Protection of the religion of Islam by rulers was only possibly by following four principles. Those who abided by them would be rewarded however sinful a life they had led, by being counted, on Judgement Day, among the **prophets and saints. Saiyid Nuru’d-Din Mubarak's definition of**

Muslims excluded non-Sunnis. His four principles for the protection of Islam were as follows:

1. They (rulers) should promote Islamic customs, **promulgate the commands of the Sharia**, enforcing what is ordained and prohibiting what is forbidden by it, and **uproot kufr, shirk and idolatry. If they cannot fully uproot kufr and shirk they should make every effort to disgrace and humiliate Hindus, mushriks (Polytheists) and idolaters, for they are inveterate enemies of God and the Prophet Mohammed. They should not tolerate the sight of Hindus**, and in particular they should exterminate Brahmans, who are the leaders of the heretics and disseminators of heresy. They should not allow kafirs and mushriks to lead an honourable life or assign to them high office.
2. Sins, debauchery and adultery should not be openly committed in Islamic towns...
3. The duty of the enforcement of Sharia should be entrusted to the pious, and God-fearing offices who have **expert knowledge of Sharia and Tariqa**, and should not be given to the untrustworthy or self-seeker. **Philosophers should be banished and the teaching of philosophy prohibited in Islamic territories. The irreligious and the enemies of Sunni beliefs that is, Shi'is, should be mercilessly disgraced and should not receive government posts.**
4. Justice should be strictly dispensed... (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, pp. 194-95)

Mubarak's guidelines are quite close to the dictates of the Asura of Falsehood's Islam, with Polytheists and idolaters assigned humiliation, with Shiakuffar and "philosophers" likewise to be disgraced; for the latter two are also enemies of Islam - the philosophers guilty of attempting to view the world according to the more fluid rational mind when Islam is about simple obedience to infrarational doctrine. While Mubarak is close to the Islamic truth in his demand that philosophers be exiled, he should have gone a step further by demanding the triple choice of death, conversion or jizya upon both the blasphemous philosophers and the kuffar Hindus and Shi'ites: He also failed to realize the irony in glorifying *tariqat*, the second stage of the sufi path, one which we will shortly find to be full of heretical notions and requirements. Nonetheless, Mubarak's screed is a great example of the sufis - supposedly the guardians of 'tolerant' Islam - promoting the shariat call to hatred and violence against the Hindus, a bloody denouement that can only emerge after the mentality has been brainwashed into believing its ideology to be the only truth, a falsehood that one would expect a 'saint' to reject. Unfortunately, the majority of sufis take their shariat instruction to heart, with the famous sufi Ali Hujwari describing the extreme importance of the Asuric mantra known as the shahada:

Rejection of the Law is heresy, and rejection of the Truth is infidelity and polytheism. Any (proper) separation between them is made, not to establish a difference of meaning, but to affirm the Truth, as when it is said: "The words *there is no god save Allah* are Truth, and the words *Muhammad is the Apostle of Allah* are Law." No one can separate the one from the other without impairing his faith, and it is vain to wish to do so. In short, the Law is a branch of the Truth: knowledge of God is Truth, and obedience to His command is Law. (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwari, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, pp. 139-40)

From this alone we can gather that Hujwari, hugely important to the spread of Sufism in the Indian subcontinent, can hardly have been expected to be respectful or friendly towards the Sanatana Dharma when he did not even believe in the existence of Hindu names for God. From this basic Islamic bigotry came Hujwari's belief in the religious obligation of jihad against non-Muslims, a demand that he never himself fulfilled, yet believed necessary for fellow sufi dervishes to potentially engage in if travelling:

When a dervish chooses to travel, not to reside, he ought to observe the following rules. In the

first place, he must travel for God's sake, not for pleasure, and as he journeys outwardly, so he should flee inwardly from his sensual affections; and he must always keep himself in a state of purity and not neglect his devotions; **and his object in travelling must be either pilgrimage or war (against infidels) or to see a (holy) site or to derive instruction** or to seek knowledge or to visit a venerable person, a Shaykh, or the tomb of a saint; otherwise his journey will be faulty. (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 345)

While the visit to a saint's tomb is a common sufi blasphemy that we will later discuss, Hujwari was at least able to accurately promote migration for the cause of jihad. Similarly did Ziya'u'd-Din Barani, a famous sufi disciple of Auliya, demand that the Islamic ruler comply with Quran and Hadith provisions:

The Badshah-i Islam (Muslim Ruler) to Barani could not justify his existence and his divine commission without depriving Hindus of higher posts and by forcing the Brahmans (whom he compared to the Muslim ulama) into bankruptcy and social misery. Those who departed from orthodox Sunnism and most notably the Ismailis and Muslim philosophers were to be annihilated, so as to glorify Sunni Islam in India and to make it the leading religion. According to Barani this made the autocratic form of rule of the Delhi sultans justified and religious. ...Barani was both a sufi and a courtier... (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume II, p. 359)

Barani was able to rightly identify death as the correct outcome for the non-Sunnis and philosophers, many of whom, ironically, have historically comprised sufi ranks. Barani not only wished to impoverish the Brahmans, but all Hindus as well:

Perhaps the most interesting personality of all the Shaikh's disciples was Ziya'u'd-Din Barani, the author of the well-known *Tarikh-i Firuz Shahi*...He urged the Sultans to reserve high office for only eminent Saiyids and Shaikhs. **Hindus should be deprived of their wealth, Barani believed, and philosophers and non-Sunnis should be liquidated.** (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 174)

Shaykh Nizamuddin Auliya, as expected, failed to dissuade Barani of these opinions, since they were in accordance with the Quran and Hadith. Similarly, another famous sufi of the Chistiyya order, Gisu Daraz, received no guidance to the contrary in his view that Islam must spread everywhere, which as we know is the command of Allah recorded in the Quran:

Gisu Daraz laid down the following guidelines...The truly spiritual ruler should be compassionate and just to the weak and disadvantaged amongst his subjects, and should appoint only the most honest of men to his administration. **Such a king should also be unceasing in the spreading of Islam** (literally God's word). (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 255)

That the spread of Islam is accompanied by the triple threat of death, forced conversion or jizya is irrelevant to the sufis, who by believing shariat to be a necessary component of *spirituality*, will then take murder and rape as 'divinely' ordained and therefore 'enlightened' patterns of human activity. In another, more curious example, we find the sufi father and son combination of Shaikh Abdul Quddus and Shaikh Ruknu'd-din imploring the Islamic rulers of their time to isolate and demean the Hindu kuffar, with the former demanding jizya be imposed on the Hindus:

Moreover a letter written by the Shaikh to Babur indicates that they were acquainted with each other...While requesting the Emperor to honour, ulama, aima, and the weak, the Shaikh commented...No kafir should be appointed to any post in the diwan of a Muslim capital or

should hold offices such as amirs and amil. **Kafirs should be forced to pay regular revenue and taxes on their agricultural and commercial undertakings, their dress should differ from Muslims, their worship should be in secret and they should not openly indulge in heretical practices...Equal treatment with Muslims was not to be given in the interests of Islam.** (*Maktubat-i Quddusiyya*, pp. 236-37) ...Another letter was written by Shaikh Abdul-Quddus to Prince Humayan recommending that he accord honourable status to the ulama and holy men...Shaikh Ruknu'd-Din was, however, critical of Humayun's religious policy. The *Lata'if-i Quddusi* was commenced a month before his father's death and completed after it. **In it Humayun was accused of not making a distinction between the *kufir* and Islam.** (pp 79-81). (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, pp. 345-46)

Remarkable is this particular display of Islamic piety, because the sufis in question are, as later to be presented, two of the more blatant hypocrites that Sufism has ever produced – as both of them believed in the Yogin experience of *jivan-mukta* even as they demanded the Hindus to be kept in a degraded status! This bizarre sufi fusion, for the Hindu, is absolutely useless in the ordinary setting, because the possible sufi belief in *jivan-mukta* is a personal one, while their societal beliefs involve the humiliation and domination of the Hindus. Indeed another sufi, Shah Waliullah, in addition to demanding that the Islamic leader treat the infidels like “animals”, proposed that such extreme duress would then lead the Hindus to convert to Islam:

Perhaps the most important duty of an Imam, asserted Shah Waliullah, was to make his religion dominant over others. In this mission he should not be expected to spare an opponent's honour or shield him from humiliation. The performance of the Imam's duties, according to the Shah, would divide his subjects into three categories:

1. **Those who would be both outwardly and inwardly obedient to his religion.**
2. Those outwardly obedient to the Imam and powerless to rebel.
3. **Despicable infidels whom the Imam would treat like animals. These should be spared only to work as agricultural labourers and beasts of burden, and would be required to pay jizya in a state of utter humiliation...It is also imperative that the Imam should forbid members of other faiths from publicly performing their own rites. Moreover infidels should not be treated on an equal footing with Muslims...Such disabilities might prompt Infidels to embrace Islam.** (Shah Waliullah, *Izalat al-khafa*, I, pp 256-57) (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume II, p. 379)

While these citations from various sufis show the prevalence of the literalist – and thus correct - interpretation of Islamic scripture corrupting the minds of the sufis into Asuric falsehood, even the sufis who attempt a symbolic reading of the Quran still manage to denigrate Hindu beliefs:

Sufis applied an esoteric meaning to verses in the Quran which related to repentance, abstinence, renunciation, poverty, patience, trust in God, satisfaction, fear, hope etc. The main aim of their lives was to rid themselves of hypocrisy and lust – to them latent forms of polytheism. (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 60)

That the sufis can read the Quran and take it as a doctrine on removing lust is quite extraordinary, for nowhere in the Quran do we find Allah admonishing Mohammed's obscene lust; in fact, numerous verses attesting to Mohammed's – and Muslim's – ‘divine’ right to sexual slaves and multiple wives ultimately only encourage Islamic sexual depravity. But it is the sufi view that lust and hypocrisy are forms of Polytheism that provides an important example of the failure of Sufism to truly encourage samata, since Polytheism is perfectly valid, a function of God's inherent ability to fashion Himself into infinite Gods or Godheads, and at once remain entirely One: After all, He – or She – or It – is Immortal

and Omnipotent. That the sufis cannot ascertain the truth of Polytheism speaks to their limited mystical knowledge of the Divine; that they in turn accept Islamic falsehoods as truths again illustrates why it remains difficult to take the sufi experiences seriously, as to rigidly separate swaths of mankind into the category of denizens of afterlife torture, is to go against the United Reality of the Purusha which is beyond pain and pleasure.

Yet is their cursory similarity to the Yogin and Gurus helpful in providing an important benefit to the causes of *both* Sufism and Islam, for it helps to mask the internal beliefs of the sufi, including the shariat that motivates them to convert the ‘impure’ infidel and justifies their use of dissimulation in doing so. While the commonplace ideal of the sufi Shaikh - the type Sirhindi would have railed against – is markedly divergent to the reality of the majority of famous sufi saints, the rare examples of the former are, because of their instruction in the shariat, certainly close enough to real Islam to the point where they may feel galvanized enough to try and convert the Hindu. Nevertheless, it is precisely due to this minority of barely ‘tolerant’ saints, who in reality have minimal influence over the orthodox Muslims, that Sufism, even after centuries of sufi-initiated or assisted violence inspired by the message of the Quran and Hadith, can still be used as propaganda for the myth of a tolerant Islam. That Sufism can so confuse people is due to a selective reading of some of the astonishing beliefs of its self-professed adherents, including a famous saint of Sirhindi's same Naqshbandi order:

The Muslim intellectuals believed that some prophets had been sent to India, but a fierce controversy raged as to their identification. Later, during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the Mujaddid (Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindi, 1564-1624) also considered that prophets had come to India, although the Indians generally had ignored their teachings. According to him, the Hindu works on divine being had been plagiarized from the works of ancient prophets. He asserted that the terms ‘prophet’ and ‘apostle’ occurred only in Arabic and Persian and had no Indian equivalents. Consequently, the Indians had no perception concerning prophets. The Mujaddid did not believe that Rama and Krishna were prophets and could not tolerate the suggestion that they were divine names. **Mirza Mazhar Jan-i Janan (d. 1781), however, a distinguished sufi scholar of the Mujaddis's sufic order, accepted both Rama and Krishna as prophets. He also glossed over Hindu idol-worship, although he considered any Hindus who persisted in their faith in Rama and Krishna after the advent of Islam to be infidels who had departed from the right path.** (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The Wonder that was India*, Volume II, p. 256)

Mazhar's belief that Rama and Krishna were prophets establishes him as an apostate, for nowhere in the Quran or Hadith do we find any mention of the two as prophets. To declare as prophets anyone other than those identified by Allah, in his final ‘revealed’ scripture, is to innovate into the Islamic religion, especially when we consider the differing contents between the Hindu Avatars and the mono-ego-theistic Arab messengers. Mazhar's attempt to absolve himself of heresy, by declaring those persisting in their belief of Rama and Krishna to be infidels, is of no avail, as his deviation struck at one of the key elements of the Islamic religion, that God *cannot* take human birth as Himself, and that prophets or messengers – unlike Sri Krishna especially – are mere mortals. It was a confusion as to what constitutes Islam, a relapse into the ancient ways, that Mazhar had fallen into. Yet even as a hypocrite who accepted historic proponents of *shirk* into the Muslim fold as prophets, he still believed himself a true Muslim trying to bring infidels into the right path of Islam, and his cosmetic acknowledgement – with major caveats – of Rama and Krishna's existence, can be used by some as a sign of Sufism's “tolerance” or even “acceptance”!

That the heresy of Mazhar and other wayward sufis could emerge in the first place is related to the very idea that there exist ‘spiritual’ stages beyond shariat, since shariat *alone* should form the basis of the way Muslims must live. To include three other separate stages is only likely to lead to blasphemy,

especially when these three – *tariqat*, *haqiqat*, and *marifat* - are not defined as orthodox to the religion. Thus to fulfil them without straying from austere Islam becomes an arduous task, one difficult for even the most rigid of personality types. From these three stages arise the bidats so feared by Sirhindi, the reflex to Hindu and ancient West Asian mysticism that defined the lands trampled upon by Asuric Islam. Indeed, the second stage of tariqat is rooted in pre-Islamic occult and mystic practices, with the original name of those now called sufis helping us to understand how tariqat became so important. For Sufism has been known throughout history as *tasawwuf*, the path of the woolen-clothed. As one can infer, the description highlighted the historic dress of the sufis, especially those in the early centuries of Islam: the attire in question is also universal to the ascetic path both ancient and modern. It was this asceticism that characterized the sufis of those times, with the medieval traditions surviving to present day. As with the vast majority of ascetic paths of which the pre-Islamic West Asian world was quite familiar, the sufis continued a pattern involving seclusion and retreat from the world, with sufis frequently residing in monasteries where the novice or intermediary spiritual seeker, the *murid*, is guided by a master, the *pir*. While the relationship between a pir (or Shaykh or Sayyid) and the junior murid is not explicitly banned in the Quran or Hadith, the practice of monasticism – known in Mohammed's time to be associated with such relationships – is distinctly prohibited:

Then We caused Our messengers to follow in their footsteps; and We caused Jesus, son of Mary, to follow, and gave him the Gospel, and placed compassion and mercy in the hearts of those who followed him. **But monasticism they invented - We ordained it not for them - only seeking Allah's pleasure, and they observed it not with right observance. So We give those of them who believe their reward, but many of them are evil-livers.** (Quran 57:27)

By the infrarational word of the Quran, the countless monasteries (*khanqahs*) founded by sufis throughout the centuries marks them as guilty of heresy from Islam, as their construction is forbidden by Allah. The pir-murid relationship even in its superficial appearance also presents another likely bidat; after all, nowhere in the Quran or authentic hadith do we find Mohammed taking the guidance of an earthly spiritual master; neither do we find a record of him being initiated – like the Polytheists of the classical West Asian and European mysteries, or the Hindus – into a spiritual order through which he became linked to a master or Guru. Sufi orders, on the other hand, are conspicuous by these rituals:

Though baiya or formal initiation, disciples were inextricably spiritually linked to their pirs. In order to solemnize the occasion, the pir would place his hand on the disciple's head, or alternately, the ritual involved the grasping of each other's hands. (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 102)

While there is no support for these sort of rituals – and especially the position of pir – within the Islamic scripture, some sufis like to use the following Asuric revelation to justify the pir-murid partnership:

Surely those who swear allegiance to you do but swear allegiance to Allah; the hand of Allah is above their hands. Therefore whoever breaks (his faith), he breaks it only to the injury of his own soul, and whoever fulfils what he has covenanted with Allah, He will grant him a mighty reward. (Quran 48:10)

To take this verse as ‘revealed’ evidence of the pir-murid relationship is sophistry on the part of the sufis, because the allegiance being sworn to Mohammed (and *only* the Prophet) is clearly that of a soldier to his general: indeed the chapter in question is entitled “Victory” - of the terrestrial variety, to be obtained militarily against the kuffar. Mohammed is not functioning in this verse as a spiritual guide, because the infrarational revelations have already told Muslims that there is no more ‘spiritual knowledge’ to be sought after, since the *entire* ‘truth’ has been encapsulated within the Quran. Mohammed is also recorded as being a “mortal”, without the occult powers – as will be examined

shortly – attributed to sufi masters. Additionally, it is important to re-emphasize that Mohammed was neither the *pir* nor the *murid*, for as we recall, there was no *corporeal* spiritual instructor with him in the cave of Hira, and while his initial behaviour was similar to the practices undertaken by sufis, it cannot be equated with *tariqat* because the only entity ‘spiritually’ guiding him was the Asura of Falsehood masked as the angel Gabriel.

The complete lack of evidence for Mohammed having a worldly spiritual master should instantly hint to the sufis of the innovative nature to their stage of *tariqa*, especially with the Quran's clear rejection of monasticism. That the practice developed in Sufism is strictly related to the classical mysticism of West Asia predating Islam, as much of the growth of Sufism emerging in modern day Levant, Iraq, Persia and Transoxiana - areas that had a rich mix of cultures including Zoroastrianism, Buddhism and monastic Christianity from which the West Asian mystics fused Islam to create their heretical faith. Thus the ancient culture, which only a few centuries after Islam's advent was nearly eradicated from public life within these lands, was able to survive in mutated form through the sufi “Muslim” sect. The continuation of the now forbidden – after Islam's dominance was established - practices was best maintained by an individualized, one-on-one, basis, a historic method used to transmit mystic secrets well before the creation of the written word. It is a mechanism seen to this day in the Guru-Sadhak pairing, a somewhat similar interaction to the heretical sufi sect's designation of a *pir* and a *murid*. The Guru is supposed to be the Divine Consciousness – after It takes control of an earthly body, vital and mental triple unit - dispassionately helping the *sadhak* progress on the spiritual quest. The *pir*, like the comparable yet ultimately distinct Guru, is likewise tasked with ‘spiritually’ instructing the *murid* through a variety of means. Some techniques used by the *pir* to instruct his *murid* appear benign in terms of their potential heresy to Islam, whether that be the use of *awrads* (the series of prayers specific to that sufi order) or *mujahida*, defined below:

Mujahida, or self-mortification performed under the guidance of a *pir*, strictly adhered to Sharia and was designed to achieve purification of the soul. (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 100)

Self-mortification, while not categorically rejected in the Islamic scripture, is conversely neither authenticated, and its more gruesome outcomes will on their own lead the pious Muslims to suspect the customs of the sufis. From the standpoint of an actual spiritual practice, self-mortification is completely useless for the purification of human behaviour – let alone the Soul! That the sufi *pirs* think the Soul is something in need of purification immediately speaks to their lack of mystic knowledge, because the Purusha is Unblemished, beyond the ignorance of the mortal world. And as most human impurities are vital or mind based, the use of physical self-punishment represents, at best, a fleeting remedy. If *mujahida* will raise the eyebrows of the pious by its grotesqueness, different sufi rituals venture into heretical territory by virtue of their close association with the Sanatana Dharma. For instance take the practice of *zikr*, the remembrance of Allah, which involves the control of one's breathing:

Zikr was performed both communally and **in seclusion**. The former enabled senior disciples to supervise the progress of their juniors. The *zikr-i khaif*, recollection performed either mentally or in a low voice, was recommended by the Naqshbandis; the Qadiriyya and the Chishtiyya generally performed *zikr-i jali*, which was recited aloud. Both forms of *zikr* involved control of the breath and over inhalation and exhalation. (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 101)

The control of breathing is known in yogic practice as *pranayama*, and fails to be seen in either the Quran or authentic hadith, indicating the blasphemous nature of Sufism's version of *zikr*, which although in its mental form of simple remembrance appears harmless for the Muslim, is actually on its own dangerously close to heresy, since the full extent of sufi *zikr* is to expel everything *separating* the individual from God. Islam, we recall, only strengthens the separation, with all of humanity assigned to

Paradise or Hell, with nobody capable of consciously uniting with Allah. Similarly does Islam reject the principle of secluded worship, demanding that real Muslims participate in multiple obligatory congregational prayers. The sufis on the other hand, often use the principles of yogic paths, primarily designed for private application, to organize their own rituals, with the founder of the Naqshbandi order in particular guilty of this:

A significant sufi order named Silsila-i Khwajgan, which thrived mainly in Transoxiana and later in India in its re-organized form, was known as the Naqshbandiyya. It traced its origin from Khwaja Abu Yaqub Yusuf al-Hamadani...of his four disciples, Khwaja Abdul-Khaliq bin Abdul-Jamil, who came from Ghujduwan..was the true originator of the unique features of the Silsila-i Khwajgan.

Shaikh Ghujduwani wrote works both in Persian prose and poetry and compiled several treatises. A collection of his sayings, *Masaliku'l-Arafîn*, advocated that his disciples should acquire a precise learning of the Quran, Hadis and Fiqh...**The writings of Shaikh Ghujduwani were founded on the Sharia but his eight principles of sufi life and the rituals he advocated were largely based on yogic practices, current in the Bukhara region.** (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 95)

As these principles of yogic life have been passed down throughout each Naqshbandi generation, we will find the same Islamic crime of religious innovation in modern Naqshbandi sufis, even if *some* of the rituals are performed away from public view. While the blasphemous details of different sufi rituals will be discussed later, the fundamental reason for their deviance from Islam returns us to the pir-murid relationship, in which the pir is tasked with guiding the murid to a state of existence far different to the afterlife Paradise that is supposed to be the only panacea for the pious:

During a mystic journey certain conditions such as *qabz* (contraction), *bast* (dilation) and illumination, descended into the heart **from God** through divine grace. **Only a perfect pir understood the significances of these states and was able to discriminate between a true illumination and the appearance of one, which in reality was a delusion emanating from the devil.** Thirdly, the sufi journey of a novice from the intellectual perception of God to an emotional involvement with Him was a personal experience, **a mystery to be shared only with a perfect guide. These experiences could be revealed only to one's pir.** (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, pp. 99-100)

Thus even the use of *awrads* is specifically for this attempt at an “emotional involvement” with Allah, or an “illumination” that is supposed to have been forever enshrined in the Islamic scripture and therefore does not require a pir to access. Rizvi's description of the pir's engagement with the murid is much closer to the Guru-Sadhak interaction than anything found in Islam, albeit with the significant difference that from the Hindu perspective, experiences discriminated as being ‘untrue’ do not necessarily mean they emerge from the devil, because there are a myriad of possibilities in between the evil Asuric experiences and those of the Divine – quickly assigning false or half-lights to the devil once more illustrates the paucity of sufi mystic knowledge. Nevertheless, to the murid at least, the pir is all-knowing, indispensable even, someone worthy of endless praise:

In Jamada I, 718/July 1318, Khusraw completed the *Nuh-Sipih*r (Nine Skies). It consisted of panegyrics to Mubarak Shah Khalji. It also described buildings constructed by him, **praised India and the achievements of Hinduism in relation to metaphysics** and linguistics, made mention of planets and to a host of other historical and sociological subjects. **Copious praise heaped on Shaikh Nizamu'd-Din Auliya by his disciple tended to emphasize his belief that a pir was indispensable in the pursuit of a sufi path.** (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 170)

Once more, the sufi misunderstanding – deliberate or not – of real Islam is present, with Khusraw praising Hindu metaphysics, a subject matter involving the reality of Polytheism or at least – if we recall the Gods as Personalities of Brahma - the exultation of a God not *named* Allah. To then praise the kafir religion sends the “Muslim” into dangerous territory, even if the believer in question, Khusraw, penned numerous paeans to genocidal Islamic emperors. Additionally is it precarious to excessively praise or honour another mortal, as Khusraw did with Auliya and as all murids do with their pirs, sometimes by the practice of kissing their master's feet, which in Auliya's illegal khanqah was done on a regular basis, including one example in which the heresy of exalting solitary prayer over the congregational was also indulged:

I obtained the benefit of kissing the master's feet. The topic of conversation turned to reciting the Quran and staying up throughout the night. At that time there was a group observing the all-night prayer vigil in the mosque. “If one stayed up all night in one's home,” I asked, “what would be the result?” **“To recite one portion of the Quran at home,” he replied, “is better than to recite the whole Quran in a mosque!”** (*Fawaid ul-Faud, The conversations of Hazrat Khwaja Nizamuddin Auliya as recorded by Khwaja Amir Hasan 'Ala Sijz, Assembly 24*)

Auliya himself was also guilty of attaching an excessive importance to Baba Farid, his own pir:

The severity of Baba Farid's tutelage is also clearly depicted in the following story. The Baba was teaching his disciples from a defective copy of *Awarifu 'l-Ma 'arif* and at the same time taking great care to correct the errors. His pupil remarked that the Baba's brother, Shaikh Najibu'd-Din Mutwakkil, had a more perfect copy of the work. Baba Farid reacted vehemently against such a suggestion, which appeared to him to imply an inability on his part to correct the copy. The Shaikh (Nizamu'd-Din Auliya) was amazed when he discovered this...Falling at his master's feet, he apologized profusely. The Baba was unsatisfied, however, and **in despair his disciple contemplated taking his own life.** Finally, due to the supplication of one of his sons, the Baba relented... (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 158)

That a “Muslim” would consider taking his own life due to the anger of another mortal, speaks to the inability of that “Muslim” to have removed non-Islamic idolatry from his own life, because the only idols a pure Muslim should excessively attach himself to, are the Quran, Mohammed and Ka'ba. And this sort of attachment to another mortal is unlikely to happen with the scripturally approved Imam, who guides his flock under strictly *religious*, rather than spiritual terms. Thus the Imam, having suppressed his own personality, is supposed to instruct according to the Quran and authentic hadith, although the believer can also – with the exception of attending mandatory congregational prayer – subsist alone as long as he can read, and interpret *literally*, the Quran and authentic hadith. The pir on the other hand, transgresses beyond the scripture, incorporating bidats to instruct his murids, and thus assumes an *individualized* religious importance because the murid – unlike with the Quran and Hadith - cannot *on his own* access the pir's personalized religious knowledge. And if some sufis simply engage in excessive and therefore inappropriate praise of the shaykhs, others, such as Abdul Quddus, go as far as boldly claiming that those without a human pir are the disciples of Satan!

Quoting the sufi belief that those who had no human pir were disciples of the devil, in a Hindi verse the Shaikh said that if a blind man led another blind man, both were bound to fall into a well. A ceaseless effort was needed to find the perfect guru whom the Shaikh likened to a diamond mind. (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, pp. 341-42)

The Quran and Hadith, however, only recognize the status of the Imam, an *earthly* religious and political leader of Muslims; there is no mention of a mystic guide who instructs a disciple with knowledge obtained from sources other than the Quran or the authentic tradition of Mohammed. The Imams are meant to be robotic extensions of Gabriel's infrarational word and Mohammed's barbaric

actions - nothing more. These facts in themselves are enough to establish tariqa as a heretical innovation, because the pir is using non-Islamic principles to *religiously* guide a “Muslim”. Even more support can be found, however, by recalling simple facts of Mohammed's lifetime, including his companions having never been recorded prostrating before him, and the reality that Mohammed *never* had an earthly Guru or pir or master or spiritual instructor. His infrarational experiences were obtained by his own practice, and as the Asura of Falsehood made him the last prophet, Muslims are technically not even supposed to imitate his *occult* endeavours, since the purpose of such a path has already been *permanently* discovered by Mohammed, and mankind was informed – as we will later review - that similar efforts were subsequently illegal.

While Mohammed's infrarational experiences were certainly of the *supraphysical* variety (rather than experiences superior to the ordinary *mental* regions), we must remember that they were both infrarational and *revelatory* in nature, which meant he was merely *seeing* and *receiving* the ‘Word’ and scenes cultivated by the Asura of Falsehood. Mohammed did not, other than a handful of exceptions, engage in the personal use of occult powers; he was passive in the occult domain while active in the terrestrial plane, where he brought warfare and genocide to the Infidels of the Arabian peninsula. Sufis, on the other hand, are primarily the opposite, failing to fulfil their terrestrial Islamic duty of jihad yet vigorously attempting to obtain *subliminal* powers and occult experiences similar or higher to those witnessed by Mohammed from the cave of Hira onward. Consequently, we find the proliferation of magical sufi tales of supraphysical feats, from those – previously cited - attributed to the Moinuddin Chishti, to other astonishing feats including Nizamuddin Auliya's procurement of a flying camel for daily travel to the Ka’ba idol in Arabia:

Still bearing the marks of his exile, Amir Khwurd decided to unburden his personal frustrations by writing biographies of the Chishti saints. He wrote a detailed biography of Shaikh Nizamu’d-Din Auliya, with reference to his many disciples and to his teachings. His material was based on first-hand information and he had access to the papers of the great Shaikh. This task was performed by Amir Khwurd with tremendous enthusiasm and devotion. Carefully he tried to avoid details of miracles and supernatural feats, much in demand at the time, but could not restrain himself from recording that each night during Shaikh's lifetime a flying camel had stopped at the window to take Nizamu’d-Din Auliya to the Ka’ba and bring him back in time for early breakfast. (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, pp. 9-10)

While the veracity of this particular anecdote is easily questioned, it nevertheless shows the extent of the subcontinental “Muslim” populace desire for these type of stories, a fascination that continues – albeit somewhat reduced - to this day, with different occult supraphysical powers attributed to the sufi's personal realm, including gifts beyond the mere control of separate objects or animals:

No account of Shaikh Safiud-Din's activities at Uch remains. An anecdote, related to his disciples by Shaikh Nizamu’d-Din Auliya, gives an interesting account of the Shaikh's encounter with a yogi. According to the story, a yogi visited Shaikh Safiu’d-Din at Uch and challenged him to a competitive performance of miracles. The tale continues that the yogi began an exhibition of supernatural powers by flying to the ceiling and returning safely to the ground. When it was his turn, Shaikh Safiu’d-Din prayed to God, begging Him for some miraculous power. Then, leaving the room, he flew to the west, the north and the south, returning to the room and the awestruck yogi. Although he himself could bodily rise in a perpendicular position as a result of powers achieved through his own spiritual exercises, the yogi admitted that the Shaikh's performance emanated from divine grace and was therefore miraculous. (Amir Hasan Sijzi, *Fawaidul Fuad*, Bulandshahr 1855-56, pp 57-58) (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, pp. 111-12)

There should not have been any need for Safiu’d-Din to beg Allah for a miracle, because a real Muslim

would have already retained the 'truth' of the Islamic scripture. If he was to have engaged the 'yogi' in any way, it should have been by offering the kafir a choice between converting to Islam, paying the jizya, or death. The sufi should not have been impressed with his supraphysical powers, because nowhere in the Quran are those mentioned as belonging to the mortal or of comprising an Islamic 'truth'. And the 'yogi' in question cannot be described as such, because the Yogin are those who have attained a Consciousness beyond the mortal one, a state free of the earthly defects of ambition, vanity and lust, to name a few. Liberated, especially, should they be from the error of spiritual ambition and vanity; to engage in these two can lead a Yogi to experience a fall from his or her previously achieved elevation in consciousness, as the boasting of supraphysical powers – seen in this example – is a clear sign that the mortal ego remains active, without the transformation or purification that *must* take place in order to permanently live in the Eternal Consciousness without any possibility of a fall.

Yoga is for either the removal, or the Divine transformation, of the ego, not for its aggrandizement. A sign of a Yogi instead of a charlatan is precisely this lack of ego, which means there should be no displays of spiritual vanity by way of a useless utilization of accessible occult powers. Neither, especially, should there be the ambition of being known as a famous "yogi" who can perform miracles or awe crowds. Any unnecessary displays of occult powers should immediately signal to the seeker that the "yogi" or "guru" in question either only has a partial light or is a charlatan. It is not to say that Self-Realized individuals cannot be famous, just that they should lack *desire* for the fame, and therefore should *never* actively seek it. That fame might arrive at their doorsteps should only materialize due to Prakriti's understanding that it remains a mechanism for spiritual seekers to find a Guru far from their immediate vicinity. That there is no concurrent criticism within Sufism of the fame afforded their pirs, or the incessant need to attribute vain powers to them, provides more evidence of Sufism's inability to free its adherents from the ensnarement of ego, regardless of sufi mystic claims – soon to be analysed – of a 'unity' with God. The sufis also gravely err - from the proper path of Islam - in granting such a special status to the shaykhs and sayyids. This ongoing sin has upset numerous Muslims, including other sufis, throughout Sufism's history, with the aforementioned Ali Hujwari, also known in the subcontinent as Data Ganj Bakhsh, expressing disgust over the idolization of saints within the subcontinental Muslim community:

The *Kashf al-Mahjub* suggests that in the eleventh century a number of mystics and scholars who had settled in Lahore were strongly hostile to the views of its author. A scholar, who Hujwari fails to name, an expert in Quranic commentaries, sharply disagreed with his interpretation of fana and baqa. According to the scholar, baqa indicated God's subsistence in man. Some Lahore sufis believed that gnosis emanated from inspiration; Hujwari disparagingly called this view 'Brahmanical.' Moreover he accused some Muslims of not accepting what he saw as the higher status of prophets. To Hujwari's dissatisfaction they advocated that the saints were superior to prophets. These developments so distressed Hujwari that he considered himself a 'captive among uncongenial folk' in Lahore. (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 113)

Though this critique is valid from the orthodox perspective, Hujwari, like many sufis, was afflicted with the inability to reconcile his *own* blasphemy and glorification of saints with that of his criticism of the apostate notions he encountered. For Hujwari, while not raising the sufi saints above the prophets, attributed to them – and himself - heretical and innovative features well beyond what Islam permits Muslims, including the placement of sufi saints above the angels in a spiritual hierarchy:

The whole community of orthodox Moslems and all the Sufi Shaykhs agree that the prophets and such of the saints as are guarded from sin are superior to the angels. The opposite view is held by the Mu'tazilites, who declare that the angels are superior to the prophets, being of more exalted rank, of more subtle constitution, and more obedient to God. I

reply that this is not as you imagine, for an obedient body, an exalted rank, and a subtle constitution cannot be causes of superiority, which belongs only to those on whom God has bestowed it. (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 239)

While the superiority of the prophets to the angels is highly debatable, since the angels – according to Islam – facilitated the communication of Allah's infrarational word and thus should be considered one grade closer to Allah, orthodox Muslims will have absolutely no consideration for saints, because there is no such thing as a saint in the Islamic scripture! To then place this innovated category of sufi 'saints' above the scripturally sanctioned Angels, is in itself a flagrant bidat. Worse still is the range of powers alleged by Hujwiri and different 'saints' to themselves, as vividly described by the former, who remains one of rump Pakistan's most revered sufis:

God has made the Saints the governors of the universe; they have become entirely devoted to His business, and have ceased to follow their sensual affections. Through the blessing of their advent the rain falls from heaven, and through the purity of their lives the plants spring up from the earth, and through their spiritual influence the Muslims gain victories over the unbelievers. Among them there are four thousand who are concealed and do not know one another and are not aware of the excellence of their state, but in all circumstances are hidden from themselves and from mankind. Traditions have come down to this effect, and the sayings of the Saints proclaim the truth thereof, **and I myself** – God be praised – **have had ocular experience** of this matter. (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, pp. 213-14)

This passage, from Hujwiri's seminal *Kashf al-Mahjub*, exposes multiple blasphemous sufi beliefs, including the function of 'saints' as governors of the universe when the Islamic scripture only discusses Prophets and Imams as the mortals with any earthly, let alone cosmic, influence. Nor does the scripture authorize any mortal the power to make rain fall down from the heaven, or to make plants emerge from the earth, because those are Allah's powers and to ascribe it to humans even in poetic flourish is to tread the line of apostasy. But the attribution to the saints as spiritual aids of the mujahideen is yet an even worse heresy, because the Quran and Hadith assign credit of Muslim victories to Allah and the angels, and then the mujahideen, in that order, with the latter given access to the more exquisite levels of Paradise as their additional reward. Nowhere in the scripture are 'saints' - whether physically present or invisible to the naked eye – identified as having the power to influence victory over the kuffar; and most certainly is there no documentation of hidden 'saints' that can be occultly envisioned by "Muslims" like Hujwiri and the rest of the sufis (indeed *any* type of occult "ocular experience", as we shall emphatically observe, is forbidden by Islam for those after Mohammed).

That the *Kashf al-Mahjub*, the highly influential – even in modern times - treatise outlining Sufism's doctrine and its myriad of orders, can at once utter multiple hypocritical – to Islam – assertions while lauding victory over the hated non-Muslims, helps us begin to understand the danger of Sufism to the Hindus, because the sect is capable of harbouring enmity to the Hindus due to its belief in shariat, while simultaneously sounding Polytheistic and thus superficially appearing friendly to the Hindus. This innovative nature of the sufis, the element that causes some Hindus to drop their guard with regard to them, mistaking Sufism for a fraternal religion, is clearly seen in the bizarre exaltation of sufi 'saints' by its adherents, with another famous sufi, Abu Abdullah Muhammad ibn Ali bin al-Husain al-Hakim al-Tirmizi, detailing a hierarchy of sainthood equivalent to the different levels of Islamic paradise:

To Tirmizi the highest rungs on the ladder of sainthood are *al-budala*, *al-siddiqin*, *al-muhaddasun*, and *Khatm al-Awliya*, in order of increasing precedence. **The last rung is for one who was the seal of the saints, just as the Prophet Muhammad was the seal of the prophets.** The rightful place of the *Khatm al-Awliya* was before God in the Kingdom of

Oneness. Tirmizi clearly acknowledges the superiority of the prophets over the saints: ‘the prophets were saints of God before they became prophets; hence they possess both qualities, prophethood and sainthood. Nobody is their equal.’ (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 41)

While this might at first glance appear to be a benign yet odd bidat, Tirmizi's classification of sainthood – as defined by Rizvi – includes decidedly blasphemous definitions, with *budala* saints those surrounding the “divine thrones”, *siddiquins* those offering their Souls to Allah and in turn being rewarded with “His light”, and muhaddasuns the “masters of saints” (ibid, p. 41). And the very fact that Tirmizi defined the *Khatm* as existing with God in a “Kingdom of Oneness” should rightly concern the most pious that Sufism and its ‘saints’ are promoting principles that are merely variations of *shirk*. At the very least, they are guilty of grave heresy, with Hujwari's description of the innovated sainthood – and its peculiar hierarchy - quite similar to that of Tirmizi's:

But of those who have power to loose and to bind and are the officers of the Divine court there are three hundred, called Akhyar, and forty, called Abdal, and seven, called Abrar, and four, called Awtad, and three, called Nuqaba, and one, called Qutb or Ghawth. All these know one another and cannot act save by mutual consent. (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 214)

The Abdal are specifically mentioned by the Persian Jalalu'd-Din Rumi (1207-1273), considered by many to be the finest poet produced by Sufism. In one part of his *Mathnawi*, Rumi hints at the immortal powers attributed by sufis to the Abdal:

But if you are one of the *Abdal* (saints) and your sheep has become a lion, come on securely, **for your death has been over thrown.**

Who is the *Abdal*? He that becomes transmuted, he whose wine is turned into vinegar by Divine transmutation. But you are drunken, pot and from (mere) opinion think yourself to be a lion: Beware, do not advance!

God hath said of the unrighteous Hypocrites, “*Their valour amongst themselves is a great valour.*”

Amongst one another they are manly, (but) in a warlike expedition they are as the women of the house.”

The Prophet; the commander-in-chief of the things unseen, said, “There is no bravery, O youth, before the battles.”

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book III, 3999-4004)

Rumi, like most sufi hypocrites, never partook in the real Islamic jihad, preferring instead to claim the ‘inner’ jihad to be the superior type. With this poorly substantiated – according to Islamic scripture – path came his diffusion, albeit in grander poetic form, of an occult ‘knowledge’ similar to Hujwari and other sufis, with another part of his *Mathnawi* describing hundreds of thousands of saints residing in subliminal planes:

Hundreds of thousands of hidden (spiritual) kings are holding their heads high (in the region) beyond this world; Because of God's jealousy their names remained hidden: every beggar did not pronounce their names.

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book II, 931-932)

According to Rumi, the sufi ‘saints’ – whether concealed from the world or within it – are capable of extraordinary powers beyond a simple existence as “hidden kings”. Among these powers (that they

obtain from God) is the ability to cause mortals to remember or forget – the sufi ‘saints’ can block or unblock another human's mental perceptions!

The saints possess power (derived) from God: they turn back from its course the arrow that has sped.

When the saint repents, he closes the doors of the results (shuts off the results) from the cause by that hand (power) of the Lord.

Through the opening of the door (of Divine grace), he makes unsaid what has been said, so that neither spit nor roast-meat is burnt thereby.

He wipes out the saying from all the minds that heard it, and makes it imperceptible.

O sire, if thou must needs have demonstration and proof (of this), recite “*(Whatever) verse (We cancel) or cause to be forgotten.*”

Read the verse “*They made you forget My warning*”:

acknowledge their (the saints) power to put forgetfulness (in men's hearts).

Since they are able to make (you) remember and forget, they are mighty over all the hearts of (God's) creatures.

When he (the saint) has blocked the road of (your) mental perception by means of forgetfulness, it is impossible (for you) to act, even if there be virtue (in you).

Think ye those exalted ones are a laughing-stock? Recite from the Qur'an as far as (the words) “*They made you*

forget.” (*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book I, 1669-1677)

The state of remembrance and forgetfulness in Islam is primarily a reference, especially in the Quran, to Allah's placement of a “veil” over the unbelievers, a covering that prevents them from understanding and then believing in the ‘Divine’ verses, an obscuration never attributed to a group of mortals known as sufi ‘saints’. This particular veil was the means by which the Asura of Falsehood was able to convince Mohammed that his infrarational revelations were the only true ones, even if his Arab compatriots failed to heed the message, for as Gabriel told the Prophet, “Surely you do not make the dead to hear, and you do not make the deaf to hear the call when they go back retreating.” (Quran 27:80) It was also described as a “seal”, created by Allah, on the unbeliever's frigid hearts – the only possible explanation for their rejection of the ‘truth’:

And certainly We have set forth for men every kind of example in this Quran. And if you should bring them a communication, those who disbelieve would certainly say: “You are naught but false claimant.” **Thus does Allah set a seal on the hearts of those who do not know.** (Quran 30:58-59)

While the assumed narrative of the Quran is that the ‘Word’ belonged exclusively to Allah, we have already observed that many of the infrarational revelations were presented in the form of a Plurality rather than the sole Allah mentioned in some of the verses. The message of the deafness and blindness of unbelievers is no different, with other verses crediting the Plurality veiling the hearts and deafening the ears of the unbelievers:

Of them are some who listen unto thee, but We have placed upon their hearts veils, lest they should understand, and in their ears a deafness. If they saw every token they would not believe therein, to the point that, when they come unto thee to argue with thee, the disbelievers

say: "This is naught else than fables of the men of old." And they forbid (men) from it and avoid it, and they ruin none save themselves, though they perceive not. If thou couldst see when they are set before the Fire and say: "Oh, would that we might return! Then would we not deny the revelations of our Lord but we would be of the believers!" Nay, but that hath become clear unto them which before they used to hide. And if they were sent back they would return unto that which they are forbidden. Lo! They are liars. (Quran 6:25-28)

These were the types of verses – evident by Rumi's use of Quran 2:106, which says, "None of **Our** revelations do we abrogate or cause to be forgotten, but we bring something better or similar (Quran 2:106) – that the famous poet had in mind when he usurped the real nature of the Plurality to illegally include the sufi saints. For as we have discussed, the Plurality could only have consisted of Allah and the 'angels', because only the 'angel' Gabriel could be heard by Mohammed. There is no mention in the Islamic scripture of immortal saints existing in a divine court, governing the universe and controlling the minds of men. But Rumi wrote otherwise, conceiving the powers of these 'saints' to include an ability to cause Muslims to rebel against Allah:

(Similarly), then, because of the repulsion exerted by the hearts of the perfect (saints), the spirits of Pharaohs remain in perdition.

Therefore, through being rejected by this world and by that world, these lost ones have been left without either this or that.

If you turn away your head from the (holy) servants of the Almighty, know that they are disgusted by your existence.

They possess the amber: when they display it, they make the straw of your existence frenzied (with desire for it).

When they conceal their amber, they quickly make your submission (to God) rebellion (against Him).

That (position which you hold in relation to them) is like the stage of animality, which is captive and subject to (the stage of) humanity.

Know that the stage of humanity is subject to the power of the saints as the animal (is subject to man), O master.

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book I, 2489-95)

The religion of Islam, contrary to the heinous fantasies Rumi defiled it with, conceives of a Plurality of which only Allah and the angels are possible parties, because there is absolutely no documentation of 'saints' within the authentic Islamic scripture. Allah and the angels are the only possible entities able to cause forgetfulness, to veil the hearts of unbelievers, to lead one from belief (Islam) into disbelief:

And who is more unjust than he who is reminded of the communications of his Lord, then he turns away from them and forgets what his two hands have sent before? Surely We have placed veils over their hearts lest they should understand it and a heaviness in their ears; and if you call them to the guidance, they will not ever follow the right course in that case. (Quran 18:57)

While the underhanded use of the Plurality verses to include the sufi 'saints' in the sanctified air of the angels and Allah is certainly deceitful, it did at least allow sufis like Rumi a theological foothold in their claim to represent Islam. In contrast with this barely plausible connection, different and more fanciful powers delegated to the sufi saints were completely without any attempt at scriptural justification, including Rumi's brazen allegation of the pir's *immortal* presence even prior to creation!

The heart that is the rising-place of the moonbeams (of Divine light) is the opening of the doors (of Reality) for the gnostic.

To you it is a wall, to them it is a door; to you a stone, to (those) venerated ones a pearl.

What you see plainly in the mirror—the Pir sees more than that in the brick.

The Pirs are they whose spirits, before this world existed, were in the Sea of (Divine) bounty.

Before (the creation of) this body they passed (many) lifetimes; before the sowing they took up (harvested) the wheat.

They have received the spirit before (the creation of) the form; they have bored the pearls before (the creation of) the sea.

(Whilst) consultation was going on as to bringing mankind into existence, their spirits were in the Sea of (Divine) Omnipotence up to the throat.

When the angels were opposing that (creation of man), they (the Pirs) were secretly clapping their hands (in derision) at the angels.

He (the Pir) was made acquainted with the (material) form of every existent being, before this Universal Soul became fettered (by materiality).

Before the (creation of the) heavens they have seen Saturn, before the (existence of) seeds they have seen the bread.

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book II, 165–174)

This type of magical nonsense – at least according to the opinion of the real Muslims who understand Sufism's fantasies to be innovations unsupported by the Islamic scripture – of 'saints' deriding the angels and existing beyond lifetimes, of pirs who were present *before* the existence of this world and material reality (as if they were *Gods*), also includes a belief that the Awtad and Qutb are pivotal in keeping the entire universe afloat:

It is well known among Sufis that every night the Awtad must go round the whole universe, and if there should be any place on which their eyes have not fallen, next day some imperfection will appear in that place; and they must then inform the Qutb, in order that he may fix his attention on the weak spot, and that by his blessing the imperfection may be removed. (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 228)

To Rumi, the Qutb was like a lion, with the people dependent on this 'saint' – rather than Allah *alone* – for mystic experiences; such is his importance that Rumi encouraged *devotion* to the Qutb:

The Qutb is (like) the lion, and it is his business to hunt: (all) the rest, (namely), these people (of the world), eat his leavings.

So far as you can, endeavour to satisfy the Qutb, so that he may gain strength and hunt the wild beasts.

When he is ailing, the people remain unfed, for all food provided for the gullet comes from the hand of reason, Since the ecstasies (spiritual experiences) of the people are

(only) his leavings.

Keep this (in mind), if your heart desires the (spiritual) prey.
He is like the reason, and the people are like the members of
the body: the management of the body depends on the reason.
The weakness of the Qutb is bodily, not spiritual: the
weakness lies in the Ship (Ark), not in Noah.

**The Qutb is he who turns round himself, (while) round
him is the revolution of the celestial spheres.**

**Lend some assistance in repairing his (bodily) ship, if you
have become his favourite slave and devoted servant.**

(The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book V, 2339-46)

That there is no authentic scriptural support for Awtads or Qutbs is irrelevant to the majority of sufis, whose traditions are heavily influenced by the likes of Rumi and Hujweri. Indeed the latter went as far as declaring a contemporary Shaykh to be the Qutb of his time:

Shaykh Abu'l-Qasim Gurgani, who today is the Qutb - may God prolong his life! - relates, speaking of his novitiate, that he saw his lower soul in the form of a snake. (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 206)

Not only can the Awtads and Qutbs – without precedence in Islam prior to the sufi heretics – be taken for religious innovation, they can also be deemed a component of sufi *shirk*, because these unseen ‘saints’ of Sufism, some of whom act within their bodily life, have powers that, according to the Quran, are only authorized to Allah or his angels. After all, if the viability of the universe is dependent upon one immortal sufi (the Qutb), one can understand why “Muslims” deluded by sufi renegades would wish to pray to the saints instead of Allah – an act that instantly establishes them as apostates guilty of the crime of *shirk*. Similarly, in the fantastical sufi legend of Khizr (or Khidr or Khizar), we find another potential avenue for *shirk* - or at the very least multiple egregious religious innovations:

There were some exceptions to this rule among sufis who claimed they were disciples of Khazir (or Khizr). A mysterious figure who appeared in Islamic legends, there was some controversy as to whether Khizr was a prophet. **Generally it was believed he had drunk the fountain of life, had been rendered immortal and that he was a contemporary of every age.** Some commentators on verses 59 to 81 of Chapter 18 of the Quran represent Khizr as the guide of Moses **who revealed to him the secret, mystical truth that transcended the Sharia**, which Moses himself was commissioned to introduce. It was little wonder that sufis believed he was a unique guide in their pursuit of truth and in their efforts to reach Reality. Belief in Khizr's immortality made him a supernatural being who was involved in assisting of sufis of well-known orders. In legends Khizr saved men in desperate situations...**the continued association of the sufi movement with the legend of Khizr was so great that almost all eminent sufis are said to have met or encountered this mysterious figure at some time in their careers.**

Some sufis were said to be his constant companions, others were believed to have had a casual acquaintance with him. (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 100)

Before we address the outlandish sufi claims relating to Khizr's personality, we must recall that there is no Islamic ‘truth’ greater than that of shariat, which is the infrarationally revealed ‘Word’ of Allah combined with Mohammed's authentic tradition. No other ‘truth’ transcends this shariat scripture, and to say otherwise specifically exposes the particular “Muslim” as an apostate. That the belief in Khizr is so prevalent in sufi orders simply provides additional evidence of Sufism's blasphemous nature, one that includes quite liberal – or deceitful from the orthodox viewpoint – interpretations of the scripture, as we find when reading the aforementioned Chapter 18 passage of the Quran, reproduced below:

And (all) those townships! We destroyed them when they did wrong, and We appointed a fixed time for their destruction. And when Moses said unto his servant: "I will not give up until I reach the point where the two rivers meet, though I march on for ages." And when they reached the point where the two met, they forgot their fish, and it took its way into the waters, being free. And when they had gone further, he said unto his servant: "Bring us our breakfast. Verily we have found fatigue in this our journey." He said: "Didst thou see, when we took refuge on the rock, and I forgot the fish - and none but Satan caused me to forget to mention it - it took its way into the waters by a marvel." He said: "This is that which we have been seeking." So they retraced their steps again. **Then found they one of Our slaves, unto whom We had given mercy from Us, and had taught him knowledge from Our presence.** Moses said unto him: "May I follow thee, to the end that thou mayst teach me right conduct of that which thou hast been taught?" **He said: "Surely you cannot have patience with me. And how can you have patience in that of which you have not got a comprehensive knowledge?"** Moses said: "If Allah pleases, you will find me patient and I shall not disobey you in any matter." He said: "If you would follow me, then do not question me about anything until I myself speak to you about it." So they went (their way) until when they embarked in the boat he made a hole in it. (Moses) said: "Have you made a hole in it to drown its inmates? **Certainly you have done a grievous thing.**" He said: "Did I not say that you will not be able to have patience with me?" (Moses) said: "Be not wroth with me that I forgot, and be not hard upon me for my fault." **So they went on until, when they met a boy, he slew him. (Moses) said: "Have you slain an innocent person otherwise than for manslaughter? Certainly you have done an evil thing." He said: "Did I not say to you that you will not be able to have patience with me?"** Moses said: "If I ask you about anything after this, keep me not in your company; indeed you shall have (then) found an excuse in my case." So they went on until when they came to the people of a town, they asked them for food, but they refused to entertain them as guests. Then they found in it a wall which was on the point of falling, so he put it into a right state. (Moses) said: "If you had pleased, you might certainly have taken a recompense for it." He said: "This shall be separation between me and you; now I will inform you of the significance of that with which you could not have patience. As for the boat, it belonged to (some) poor men who worked on the river and I wished that I should damage it, and there was behind them a king who seized every boat by force. **And as for the lad, his parents were believers and we feared lest he should oppress them by rebellion and disbelief. So we desired that their Lord might give them in his place one better than him in purity and nearer to having compassion.**" (Quran 18:59-81)

While Khizr is certainly presented with characteristics of a prophetic figure, Gabriel did not explicitly describe him as such. Nevertheless, even if we assume Khizr to be a prophet, at no point do the verses record him as an *immortal* prophet as alleged by the sufis. Nor should he have been, as even the most important prophet of all, Mohammed, was specifically identified by Allah to have been an ordinary human bound by the terms of death:

Truly thou wilt die (one day), and truly they (too) will die (one day). In the end will ye (all), on the Day of Judgement, settle your disputes in the presence of your Lord. (Quran 39:30-31)

If the greatest mortal to have ever graced this planet was told by Allah – through the conduit of Gabriel - of his inevitable demise upon earth, then a real Muslim should never believe in immortal 'saints', particularly when there is no other scriptural backing for immortality among humans. That the sufis both embrace the heretical concept of an *immortal* prophet, while at once desiring companionship with the same Khizr, can also be used as further documentation of their peculiar version of *shirk*, especially if the orthodox Muslim confuses it for a Polytheistic belief not seen in the Hindu idea of the Guru. The latter, who unlike the Khizr is Self-Realized, has only attained Immortality in accordance with the

Supreme *Consciousness*, distinct from either the immortality of the corporeal sheath or even the subtle body (as far as consciousness) which constitutes Khizr's supposed immortality. For the Self-Realized Guru, the earthly body will eventually perish, but His or Her Consciousness as Satchitananda will continue on, whether or not they – now Aware of the process as the Purusha or Jivatman – assume another earthly triple-sheath through reincarnation.

Indeed in their blasphemous declaration of Khizr's immortality, the sufis again display their specious mystic knowledge, something also seen in their casual acceptance of Khizr's Asuric actions and, most importantly, his rationalization of those acts. This, after all, is an 'immortal saint' who killed a boy simply because of a fear that he would "oppress" his parents through disbelief, and then hoped that the parents might get in his place a child of better "purity" - once more the Asura's historic inversion of wisdom is exposed, with "compassion" and "purity" assuming grotesque features. The fact that the sufis in turn venerate such a spiteful figure orients us to the infrarational nature of what many of them, in the past and present, experience and believe in - the acceptance of falsehood into their paths. But if that is of concern to the Hindus, what matters to the most pious, the orthodox Sunnis in their 'religious' wrath, is the irreparable deviance of Sufism from actual Islam. For with their intricate hierarchy of sainthood and their belief in "hidden" immortal prophets, we find the sufis directly violating one of Allah's infrarational revelations:

And they disbelieved in it before, **and they utter conjectures with regard to the unseen from a distant place.** And a barrier shall be placed between them and that which they desire, as was done with the likes of them in the past: surely they are in a disquieting doubt. (Quran 34:53-54)

That the verses are in reference to disbelievers on the Day of Judgement in no way alters its relevance to Sufism, because the sufis wildly describing "unseen" awhtars and akhyars and rudalas and qutbs will certainly – per the correct Islamic perspective – find their way into the ranks of disbelievers on Judgement Day, even though the sufis believe themselves to be Muslims. And the judgement upon them is sure to be the hellfire, especially when we consider that the importance Sufism assigns to shaykhs *more* flagrantly transgresses that which has been previously mentioned. In one example, we find Sultan Bahu, a famous subcontinental sufi who remains popular in "Pakistan", describing his relationship to his own pir in terms more appropriate to the Hindu experience of Unity of Consciousness through the Purusha or Atman:

The relation of the seeker to pir or murshid is described thus:

Murshid: Mecca, Seeker: Haji

And let love the Ka'ba be

In the presence of these factors

Haj perform do always we

Does not leave me for a moment

Yearning for my Murshid, see!

Seeping in my hair-roots Bahoo

I am he and he is me. (*The Aybat*, p 154)

Murshid's lesson is so different

Reading not, I read and read

Plugging fingers in my ears

Hearing not, I hear and heed.

Eye to Eye transmits the lesson

Seeing not, I see in-deed.

Bahoo! He dwells in my being

Love of his, my senses feed. (*The Aybat*, p 158) (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume II, p. 442)

Actual Muslims, we recall, do not believe that fellow believers can be 'one' with each other, especially to the extent where a particular believer can dwell within another, or that one believer is "he" and "me" at the same time. Neither do they claim, as Rumi did, that the presence of the sufi 'saints' can lead a person to "sit" with God, or that the contrary absence from 'saints' is the result of Satan:

Whoever wishes to sit with God, let him sit in the presence of the saints.

If you are broken off (divided) from the presence of the saints, you are in perdition, because you are a part without the whole.

Whomsoever the Devil cuts off from the noble (saints), he finds him without any one (to help him), and he devours his head.

To go for one moment a single span apart from the community (of saints) is (a result of) the Devil's guile.

Hearken, and know (it) well.

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book II, 2163-65)

Rumi also compared the shaykhs favourably to the prophets, going as far as attributing an endorsement of the former category of men by none other than the Prophet Mohammed:

Formerly there was a Shaykh, a (spiritual) Director, a heavenly Candle on the face of the earth,

One like a prophet amongst religious communities, an opener of the door of the garden of Paradise.

The Prophet said that a Shaykh who has gone forward (to perfection) is like a prophet amidst his people.

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book III, 1772-74)

The Prophet, however, *never* spoke of saints defined according to Sufism's precepts; to allege otherwise is a misrepresentation of Mohammed's *authentic* tradition that we find in multiple instances, a sufi practice that brings to mind the hadith severely criticizing the habit (adulterating Mohammed's tradition) as belonging to heretics. The previous couplets also remind us of the error of bidat, with the shaykh supposedly capable of opening the door to the garden of Paradise, when it is only the appropriate obedience to the Quran and Allah that allows the Muslim a reprieve from the hellfire. This sort of extreme praise or love for the pir is one that, if not describing the unity hinted at by Sultan Bahu, at the very least makes an idol of the shaykh - an idolatry exemplified by the disciples of Shaikh Ahmad Abdu'l-Haqq, who would chant their pir's name whenever he visited:

Often Shaikh Ahmad Abdu'l-Haqq remarked that Hallaj had been a child to disclose divine secrets and that there were some sufis who were so mature they could drink an ocean of divine secrets and reveal nothing.

'Haqq was the most perfect of the many names and attributes of Allah,' believed Shaikh Ahmad Abdu'l-Haqq. With his disciples in the khanqah **he showed great devotion to *pas-i anfas* (breath control)** and the key word before and after prayer was Haqq. Whether they were talking or buying and selling in the bazaar, the Shaikh's disciples would cry 'Haqq.' **When the Shaikh visited the mosque his disciples walked in front of him crying 'Haqq.'** Many people were critical of such a custom, calling it pir worship, but the Shaikh justified it by quoting from the *Futuh al-Makkiyya* of Ibn al-Arabi. (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, pp. 271-72)

That this particular sufi pir spoke of divine secrets that could be obtained from sources other than the

infrarational word of Islam is a common aspect of Sufism's heresy that will be examined later in this chapter. Yet more extreme – to Islam – was his belief in his own name as the greatest of Allah's attributes, along with the use of his name as a mantra by his disciples. That he chose to defend the practice through the book of the sufi Ibn al-Arabi instead of verses from the Holy Quran, or even authentic hadith, shows one example of the complete absence of Islamic support for the majority of tariqat variations, including the most dangerous kind that Abdu'l-Haqq was perilously close to practising. As one might surmise, this involves the partnering of the pir with Allah in the illegal practice of *shirk*, a crime of which some sufis perform by using the image of one's pir during meditation:

Zikr was followed by meditation to allow the individual thoughts of sufis to emerge. **Generally dervishes meditated on some particular verse of the Quran, and at the same time an image of the pir was recalled to mind.** (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 102)

As one of the key motivating forces of Islam is to eradicate their severely limited conception of idolatry, which they define according to images of God, the sufi use of a mental image of their pir while meditating – a custom designed to help them get closer to Allah – represents a subtle violation of Allah's eternal message. A more flagrant example was described by Qazi Muhi'u'd-Din Kashani, a *khalifa* (successor) to Nizamu'd-Din Auliya:

On one occasion, the Qazi asked Shaikh Nizamu'd-Din Auliya whether a disciple should contemplate God, the Prophet Mohammed and his pir separately, or the three simultaneously. The Shaikh said that both were possible but if he wished to contemplate the three at the same time, he should think that God was in front of him, the Prophet on his right and his pir on his left. (*Siyaru'l Auliya*, pp 294-96, AA p 98) (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 177)

This is clear *shirk*, with the contemplation of Allah – a form of worship – associated with others, in this case the mortal Mohammed and the likewise human Nizamu'd-Din Auliya. Indeed, one might describe this to be Sufism's version of the trinities outlined by different religions including the Sanatana Dharma. Austere Islam, as we know, rejects such metaphysical arrangements, along with the belief that a human shaykh should be worshipped. This latter veneration, however, is pervasive to Sufism, even if the devotion to the pir is presented in different styles, from the meditative worship of Auliya to Rumi's multiple themes, one of which portrays the shaykhs as “spiritual physicians” inspired by Allah:

**We are the (spiritual) physicians, the disciples of God:
the Red Sea beheld us and was cloven.**

Those natural physicians are different, for they look into the heart by means of a pulse.

**We look well into the heart without intermediary, for through
clairvoyance we are in a high belvedere.**

Those (others) are physicians of food and fruit: by them the animal soul is (made) strong.

**We are physicians of deeds and words: the ray of the light of
(Divine) Majesty is our inspirer,**

(So that we know) that a deed like this will be
beneficial to thee, while a deed like that will cut (thee) off
from the Way;

And that words like these will lead thee on (to grace), while
words like those will bring anguish to thee.

To those (other) physicians a (sample of) urine is evidence,

whereas this evidence of ours is the inspiration of the
Almighty. (*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book III, 2700-2707)

While the heresy of any mortal becoming 'inspired' by Allah will be detailed in depth later, of significance to the current analysis is the abnormal – to Islam – power attributed to these alleged sufi physicians, who are able to diagnose without any need of the non-sufi to vocalize a problem - for the sufi 'saints' have "seen" the person even before birth!

**How, then, should the divine physicians in the world not
diagnose (disease) in you without word of mouth?**

From your pulse and your eyes and your complexion alike
they immediately discern a hundred (spiritual) maladies in
you.

In sooth, tis (only) these newly-taught physicians that have
need of these (external) signs.

The perfect (the divine physicians) will hear your name
from afar and quickly penetrate into the deepest ground of
your being and existence;

**Nay, they will have seen you (many) years before your birth
—you together with all the circumstances (connected with**

you). (*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book IV, 1797-1801)

Not only is the capacity for such clairvoyance unauthorized in the Quran, the final – infrarational - revelations also ordain these suprahuman powers as exclusive to Allah, with one verse saying, "Allah chooses messengers from among the Angels and from among the men; **surely Allah is Hearing, Seeing.**" (Quran 22:75) There is no Quranic account of a class of men endowed with the ability to mystically 'see' mortals from before birth; nor is there any mention of "spiritual physicians" being able to penetrate the "souls" and beliefs of men:

**But the spiritual physician enters into his (patient's) soul and
by the spiritual way penetrates into his (inmost) belief.**

He hath no need of fine acts and words: "beware of them
(the spiritual physicians), they are spies on (men's) hearts."

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book V, 239-40)

This sufi claim, of course, has been made illegal by the Quran, which in multiple verses assigns awareness of man's secret beliefs to Allah exclusively (or at least to a Plurality void of any sufi), including the following passage which asserts creation as emerging solely due to Allah, without any assistance from sufi 'saints' allegedly present before the world's birth. The passage again rejects the idea that a believer can serve someone else besides Allah, even if that supplication – for instance, by a "Muslim" to a sufi 'saint' – is purportedly done in order to get "nearer" to Allah:

Now, surely, sincere obedience is due to Allah (alone), and (as for) those who take guardians besides Him, (saying), "**We do not serve them save that they may make us nearer to Allah,**" **Surely Allah will judge between them in that in which they differ, surely Allah does not guide him aright who is a liar, ungrateful.** If Allah desire to take a son to Himself, He will surely choose those He pleases from what He has created. Glory be to Him: He is Allah, the One, the Subduer (of all). He has created the heavens and the earth with the truth. He makes the night cover the day and makes the day overtake the night, and He has made the sun and the moon subservient - each one runs on to an assigned term. Now surely He is the Mighty, the great Forgiver. **He has created you from a single being, then made its mate of the same (kind), and He has made for you eight of the cattle in pairs. He creates you in the wombs**

of your mothers - a creation after a creation - in triple darkness; that is Allah your Lord, His is the kingdom. There is no god but He - whence are you then turned away? If you are ungrateful, then surely Allah is Self-sufficient above all need of you. And He does not like ungratefulness in His servants. And if you are grateful, He likes it in you. And no bearer of burden shall bear the burden of another, then to your Lord is your return, then will He inform you of what you did. **Surely He is Cognizant of what is in the hearts of men.** And when distress afflicts a man he calls upon his Lord turning to Him frequently. Then when He makes him possess a favour from Him, he forgets that for which he called upon Him before, and sets up rivals to Allah that he may cause (men) to stray off from His path. Say: "Enjoy yourself in your ungratefulness a little, surely you are of the inmates of the fire." (Quran 39:03-08)

Irrespective of the disciple's intentions or aspirations, a Muslim's genuflection towards a pir for the purpose of mere spiritual *guidance* remains a blasphemy, because Allah has rejected serving anyone else – setting up rivals - besides himself, especially when those in question, according to Rumi and other sufis, are specifically to become the objects of *devotion*:

When ye have regard for the hearts (feelings and wishes) of the physicians, ye will see yourselves and will become ashamed of yourselves.

Tis not in the power of created beings to remove this blindness, but the honouring of the physicians (by you) is from Divine guidance.

Become devoted to these physicians with (all your) soul, that ye may be filled with musk and ambergris.

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book III, 2730-32)

While devotion might be interpreted as something other than worship, it can still be considered a form of *shirk* by the simple fact that the sufi "divine physicians" illegally annex certain powers of Allah, and thus inevitably assume the status of his associate. But Rumi took this heresy further than simple devotion, in one instance characterizing the perfect 'saint' as commanding *obedience* from the "soul of all things":

Since the spirit (of the perfect saint) has become superior and has passed beyond the utmost limit (reached by men and angels), the soul of all things has become obedient to it Birds and fishes and Jinn and men—because it exceeds (them), and they are deficient (in comparison with it).

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book II, 3333-34)

Obedience - at least with regards to Islam's infrarational spirituality - however, is the exclusive domain of Allah and his final messenger, with multiple verses attesting to this Islamic fact. One Quran passage in particular demands that this mandatory allegiance be performed incessantly:

And Allah has said: "Take not two gods, He is only one Allah; so of Me alone should you be afraid." And whatever is in the heavens and the earth is His, and to Him should obedience be (rendered) constantly. Will you then guard against other than (the punishment of) Allah? And whatever favour is (bestowed) on you it is from Allah; then when evil afflicts you, to Him do you cry for aid. Yet when He removes the evil from you, lo! a party of you associate others with their Lord, so that they be ungrateful for what We have given them. (Quran 16:51-55)

For those who renege from the command of constant obedience to Allah as the singular deity or power, whether that deviance occurs through a belief in the perfect 'saint' commanding all souls, or some other heresy, Allah has promised a striking response:

And (as for) those who dispute about Allah after that obedience has been rendered to Him, their plea is null with their Lord, and upon them is wrath, and for them is severe punishment. (Quran 42:16)

One of these historic disputes, especially against Christianity, concerns the belief that God can have children, with Asuric Islam fanatically opposed to the superficially perceived impossibility of God begetting offspring:

Yet they ascribe as partners unto Him the jinn, although He did create them, **and impute falsely, without knowledge, sons and daughters unto Him**. Glorified be He and High Exalted above (all) that they ascribe (unto Him). The Originator of the heavens and the earth! **How can He have a child, when there is for Him no consort, when He created all things and is Aware of all things?** That is Allah, your Lord, there is no god but He, the Creator of all things. Therefore serve Him, and He has charge of all things. (Quran 6:100-102)

But as the Asura of Falsehood is the real originator of the Islamic religion, the distortion of knowledge in the passage is expected, with contradictions apparent within the same verse. For if Allah created all things, they are accordingly his children; and since God is Omnipotent, He does not necessarily need a consort to fashion a “child”, because His Conception is beyond the restrictions of the physical human body requiring the reproductive elements of *two* mortals to produce one child. The Asura, however, insisted upon assigning to God the most base nature of mankind's lower ego, including fratricide:

Never did Allah take to Himself a son, and never was there with him any (other) god - in that case would each god have certainly taken away what he created, and some of them would certainly have overpowered others. Glory be to Allah above what they describe! Knower of the Invisible and the Visible! and Exalted be He over all that they ascribe as partners (unto Him)! (Quran 23:91-92)

But the multiple Gods and Goddesses – in the Yogin experience – fashioned by the Supreme Mother out of Herself, are not corrupted by the Ignorance or Falsehood of the world, as they contain all of the other Gods and Goddesses within themselves, and are completely Conscious of the Supreme One from which they were created. Thus there can be no permanent separation and hatred, no infrarational violence or fratricide or filicide or patricide, among Immortals fully Conscious of their Unity. The separate (but only in Aspect rather than Consciousness) Gods and Goddesses, while often serving different purposes, are not in battle to usurp one another; the glorious war they silently wage is against the Asuras, the ones who distort the reality of Polytheism into the most brutal form of competition, the type where the son usurps the father to take control of the clan. With this Islamic vulgarization of Polytheism to the lowest nature of the animal kingdom, the half-Muslim (and thus entirely apostate) sufi cannot help but find the Hindu beneath himself, even as the same sufi practices pranayama and other heresies, including Rumi's blasphemous belief that the sufi ‘saints’ are Allah's special children:

O son, the saints are God's children: (both) in (their) absence and presence (He is) well aware (of what befalls them).

Do not deem absence (from Him) to be the result of imperfection on their part, for He takes vengeance for the sake of their spirits (which are one with Him).

He said, “These saints are My children in exile, sundered from (My) dominion and glory;

(They are) despised and orphaned for the sake of probation, but secretly I am their friend and intimate.

All of them are supported by My protections: you may say they are in sooth parts of Me.

Take heed! Take heed! These are My dervishes; they are a hundred thousand thousand and (yet) they are one body.”

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book III, 79-84)

This is *shirk* in all but an explicit statement declaring the sufi pirs to be God, because the saints are deemed the sons of Allah, “parts” of him. It is also a clear violation of numerous Quranic injunctions, with another infrarational revelation describing the assertion of Allah having children as a “lie”:

And warn those who say, “Allah has taken a son.” They have no knowledge of it, nor had their fathers. A grievous word it is that comes out of their mouths; they speak nothing but a lie.
(Quran 18:04-05)

Pertinently, the liars – like the famous Rumi - who dare to attach a son or children to Allah are adjudged to have no authority to make such outlandish claims:

They say: “Allah has taken a son (to Himself)!” Glory be to Him! He is the Self-sufficient! His is what is in the heavens and what is in the earth; you have no authority for this; do you say against Allah what you do not know? (Quran 10:68)

Furthermore are the sufis overstepping the boundaries of Islam when, as Rumi did in the following, outrageously declaring the pir's word to be very ‘Word’ of Allah:

That prayer traversed the Seven Heavens: the fortune of the miserable wretch (Nasuh) at last became good;

For the prayer of a Shaykh (Spiritual Director) is not like every prayer: he is naughted (*fani*) and his words are the words of God.

Since God asks and begs of Himself, how, then, should He refuse to grant His own prayer?

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book V, 2242-44)

To even think that a human's word could be equal to that of Allah's, is a grave blasphemy according to Islam, whether the mortal is a medium for Allah's ‘Word’ or if they are instead claiming overt ownership of the communication. The former violates the Quran's infrarational revelation that Mohammed was the seal of the prophets, which means that the possibility of ensuing revelation has ceased; the latter is blatant *shirk*, and can be interpreted as Sufism supporting the incarnation of Allah into the ‘saint’. The sufi's, including Rumi, will for the most part vehemently deny such reasonable accusations, claiming a type of unity with Allah markedly distinct from the Yogin experience, a unity that they think makes them immune from the crime of *shirk*. But before we discuss the specifics of the impoverished sufic idea of unity, we must emphasize that even if the sufi's are *not* practising Hinduism, neither are they adhering to Islam. For there should be no Muslim idea of unity whereby a slave can dare to attest his word as equal to Allah's: Nor should he take the next irreversible step, as Abdul-Quddus did, by moving beyond the *shirk* of equal partners to that of the *superiority* of pir worship over a simple devotion to Allah!

The letters which Shaikh Abdul-Quddus wrote were collected by his disciple, Buddhan...under the title the *Maktubat-i Quddusiyya*...In a letter to Qazi Abdur-Rahman Sufi of Shahabad the Shaikh wrote that the world was full of imposters and charlatans...**A disciple worshipping his pir was better than the worshipper of the Lord, argued the Shaikh, for the latter was busy with the contemplation of his own self and therefore neglected God; one who adored his pir, however, worshipped God through the contemplation of His creature.** (p 124) (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 348)

While there might be some merit to Abdul-Quddus' argument, from the Islamic perspective it clearly

defines him as an apostate, one who accepts other deities along with, and greater than, Allah. The sufi worship of their shaykh is similar to the sadhak's worship of the earthly Guru, with the major exception that the sufi pir, as we shall see, cannot *by their own doctrine* be Self-Realized. The sufis are thus worshipping another mortal, which is not what the sadhak is doing (assuming they are not encountering a charlatan), because the Self-Realized Guru *is* God (in Consciousness). That the sufis, even with such heinous apostasy, have managed to survive to present times in the subcontinent, is due to the orthodox understanding of their usefulness in obtaining Hindu converts, for otherwise many of Sufism's clear innovations, like the following, would have long been used as the impetus to execute swaths of them:

Infidelity hath a fixed limit and range—know (this for sure); (but) **the Shaykh and the light of the Shaykh have no bound.** (*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book II, 3320)

If the reader were to interpret this light as symbolic (thus making it a less egregious statement), further Rumi couplets disabuse us of that notion, as he documents a select group of mankind who are able to receive the *substance* of “light” from Allah, with the “light” of such potency that the sufi ‘saints’ are then *worshipped* by the angels!

When Man receives light from God, he is worshipped by the angels because of his being chosen (by God).

Also, (he is) worshipped by that one whose spirit, like the angel, has been freed from contumacy and doubt.

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book II, 1353-54)

If Mohammed, the greatest of all humans, the pinnacle of all global religion, was never actually worshipped by the angels, then neither should anyone else, regardless of their proclamation to Allah's *actual* light or any other divine characteristic, including the ability to assume the very “nature of God”, as Rumi asserted the “luminous” sufis to have secured:

That one who gives without expectation of (any) gains—that one is God, is God, is God,

Or the friend of God (the saint), who has assumed the nature of God and has become luminous and has received the Absolute Radiance;

For He is rich, while all except Him are poor: how should a poor man say “Take” without compensation?

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book III, 3352-54)

While the “nature of God” described by Rumi and other sufi ‘saints’ is, as we will learn from *their* own words, not the same as the Hindu experience of moksha, there is absolutely no scriptural evidence in Islam to propose that a Muslim can hold the nature of Allah, an orientation that inevitably presumes an illegal partnership with the one, exclusive, god. The sufi blasphemy of receiving – while on earth – Allah's “absolute radiance”, is further compounded by another alleged source of the pir's luminosity:

The ulama accused the sufis of deifying their spiritual teachers (Shaikhs, pirs or murshids) but the sufis saw their Shaikhs as being illuminated by the light of Muhammad which had existed even before his birth and was the sole cause of creation. (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 98)

For the sufis to defend the deification of their shaykhs through a supposed connection to the “light of Mohammed”, is to exalt one blasphemy by way of a second, because there is no rigorous scriptural support to justify an immortal “light of Mohammed” that continues to illuminate pirs to this day. As we have already cited, Mohammed was told that he would die and reside in heaven; another verse similarly

has the Prophet informing mankind that he is merely a mortal, a category that certainly precludes him from existing *before* his birth:

Say: “**I am only a mortal like you.** My Lord inspireth in me that your Allah is only One Allah. And whoever hopeth for the meeting with his Lord, let him do righteous work, and make none sharer of the worship due unto his Lord.” (Quran 18:110)

Subsequently, we cannot expect his presumed light to continue to influence the planet, especially when there is no particular need for it according to Islam, as all of the unbelievers and apostates will be permanently punished on Judgement Day, with the minority of real Muslims elevated into Paradise. No progressive light upon earth will change an outcome that the Quran has infrarationally revealed as predetermined; and since the last of Allah's ‘Word’ has already been recorded and disseminated, there is no further need for revelations or light or inspiration. The sufis nevertheless persist in their deviant belief of Mohammed's ‘eternal light’, using a particular passage in the Quran for justification:

Allah is the Light of the heavens and the earth. The **similitude** of His light is as a niche wherein is a lamp. The lamp is in a glass. The glass is as it were a shining star. (This lamp is) kindled from a blessed tree, an olive neither of the East nor of the West, whose oil would almost glow forth (of itself) though no fire touched it. Light upon light. **Allah guideth unto His light whom He will. And Allah speaketh to mankind in allegories,** for Allah is Knower of all things. (This lamp is found) in houses which Allah hath allowed to be exalted and that His name shall be remembered therein. Therein do offer praise to Him in the morning and evenings. (Quran 24:35-36)

Although Allah may guide his “light” unto whomever he chooses, there is no particular mention of Mohammed possessing his *own* eternal or temporal light, and the verses clearly indicate the passage to be allegorical, with the use of light and lamp directly referenced as a “similitude” whereby Mohammed *and* the Mosques are simply vessels for *Allah's* light - these are the rare verses requiring a slightly less superficial interpretation than the usual demand of literal ingurgitation. Indeed the indirect representation seen above is, as in the rest of the verses of the same nature, openly announced as a similitude, which makes the sufi declaration that Allah's light can be concretely imparted upon the *substantial* composition of another mortal – whether that person be Mohammed or a sufi pir - a clear blasphemy. And if this passage is insufficient justification for the sufi belief, another previously mentioned verse is more damning to the doctrine's veracity, affirming the “light” as specifically belonging to Allah:

They desire to put out the light of Allah with their mouths but **Allah will perfect His light**, though the unbelievers may be averse. (Quran 61:08)

Sufism however, is captivated by the heretical notion of Mohammed's ‘eternal light’, with Rizvi noting a couple of examples:

The theme of Muhammad's *Nur* (Light) gave great scope to Bengali Muslim poets in their expression of the mystic state. The *Nur-nama* or the *Nur-Kandil* of Saiyid Murtaza, the author of the *Yoga-Qalandar*, using Nath-sufi terminology presents Muhammad's light as the source of creation. The *Nur-Nama* of Razzaq Nandan Abdul-Hakim is similar in approach but militantly seeks to assert it is misguided to conceive that Bengali was one the languages of Hindus. (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, pp. 371-72)

While the West Asian mystics were more influential in the genesis of this blasphemy, it comes as no surprise to find subcontinental sufis finding superficial commonality with the Hindus, as the experience of the Divine – as opposed to different variations of light in the occult planes of existence - Light is frequent to the Yogin. That the sufis nevertheless try and stress their separation – in this case through a

denial of Bengali as a “Hindu” language – from Hinduism does not absolve them of their blasphemy, because Mohammed is never mentioned by the authentic Islamic scripture as a substance of light behind all of creation – it is instead a sufic fantasy that reminds us of the heretical sect's tales of ‘saints’ who existed before the emergence of the world. And of the West Asian sufis, one of the first to articulate this blasphemy of Mohammed's *Nur* was Mansur Hallaj (858-922), a Persian sufi who remains popular to modern sufis, even if his life story – which we will eventually detail – should in truth serve as a warning to all Muslims, his extreme innovation of Mohammed's substance a mere glimpse into his notorious apostasy:

Oh marvel! What is more manifest, more visible, greater, more famous, more luminous, more powerful or more discerning than him? **He is and was, and was known before created things and existences and beings. He was and still is remembered before ‘before’ and after ‘after’, and before substances and qualities. His substance is completely light**, his speech is prophetic, his knowledge is celestial, his mode of expression is Arabic, his tribe is ‘neither of the East nor the West’ (24.35), his genealogy is patriarchal, his mission is conciliation, and he has the title of the ‘unlettered’. The eyes were opened by his signs, secrets and selves perceived by his being there. It was Allah who made him articulate by His Word, and being the Proof, confirmed him. It was Allah who sent him forth. He is the proof and the proven. It is he who quenches the thirst of the vehemently thirsty heart, it is he who brings the uncreated word that is not touched by what touches it, nor phrased by the tongue, nor made. It is united to Allah without separation, and it surpasses the conceivable. It is he who announces the end and the ends and the ends of the end. (Mansur Hallaj, *Kitab al-Tawasin*, The Ta-Sin of the Prophetic Lamp, 8-9)

That these sufis can call themselves Muslim is astonishing, when the Quran is unequivocal on Mohammed existing as a mortal slave who, even if his importance was paradoxically exaggerated to that of an idol, nevertheless was *never* described as pure ‘Divine light’. It is an audacity additionally displayed through their deliberate ignorance of the Prophet's own words – which separate himself from *Allah's* light - on the matter:

Narrated Ibn Abbas:

Whenever the Prophet offered the night (Tahajjud) prayer, he used to say, “O Allah! All the Praises are for You; **You are the Light of the Heavens and the Earth**. And all the Praises are for You; You are the Keeper of the Heavens and the Earth. All the Praises are for You; You are the Lord of the Heavens and the Earth and whatever is therein. You are the Truth, and Your Promise is the Truth, and Your Speech is the Truth, and meeting You is the Truth, and Paradise is the Truth and Hell (Fire) is the Truth and all the prophets are the Truth and the Hour is the Truth. O Allah! **I surrender to You, and believe in You, and depend upon You, and repent to You, and in Your cause I fight and with Your orders I rule**. So please forgive my past and future sins and those sins which I did in secret or in public. **It is You Whom I worship, None has the right to be worshipped except You.**” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 93, Number 590)

At most, the sufis can turn to a handful of Sahih Muslim hadith describing Mohammed *asking* for light, with Ibn Abbas reporting, “It was in thirteen rakahs that the (night) prayer of the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) was completed. He then slept till he began to snore, and we knew that he had gone to sleep by his snoring. He then went out (for the dawn prayer) and then again slept, and said while praying or prostrating himself: ‘O Allah! **place** light in my heart, light in my hearing, light in my sight, light on my right, light on my left, light in front of me, light behind me, light above me, light below me, make light for me,’ or he said: ‘Make me light.’” (Sahih Muslim Book 4, Number 1677) This hadith actually confirms that Mohammed was *not* a pre-existing embodiment of eternal light, and

therefore had to *ask* Allah for that light, with no other authentic hadith existing to confirm whether or not Mohammed was granted his prayer by Allah. It is also – at least as far as the “Make me light” portion – a hadith somewhat contradicted by the same narrator:

Ibn Abbas reported:

I spent a night in the house of my mother's sister, Maimuna, and then narrated (the rest of the) hadith, but he made no mention of the washing of his face and two hands but he only said: He then came to the water-skin and loosened its straps and performed ablution between the two extremes, and then came to his bed and slept. He then got up for the second time and came to the water-skin and loosened its straps and then performed ablution which was in fact an ablution (it was performed well), and implored (the Lord) thus: “Give me abundant light, **and he made no mention of: “Make me light.”** (Sahih Muslim Book 4, Hadith 1679)

Sahih Muslim is thus not entirely conclusive as to whether or not Mohammed even *asked* Allah to turn him into the very substance of divine light, which would have made the Prophet joint-possessor, rather than the receiver of light - as in the “give me abundant light” that acknowledges a different owner of the light. That, combined with the absence of any authentic documentation that shows Allah *granting* Mohammed a physical composition of light, and the Quran verses clearly assigning ownership of light to Allah *exclusively*, means that there is no Islamic justification for the sufis to persist with their delusion of an eternal Mohammed subsisting solely of light. The Quran at best delegates to Mohammed the *similitude* of the lamp, without allocating him *possession* of Allah's Light, a fact confirmed in another infrarational revelation stating, “O Prophet! Lo! We have sent thee as a **witness** and a bringer of good tidings and a **warner**. And as a summoner unto Allah by His permission, **and as a lamp** that giveth light.” (Quran 33:45-46) The “light” belongs to Allah, not his warner or witness, who is merely the vessel or lamp by which the “light” is *displayed* to mankind - the lamp is not the source of the light, but is the house in which it shines: To allege someone other than Allah as capable of accessing his “light” is to then innovate in religion away from Islam, and once more confirms the apostasy of the majority of sufis.

And as all the different religions and potential deities – including the deification of any prophets – are false, and as the Quran has not entitled Mohammed to “Light”, there should be no need for sufis, who claim to be Muslim, to speak of Mohammed's *Nur* existing before he was born, or to assert that his supernatural “Light” played *any* role in creation. The sufis use, for explicit scriptural support of their belief, a sole hadith whereby Mohammed is allegedly recorded as saying to his companion Jabir, “O Jabir, the first thing Allah created was the light of your Prophet from His light.” But this hadith is not only *absent* from the kutub al-sittah, the six authentic hadith collections, it is also widely considered to be fabricated. That it was found by countless Islamic scholars to be a fabrication is completely understandable when we consider the Quran pronouncements, such as the following, on creation and the source of creation:

Say: “Who is the Lord of the heavens and the earth?” Say: “Allah.” Say: “Do you take then besides Him guardians who do not control any profit or harm for themselves?” Say: “Are the blind and the seeing alike? Or can the darkness and the light be equal? **Or have they set up with Allah partners who have created creation like His, so that what is created became confused to them?**” Say: “Allah is the Creator of all things, and He is the One, the Supreme.” (Quran 13:16)

This verse alone is enough to dismiss Sufism's fantasy that Mohammed's light was either the solitary origin of creation, or joined with Allah for that purpose. Yet do we have additional Asuric revelations underpinning the Islamic tenet that those daring to partner creation with someone – including Mohammed - other than Allah are indeed “misled”:

Say: **“Is there of your partners (whom ye ascribe unto Allah) one that produceth Creation and then reproduceth it?”** Say: **“Allah produceth Creation, then reproduceth it. How then, are ye misled!”** Say: “Is there of your partners (whom ye ascribe unto Allah) one that guides to the Truth?” Say: “Allah guides to the Truth. Is He Who guides to the Truth more deserving that He should be followed, or he who finds not the way unless he (himself) be guided. What ails you? How judge ye?” (Quran 10:34-35)

While the wording of the previous passage is enough to contradict the sufi delusions – as seen in Rumi's poetry mentioning the eternal saints “consultation” before the germination of mankind – regarding their own involvement in the creation of the universe, it is also a firm rebuttal to their doctrine of Mohammed's *Nur*. Indeed even if we recall certain verses assigning a Plurality to creation, Mohammed himself, just like the sufi ‘saint’, was *never* included in that group of Asuras and “Allah”. Thus gravely do the sufis sin when designating Mohammed as an owner of the “Light” through which creation occurs, because passages in the Quran unquestionably state that the messengers are only supposed to deliver the message - a dogma that, in a different passage, is *immediately* followed by the declaration that Allah is *solely* responsible for the “initial” and “latter” creations:

And (We sent) Abraham, when he said to his people: “Serve Allah and be careful of (your duty to) Him; this is best for you, if you did but know. You only worship idols besides Allah and you create a lie; surely they whom you serve besides Allah do not control for you any sustenance, therefore seek the sustenance from Allah and serve Him and be grateful to Him; to Him you shall be brought back. And if you reject (the truth), nations before you did indeed reject (the truth). **And nothing is incumbent on the messenger but a plain delivering (of the message).**” **What! Do they not consider how Allah originates the creation, then reproduces it?** Surely that is easy to Allah. **Say, O Mohammed: “Travel in the earth and see how He makes the first creation, then Allah creates the latter creation;** surely Allah has power over all things. He punishes whom He pleases and has mercy on whom He pleases, and to Him you shall be turned back. **And you shall not escape in the earth nor in the heaven, and you have neither a protector nor a helper besides Allah.**” And (as to) those who disbelieve in the communications of Allah and His meeting (in the Hereafter), they have despaired of My mercy, and these it is that shall have a painful punishment. So naught was the answer of Abraham's people except that they said, “Slay him or burn him”, then Allah delivered him from the fire. Most surely there are signs in this for a people who believe. And he said: “You have only taken for yourselves idols besides Allah by way of friendship between you in this world's life, then on the resurrection day some of you shall deny others, and some of you shall curse others, and your abode is the fire, and you shall not have any helpers.” And Lot believed in Him, and he said: “I am fleeing to my Lord, surely He is the Mighty, the Wise.” (Quran 29:16-26)

If the Islamic law – which as we recall, is never to be ignored or changed by mankind – is quite clear on the matter, there do exist infrarational revelations that, while not explicitly identifying a ‘Light of Mohammed’, help to somewhat account for the sufic indulgence of *shirk* manifesting in their extreme exaggeration of Mohammed's place in creation and his powers. We refer of course, to the discussion in the previous chapter on the Asura's idolization of Mohammed, the one whom Muslims are supposed to pray for blessings upon:

Surely Allah and His Angels bless the Prophet: “O you who believe! Call for (Divine) blessings on him and salute him with a worthy salutation.” (Quran 33:56)

That the sufikuffar might take this as a sign of the Prophet's immortality is understandable, for the Asura of Falsehood's revelations are the ‘last Word’ of Allah, to be followed by mankind until Judgement day – consequently, Muslims post-Mohammed can be reasonably expected to call for “Divine” blessings upon the Prophet. Further aiding the sufic allegation are the Asuric revelations, like

the following, that Muslims are to *believe* in Allah *and* His Messenger:

Say: "O people! Surely I am the Messenger of Allah to you all, of Him Whose is the kingdom of the heavens and the earth: there is no god but He. He brings to life and causes to die, therefore **believe in Allah and His messenger**, the Unlettered Prophet who believes in Allah and His words, and follow him so that you may walk in the right way." (Quran 7:158)

If the belief in Mohammed was perhaps meant in relation to his earthly actions, the mere association of *belief* in both Allah and Mohammed, as we have already discussed, at the very least elevates Mohammed to the status of primary idol for the religion. With the repeated call to believe in Allah *and* His messenger, including Quran verses 4:136 and 64:08, combined with Sufism's custom of worshipping human pirs, one can understand how the sufis stray in vaulting Mohammed from the idol of extreme importance to the level of a Polytheistic god. Even the sufis who do not jump from mere idolatry to outright *shirk* are still likely to excessively praise Mohammed more than ordinary Muslims, who generally practice their idolatry through the *imitation* of Mohammed's actions instead of superfluous invocations. The sufis, especially with regards to their overall failure in risking their bodily lives in actual jihad, lean more to the mental attachment than the imitation of Mohammed's tradition, a stance that once more establishes them as hostile to the only human that Islam has fashioned to be the "perfect exemplar" for all of existence, the one man whose tradition *has* to be followed in literal terms, the mortal whom we recall to have unique intercession powers with Allah:

Narrated Jabir bin Abdullah:

Allah's Apostle said, "**I have been given five things which were not given to any amongst the Prophets before me.** These are:

1. Allah made me victorious by awe (by His frightening my enemies) for a distance of one month's journey.
2. The earth has been made for me (and for my followers) a place for praying and a thing to perform Tayammum. Therefore my followers can pray wherever the time of a prayer is due.
3. The booty has been made Halal (lawful) for me (and was not made so for anyone else).
4. Every Prophet used to be sent to his nation exclusively but I have been sent to all mankind.
5. **I have been given the right of intercession (on the Day of Resurrection.)** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 1, Book 8, Number 429)

Completely absent from the five points is the dispensation of Allah's "Light" to his final apostle, with the right of intercession, while certainly a power distinguishing the Prophet from the humble warner he is alleged, in other verses, to have been, nevertheless far inferior to the eternal *Nur* that Sufism illegally asserts as belonging to Mohammed. The Prophet's intercession, as he mentioned to his followers, was exclusive to him in form rather than proprietorship:

Narrated Anas:

that the Prophet said, "For every prophet there is an invocation that surely will be responded by Allah," (or said), "For every prophet there was an invocation with which he appealed to Allah, and his invocation was accepted (in his lifetime), but I kept my (this special) invocation to intercede for my followers on the Day of Resurrection." (Sahih Bukhari Volume 8, Book 75, Number 317)

Mohammed's special intercessory power, the one distinguishing him from the previous prophets, if certainly repudiating other Quran verses professing his simplicity, nonetheless provides incontrovertible proof that Allah did *not* authorize Mohammed a rare and eternal light. For it he had

genuinely done that, the multiple hadith accounts of Allah granting his last messenger's extraordinary intercessory power, including the following, would have correspondingly confirmed Sufism's myth of Mohammed's *Nur*:

The Prophet said, "Allah will gather the believers on the Day of Resurrection in the same way (as they are gathered in this life), and they will say, 'Let us ask someone to intercede for us with our Lord that He may relieve us from this place of ours.' Then they will go to Adam and say, 'O Adam! Don't you see the people (people's condition)? Allah created you with His Own Hands and ordered His angels to prostrate before you, and taught you the names of all the things. Please intercede for us with our Lord so that He may relieve us from this place of ours.' Adam will say, 'I am not fit for this undertaking' and mention to them the mistakes he had committed, and add, 'But you'd better go to Noah as he was the first Apostle sent by Allah to the people of the Earth.' They will go to Noah who will reply, 'I am not fit for this undertaking,' and mention the mistake which he made, and add, 'But you'd better go to Abraham, Khalil Ar-Rahman.'

They will go to Abraham who will reply, 'I am not fit for this undertaking,' and mention to them the mistakes he made, and add, 'But you'd better go to Moses, a slave whom Allah gave the Torah and to whom He spoke directly.' They will go to Moses who will reply, 'I am not fit for this undertaking,' and mention to them the mistakes he made, and add, 'You'd better go to Jesus, Allah's slave and His Apostle and His Word (Be: And it was) and a soul created by Him.' **They will go to Jesus who will say, 'I am not fit for this undertaking, but you'd better go to Mohammed whose sins of the past and the future had been forgiven (by Allah).'** So they will come to me and I will ask the permission of my Lord, and I will be permitted (to present myself) before Him. **When I see my Lord, I will fall down in (prostration) before Him and He will leave me (in prostration) as long as He wishes, and then it will be said to me, 'O Muhammad! Raise your head and speak, for you will be listened to; and ask, for you will be granted (your request); and intercede, for your intercession will be accepted.'** I will then raise my head and praise my Lord with certain praises which He has taught me, and then I will intercede. Allah will allow me to intercede (for a certain kind of people) and will fix a limit whom I will admit into Paradise.

I will come back again, and when I see my Lord (again), I will fall down in prostration before Him, and He will leave me (in prostration) as long as He wishes, and then He will say, 'O Muhammad! Raise your head and speak, for you will be listened to; and ask, for you will be granted (your request); and intercede, for your intercession will be accepted.' I will then praise my Lord with certain praises which He has taught me, and then I will intercede. Allah will allow me to intercede (for a certain kind of people) and will fix a limit to whom I will admit into Paradise, I will return again, and when I see my Lord, I will fall down (in prostration) and He will leave me (in prostration) as long as He wishes, and then He will say, 'O Muhammad! Raise your head and speak, for you will be listened to, and ask, for you will be granted (your request); and intercede, for your intercession will be accepted.' I will then praise my Lord with certain praises which He has taught me, and then I will intercede. **Allah will allow me to intercede (for a certain kind of people) and will fix a limit to whom I will admit into Paradise. I will come back and say, 'O my Lord! None remains in Hell (Fire) but those whom Qur'an has imprisoned therein and for whom eternity in Hell (Fire) has become inevitable.'** "

The Prophet added, "There will come out of Hell (Fire) everyone who says: 'La ilaha illal-lah,' and has in his heart good equal to the weight of a barley grain. Then there will come out of Hell (Fire) everyone who says: 'La ilaha illal-lah,' and has in his heart good equal to the weight of a wheat grain. Then there will come out of Hell (Fire) everyone who says: 'La ilaha illal-lah,' and

has in his heart good equal to the weight of an atom (or a smallest ant).” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 93, Number 507)

As one can see in this fundamental hadith, there is no mention of the *Nur* of Mohammed, which would certainly have been described in great detail if it actually existed, as anyone – most of all the Islamic scholars who compiled the six authentic hadith – can identify the paramount importance of such a characteristic. The sufi extrapolation of Mohammed's eternal light from the verses and hadith idolizing the Prophet is, while understandable, not consistent enough with the rest of the scripture to be permitted to stand as a correct interpretation, especially when the majority of the Muslim orthodoxy will deny their own idolatry of the Quran, Mohammed and the Ka'ba, to say anything of actual worship and the basic equality the infrarational revelations create between Mohammed and Allah. That it – the Islamic idolatry – is at most a subconscious type of devotion, and is, as discussed, more of an attachment than an external act of worship, means that the sufi's actual exaggerated praise of Mohammed – to the point where they believe him to retain light and powers belonging to Allah, a status inherently making the Prophet a god beside Allah – explicitly exposes them as apostates to be killed according to the austere Islamic law that they only partially follow.

The intercession hadith also serve as reminders to mankind of the sole object of prostration, the one and only Allah, the Lord of Retribution whom Mohammed states will be seen on Judgement day. Similarly does it only mention the intercession capabilities of prophets; completely absent in these crucial – especially to the analysis of Sufism – hadith is any recognition of a category of mortals known by either the term or the characteristics of ‘saints’, which includes their alleged ability to be mediums for ‘Divine’ ‘light’ and ‘knowledge’. Instead, these authentic hadith only document a singular group of earthly religious *mediums* approved of by Allah, with Mohammed the final member of that rare category of men, who per the Hadith are also the only mortals granted any *active* ‘spiritual’ capacity – intercession – beyond receiving occult communications and verbally threatening mankind. The sufis however, as they are prone to do, violate the clear boundaries outlined by the Islamic scripture, because their illegal tradition of *shirk* embraces an allegation that their ‘saints’, who are not prophets, *also* possess the gift of intercession, with Rizvi in one selection informing us of the “divine” powers credited to multiple shaikhs:

The preliminary requirement for the *zikr* of a Chishti disciple was to imagine that his Shaikh was personally present before him, directing his contemplation. **The practice amounted to a belief that the Shaikh's spirit was divine both in its emanation and power.** It was the apparent deification of the Shaikhs and the Chishti practice of kissing the feet of, and prostration before pirs, that shocked their orthodox opponents. *Sajda* or prostration is an act of worship in which a man's forehead touches the ground...The practice was not invented by the Indian Chishtis. It was even sanctioned by Shaikh Abu Sa'id bin Abi'l Khair who argued that prostration was designed to show humility before the Shaikh **and that this invariably raised the spiritual status of the disciple.** Shaikh Nizamu'd-Din Auliya believed the practice should cease, but he found himself unable to oppose the traditions followed by Shaikh Qutb'd-Din Bakhtiyar Kaki and Shaikh Faridu'd-Din, who had both permitted prostration...Amir Hasan argued that those **who performed *sajda* before Shaikh Nizamu'd-Din Auliya, crushed the arrogance of their lower selves, elevating their spirituality. The Shaikh had been made holy by God; his eminence was not derived by a disciple's obeisance.** (*FF*, p 173)...Some argued that there was a distinction between *sajda*, designed to show respect, and the *sajda* of worship, and that the former was valid. Another form of expression was the placing of the head on the ground and in this instance the word *sajda* was not used. **However, the orthodox were also unsatisfied with this form, as prostration was made in the same way in both cases.** (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, pp. 218-220)

Although the term intercession is not used, one finds in the depiction of the disciple's prostration the same manner of worship Mohammed describes in the intercession hadith, with the shaikhs in question capable of raising the prostrating murid's "spiritual status", similar to how Mohammed's power of intercession lifts the believers into Paradise. Mohammed's prostration, however, was to Allah on the Day of Judgement; the sufi disciple bows before an earthly mortal whom Islam has not authorized the right to elevate the 'spirituality' of believers. While the pirs are *usually* aware enough to refrain from an explicit vocalization of *afterlife* intercessory powers (thus helping to sometimes avoid orthodox wrath), by permitting – or in the case of Auliya failing to prevent it – their followers to prostrate in worship before them, the sufis pirs nevertheless commit the heresy of *shirk*, confirming their departure from Islam *and* by the very fact of hoisting themselves to the level of Allah, allow for the entry of a belief – often found in the Indian subcontinent – that they possess intercessory powers. And as we already know Sufism to purport its 'saints' as capable architects of magic and miracles, as it proposes the existence of different levels of 'saints' who uphold the universe from the position of the "Unseen", and as the unseen sufi 'saints' continue their 'divine' work independent of the terms of death, we unsurprisingly find that these sufi 'saints', even after having left their physical body, have historically, and continue to be, worshipped by "Muslim" pilgrims because of an alleged ability to intercede:

Generally, Shaikhs were buried inside their khanqahs or close-by. Eventually rulers or important nobles, devoted to a particular Shaikh, erected imposing tombs on the graves of their patron saints. Even the humblest of these burial sites became institutions of far-reaching significance. By the eleventh century, khanqahs had become centres for the spiritual elite. However, the tombs were also for the people, both Muslim and non-Muslim, many of whom travelled vast distances to reach them. **Pilgrims sought the intercession of the Shaikh's spirit for the fulfilment of their own ambitions, both religious and mundane.** Naturally, the most enthusiastic disseminators of miraculous powers attached to the tombs were those whose wishes were attained...Gradually the veneration of tombs degenerated into an excess of superstitious practices. The belief spread that the spirit of the saints resided in their graves and could be invoked for private use. (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 103)

Notwithstanding Rizvi's criticism of the sufi custom of invoking the grave's spirit for personal use, the mere act of seeking the mediation of the shaikh's spirit for religious *intercession*, which in Islam is done with the purpose of escaping the punishment of hellfire, marks the past and modern sufis as apostates. After all, not only are the pirs incapable of interceding (since the hadith only identify the prophets as the mortals having a varied ability to petition Allah on Judgement Day), the tradition of Mohammed describes the practice of grave worship to be a vile one:

Narrated Aisha:

Um Habiba and Um Salama mentioned about a church they had seen in Ethiopia in which there were pictures. They told the Prophet about it, on which he said, **"If any religious man dies amongst those people they would build a place of worship at his grave and make these pictures in it. They will be the worst creature in the sight of Allah on the Day of Resurrection."** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 1, Book 8, Number 419)

While not Christian, adherents to Sufism certainly fall under the same category of the worst of creatures, worshipping at the grave of men they deem to be religious, when worship should be done in the mosque, facing Mecca rather than the pir's tomb, and during mandatory congregational prayers. That this practice continues in the Indian subcontinent establishes the impurity of the Islamic religion therein, with the "Muslims" of places like "Pakistan" failing to heed the message of the Quran, one that unequivocally rejects the practice of taking intercessors besides Allah:

Or have they taken intercessors besides Allah? Say: "What! Even though they did not ever

have control over anything, nor do they understand.” Say: “Allah's is the intercession altogether. His is the kingdom of the heavens and the earth, then to Him you shall be brought back.” And when Allah alone is mentioned, the hearts of those who do not believe in the hereafter shrink, and when those besides Him are mentioned, lo, they are joyful. Say: “O Allah! Originator of the heavens and the earth, Knower of the unseen and the seen! Thou (only) judgest between Thy servants as to that wherein they differ.” And had those who are unjust all that is in the earth and the like of it with it, they would certainly offer it as ransom (to be saved) from the evil of the punishment on the day of resurrection, and what they never thought of shall become plain to them from Allah. And the evil (consequences) of what they wrought shall become plain to them, and the very thing they mocked at shall beset them. (Quran 39:43-48)

As we have already seen in scripture *superficially* contradicting these verses, there are those who can partake in the intercession process besides Allah; but that fact does not subsequently mean that the *sufis* have religious justification for their grave – or any other type of - worship of shaykhs, because the Quran informs us that only Allah will decide who can assist him in dividing mankind betwixt heaven and hell:

Say: “Call upon those whom you assert besides Allah; they do not control the weight of an atom in the heavens or in the earth nor have they any partnership in either, nor has He among them any one to back (Him) up. **And intercession will not avail aught with Him save of him whom He permits.** Until when fear shall be removed from their hearts, They shall say: ‘What is it that your Lord said?’ They shall say: ‘The truth. And He is the Most High, the Great.’” (Quran 34:22-23)

In the authentic hadith we have already seen multiple examples wherein the prophets are granted by Allah the ability to request intercession; so too are the angels authorized to intercede – but only if they have pleased Allah:

And how many an angel is there in the heavens whose intercession does not avail at all except after Allah has given permission to whom He pleases and chooses. (Quran 53:26)

Unsurprisingly, there is no mention of ‘Unseen’ sufi ‘saints’ granted the ability to intercede for believers on Judgement Day, whether on the actual Day in question or previous to it by way of worship done at their graves. Neither is there Islamic documentation of ‘saints’ having the capacity to bestow boons unrelated to matters of the Hour. Of course, famous sufikuffar have historically propagated the opposite, with Hujwari claiming that the tomb of Abu’l Abbas Qasim B. al-Mahdi al-Sayyari, a sufi predating his own time, was known – as if he were a god - to grant the prayers of “Muslims” worshipping there:

His tomb is still to be seen at Merv, and people come thither to seek what they desire; and their prayers are granted. (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 158)

That Hujwari could so boldly claim to know that their prayers were being answered additionally confirms his violation of the Quran verse to not utter conjectures regarding the unseen, including the patently false – according to Islam – claim that Allah would permit, in his religion, a prayer towards the tomb of a sufi ‘saint’ as somehow immune from the charge of *shirk*. But Hujwari is far from alone in committing this great sin of innovating Polytheism into Islam, in practising and disseminating the false notion that grave worship is a lawful convention in the Asura of Falsehood's semblance of a religion. The celebrated Rumi, considered by many as representative of the myth of tolerant Islam, likewise exalted the power of grave worship in couplets relating Abu’l Hasan's worship of the Persian pir Bayazid Bastami's (born 804) grave:

It came to pass just as he (Bayazid) had said. Bu'l-Hasan heard from the people that (prediction), (Namely), "Hasan will be my disciple and my true follower (*umma*), and will receive lessons from my tomb at every dawn."

He (Abu'l-Hasan) said, "I have also seen him in a dream and have heard this from the spirit of the Shaykh."

Every dawn he would set his face towards the grave and stand (there) in attention till the forenoon, And either the apparition of the Shaykh would come to him, or without anything spoken his difficulty would be solved.

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book IV, 1925-29)

Of note in this magical heresy, of which Rumi offered no criticism, is the remarkable separation between the two – Abu'l Hasan born in 963 long after the death of Bayazid. Yet as Rumi propagated the blasphemy of immortal 'saints' alive prior to the world's creation, the power of Bayazid's grave was naturally extolled by him, as if it were equal or superior to the Ka'ba (the only appropriate direction for real Muslims to direct their prayers), as if the worship of a sufi's tomb is equivalent to devotion to Allah. Similarly did other famous sufis of the medieval age venerate the tombs of pirs, with the highly influential Nizamuddin Auliya known to pray at the tomb of a female saint named Bibi Fatima Sam:

Baba Farid frequently referred to the piety and sanctity of Bibi Fatima Sam of Delhi. She used to consider the Baba and his brother, Shaikh Najibu'd-Din, as her own brothers...**After her death, Shaikh Nizamu'd-Din Auliya used to go to her tomb to offer prayers and obtain spiritual satisfaction.** (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 402)

Auliya, whose Chistiyya order dominates the sufikuffar landscape within the subcontinent, sinned not only by practising *shirk*, but also by violating the verses lambasting female deities, with his prayers at the tomb of the rare woman sufi. Such was his esteem however, that upon his death the actual laws of Islam were once again ignored, this time by Muhammad bin Tughluq, the Islamic ruler of the time, who instead of striving to eradicate the crime of *shirk*, chose to build a dome over Auliya's grave in honour of the sufi:

Shaikhu'l-Islam Shaikh Ruknu'd-Din Multani led Shaikh Nizamu'd-Din's funeral prayer. Although he had wished to be buried in the open, Muhammad bin Tughluq later constructed an imposing dome over the Shaikh's grave. Both Hindus and Muslims were attracted to the Shaikh's tomb and considered its dust a sacred relic. (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 163)

This dargah remains a popular destination for "Muslim" religious activity within the subcontinent, and similar tombs have historically maintained the same magnetism to corrupt some of the most pious of Muslims to have ever graced the subcontinent:

Shah Madar's tomb in Makanpur in Kanpur attracted hordes of people. On 9 January 1659 while marching against his rival Prince Shuja, **the puritanically orthodox Aurangzeb yet saw fit to visit the tomb.** (*Alamgir-Nama*, Muhammad Kazim, p 241) (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 319)

Even the likes of Tughluq and Aurangzeb – the latter notorious for his genocidal jihads against Hindus – could not resist the urge, in varying degrees, to deify the sufi 'saints' through the construction or visiting of dargahs, when the actual religious teachings of Islam command the most pious of Muslims to destroy such tombs of infidelity and *shirk*. As the Islamic rulers, they should have informed themselves of the multiple authentic hadith in which the Prophet intimated that even his own grave

must be kept from public view:

Narrated Aisha:

Allah's Apostle in his fatal illness said, "Allah cursed the Jews and the Christians, for they built the places of worship at the graves of their prophets." And if that had not been the case, then the Prophet's grave would have been made prominent before the people. So (the Prophet) was afraid, or the people were afraid that his grave might be taken as a place for worship. (Sahih Bukhari Volume 2, Book 23, Number 472)

The language in the hadith is absolutely clear, which means that the continued existence of Sufism's practice of tomb worship at the pir's grave, especially in political states claiming to practice "pure" Islam, is quite ironic, with these so-called Muslims failing to heed the infrarational word of Allah that intercessors other than Allah – or those not included with the angels and prophets approved by him - will be of no value to devotees:

They worship beside Allah that which neither hurteth them nor profiteth them, and they say: "These are our intercessors with Allah." Say: "Would ye inform Allah of (something) that He knoweth not in the heavens or in the earth? Praised be He and High Exalted above all that ye associate (with Him)!" (Quran 10:18)

The sufi shaykhs and their "Muslim" followers nevertheless persist with their incorrect and blasphemous belief in the *barakah* or spiritual power that a pir - whether living or deceased – supposedly possesses; a puissance for which tomb pilgrimages known as *ziyara* are undertaken. Like other sufi tenets, the evidence within the Quran or the authentic hadith is almost nonexistent for support of their *polytheistic* heresy, with the sufis often turning to one particular Sahih Muslim hadith to vindicate *ziyara*:

Ibn Buraida reported on the authority of his father that the Messenger of Allah said: "**I forbade you to visit graves, but you may now visit them**; I forbade you to eat the flesh of sacrificial animals after three days, but you may now keep it as long as you feel inclined; and I forbade you nabidh except in a water-skin, you may drink it from all kinds of water-skins, but you must not drink anything intoxicating." (Sahih Muslim, Book 4, Hadith 2131)

The particular hadith is considered somewhat suspect, as the tradition is recollected by the father of Ibn Baraida instead of the reporter. But irrespective of that, the hadith itself does not actually support the sufi practice, as all it permits the believers to do is *visit* a grave; nowhere is there any mandate to pray towards a tomb within the mausoleum of a dead individual. Indeed Mohammed was absolute in his damning of the religious custom of grave worship, whether that be for the intercession by the pir's spirit for earthly affairs, or to assist the pilgrim on the Day of Judgement, as these are the religious habits of the unbelievers, with no overlap permitted for the real Muslims:

Narrated Aisha and Abdullah bin Abbas:

When the disease of Allah's Apostle got aggravated, he covered his face with a Khamisa, but when he became short of breath, he would remove it from his face and say, "**It is like that! May Allah curse the Jews and Christians because they took the graves of their prophets as places of worship.**" **By that he warned his follower of imitating them, by doing that which they did.** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 7, Book 72, Number 706)

The sufis are therefore guilty of disobeying the Prophet's tradition, and are to be – at the very least - cursed by the pious followers of Mohammed for imitating the religious customs of the kuffar. More perilous to the sufis than insults, however, is the orthodox case for them to be labelled as apostates and face the death penalty. Because in Sufism's creation of a heretical sect in which 'saints' are turned into

partners with Allah, in which intercession is permitted to those not actually sanctioned by Allah, in which “Muslims” are misdirected from the Quran and authentic hadith into wild sufi speculations on the “Unseen”, it has deviated from the “right religion” of Islam into a sect glorifying its own peculiar notions of religion and spirituality. And in their fissure from Islam into a strange hybrid sect, Sufism became what the Quran warned against:

So set thy purpose (O Muhammad) for religion as a man by nature upright - the nature (framed) of Allah, in which He hath created man. **There is no altering (the laws of) Allah's creation. That is the right religion, but most men know not - Turning unto Him (only); and be careful of your duty unto Him and establish worship, and be not of those who ascribe partners (unto Him); Of those who split up their religion and became schismatics, each sect exulting in its tenets.** (Quran 30:30-32)

This passage, easily understood on its own as another passage censuring the alteration of the scripture and the modification of a Muslim's adherence to it, is further elucidated by the Hadith, in which Islam is similarly defined to be straight, without the changes – including the ‘conversion’ of babies from their incipient Islamic faith - made by mortals:

Narrated Abu Huraira :

Allah's Apostle said, “Every child is born with a true faith of Islam (i.e. to worship none but Allah Alone) but his parents convert him to Judaism, Christianity or Magianism, as an animal delivers a perfect baby animal. Do you find it mutilated?” Then Abu Huraira recited the holy verses: “The pure Allah's Islamic nature (true faith of Islam) (i.e. worshipping none but Allah) with which He has created human beings. **No change let there be in the religion of Allah** (i.e. joining none in worship with Allah). That is the straight religion (Islam) but most of men know, not.” (30.30) (Sahih Bukhari Volume 2, Book 23, Number 441)

Indeed is Sufism's stage of tariqat, with its *shirk* of pir worship and fallacies of Mohammed's eternal *Nur*, enough to establish the sufis as schismatics and alterers of Allah's Islam, the aforementioned blasphemies made additionally problematic when we consider that under Sufism's historic form - ongoing to this day -, the practice of taking ‘spiritual’ disciples illegally seizes ordinary “Muslims” from the men who are their only legitimate earthly leaders: the aforementioned Imams. This select class of Muslims has actually, unlike the religious innovation of sufi ‘saints’, been sanctioned within the hallowed Asuric pages of the Quran:

And certainly We gave the Book to Moses, so be not in doubt concerning the receiving of it, and We made it a guide for the children of Israel. **And We made of them Imams to guide by Our command when they were patient, and they were certain of Our communications.** (Quran 32:23-24)

Unlike the apostate sufis, the Imams or Leaders of Islam are required to be certain of the final infrarational verses. They are not authorized to indulge in pir worship or obsess over Mohammed's mythical light; neither should they appropriate kafir practices like yoga and other heresies found in the *haqiqat* and *marifat* stages of Sufism. Indeed the function of the Imam, as indicated in the Quran, is to govern over the aggregate *earthly* power of the Muslims, rather than retreating to secluded khanqahs:

Surely Pharaoh exalted himself in the land and made its people into parties, weakening one party from among them; he slaughtered their sons and let their women live; surely he was one of the mischiefmakers. **And We desired to bestow a favour upon those who were deemed weak in the land, and to make them the Imams, and to make them the heirs, And to grant them power in the land,** and to make Pharaoh and Haman and their hosts see from them what they feared. (Quran 28:4-6)

Nowhere in the Quran or authentic hadith do we find Islamic leaders obliging the concept of 'spiritual' or even religious disciples, let alone the practice of *shirk* ubiquitous to Sufism. For any of that constitutes disobedience to Allah, and Mohammed has informed mankind that while it is their duty to obey their particular Imam, if that Imam were to stray from Islam, the Muslim must in turn cease to follow him:

Narrated Ibn Umar:

The Prophet said, **"It is obligatory for one to listen to and obey (the ruler's orders) unless these orders involve one disobedience (to Allah);** but if an act of disobedience (to Allah) is imposed, he should not listen to or obey it." (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 52, Number 203)

Even the most superior of Imams, the Caliph, is only supposed to follow the 'Word' of Allah, the tradition of Mohammed and the authentic example of previous Caliphs, as the hadith relating to Uthman's accession attests:

Narrated Al-Miswar bin Makhrama:

The group of people whom Umar had selected as candidates for the Caliphate gathered and consulted each other. Abdur-Rahman said to them, "I am not going to compete with you in this matter, but if you wish, I would select for you a caliph from among you." So all of them agreed to let Abdur-Rahman decide the case. So when the candidates placed the case in the hands of Abdur-Rahman, the people went towards him and nobody followed the rest of the group nor obeyed any after him. So the people followed Abdur-Rahman and consulted him all those nights till there came the night we gave the oath of allegiance to Uthman. Al-Miswar (bin Makhrama) added: Abdur-Rahman called on me after a portion of the night had passed and knocked on my door till I got up, and he said to me, "I see you have been sleeping! By Allah, during the last three nights I have not slept enough. Go and call Az-Zubair and Sa'd." So I called them for him and he consulted them and then called me saying, "Call Ali for me." I called Ali and he held a private talk with him till very late at night, and then Ali, got up to leave having had much hope (to be chosen as a Caliph) but Abdur-Rahman was afraid of something concerning Ali. Abdur-Rahman then said to me, "Call Uthman for me." I called him and he kept on speaking to him privately till the Mu'adh-dhin put an end to their talk by announcing the Adhan for the Fajr prayer. When the people finished their morning prayer and that (six men) group gathered near the pulpit, Abdur-Rahman sent for all the Muhajirin (emigrants) and the Ansar present there and sent for the army chief who had performed the Hajj with Umar that year. **When all of them had gathered, Abdur-Rahman said, "None has the right to be worshipped but Allah," and added, "Now then, O Ali, I have looked at the people's tendencies and noticed that they do not consider anybody equal to Uthman, so you should not incur blame (by disagreeing)." Then Abdur-Rahman said (to Uthman), "I gave the oath of allegiance to you on condition that you will follow Allah's Laws and the traditions of Allah's Apostle and the traditions of the two Caliphs after him." So Abdur-Rahman gave the oath of allegiance to him, and so did the people including the Muhajirin (emigrants) and the Ansar and the chiefs of the army staff and all the Muslims.** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 89, Hadith 314)

If the Islamic rulers – from the level of the global Caliph down to the regional or local Imam – fail to follow the shariat, the Prophet has informed mankind of their resultant status on the day of resurrection:

Narrated Ibn Abbas:

The Prophet said, "If somebody sees his Muslim ruler doing something he disapproves of, he should be patient, for whoever becomes separate from the Muslim group even for a span and

then dies, he will die as those who died in the Pre-Islamic period of ignorance (as rebellious sinners).” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 89, Number 257)

The Muslim Caliphs and Imams are absolutely inequivalent to the sufi ‘saint’ (who again, simply do not exist according to Islam), and are considered by Islam to be the most important of living men. Yet is this fact of the Asura of Falsehood's religion ignored by many of the famous sufis, including Rumi, who in his *Mathnawi* equated certain pirs with the Caliphs of Islamic tradition:

**Therefore in every epoch (after Mohammed) a saint
arises (to act as his vicegerent): the probation (of the people)
lasts until the Resurrection.**

Whosoever has a good disposition is saved; whosoever is of
frail heart is broken.

**That saint, then, is the living Imam who arises (in every age),
whether he be a descendant of Umar or of Ali.**

**He is the *Mahdi* (the God-guided one) and the *Hadi* (the
Guide), O seeker of the (right) way: he is both hidden (from
you) and seated before your face.**

**He is as the Light (of Mohammed), and (Universal) Reason is
his Gabriel; the saint that is lesser than he is his lamp (and
receives illumination from him).**

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book II, 815-19)

If these Rumi couplets are certainly heretical in their allegation of the epochal saint as the *Nur* of Mohammed, and in the sufi saint's illegal usurpation of the scripturally approved Caliph, they nevertheless contain some semblance of Islam, because when Rumi attempted to establish the vicegerent saint as the living Imam of the epoch, he did have for cursory support the hadith – like the following – that mention a select number of Caliphs who were to emerge after Mohammed:

It has been narrated on the authority of Jabir b. Samura who said:

I heard the Messenger of Allah say: “Islam will continue to be triumphant until there have been twelve Caliphs.” Then the Prophet said something which I could not understand. I asked my father: “What did he say?” He said: “He has said that all of them (twelve Caliphs) will be from the Quraish.” (Sahih Muslim Book 20, Hadith 4480)

The hadith presaging the Caliph's after Mohammed are known as the Hadith of the Twelve Successors, with another Sahih Muslim selection further delineating the Prophet's recorded prediction:

It has been narrated on the authority of Amir b. Sa'd b. Abu Waqqas who said:

I wrote (a letter) to Jabir b. Samura and sent it to him through my servant Nafi, asking him to inform me of something he had heard from the Messenger of Allah. He wrote to me (in reply): “I heard the Messenger of Allah say on Friday evening, the day on which al-Aslami was stoned to death (for committing adultery): ‘**The Islamic religion will continue until the Hour has been established, or you have been ruled over by twelve Caliphs, all of them being from the Quraish.**’ ” (Sahih Muslim Book 20, Hadith 4483)

The Hadith of the Twelve Successors are crucial to understanding both the couplets of Rumi and the core of Shi'ite doctrine, especially when we focus on their belief in the Mahdi, mentioned by Rumi in a slightly discrepant manner to the Shia tradition. For the latter, as befitting the predominant Twelver branch of their heretical sect, are specific with regards to the Mahdi, taking him to be the final of the twelve Imams. They use for support Hadith compilations lower in order of overall authenticity, including Sunan Ibn Majah, considered only by some to be the sixth authentic collection. In it, Abu

Saeed al-Khudri narrated the Prophet as saying, “The Mahdi will be among my nation. If he lives for a short period, it will be seven, and if he lives for a long period, it will be nine, during which my nation will enjoy a time of ease such as it has never enjoyed. The land will bring forth its yield and will not hold back anything, and wealth at that time will be piled up. A man will stand up and say: ‘O Mahdi, give me!’ He will say: ‘Take.’” (Sunan Ibn Majah, Vol. 5, Book 36, Hadith 4083) Ibn Majah also records Abdullah bin Harith bin Jaz Az-Zabidi as stating, “People will come from the east, paving the way for Mahdi, meaning, for his rule.” (Sunan Ibn Majah Vol. 5, Book 36, Hadith 4088) The decidedly more authentic – per Islamic scholarly opinion – Sunan Abi Dawud also has references to the Mahdi, with one affirming the above Ibn Majah hadith. Another, narrated by Umm Salamah, records, “The Prophet said: ‘The Mahdi will be of my family, of the descendants of Fatimah.’” (Sunan Abi Dawud, Book 37, Hadith 4271) Ibn Majah, however, conflictingly holds the Mahdi to be the son of Mary, none other than Jesus:

It was narrated from Anas bin Malik that the Messenger of Allah said: “Adhering to religion will only become harder and worldly affairs will only become more difficult, and people will only become more stingy, and the Hour will only come upon the worst of people, and the only Mahdi (after Muhammad) is Eisa bin Maryam.” (Sunan Ibn Majah, Vol. 5, Book 36, Hadith 4039)

But this particular hadith is considered weak, and is contradicted by the much stronger Sahih Muslim, which establishes the Mahdi as the final Caliph in one selection, and also distinguishes him from Jesus in a different tradition. The former relates the Mahdi as bountiful to the believers:

Abu Nadra reported:

We were in the company of Jabir b. Abdullah that he said it may happen that the people of Iraq may not send their qafiz and dirhams (their measures of food stuff and their money). We said: “Who would be responsible for it?” He said: “The non-Arabs would prevent them.” He again said: “There is the possibility that the people of Syria may not send their dinars and mudds.” We said: “Who would be responsible for it?” He said this prevention would be made by the Romans. **He (Jabir b. Abdullah) kept quiet for a while and then reported Allah's Messenger having said there would be a caliph in the last (period) of my Ummah who would freely give handfuls of wealth to the people without counting it. I said to Abu Nadra and Abu al-Ala: “Do you mean Umar b. Abd al-Aziz?” They said: “No (he would be Imam Mahdi).”** (Sahih Muslim Book 41, Hadith 6961)

The other Sahih Muslim selection clearly holds Jesus to be a separate figure to the Mahdi, to the extent that Jesus will decline the option of leading the prayer, as that is the purview of the Imam or Caliph:

Jabir b. Abdullah reported:

I heard the Messenger of Allah say: “A section of my people will not cease fighting for the Truth and will prevail till the Day of Resurrection.” **He said: “Jesus son of Mary would then descend and their (Muslims) commander would invite him to come and lead them in prayer, but he would say: ‘No, some amongst you are commanders over some (amongst you). This is the honour from Allah for this Ummah.’”** (Sahih Muslim Book 1, Hadith 293)

Of course, the matter of Jesus' involvement is further complicated by the existence of a Sahih Bukhari hadith, narrated by Abu Huraira, that declares, “Allah's Apostle said, ‘**The Hour will not be established until the son of Mary (i.e. Jesus) descends amongst you as a just ruler**, he will break the cross, kill the pigs, and abolish the Jizya tax. Money will be in abundance so that nobody will accept it (as charitable gifts).’” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 3, Book 43, Number 656) While the problem of the Mahdi's identity is certainly a debatable one within orthodox Islamic circles, Shi'ism and Sufism

exaggerate the Mahdi's status to the level of undeniable blasphemy, as seen in the previous Rumi couplets (II, 815-19) which find agreement with the Shi'ite on the hidden nature of the mahdi. For the Shiakuffar believe the Mahdi to have already been born, only to have subsequently assumed Occultation, where he continues to exist in the subtle realms while he waits for the time to return. The Sunnis - presuming they don't identify Jesus as the Mahdi – justifiably contend that the Mahdi has not taken birth yet, and will arrive as the final mortal – thus void of the supernatural qualities alleged to him by Sufism and Shi'ism - ruler of the believers prior to Judgement Day.

And if Rumi's couplets do not mention the Mahdi in the precise manner of the Shi'ite Twelver doctrine, they nevertheless display multiple heresies consistent to Sufism, including the fraudulent *Nur* of Mohammed, and the equally important usurpation of the real Imam's standing by the sufi imposters. For the sufi 'saints' should not dare claim the honorific of Imam over the Muslim masses, because the pirs are of the rebellious sinners, leading ordinary Muslims down the path of bidats and *shirk*, away from a uniform and unthinking obedience to the Asura of Falsehood's scripture. And for their peculiar form of 'guidance', there is a corresponding authentic hadith which perfectly identifies the nature of their erroneous instruction, along with the correct Islamic punishment for the pirs:

Narrated Abu Wail:

Somebody said to Usama, "Will you go to so-and-so (i.e. Uthman) and talk to him (i.e. advise him regarding ruling the country)?" He said, "You see that I don't talk to him. Really I talk to (advise) him secretly without opening a gate (of affliction), for neither do I want to be the first to open it (i.e. rebellion), nor will I say to a man who is my ruler that he is the best of all the people after I have heard something from Allah's Apostle." They said, "What have you heard him saying?" He said, "I have heard him saying, **'A man will be brought on the Day of Resurrection and thrown in the (Hell) Fire, so that his intestines will come out, and he will go around like a donkey goes around a millstone. The people of (Hell) Fire will gather around him and say: 'O so-and-so! What is wrong with you? Didn't you use to order us to do good deeds and forbid us to do bad deeds?' He will reply: 'Yes, I used to order you to do good deeds, but I did not do them myself, and I used to forbid you to do bad deeds, yet I used to do them myself.'**'" (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 54, Number 489)

The sufi masters find themselves in this exact position by virtue of their practice of the four spiritual stages, with the shariat portion providing them with the basic words by which to instruct their followers, including encouraging them to undertake *jihad*, asking them to recite the shahada, and denigrating the unbelievers such as the Hindus. Yet the subsequent three stages are what cause them to go astray in their actions, in which they fail – with the exception of a few cases – to actually fulfil their mandatory Islamic obligations, including physically participating in jihad against the kuffar (the sufis instead preferring to reside in monasteries). The stage of *tariqa* specifically accounts for their lapse into *shirk* – their recitations of the shahada failing to safeguard them – through pir worship; and all three of the final stages lead the sufis to exalt doctrine distinctly similar to that found in the Sanatana Dharma and other Infidel faiths, further corroborating a vile apostasy that includes illegally assuming leadership of Muslims. Indeed the vast majority of shaykhs cannot be equated with the 'divinely' sanctioned Imam, because the latter is verified in the scripture while the former is completely absent. This Islamic fact has long been understood by the more properly Islamic of the sufis, with one of them, Saiyid Ahmad Shahid, specifically assuming the mantle of *Imam* in order to feel secure enough to direct the Muslim masses in a true jihad, the fighting against the unbelievers commanded by the Quran and Hadith. He found supporters in the Islamic theologians and, ironically, other sufis:

The annihilation of the Sikhs throughout northern India was the overwhelming political and religious motivating force of the fiery Saiyid Ahmad Shahid. He believed that a programme for the liquidation of the British should be undertaken only after the complete annihilation of the

Sikh rule under Raja Ranjit Singh. **As jihad could be fought only with the leadership of an Imam, Saiyid Ahmad felt divinely drawn to assume such a position.** On 12 Jumada II 1242/11 January 1827 he officiated at a ceremony of *bay'a* in which several thousand theologians, sufis, leading citizens and common people in the North West Frontier pledge him their allegiance...In a long letter to the rulers of Bukhara, Saiyid Ahmad asserted that he had personally been divinely delegated the task of liberating Muslim towns from the hands of infidels...All Muslims should be obedient to the present Imam, Saiyid Ahmad, stated Shah Ismail; **those who rejected him as Imam or later relinquished their allegiance should be annihilated as if they were kafirs.** (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume II, pp. 388-89)

Of course, if Saiyid Ahmad Shahid wanted to thoroughly bring jihad to its resolution, he would have been wise to include the sufis among his aforementioned victims, including some of the very sufis who accepted him as Imam. For the sufi pirs, by way of a combination involving their shariat stage mandating that they verbally pledge allegiance to Islam through the shahada, their initiation of Muslim disciples by which they assume leadership of a group of “Muslims”, and finally their application of the religious traditions of the kuffar, are technically the enemies of Muslims, as outlined in a hadith describing the necessity of jihad against rulers displaying such disbelief:

Narrated Junada bin Abi Umaiya:

We entered upon Ubada bin As-Samit while he was sick. We said, “May Allah make you healthy. Will you tell us a Hadith you heard from the Prophet and by which Allah may make you benefit?” He said, **“The Prophet called us and we gave him the Pledge of allegiance for Islam, and among the conditions on which he took the Pledge from us, was that we were to listen and obey (the orders) both at the time when we were active and at the time when we were tired, and at our difficult time and at our ease and to be obedient to the ruler and give him his right even if he did not give us our right, and not to fight against him unless we noticed him having open Kufr (disbelief) for which we would have a proof with us from Allah.”** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 88, Number 178)

While the tariqat stage certainly leads the majority of sufis to diverge from genuine Islam into disbelief, there remains one way in which tariqat can be kept without heresy. That, of course, would involve a complete removal of the Infidel accretions, especially that of pir worship. The pir could no longer be an innovative ‘spiritual’ guide, and would only be able to instruct under strict accordance with the Quran and authentic hadith. Likewise would the khanqahs and other heretical components have to be eliminated, reducing tariqat to the Islamic version of a professor-student relationship. But as these changes would simply eliminate the purpose of Sufism, and as we can already find this sort of structure in the later establishment of madrassas and even Islamic universities, and as the sufikuffar believe their blasphemous creed to be representative of a profound Islam, the necessary correction will never happen, and the pirs will continue to represent the “ignorant people”, who Mohammed prophesied would high-jack the place of learned religious men:

Narrated Abdullah bin Amr:

I heard the Prophet saying, “Allah will not deprive you of knowledge after he has given it to you, but it will be taken away through the death of the religious learned men with their knowledge. **Then there will remain ignorant people who, when consulted, will give verdicts according to their opinions whereby they will mislead others and go astray.**” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 92, Number 410)

The sufis are not of the hadith approved category of learned religious scholars, because they incorrectly uphold kafir teachings as permissible to the Muslim, adopting the practices used by Infidels in their

Polytheistic shaykh worship and subsequently misleading Muslims into apostasy. Of particular note is the sufi appropriation of the seemingly benign – in comparison to the flagrant blasphemy of pir devotion – meditation and secluded prayer. But these latter two, including meditation which as a silent contemplation on God becomes a variation from standard Islamic worship, actually violate the scriptural insistence – with the previously cited penalty of violence – on mandatory congregational prayer, which we know, through the tradition of Mohammed, as far superior to private devotion:

Allah's Apostle said, “The prayer in congregation is twenty seven times superior to the prayer offered by person alone.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 1, Book 11, Number 618)

The leaders of these prayers are to be the Imams, with the determination of the leader based upon their knowledge of Islamic, rather than Infidel, scripture:

Narrated Amr bin Salama:

...The Prophet afterwards said to them, “Offer such-and-such prayer at such-and-such time, and when the time for the prayer becomes due, then one of you should pronounce the Adhan (for the prayer), **and let the one amongst you who knows Qur’an most should, lead the prayer.” So they looked for such a person and found none who knew more Qur’an than I because of the Qur’anic material which I used to learn from the caravans. They therefore made me their Imam (to lead the prayer) and at that time I was a boy of six or seven years**, wearing a Burda (i.e. a black square garment) proved to be very short for me (and my body became partly naked). A lady from the tribe said, “Won't you cover the anus of your reciter for us?” So they bought (a piece of cloth) and made a shirt for me. I had never been so happy with anything before as I was with that shirt. (Sahih Bukhari Volume 5, Book 59, Number 595)

Such is the extreme importance of the Quran idol, that the believers will follow the command of a child of six years old, as long as that child has rote memory of the Quran. The Islamic position is decidedly different to that of sufis like Rumi, who alleged that the Prophet outlawed monasticism for the main purpose of bringing the *saints* into the congregational gatherings, whereby the sufis, by their presence, might grace the lesser Muslims of the assembly:

In (all) assembly-places always be seeking amidst the intellects such an intellect as is (found) in the Prophet,
For the only heritage from the Prophet is that (intellect) which perceives the unseen things before and behind (future and past).

Amidst the (inward) eyes, too, always be seeking that (inward) eye which this epitome has not the power to describe.

Hence the majestic (Prophet) has forbidden monkery and going to live as a hermit in the mountains, In order that this kind of meeting (with saints) should not be lost; for to be looked on by them is fortune and an elixir of immortality.

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book VI, 2617-2621)

The Prophet, of course, did not personally provide any sort of comment on monasticism; he instead relayed the ‘Word’ of Allah permanently condemning the practice, a commandment that the sufis continue to deliberately ignore. What Mohammed did confirm, however, was the extreme importance of the Islamic idol of the holy book, to the extent where his tradition – on the idolatry of the Quran - utterly discredits Rumi's thesis that the meeting with the ‘saints’, those perceiving the “unseen”, was the intention of congregational prayer. For we know there to be numerous authentic hadith, including

one narrated by Uthman, in which “the Prophet said, ‘The best among you (Muslims) are those who learn the Quran and teach it.’” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 6, Book 61, Number 545) Consequently, the six year old with an understanding of the Quran in its literal ‘purity’, is at the pinnacle of mortal slaves in comparison to the eloquence of the poetic sufi description of immortal ‘saints’ and Mohammed's *Nur* and pir worship. Indeed the undeniable fluidity of Sufism's interpretation of the Quran is antithetical to the Prophet's tradition, in which we find him demanding that his followers reach a *uniform* opinion on the Quran's meaning:

Narrated Jundub:

The Prophet said, **“Recite (and study) the Quran as long as you agree about its interpretation, but when you have any difference of opinion (as regards its interpretation and meaning) then you should stop reciting it (for the time being).”** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 6, Book 61, Number 581)

The authentic hadith are incontestable evidence contravening Rumi's couplets, for they show the infrarational word of the Quran – instead of the meeting of ordinary believers with the sufi ‘saints’ – to be the primary reason for the congregational prayer, with the leader of the assembly, the Imam, concerned only with disseminating a homogeneous interpretation of the Quran, rather than his individual perception of “unseen” things. Indeed as we shall see, the Quran has banned the very idea that an individual can experience anything of the “unseen” while upon the earth; and such fabricated – according to orthodox opinion – accounts are inherently likely to lead to disagreements, when what the Asura of Falsehood desires – at least in opposition to self-identified kuffar - is an enormous congregation of automatons slavishly heeding the Quran-outlined sermons of the Imam. This leader, as the hadith previously cited help to define, is someone only differentiated from the assembly by his rote memory and verbalization of the Quran, rather than his experiences or a true individuality based on svadharma. If some of the flock do not have the capacity to learn the Quran by memory, they can at least follow the Imam's sermons and display their understanding through actions, including jihad against the unbelievers. Such is his importance that, in a hadith also describing the sweeping weight of the assembly, the prayer with the Imam is related by the Prophet as leading to a vastly superior religious bounty than the prayer performed in seclusion:

Abu Musa reported Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) as saying: “The most eminent among human beings (as a recipient of) reward (is one) who lives farthest away, and who has to walk the farthest distance, and he who waits for the prayer to observe it along with the Imam, his reward is greater than one who prays (alone) and then goes to sleep.” In the narration of Abu Kuraib (the words are): “(He waits) till he prays along with the Imam in congregation.” (Sahih Muslim, Book 4, Chapter 91, Number 1401)

The Imam is tasked with both keeping the prayer authentically Islamic and avoiding innovations or heresies that might arise from a mixture of non-Islamic religious tenets, including labelling his Muslim flock as ‘disciples’ who should be worshipping him. In refraining from these heresies, the Imam will augur himself nicely on the Day of Judgement, potentially saving himself from the fate awaiting those, such as the sufis, who veer off the path of Islam when specifically warned otherwise:

And (He commandeth you, saying): “This is My straight path, so follow it.” Follow not other ways, lest ye be parted from His way. This hath He ordained for you, that ye may ward off (evil). (Quran 6:153)

The sufis, neither completely Islamic and only superficially Dharmic, in the tariqat stage alone violate the straight path demanded of Muslims by Allah and Mohammed, by instead arrogantly raising themselves up to the level of associates with Allah. Indeed within the Quran we find an infrarational revelation utterly applicable to the sufis and their blasphemous tariqat elevation of their ‘saints’:

They have taken as lords beside Allah their rabbis and their monks and the Messiah son of Mary, when they were bidden to worship only One Allah. There is no Allah save Him. Be He Glorified from all that they ascribe as partner (unto Him)! (Quran 9:31)

The sufi pirs are certainly equivalent to the monks of the scripturally forbidden monasteries, and the use of this verse to damn the shaykhs – if Gabriel could have prophesied their emergence – is quite seamless. And though we know that the Jews and Christians, unlike the sufis, do not worship their rabbis and monks, that differentiation only makes the crimes of Sufism even more diabolical, especially when they were offered scriptural warnings against *non-devotional*, let alone devotional, monasticism. But the sufis only loosely follow Islam, primarily when attempting to differentiate themselves from the Hindus of whom they yet share the practice of Polytheism. That *shirk* is so ubiquitous to the sufi mentality is seen in the colourful levels of obscenity (against the Quran) through which Sufism incorporates their partners with Allah - from the establishment of sainthood, to the immortal and “unseen” powers of the same pirs, to invisible prophets like Khizr. But perhaps the nadir, the culmination of their stunning disobedience to the Asuric word of Islam, is found in a sufi innovation to the very concept of apostasy:

I have already said that the saints are not preserved from sin, for sinlessness belongs to the prophets, but they are protected from any evil that involves the denial of their saintship; **and the denial of saintship, after it has come into being, depends on something inconsistent with faith, namely, apostasy**: it does not depend on sin. This is the doctrine of Muhammad b. Ali Hakim of Tirmidh, and also of Junayd, Abu'l-Hasan Nun, Harith Muhasibi, and many other mystics. (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashfal-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 225)

Of course, we might suppose this to be the natural result of Sufism's decision to allow shaykh worship in combination with their doctrine – inevitably imprinted upon them due to the first stage of shariat – that disbelieving in something or someone or God marks a person as a religious apostate, henceforth guilty of committing treason. But this principle is in actuality a derogatory and false idea, for in true religion, there can be no apostasy, because religion and spirituality are ultimately personal matters – thus any decision to disbelieve in saintship, or a God, or multiple Gods, or one God, can never mean that one is betraying *oneself*, as long as the decision made is appropriate for the individual. Neither will that individual be a renegade to God, because God, an Immortal and Omnipotent Being, is not so fragile as to become upset when an individual decides to follow the lines of their internal law or svadharma. Indeed God might in turn rejoice at the development, for the idea of apostasy created by mortals, the ‘infidelity’ angering the orthodox, might in truth – even with the atheistic turn – be a move closer to the Purusha within.

Nevertheless, this particular self-conceit of the sufis - that a denial of their saintship is grounds to declare a person an apostate, with the sufis knowing well the severe repercussions that can accompany the epithet - hints at the double-sided bankruptcy to their final stages of *haqiqat* and *marifat*, ironically the same sources of some of their most celebrated output and subjective experiences. For it is not the Islamic religion to speak of saints or their authorized worship alongside Allah; nor is it Islamic to assign the label of apostasy to those failing to heed the affirmation of a non-existent – in Islam - “saintship”. Neither still, on the other side, is it Dharmic to allow for the vanity associated with declarations of sainthood, a narcissism which subtly threatens ‘Divine’ punishment to those refusing to acknowledge their status as immortal ‘saints’. Indeed, in their ultimate stages of *haqiqat* and *marifat*, we find both the accumulation of further heresies (against Islam) into Sufism, and the wilful defeat of the blasphemous sect in even *attempting* to ascend to the spiritual summit uncovered so long ago by the Rishis and other classical mystics.

If the sufi stage of tariqa has, in the form of the pir-murid relationship, a cosmetic similarity to the Guru-Sadhak partnership of the Hindu tradition, likewise in the haqiqat and marifat stages do we observe additional outwardly harmonious similarities between Sufism and the Sanatana Dharma. In these latter two gradations, the murid is guided by his pir to move beyond his tutelage and reach the pinnacle of sufi thought and experience, which to compare with the Yogin experience would require the consolidation of the two stages. For haqiqa is *slightly* analogous to Sat; marifat somewhat closer – respectively - to the stupendous Ananda. The crucial difference at the outset, besides the glaringly divergent Sat and haqiqa, is the very distinction made by the sufis between their final levels, when the Yogin would correspondingly experience it as *haqiqamarifat*. There is indeed a good reason for the separation, because as the forthcoming sufi writings will make abundantly clear, the vast majority of sufis do not believe in a Unity of Consciousness with God – especially the *Satchit* (Truth-Existence-Consciousness-Life-Puissance) in Satchitananda. Since their writings consistently deny that possibility, there can be – by the admittedly limited capacity of mortal expression – no substantial equivalence between the sufi experiences and the Brahma the Yogin live *As*. It is an admission, by multiple sufis in different ages, further magnified by the absence - or outright rejection – in their writings of the positive descriptions similar to those made by the Yogin of their Self-Realization.

All this then, demonstrating the haqiqa and marifat stages to be insufficient to the Yogin experience of the Truth-Existence along with the Power-Consciousness encompassed by the Pure Bliss, even if the marifat experiences certainly contain elements of profundities far superior to the genuine Islam the sufis deviate from. Nevertheless, Sufism's presentation of their stages gives the impression of far grander outcomes than actually realized by the disciple, with haqiqa defined as the fathomless inner or esoteric knowledge - the entire reality. This is the first half of the reward – for the disciple – obtained after venturing into the heretic world of pirs and khanqahs, the foundation for them to eventually experience the joys and occult experiences of marifat. It is also a concept remarkably different to the shariat, for the very idea of an esoteric truth can by its very definition potentially lead to something close to svadharma, which in turn can introduce the Muslim to blasphemous beliefs, since no true individual can be rigidly confined in character, thought and vitality to a single book. The pirs, however, do not advocate the path of svadharma to their disciples, with their pinnacle of esoteric truth something quite different, even if many of their saints describe it in terms native to the Hindu:

Haqiqat. By this word they mean a man's dwelling in the place of union with God, and the standing of his heart in the place of abstraction (tanzih). (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 384)

Hujweri's definition of haqiqat is more obviously heretical than the vague concept of an esoteric inner truth, since it has the distinct appearance of *shirk* by way of equating man as a partner in “union” with Allah. Indeed as we shall see, the manner in which sufis like Hujweri describe their union produces a barely convincing argument against the charge of blasphemy toward Islam; *at the same time*, their writings conversely provide clear testimony *rejecting* a similarity to Yogin experiences of mystic Unity. With regards to the former, their arguments in defence against the orthodox indictment of their beliefs assumes a Sisyphean nature, for at the start they have handicapped themselves by even conceiving of a stage of reality separate to shariat. This is because in Islam, sharia encompasses *both* the law and the truth, whereas the sufis assert shariat as the exoteric law, and haqiqa – however much they attempt to base it on the Quran and Hadith – as the *independent* esoteric truth that, irrespective of the occasional declarations of the pirs, incorporates much more than the shariat, and indeed contradicts it in multiple instances. Haqiqat also fails to acknowledge the comprehensive supremacy of shariat, which as the

infrarationally revealed and final 'Word' of Allah, must by default be the law *and* the truth, just as the Imam is the political *and* religious leader of the Islamic flock. Islam should be shariat alone, with all inner workings of the believer rigidly shaped along the extremely restricted Quran and authentic hadith. This is a fact of Islam understood fairly well by Sirhindi, who instructed the final stages of Sufism to be undertaken in service of shariat rather than – as a significant amount of sufis do – something outside of its orbit:

The Shariat consists of three constituents: Ilm, amal and ikhlas. The person who has not attained these three blessings has not attained the Shariat. When a person attains the Shariat, Allahu ta'ala likes him...Then, the Shariat is the capital that makes one obtain all the fortunes of this world and the next. **There is no goodness to be looked for, to be desired outside the Shariat. Tariqat and haqiqat, which are attained by great men of tasawwuf, are the assistants, servants of the Shariat,** and are useful in attaining ikhlas, which is the third constituent of the Shariat. **They are not intended to obtain something beyond the Shariat.** (*The Collected Letters of Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindi*, Volume I, Letter 36)

Ilm, amal and ikhlas are, respectively, to learn the teachings of the shariat, to perform what is learned, and to do everything for Allah's sake. Notably absent from Sirhindi's letter is the quest for an esoteric truth or a "union" with Allah, which even in Sufism's diluted – vis-a-vis the Sanatana Dharma - definition is a heresy from shariat. Indeed the Quran, a greater authority than Sirhindi, contains a conclusive passage equating the "truth" strictly with the 'Word' of Allah, the final infrarational communications revealed to Mohammed through the – as the Asura of Falsehood is described - "witness" Gabriel's occult recitation:

Then, it may be that you will give up part of what is revealed to you and your breast will become straitened by it because they say: "Why has not a treasure been sent down upon him or an angel come with him?" You are only a warner; and Allah is custodian over all things. Or, do they say: "He has forged it." Say: "Then bring ten forged chapters like it and call upon whom you can besides Allah, if you are truthful." But if they do not answer you, then know that it is revealed by Allah's knowledge and that there is no god but He; will you then submit? Whoever desires this world's life and its finery, We will pay them in full their deeds therein, and they shall not be made to suffer loss in respect of them. These are they for whom there is nothing but fire in the hereafter, and what they wrought in it shall go for nothing, and vain is what they do. **Is he then who has with him clear proof from his Lord, and a witness from Him recites it and before it (is) the Book of Moses, a guide and a mercy? These believe in it; and whoever of the (different) parties disbelieves in it, surely it is the truth from your Lord, but most men do not believe.** (Quran 11:12-17)

As the Quran is also the obvious source of shariat (in its aspect of 'Law'), we have here incontrovertible proof that it must be – according to the infrarational revelations themselves – simultaneously the "truth" or reality, both by Islam's declaration of itself as "truth" and the absolute lack of any verse distinguishing "truth" from law. As there are no indisputable 'Divine' communications or commandments on esoteric paths, sufis must, if they are to really be considered Muslim, refrain from their search for a reality beyond that identified in the Quran and authentic hadith. For as Sirhindi wrote, it is only a Muslim's belief in, and application of, the shariat, that will matter on the infamous Day:

On the Day of Judgement everybody will be questioned about the Shariat, not about tasawwuf. Entering Paradise, being rescued from Hell will be possible only by having followed the Shariat. Prophets salawatullahi ta'ala wa taslimatuhu 'alaihim' who were the best, distinguished human beings, invited everybody to the Shariat. The way of salvation is the Shariat. Those great people were sent in order to teach the Shariat. (*The Collected Letters of*

But these warnings from their well-wishers have failed to stop sufi pontification on matters far beyond the scope granted to them by Allah's concluding directives. In one example of their terrible pastime, Hujwari sources haqiqa to the “spirit”:

When a man feels desire and passion he turns to the soul in order that it may guide him to the lower soul, which is the seat of falsehood; and when he finds the evidence of gnosis, **he also turns to the soul in order that it may guide him to the spirit, which is the source of truth and reality**. But when aught except God enters the soul, the gnostic, if he turns to it, commits an act of agnosticism. There is a great difference between one who turns to the soul and one who turns to God. (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 277)

While the Spirit, or Atman according to the Hindu terminology, is certainly the source and substance of all truth and reality, the limitation of Sufism's knowledge is apparent in Hujwari's description, because the Yogi's *Conscious* experience is that of Spirit and Soul as merely different - yet fundamentally United - Aspects of God. The Spirit or Atman is the Consciousness *above* the triple human nature, whereas the Purusha or Soul is present *within*. Both are nevertheless God, with Jivatman's Oneness universalized (even as it takes a central being), the Purusha individualized in a different manner because of its Psychic Being evolving through multiple earthly lives. The Soul is Immortal and Illimitable, an *Indivisible* Portion of Brahma; as such, God does not need to “enter” the Soul, as Hujwari erroneously speculates, for God *is* the Purusha; there is then no great difference between turning inward to the Soul or upward to the Self. In view of this, Rumi's commentary on the Individual Soul's relation to the Universal Soul is also flawed:

The Universal Soul came into contact with the partial
(individual) soul, and the (latter) soul received from it a pearl
and put it into its bosom.

Through that touch on its bosom the (individual) soul became
pregnant, like Mary, with a heart-beguiling Messiah,
Not the Messiah who is (a traveller) on land and water,
(but) the Messiah who is beyond (the limitation of) measuring
(space).

So when the soul has been impregnated by the Soul of soul,
by such a soul the world is impregnated.

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book II, 1183-86)

The Individual Soul, however, is permanently United with Mahapurusha, and thus already contains the Pearls and Knowledge and Truth and Love of the Universal Soul. The ignorance – as contrasted with the Asuric falsehood of Islam – of Sufism's ideas on the Spirit and Soul are common ones, with the emotionality and desire of the Vital confused for the Soul; the Psychic aspiration for something higher likewise mistaken for the Pure, Unblemished Purusha; the Spirit considered irreconcilably separate from the Soul. For the ordinary non-Muslim, these errors are in fact a necessary stage of evolutionary development, helping to grow from the more superficial or standard vital misconceptions of consciousness into something deeper and higher. But for the actual Muslims, such sufi conjectures are prohibited, because whatever little knowledge the believers are to learn about the Spirit has already been sent to them by Allah:

They are asking thee concerning the Spirit. Say: “The Spirit is by command of my Lord, and of knowledge ye have been vouchsafed but little.” (Quran 17:85)

Having been taught, in their shariat stage, the infrarational commandments of Allah, the sufis should

not dare to claim knowledge - whether expressed in prose or poetry - of the Soul or Spirit that goes beyond the “little” provided by the scripture. Yet that is precisely what they do, especially in the haqiqa stage, whose zenith of ‘unity’ – shortly to be discussed – is an extraordinary extrapolation of Islam's comments on the Spirit, an idea far removed from the meagre quantity of communications the Quran offers on the topic. But even the lesser components of haqiqa are heretical, with the sufis using deceptive interpretations of the Asura of Falsehood's revelations to justify their tenets, including the adoption of verse 37:164 to vindicate their precepts of earthly stations – which they are to progressively ascend on their journey to ‘unity’ - within the haqiqat stage. And it certainly sounds appropriate when one hears the verse mentioned as “And there is none of us but has an assigned place, And most surely we are they who draw themselves out in ranks.” The Quran verse and those surrounding it, however, more accurately inform us on its meaning:

Then ask them whether your Lord has daughters and they have sons. Or did We create the angels females while they were witnesses? Now surely it is of their own lie that they say, “Allah has begotten” - most surely they are liars! Has He chosen daughters in preference to sons? What is the matter with you, how is it that you judge? Will you not then mind? Or have you a clear authority? Then bring your book, if you are truthful. And they assert a relationship between Him and the jinn; and certainly the jinn do know that they shall surely be brought up. Glory be to Allah (for freedom) from what they attribute unto Him. But not so the servants of Allah, the purified ones. **So surely you and what you worship, Not against Him can you cause (any) to fall into trial, Save him who will go to hell. And there is none of us but has an assigned place, And most surely we are they who draw themselves out in ranks, And we are most surely they who declare the glory (of Allah).** And surely they used to say: “Had we a reminder from those of yore, We would certainly have been the servants of Allah - the purified ones.” But (now) they disbelieve in it, so they will come to know. (Quran 37:149-170)

The assigned places, as one might expect from the monotonous insistence of the Asura of Falsehood through his occult medium, are of Heaven and Hell. The ranks are in relation to this final outcome, and have nothing to do with the plethora of innovations imagined by the sufis, including the very idea that there are mysteries of existence beyond the final infrarational revelations of Gabriel:

When I said that I had called this book “The Revelation of the Mystery”, my object was that the title of the book should proclaim its contents to persons of insight. You must know that all mankind are veiled from the subtlety of spiritual truth except God's saints and His chosen friends. (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 4)

These mysteries, apparently hidden from the mere reader of the Quran and Hadith, are according to Rumi, kept in the heart of the pir, as if they are Gabriel waiting to reveal further ‘truths’ to the rare prophetic slave:

(For) on his (the gnostic's) lips is a lock, while his heart is full of mysteries: his lips are silent, though his heart is filled with voices.

Gnostics, who have drunk of the cup of God, have known the mysteries and kept them hidden.

Whosoever has been taught the mysteries of the (Divine) action, his lips are sealed and closed.

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book V, 2238-40)

But there should be no set of “mysteries” for the Muslim to learn according to esoteric paths, because all that he needs to know upon earth has already been delivered to him in the Quran and authentic

hadith. The sufis however, believe themselves in a superior league to the 'one true religion', with Rumi daring to write, **"Who is the infidel? One forgetful of the faith of the Shaykh. What is the dead? One ignorant of the (spiritual) life of the Shaykh."** (*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book II, 3325) There are, however, much milder transgressions committed by the sufis, including some remarkable poetry and insight that only deviates from the shariat by virtue of the latter's inherent limitation – after all, the restriction of 'truth' to one book and a few hadith is going to severely confine knowledge. Thus we find insightful sufi writings, including Rumi's description of Prakriti's evolutionary process, to nevertheless skirt the lines of heresy due to a lack of scriptural commentary on the topic:

Saiyid Muhammad Ashraf Jahangir Simnani makes an interesting commentary on the following lines contained in the *Masnawi* of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi:

I died as mineral and became a plant

I died as plant and rose to animal

I died as animal and I was a Man,

Why should I fear? When was I less by dying?

Yet once more I shall die as Man, to soar

With angels blest; but even from angelhood

When I have sacrificed my angel-soul,

I shall become what to mind e'er conceived,

Oh, let me not exist! For non-existence,

Proclaims in organ tones: "To Him we shall return." (R.A. Nicholson, *Rumi, Poet and Mystic*, London, 1964, p 103)

Simnani saw the death of self in terms of a spiritual ascent towards the Divine and maintained that it demanded complete severance from involvement in earthly existence. **The verses did not, however, advocate transmigration, which Simnani added, was a different thing altogether.** (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 269)

While this is certainly a fine, if not entirely accurate – for the secret aim of evolution is not non-existence (even in the manner which the sufis, as we will discuss, outline "non-existence"), but the Divinized individual – depiction of Prakriti's gradual evolution accompanied by sudden bursts of consciousness through Avatars, it is also a budding example of the danger of haqiqa to the person attempting to genuinely practice Islam. For these sort of expressed intuitive thoughts – or perhaps a mystical vision of evolution – can easily lead to beliefs in direct opposition to the shariat. That Simnani rejected – with Rumi never advocating – transmigration (reincarnation) as a possible mechanism for the process described in the latter's poetry, shows the origin of the stanzas to be from intuition as opposed to concrete experience, because the utmost pinnacle of the mystic path will, in the few, lead to the Realization of the Soul that *instantly* brings an awareness of the previous earthly reincarnations that helped evolve the Psychic Being to the point where Realization of the Purusha could occur. Therefore the sufi disbelief in reincarnation speaks to an absence of Self-Realization, a mystic state that – as we will conclusively learn – is also explicitly rejected by Sufism.

Continuing with our discussion of milder sufi transgressions, we arrive at a different topic - the rejection of sensory attachments, which has historically been a common method used by mystics to help develop the intuitive faculties. Similar to the previous poetry on evolution, its portrayal by sufis like Rumi produces a mild heresy:

Any one who has escaped from (the bondage of) senseperception

is a Sunnite: the man endowed with (spiritual)

vision is the eye of sweet-paced (harmonious) Reason.

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book II, 64)

The Sunnite, as the name indicates, is the follower of the deeds, sayings and teachings of the Prophet Mohammed, a man known for his perverse gratifications, the nadir of which were his serial rapes, including the nine year old Aisha and the kidnapped Juwairiya and Safiyya. This frequent sufi linkage of sensory abandonment to austere Islam, including the rejection of lust, is potentially the most vulnerable of sufi tenets to cognitive dissonance, because the Quran and the rest of the sunnah overflow with the Asuric sanction of extreme lust. Of course, as Sufism advocates multiple heresies against core Islamic principles, there are many other ways for that distress to emerge. After all, Sufism promotes a haqiqa stage that openly champions rebellion against Islam's authorized leadership:

He whose scout is his inward eye - his eye will behold
with the very acme of clairvoyance.

His soul is not content with traditional authority; nay, his
feeling of (absolute) certainty comes from the inward eye.

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book VI, 4405-06)

But the Quran and authentic hadith are unambiguous on the obligation of ordinary Muslims, including Rumi, to obey their Imam, the traditional authority. The sufis however, tend to boldly assert – at times implicitly - the opposite, with Rumi having written, “**(Only) the gnostic's glorification of God is right (perfect)**, for his feet and hands have borne witness to his glorification.” (*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book IV, 1764) It is a couplet quite narcissistic for someone partaking in the mystic life, as the mere “glorification” of God can be done in multiple ways; for the pious, of course, the only proper exaltation of Allah is to be done according to the dictates of the Quran, with any discrepant claims the sign of an apostate. Nevertheless, the sufis persist with their repudiation of the permitted Islamic hierarchy of power, with Hallaj elucidating the psychological reason:

He who says: 'I know Him as He has described Himself.' It is to be satisfied with traditional authority without immediate confirmation. (Mansur Hallaj, *Kitab al-Tawasin*, The Garden of Gnosis, 11)

Hallaj was succinctly describing the human aspiration, as old as the world itself, to something greater than the ordinary mental knowledge; it is why he sought to go beyond the mere reading of the Quran, which to him was Allah's external portrayal of Himself. Hallaj wanted to experience Allah, rather than the traditional rendering of Allah in the holy book. While his experience – contrary to how it appears - of Allah was not the same as the Yogin Unity of Consciousness, his impetus to obtain some sort of confirmation beyond the traditional authority is, from the perspective of the spiritual seeker, perfectly valid. Islam of course, contends otherwise, with its scripture rigidly governing as much of the Muslim's life as possible, including the daily prayers that *must* be performed in unison under the command of an Imam, while in an assembly. But the sufis defy the clear injunctions:

The Shaikh...asked whether the Qazi knew how to say his prayers. Next day the Qazi visited the Shaikh and said he had written a number of treatises on the ways to perform prayers and therefore it was impossible to question his ability in this regard. **The Shaikh replied that the prayers of the ulama were different to those of sufis.** The Qazi asked whether they performed prostrations in a different way or recited from a different Quran. **The ulama said prayers facing the Kaba, replied Shaikh Jalalu'd-Din, but sufis did not pray unless they saw God's throne.** (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 201)

What makes this discourse more remarkable is that Shaikh Jalalu'd-Din Tabrizi was one of the rare sufis who actually risked his bodily life in the service of proper Islamic jihad – yet he believed that sufis could differentiate themselves in prayers to the point of speaking of a ‘Divine’ throne, something unmentioned within the authentic scripture as a legal object of a Muslim's prayer. At least Tabrizi was able to understand the real nature of jihad, because one of Sufism's greatest bidats is its unusual

accretion, upon the unrelenting Islamic war machine, of a peculiar type of jihad absent of war and rape and slavery. Indeed some of the sufis are quite dismissive of the genuine jihad, with Rumi having written, “The wars of mankind are like children's fights - all meaningless, pithless, and contemptible.” (*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book I, 3435) In another stanza, Rumi questioned whether Allah even cared about conquest and expansion:

Of what use should the possession of empires be to Him who
created (all) empire and the two worlds? (*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book I, 3143)

These couplets, while certainly high-minded, are yet the antithesis of Islam's principles, with the Asuric religion, as we know, demanding its followers to commit their lives to jihad, facing death for apostasy if failing to do so. Indeed the very fact that three separate infrarational revelations were given by the Asura to Mohammed predicting Islam's global conquest, shows that Allah – at least according to the scripture – deems the possession of empires to be paramount. But Sufism transgresses beyond the mere relegation of the importance of warfare against the unbelievers, having dared to innovate a different form of jihad, one mentioned in the following Rumi stanza:

**We have returned from the lesser Jihad, we are engaged along
with the Prophet in the greater Jihad.** (*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book I, 1387)

The greater jihad in question is not, however, the one articulated in the Quran and authentic hadith; from Hujwari we find a more detailed account of the sufi fable, one allegedly confirmed by the Prophet himself:

And the Prophet said: “The (mujahid) is he who struggles with all his might against himself (jihada nafsahu) for God's sake.” And he also said: “We have returned from the lesser war (al-jihad al-asghar) to the greater war (al-jihad al-akbar).” On being asked, “What is the greater war?”, he replied, “It is the struggle against one's self (mujahadat al-nafs).” **Thus the Apostle adjudged the mortification of the lower soul to be superior to the Holy War against unbelievers, because the former is more painful.** (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, pp. 200-201)

The full conversation is attributed to an 11th century book, *Tarikh Baghdad*, by al-Khatib al-Baghdadi, and is considered by mainstream orthodox opinion to be a fabricated – or, according to a small minority, a weak – hadith. With good reason as well, because the particular hadith is not contained within the six authentic hadith collections, and its chain of transmission is unsurprisingly poor given that it was an attempt at obtaining a first-hand account five centuries after the Prophet! While the sufi stress on the battle against the ignorance of the lower “soul” - the lower vital of yogic terminology – is certainly a fine endeavour from the non-Muslim perspective, it can only be justified *according to Islam* by one of the characteristics of the previously cited Islamic commandments on jihad, exemplified in the infrarational revelation, “**Warfare is ordained for you, though you dislike it.**” (Quran 2:216) It is a verse that, in the individual sense of a disinclination to fighting, a “dislike” of the Asuric obligation to battle terrestrial “unbelievers”, becomes representative of a war against oneself, *if one is not of the nature* to easily engage in corporeal battle. But that verse in no way supports the sufi blasphemy that there exists a greater jihad exceeding the physical war against the kuffar, with one already-cited Quran passage in particular utterly exposing the sufi heresy:

Those of the believers who sit still, other than those who have a (disabling) hurt, are not on an equality with those who strive in the way of Allah with their wealth and lives. Allah hath conferred on those who strive with their wealth and lives a rank above the sedentary. Unto each Allah hath promised good, but He hath bestowed on those who strive a great

reward above the sedentary; Degrees of rank from Him, and forgiveness and mercy. Allah is ever Forgiving, Merciful. (Quran 4:95-96)

As the sufis are known to take vows of poverty, they are hardly able to even undertake jihad with their wealth; and as they rarely participate in jihad, the religious obligation of a real Muslim, they belong to the ranks of the sedentary who fail to provide *either* their money or their body for the cause of Allah, which as Mohammed informed us, is religious warfare:

Narrated Abdullah:

I asked the Prophet, "Which deed is the dearest to Allah?" He replied, "To offer the prayers at their early stated fixed times." I asked, "What is the next (in goodness)?" He replied, "To be good and dutiful to your parents." **I again asked, "What is the next (in goodness)?" He replied, "To participate in Jihad (religious fighting) in Allah's cause."** Abdullah added, "I asked only that much and if I had asked more, the Prophet would have told me more." (Sahih Bukhari Volume 1, Book 10, Number 505)

Absent in Mohammed's tradition is the idea of an inner struggle to remove the defects of the lower self; indeed another authentic hadith is more straight-forward with regards to jihad's purpose – that of promoting the superiority of Allah's 'Word':

Narrated Abu Musa:

A man came to the Prophet and said, "A man fights for pride and haughtiness, another fights for bravery, and another fights for showing off; which of these (cases) is in Allah's Cause?" **The Prophet said, "The one who fights that Allah's Word (Islam) should be superior, fights in Allah's Cause."** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 93, Number 550)

Such is the fundamental obligation of physically fighting the disbeliever, that to turn back in battle is considered, as previously mentioned, one of seven great destructive sins:

Narrated Abu Huraira:

The Prophet said, "Avoid the seven great destructive sins." They (the people) asked, "O Allah's Apostle! What are they?" He said, "To join partners in worship with Allah; to practice sorcery; to kill the life which Allah has forbidden except for a just cause (according to Islamic law); to eat up usury (Riba), to eat up the property of an orphan; **to give one's back to the enemy and freeing from the battle-field at the time of fighting** and to accuse chaste women who never even think of anything touching chastity and are good believers." (Sahih Bukhari Volume 8, Book 82, Number 840)

The punishment for turning away from battle, a violation of Allah's 'Word', is as we know, death, with the passage containing the revelation, **"But if they turn back, then seize them and kill them wherever you find them, and take not from among them a friend or a helper"**, (Quran 4:89) explained in those terms by multiple authentic hadith, including the following:

Narrated Zaid bin Thabit:

When the Prophet went out for (the battle of) Uhud, some of his companions (hypocrites) returned (home). A party of the believers remarked that they would kill those (hypocrites) who had returned, but another party said that they would not kill them. So, this Divine Inspiration was revealed: "Then what is the matter with you that you are divided into two parties concerning the hypocrites." (4.88) The Prophet said, "Medina expels the bad persons from it, as fire expels the impurities of iron." (Sahih Bukhari Volume 3, Book 30, Number 108)

Sahih Muslim also notes, according to Abu Huraira, "that the Prophet said: **'One who died but did not**

fight in the way of Allah nor did he express any desire (or determination) for Jihad died the death of a hypocrite.’” (Sahih Muslim Book 20, Hadith 4696) Most of the sufis meet the first half of Mohammed's statement, failing to even fight non-Muslims; similarly do the majority of sufis, through their minimization of real jihad as a “lesser” form, display an indifference or lack of desire to mandated fighting - a belittlement for which they are to be killed within earth and face the fire afterwards. On the other end of the spectrum from this grave punishment for avoiding physical fighting against the kuffar, is the scriptural reward for fulfilling one's mandatory attempt at murdering unbelievers. In one hadith, Abu Huraira reported the Prophet as saying, **“There are one-hundred degrees in Paradise which Allah has prepared for those who carry on Jihad in His Cause.** The distance between every two degrees is like the distance between the sky and the Earth, so if you ask Allah for anything, ask Him for the Firdaus, for it is the last part of Paradise and the highest part of Paradise, and at its top there is the Throne of Beneficent, and from it gush forth the rivers of Paradise.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 93, Number 519) If the sufis dare to use that as proof of their fabricated “greater jihad”, by claiming “His Cause” as the internal struggle leading them to witness God's throne within the life, different hadith clearly indicate the mujahideen reward of an *afterlife* Paradise as resulting from simple, terrestrial, warfare against the unbelievers, with “booty” the earthly gains if surviving the corporeal jihad:

Narrated Abu Huraira:

Allah's Apostle said, “Allah guarantees him who strives in His Cause and whose motivation for going out is nothing but Jihad in His Cause and belief in His Word, that He will admit him into Paradise (if martyred) or bring him back to his dwelling place, whence he has come out, with what he gains of reward and booty.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 53, Number 352)

The mystic path itself (rather than a mystic facing an apostasy accusation), with its renunciations and meditations and other peculiarities, of course does not lead to martyrdom by way of being killed in battle, because the spiritual seeker's warfare is a psychological one. The Quran and authentic hadith, on the other hand, make quite clear to the Muslim that the greatest jihad is the martyrdom from being killed by the kafir in physical war; the lesser jihad is *still* a corporeal battle for Islam's terrestrial expansion - yet one in which the Muslim emerges alive. The sufis, however, cannot help but become confused on the matter, because they take fabrications of the Prophet's tradition to be authentic. Among the many concoctions include the common sufi theme of ‘knowing oneself’:

The Apostle said: “He who knows himself already knows his Lord,” i.e., **if he knows himself as perishable he knows God as everlasting**, or if he knows himself as humble he knows God as Almighty, or if he knows himself as a servant he knows God as the Lord. Therefore one who does not know himself is debarred from knowledge of all things. (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 197)

This, one of the well-known fabrications of Mohammed's tradition, is naturally reiterated by the sufis as much as possible, for it represents the timeless aspiration of spiritual seekers, and helps support the sufic innovation that a Muslim can become ‘united’ with Allah. It is a bidat that when fully examined, will clarify the unusual misinterpretation of mystic wisdom mentioned by Hujwiri above - that of knowing oneself, and Allah, in terms associated with the ordinary *mental* consciousness. But before we do that, it behoves us to look at more instances of the Prophet's word being forged, a crime of which Rumi was likewise guilty:

Hence the Prophet remained in astonishment, saying, “How are the true believers not seeing my face?
How are the people not seeing the light of my face,

which has borne away the prize from the orient sun?
And if they are seeing (it), wherefore is this perplexity?"—
until a revelation came (to him from God), saying, "That face
is in concealment.

In relation to thee it is the moon, and in relation to the people
it is the cloud, in order that the infidel may not see thy face
for nothing.

In relation to thee it is the bait, and in relation to the people it
is the trap, in order that the vulgar may not drink of this

chosen wine." (*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book IV, 3474-78)

If these falsely attributed words can be, in normal circumstances, considered reasonable under the domain of poetic license, Islam is not as forgiving. For that is the very nature of an infrarational faith that demands strict obedience in thinking, because it fears the leaking of the dam will turn a trickle into a flood. Indeed, in the category of contrived prophetic words, the fantasies of a poet can lead to far worse than a minor bidat:

And the Apostle has said: "He that hears the voice of Sufis (ahl al-tasawwuf) and does not say Amen to their prayer is inscribed before God among the heedless." (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 30)

This particular forgery has a sinister element to it, because Hujwiri should have clearly understood the path of Sufism to have not existed during Mohammed's time: likewise would he have known the authentic hadith to be void of any mention of Sufism. It hints at a conscious attempt to project, through the exemplar Mohammed, an earthly power upon the sufis - with an implied punishment for those refusing to say amen to their prayer - that should only be granted to the Imams. Even if sufis like Hujwiri may only be trying to satisfy a vanity of having their prayers obeyed, instead of the earthly spoils accumulated by the Imams, the latter is likely to be extremely wary of letting the flock stray into the sufi sect, because the heresies proposed by the sufis go against the fundamental Islamic tenets, from their fabricated "greater" jihad to the similarly erroneous "greater" pilgrimage:

He (Bayazid) sat down before him and asked about his
condition; he found him to be a dervish and also a family
man.

He (the old man) said, "Whither art thou bound, O Bayazid?
To what place wouldst thou take the baggage of travel in a
strange land?"

Bayazid answered, "I start for the Ka'ba at daybreak." "Eh,"
cried the other, "what hast thou as provisions for the road?"
"I have two hundred silver dirhems," said he; "look,
(they are) tied fast in the corner of my cloak."

**He said, "Make a circuit round me seven times, and reckon
this (to be) better than the circumambulation (of the Ka'ba) in
the pilgrimage;**

**And lay those dirhems before me, O generous one. Know that
thou hast made the greater pilgrimage and that thy desire has
been achieved;**

(That) thou hast (also) performed the lesser pilgrimage and
gained the life everlasting; (that) thou hast become pure (*saf*)
and sped up (the Hill of) Purity (*Safa*).

By the truth of the Truth (God) whom thy soul hath seen, (I

swear) that He hath chosen me above His House.

**Albeit the Ka'ba is the House of His religious service,
my form too, in which I was created, is the House of His
inmost consciousness.**

Never since God made the Ka'ba hath He gone into it, and
none but the Living (God) hath ever gone into this House (of
mine).

**When thou hast seen me, thou hast seen God: thou hast
circled round the Ka'ba of Sincerity.**

**To serve me is to obey and glorify God: beware thou think
not that God is separate from me.**

Open thine eyes well and look on me, that thou mayst behold
the Light of God in man."

Bayazid gave heed to those mystic sayings, and put
them in his ear as a golden ring.

(The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book II, 2236-2250)

That Bayazid, in this narrative of Rumi, had funds for the journey to Mecca yet chose to undertake a symbolic pilgrimage, once again places one of Sufism's most famous proponents in direct violation of the infrarationally revealed scripture, which mandates the Muslim's journey to the Ka'ba:

Wherein are plain memorials (of Allah's guidance); the place where Abraham stood up to pray;
and whosoever entereth it is safe. **And pilgrimage to the House is a duty unto Allah for
mankind, for him who can find a way thither.** As for him who disbelieveth, (let him know
that) lo! Allah is Independent of (all) creatures. (Quran 3:97)

Skipping the Hajj when funds were available was not enough heresy for Bayazid, as Rumi's account also dares to initially equate the old man with the Ka'ba, only to continue burying itself in blasphemy by then asserting the old man as *superior* to the Ka'ba, finally raising him to the level of Allah by telling Bayazid that when the 'saint' saw the old man, he was in fact seeing Allah, who was not separate from this mortal! Of course, all of this is fine for mystics, who proceed on their path according to subtle psychological precepts, including symbolic rituals and the desire for oneness – the definition of which varies according to the type of mystic - with their Benefactor. Unfortunately for the sufis, as they label themselves Muslim, their canons violate the holy Islamic 'Word', with Rumi's fable advocating both *shirk* and – due to the specific violation of an infrarationally revealed command – the strict Islamic regulation against selectively choosing tenets to follow. Rumi, as one might imagine, was not alone in the latter heresy:

To Shaikh Nakhsabi, **Islam was a religion which offered and incorporated a middle path.** In his Tuti Nama he ended his preface with the poem:

'Oh Nakhsabi! Adopt the religion of those who follow a middle course.

The Prophet himself has ordained to do so.

The middle of the road policy is praiseworthy.

The commandment of Islam is moderation.' (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 133)

Khwaja Ziya Nakhsabi, a sufi disciple of Shaikh Faridu'd-Din Mahmud of the subcontinental Chistiyya order, either failed to properly read the entire breadth of the Quran, or simply ignored its unambiguous dictates on the matter of a "middle course". Either way he announced himself as an apostate, for as we know, the infrarationally revealed, Asuric word of Islam, categorically rejects the adoption of a "middle course":

And when a wave like mountains covers them they call upon Allah, being sincere to Him in obedience, **but when He brings them safe to the land, some of them follow the middle course; and none denies Our signs but every perfidious, ungrateful one.** (Quran 31:32)

If the *literal* repudiation, by the Quran, of those following the “middle course” is not enough for the likes of Nakshabi, a group whom incredibly persist – fabricating the Prophet's tradition in the process - with the notion that Islam is a religion of moderation, other verses previously mentioned similarly dismiss such conjectures, with one passage stating, **“Surely those who disbelieve in Allah and His messengers and (those who) desire to make a distinction between Allah and His messengers and say, “We believe in some and disbelieve in others,” and desire to take a course between (this and) that. These it is that are truly unbelievers, and We have prepared for the unbelievers a disgraceful chastisement.”** (Quran 4:150-51) These verses, the importance of which cannot be overstated, are clear in their language, and show the sufi fantasy of a moderate or flexible Islam to be a lie. For Islam is a religion of obedience, not moderation; the Asuric word of Allah must be completely followed at the threat of death in the life or torture subsequent to it. Yet it is that same infrarational word, the Quran, the only path a Muslim is to follow, without a middle, distinct from “this and that”, that the sufis insult in their myriad of heresies from the sole course, with Rumi even attesting to the irrelevance of *any* book:

But if you serve God and do not read a single book, you will
learn rare sciences from your (own) bosom. (*The Mathnawi of Jalalu 'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book VI, 1932)

If this is fine for the sufis, who have a pir to instruct them on the “rare sciences”, the actual Muslim cannot follow the ‘true religion’ without the guide of either the Quran or the Imam informed on the same scripture. The Muslim is not required to learn anything other than the Quran and Mohammed's tradition – the Asura of Falsehood does not, *at least until* the preeminence of Islam is established, want any innovations into the religion that might potentially weaken his desired inculcation of falsehood, hatred and violence within the believers, from which they lash out against the non-Muslims: It is only after the orthodoxy is entrenched that the Asura of Falsehood will find those studying non-Islamic teachings useful – but only because they will then function as *objects* of the Asuric hatred by way of their deviancy from Islam. And the sufis can certainly assume that unenviable standing, because if they are not blithely slighting the position of the Quran by degrading the importance of reading it, they are instead exalting other books than the Quran to dangerous levels, with Rumi, in one example, self-promoting the fourth book of his own Mathnawi:

Only the thief and the coiner are adversaries of the light:
succour (us) from these twain, O Succourer!
**Shed light upon the Fourth Book, for the sun rose from
the Fourth Heaven.**

Come, give light, like the sun, from the Fourth (Book), so that
it may shine upon (all) countries and inhabited lands.

**Whoever reads it (as) an idle tale, he is (as) an idle tale; and
he who regards it as money in his own hands (real truth to be
applied to himself) is like a man (of God).**

It is the water of the Nile, which seemed blood to the
Egyptian, (but) to the people of Moses was not blood, but
water.

**At this moment the enemy of these words (the *Mathnawi*) is
pictured in (thy) sight (falling) headlong into Hell-fire.**

O Ziya'u'l-Haqq (Radiance of God), thou hast seen his

(evil) state: God hath shown unto thee the answer to his (evil) actions.

Thine eye which beholds the invisible is a master(-seer) like the Invisible: may this vision and gift not vanish from this world! (*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book IV, 29-36)

Ironically for someone who minimized the importance of books, his own poetry was glorified – by him – to the level of God, with the enemy of Rumi's words apparently – as if they were deniers of the Quran – worthy of Allah's afterlife punishment. Contrary to Rumi's fantasy, there is no word other than the Quran that is to receive any sort of supreme status; to assert otherwise becomes a most dangerous religious innovation, one that inevitably leads to a venture into books, ideas or beliefs outside of the borders of the Islamic scripture, culminating in a dreaded hybrid faith that is automatically non-Islamic. Unsurprisingly, we find many sufis, especially those from the Indian subcontinent, indulging in this illegal fusion - with Hinduism, of all religions, partnering Islam in their haqiqat concoctions:

Shaikh Abdu'r-Rahman Chishti, a descendant of Shaikh Ahmad Abdu'l-Haqq of Rudauli, who succeeded to the leadership of the Chishti order in 1032/1622 was an interesting personality. **A scholar of Sanskrit, he gave new explanations to the Bhagavad-Gita in the light of Islam, most notable is his work, the Mir'atu'l Makhluqat, which associated the Hindu cosmogony of Yoga-Vashisht philosophy with Muslim beliefs.** (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 14)

Others went further, with the aforementioned Abdul-Quddus advocating the yogic experience of *samadhi*:

...the most significant impact of Hathayoga was the treatise, the *Amrita-Kunda*. It is believed that it was translated by Qazi Ruknu'd-Din Samarqandi who was probably Qazi Ruknu'd-Din Abu Hamid Muhammad bin Muhammad al-Amidi of Samarqand, the author of the *Kitab al-Irshad* who visited Lakhnauti between 1209-19 and 1216-17 **and was initiated into Hatha-Yogic principles by a Siddha, called Bhojar Brahman...**A further Arabic version was again prepared by a Brahman from Kamrup, apparently in collaboration with a Muslim scholar. This version was re-translated into Persian by Shaikh Muhammad Ghaus Shattari...Shaikh Abdul-Quddus Gangohi who had an extensive knowledge of the Arabic and Persian versions of the *Amrita-Kunda*, which were widespread before the translation by Shaikh Muhammad Ghaus, imparted its essence to one of his disciples, Shaikh Sulaiman...**The work goes on to prescribe exercises by which one could achieve the Nath-Yogic goal of transubstantiation of the body into a state of Samadhi.** (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 335)

Samadhi, while often very helpful for the aspirations of a mystic, does not necessarily imply the Realization of the Self, for in its purest definition samadhi is simply an intense inner concentration with a corresponding silence of the ordinary external mind. This state, often described in English as a trance, is quite broad and encompasses experiences of the higher mind, or the absolute stillness and peace of Nirvana, or the potential to reach a state where one receives downrushes of Ananda – yet without the corresponding Supreme Consciousness – alone, and of course the ultimate pinnacle of the Pure Satchitananda. It is a sublime concentration that while rare, extraordinary and subjectively stupendous, has the small drawback whereby on its own, it does not necessarily transform the outward consciousness, even if the potential for samadhi experiences to do so is certainly possible. The type of samadhi that leads to the transformation, however, is the highest type of 'trance', as other types of internal concentrations – for the individual whose consciousness has not been purified to the extent of creating a firm opening to the highest planes – might instead result in intensified *vital* experiences that confuse the seeker.

While we will find the subtle variances of samadhi important to our later examination of Sufism's marifat occult experiences, the very fact that a significant amount of sufis dare to incorporate the yogic conception of samadhi into their religion, once again highlights their intransigent blasphemy. For this particular innovation into Islam is one that can lead – as the Hindu treatises so beloved by many sufis clearly state – to an experience of a Pure and Conscious Unity with God, which as we know is *shirk* to a religion that only accepts the notion that God is transcendental and separate from humans. But the sufis, as all mystics are prone, gravitate toward wisdom from many sources, with the 14th century mystic of Tabriz, Sa'du'd-Din Mahmud Shabistari, conceding as much in questions posed by another sufi, Amir Husain. Shabistari's answers to the questions, “How can the use of various sufi symbols in poetry, such as the eye, lip, cheek, curl, and mole, be explained? How can one also explain that sufis haunt taverns and may even believe that idol worship, ideas from Christianity, and so on, can be useful in the mystic path?”, were as follows:

Sufis express their conception of God and the universe and of their own ecstatic experiences in language which may appear unseemly to others, but it is not so to them. **They are ready to appreciate the positive and true aspects contained in other religions such as Christianity, Magianism and even in idolatry.** (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, pp. 206-209)

But as the Quran incessantly bashes other religions, the recognition of their true aspects is a treacherous decision, with Islam's agnate Christianity the only one a Muslim can really get away with having a mild appreciation for. Such courtesy, of course, is not extended by Islam to the matter of “idolatry”, with Mohammed's historic example, we recall, consisting of the physical destruction of “idols” under an Asuric impetus that simultaneously inspired him to voice infrarational revelations deeming his actions a victory for “truth”:

Narrated Abdullah bin Masud:

Allah's Apostle entered Mecca (in the year of the Conquest) and there were three-hundred and sixty idols around the Ka'ba. He then started hitting them with a stick in his hand and said: ‘Truth (i.e. Islam) has come and falsehood (disbelief) vanished. Truly falsehood (disbelief) is ever bound to vanish.’ (Quran 17.81) ‘Truth has come and falsehood (Iblis) can not create anything.’ (Quran 34.49) (Sahih Bukhari Volume 6, Book 60, Number 244)

The custom of using “idols” in religious practice is condemned, per the hadith, as something “inspired” by Satan:

Narrated Ibn Abbas:

All the idols which were worshipped by the people of Noah were worshipped by the Arabs later on. As for the idol Wadd, it was worshipped by the tribe of Kalb at Daumat-al-Jandal; Suwa was the idol of (the tribe of) Murad and then by Ban, Ghutaif at Al-Jurf near Saba; Yauq was the idol of Hamdan, and Nasr was the idol of Himyr, the branch of Dhi-al-Kala. The names (of the idols) formerly belonged to some pious men of the people of Noah, **and when they died Satan inspired their people to prepare and place idols at the places where they used to sit, and to call those idols by their names.** The people did so, but the idols were not worshipped till those people (who initiated them) had died and the origin of the idols had become obscure, whereupon people began worshipping them. (Sahih Bukhari Volume 6, Book 60, Number 442)

With both the Quran and Mohammed's example firmly establishing Islam's violent inflexibility to religious artwork or architecture (with the ironic exception of the Ka'ba), items incorrectly labelled by the Asuric religion as “idols”, one would expect Muslims to not even dare indulge in apologetics for the practice. The sufis, however, are in fact obstinate renegades from the ‘true religion’, with one of their

most notorious heretics, Ibn Arabi, sharing the same opinion of “idols” as Shabistari:

He declared:

‘My heart has become the receptacle of every ‘form’;

It is a pasture for gazelles and
a convent for Christian Monks.

And a temple for idols, and the pilgrim's Kaba,
and the tablets of the Torah
and the Book of the Quran.

I follow the religion of love; whichever way its camels take,
for this is my religion and my faith.’ (*Tarjuman al-Ashwaq*, quoted by Affifi, *A history of Muslim philosophy*, I, p 144) (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, pp. 108-109)

While it is questionable to call Arabi's religion one of love, it certainly was not the religion of Islam, since Christian monasticism, Polytheist idols and Torah tablets are placed by him on the same pedestal as the jealous Quran. From the non-Muslim perspective however, Arabi's writings on the topic represent a fine understanding on the use of “idols”, as Arabi tended to view them in relation to his wider conceptions of God and the earth:

As long as an idolater was aware he was worshipping God, idolatry could be tolerated for this tended to make *tanzih* and *tashbih* complimentary. If an idol worshipper imagined that a piece of stone or wood was God, he ignored *tanzih*. (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 107)

Tanzih to Arabi was completeness in the Absolute; *tashbih* its counterpart of limitation. Arabi was attempting – as we shall shortly see – to integrate the question of idolatry into his understanding of Allah's absoluteness. But he was not the only sufi to comprehend idolatry in a heretical manner to Islam: Rumi similarly chose to consign idolatry to an attachment to forms, writing, “You are an idol-worshipper when you remain in (bondage to) forms: leave its (the idol's) form and look at the reality.” (*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book I, 2893) Hujwari likewise permitted the use of “idols” as a potential avenue to God:

Similarly, some were led to God by idols and by the sun and moon, while others were led astray. Such guides are a means of gnosis, but not the immediate cause of it, and **one means is no better than another in relation to Him who is the author of them all**. (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwari, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 273)

Islam, of course, only offers the Quran and authentic hadith as a “means” to Allah, with the obvious caveat that a separative consciousness will always exist between the Muslim and Allah, even if the former finds himself in Paradise. Hujwari was nevertheless at least – in comparison to Islam's infrarational rigidity - able to offer a superior insight into the truth of the world's diversity, including the use of “idols”, constituting the varied paths to gnosis. It was Arabi, however, who offered perhaps the most insightful sufi commentary into humanity's use of “idols”, distinguishing between the subjective natures of individuals using religious imagery in their worship:

“The knower knows who (really) is the object of his worship; he knows also the particular form in which (the object of his worship) appears (to him). He is aware that the ‘dispersion’ and ‘multiplicity’ are comparable to the corporeal members in the sensible form (of man's body) and the non-corporeal faculties in the spiritual form (of man), **so that in every object of worship what is worshipped is no other than God Himself. In contrast to this, the ‘lower’ people are those who imagine a divine nature in every object of their worship...The ‘higher’ people, on the contrary, are not victims of this kind of deceitful imagination. (In the**

presence of each idol) they tell themselves, ‘This is a concrete form of theophany, and, as such, it deserves veneration’, but they do not confine (theophany) to this single instance (i.e. They look upon everything as a particular form of theophany).’ (Izutsu, p 55) (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume II, p. 50)

In another explanation, Arabi referred to each “idol” as an aspect of Allah, and again dared to write that the worship of such objects is, at least in the ‘higher’ type of worshipper, simply faith in Allah:

Allah has an aspect in every worshipped thing. Whoever recognises it, recognises, and whoever is ignorant of it is ignorant among the people of Muhammad. Your Lord decreed that you should worship only Him that is the judgement of your Lord.

The one who possesses knowledge knows who the slave is and in what form he is manifested as far as he is a slave. Separation and multiplicity are like the limbs of the sensory form and like faculties of meaning of the spiritual form. **He only worships Allah in every worshipped object. The lowest one is the one who imagines that godness is contained in it.** Were it not for this illusion, stones and other things would not have been worshipped. This is why He said, “Say: Name them!” (13:33) If they had named them, they would have named stone, tree, or star. If they had been asked, “Who do you worship?” they would have replied, “God”...

The highest knower does not use this imagination, but rather he says that this is a divine *tajalli* which one must exalt, and he does not restrict himself. The lowest one is the one possessed of fantasy: “We only worship them so that they bring us nearer to Allah.” (39:3) The highest knower says, “Your god is One God, so submit to Him,” (22:34) wherever He is manifest, “and give good news to the humble-hearted” who humble the fire of their nature. (Ibn Arabi, *Fusus Al-Hikam*, The Seal of the Wisdom of the Breath of Divine Inspiration In the Word of Noah)

While Arabi certainly offers a more subtle and greater understanding to the use of artwork in religious practice, his interpretation is first and foremost *not* Islam, which is a barbarian religion meant to be understood and *applied* literally, with all religious artwork to be physically destroyed, just as Mohammed did. The Muslim is not supposed to say, like Arabi, that worship directed toward “idols” can be considered, under particular *subjective* circumstances, psychologically equal to praying to Allah, because multiple Quran verses (only required to be understood in an objective manner) command the opposite, including the following:

And when Abraham said to his sire, Azar: “Do you take idols for gods? Surely I see you and your people in manifest error.” (Quran 6:74)

That is the “error” - the assumed identification, by Muslims, of kuffar “idols” *as their gods* simply because of the Infidel's gaze toward the “idol” during prayer – the ancient Arab Polytheists and the revived Hindus are guilty of, yet Arabi chose to ignore the explicit verses and loosely interpret different ones to suit his heretical agenda. Indeed the very matter of theophany proposed by Arabi is blasphemous, since – and this will be discussed in depth – Allah is infrarationally revealed to be completely veiled from vision to all of humanity within each person's respective lives. Thus there cannot be any visual *manifestation* of Allah – as opposed to his signs (but only as this term is defined by austere Islam) which are not to be considered the same thing as a manifestation, because the Islamic signs serve to function as reminders and warnings of both his greatness and his punishment, rather than indicators of his actual earthly *presence* that the sufi can ‘unite’ with – during the believer's terrestrial bondage to the Islamic scripture, a slavery occurring prior to the Judgement Day. In other words, according to Islam it is impossible to have a ‘higher’ use for religious artwork by way of an illegal theophany, and any rationalized use of such material exposes one as a kafir.

But if Arabi was – compared to the ordinary Muslim - closer in his philosophical outlook to the Hindu

reality and usage of “idols”, because of the limited scope of his Islamic upbringing, his ideas naturally failed to take into account the Hindu experience of the Personal *and* Impersonal Brahma, and *His* relation to religious imagery or sculptures. For the perspective and experience of the Hindu has subtle differences to Arabi's opinion on “idols”; to the Hindu, the stone is *not* to be worshipped, but for the specific reason that it cannot be considered a Personal or Dynamic God, as Brahma is only *latent* in the inanimate objects – and *bhaktas* entirely worship the *Active* Divine Consciousness, whether that be prayer to Krishna or Saraswati or another deity. The stone or any similar type of inanimate object, however, can be *experienced* as One in Consciousness *after* Self-Realization, because that Realization consists of a Conscious Unity with *all* of God's creation, including the inanimate objects in which the Divine Consciousness is only latent and precursor to the evolving consciousness' of animal and ordinary man and higher man.

In that sense, the stone has a *superficial* similarity to the Impersonal or Static or Silent Brahma, with the Consciousness passive in both instances – except in the latter, Brahma is Withdrawn into Inactive Sat rather than the inert mode of Prakriti which accounts for Her inanimate objects. Silent Brahman is passive in Poise, not Capacity; the stone, however, only has the *latent* Divine in it, a *possibility*. Therefore the stone should not be – and *is not* by the Hindus – worshipped, because there is no responsive, *active* consciousness or Consciousness within it: Indeed in this fact Islam, Sufism and Hinduism are in agreement, and it is extremely rare to find the “lower type” of mortal anywhere, because it is fairly easy for humans, who all possess a Psychic Being, to comprehend religious artwork to be inert and unresponsive, a representative of Divine *Beauty* rather than the Dynamic *Consciousness* of Brahma. The Hindus will thus, at baseline, use their religious artwork as a point of reference during their meditation or prayers, the latter done to the Illimitable God or Goddess – a symbolic usage similar to Arabi's declaration of the “idol” as an aspect of Allah.

However, the Hindus certainly do not consider the “idol” as the ultimate object of worship, because the artwork's divinity is merely latent and thus cannot answer – whatever that might be – the prayer: An Active Consciousness from a Personal or Dynamic deity is needed for the reply. The Impersonal God – which is not the same stance as the latent God contained within inanimate objects, since the Inactive Brahma is a Poise that is *transcendent*, whereas the Divine latency of inanimate earthly objects is *within* them – is merely the Witness of Prakriti's work; it is the Active God or Goddess who intervenes in the play, whether in response to a mortal's supplication or simply because the Supreme Consciousness deems it appropriate. The “idol” – and Arabi does not mention this crucial truth – is thus more practically used for concentration, whether that be a result of bhakta or for the previously discussed meditation that seeks an ascension of consciousness above the whirl of the mind into the Ultimate Consciousness. But Arabi considered the “idol” to be a *tajalli* or self-manifestation – rather than *Self*-manifestation – of Allah, with a “nature of personality” in even the inanimate versions:

The complete gnostic is the one who sees that every idol is a locus of Allah's tajalli in which He is worshipped. For that reason, they are all called “god” in spite of having a particular name of a stone, tree, animal, man, star, or angel. This is the nature of the personality in it. Divinity is a rank which the worshipper imagines it to have, and it is the rank of his idol. In reality, it is a locus for the tajalli of Allah belonging to the sight of this particular worshipper devoted to this idol in this particular locus of tajalli.

This is why some of those who did not recognize an ignorant statement said, “We only worship them so that they may bring us nearer to Allah” (39:3) although they called them “god”, as they said, “Has he turned all the gods into One God? That is truly astonishing.” (38:5) They do not deny Him, rather they are amazed. **They stop at the multiplicity of possible forms and the ascription of divinity to them.** That is why the Messenger came and called them to one God who is recognized and not witnessed by their witnessing. They confuse Him with them and

believe in Him when they say, “We only worship them so that they may bring us nearer to Allah” by their knowledge of those forms in stones. This is why the proof went against them when He said, “Say: Name them!” and they only named them by what they know those names to have in reality...

However, the gnostics know that they do not worship the forms themselves. Rather, they worship Allah in them according to the power of the tajalli which they know of these forms. The one who denies and has no knowledge of what Allah has manifested in tajalli is ignorant of this. (Ibn Arabi, *Fusus Al-Hikam*, The Seal of the Wisdom of the Imam in the Word of Harun)

While Arabi's doctrine of a “nature of personality” attributed to inanimate objects, including the “power of the tajalli”, certainly differs to the Yogin experience of their Divine *latency*, he also failed to find common ground with Islam on this subject. For the Asura's religion, unfortunately for Arabi and the significant amount of sufis who have adopted his precepts, does not care about subjective interpretations of an idol's form or its *tajalli*: All unauthorized “idols” are to be physically demolished, the void filled by the trinity of holy Islamic idols – although never categorized by that particular term – of the Prophet Mohammed, the Quran and the Ka’ba. Neither does Islam make any sort of reference to a “multiplicity” of deities or, as Arabi describes, “possible forms” of the one Allah. It is this multiplicity – distinct from the Conscious *Multiplicity* of the Sanatana Dharma – that provides both Sufism's deceptive similarity with Hinduism, and its striking difference, with the peculiar arrangement – and the question of multiplicity – emerging from a singular Ibn Arabi doctrine:

The twelfth century was a watershed in the history of Sufism. This was brought about by the introduction and widespread acceptance of the theory of *Wahdat al-Wujud*. Ibn al-Arabi did not, in fact, devise the concept himself but he managed to reconcile varying sufi views on Reality and re-orientated them in such a way as to form a sound basis for future developments in ideas on mysticism...The concept of *Wahdat al-Wujud* (Unity of Being) expounded by Ibn al-Arabi was founded on a primordial belief in the ultimate nature of Unity which reduced to nothing, ideas of the existence of entities ‘other than God.’ According to Ibn al-Arabi, the Absolute Being was inseparable from the Absolute Existent and was the ultimate source of all existence...The Islamic doctrine of *Tawhid* or the affirmation of God's Oneness or Unity is **founded on a belief that there is no other God than Allah, who is also the Unique one, the Creator and Lord of Judgement...**Ghazali's attempt, however, to reconcile current theories, prepared the ground for Ibn al-Arabi's theory of the Unity of Being. His God was not the transcendental God of the orthodox **but the Absolute Being who manifested Himself in every form of existence, and in the highest degree in the form of the Perfect Man. According to Ibn al-Arabi, the One and the many are two aspects of ‘One.’** (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, pp. 103-106)

It is this *Wahdat al-Wujud*, one of the most important of Sufism's developments in conceiving haqiqa, that most resembles the experiences of the Rishis and the Yogin, because it progresses from the simplistic *tawhid* of Islam into an attempt at completely unifying all of existence with that transcendental God. But not only does *Wahdat al-Wujud*, however much it appears otherwise, fail to match the experiences of the Hindu mystics - thanks to its theory of a Unity in *Being* rather than the Unity of *Consciousness*-Being or Conscious-Identity *experienced* (instead of theorized) by the Yogin -, it also affirms the mutiny of this sect from the real Islamic religion in which Allah's consciousness and being and nature are strictly transcendental to the pious slave. For to allege, like the sufi “Muslims” do, that Allah is One Absolute Being manifesting in “every form of existence”, yet on the other hand to believe that there is no other name of God than Allah (the principle teaching of their shariat stage), is an irreconcilable position, because “every form of existence” *also* includes belief in the names of deities

other than Allah, or the very creation by God of multiple Gods or Goddesses or Personalities of Itself.

This sufi doctrine, however, was only trying to fill in the gaping contradiction of pure Islam, because as the one 'true' religion's real stance is that different names or ideas of god are false except Allah, it automatically creates an *absence* of Oneness, because a mandated and *enduring* separation has been formed between varied parts of the creation. Another example of Islam's *rejection* of a comprehensive Oneness is the existence of a Satan similarly separated and opposed to Allah: We recall that in Hinduism, the corresponding Asuras and the Gods are in the deepest reality experienced as One Totality of the Sole Brahma Consciousness. Indeed the Asuras are simply the Inverse of Brahma, operating with His *implicit* consent to *exist*, although the Supreme *never* actively influences or directs the Asuric machinations (at least for the purpose of upholding Asuric values, whereas in certain Asuric decisions, like Hitler's invasion of Russia which led to his downfall, we do find the Divine hand). Sufism tries to have it both ways, when only one prevailing doctrine is possible – either the absolute separation of Allah from manifestations including that of Polytheism, or a comprehensive Oneness of Allah in which no real separation or disbelief can occur, and all possibilities including Polytheism are valid. This contradiction, of course, is related to Sufism's requirement of the shariat stage and the resultant pressure – or personal desire - to somehow reconcile the mystic way of diversity – something that includes Self-Realization - with Islam's opposite prohibition. In their vain attempts, we find incorrect applications of the Islamic scripture and a prolific use of superfluous language to justify an elementary heresy clearly demarcated in the Asura of Falsehood's religion, with Arabi in one example using the two techniques to argue against the very possibility of Polytheism:

The wisdom of Luqman's legacy lies in his prohibition to his son, “Do not associate anything with Allah. Associating others with Him is a terrible wrong.” (31:13) The one wronged establishes apportioning in respect to His description even though it is the same source. So he is only associating His source with Him, and this is the very greatest ignorance.

The reason for this is that the person who has no recognition of the matter nor of the reality of the thing, does not know that diversity is actually contained in a single source although forms vary in that single source. So such a person puts the form shared by another in that station, and so he makes every form a part of that station. **It is known of the associate that the matter which indicates him through what occurs in him of partnership is not the source of the other with whom he is associated, since it is the other. In reality, there is no associate.** Everyone is based on his portion whenever it is said about him that there is a partnership between the two in it. (Ibn Arabi, *Fusus Al-Hikam*, The Seal of the Wisdom of Ihsan in the Word of Luqman)

While Arabi's premise is fine in itself, and represents a higher mystic truth, his wordy explanation of the Luqman verse is but an affectation, designed to hide his *misuse* of the verse in question. It is a dissimulation common to the sufi heretics, because they at least instinctively – and often, as we shall see, consciously - understand their path and pronouncements on 'reality' to be divergent from Islam. For the Asuric religion only looks at the topic on the surface, and when hearing a different name for God, instantly takes the *name* as a sign of infidelity and disobedience to a strict worship of Allah – and the *name* of Allah – alone. This is the real recognition of the matter, one seen in the actual passage containing Luqman's directive to his son:

This is the Creation of Allah. Now show me that which those (ye worship) beside Him have created. Nay, but the wrong-doers are in error manifest! And verily We gave Luqman wisdom, saying: “Give thanks unto Allah, and whosoever giveth thanks, he giveth thanks for (the good of) his soul. And whosoever refuseth - Lo! Allah is Absolute, Owner of Praise.” And (remember) when Luqman said unto his son, when he was exhorting him: “O my dear son! Ascribe no partners unto Allah. Lo! To ascribe partners (unto Him) is a tremendous wrong.”

And We have enjoined man in respect of his parents - his mother bears him with faintings upon faintings and his weaning takes two years - saying: "Be grateful to Me and to both your parents; to Me is the eventual coming. **But if they strive with thee to make thee ascribe unto Me as partner that of which thou hast no knowledge, then obey them not.** Consort with them in the world kindly, and follow the path of him who repenteth unto Me. Then unto Me will be your return, and I shall tell you what ye used to do." (Quran 31:11-15)

By "of which thou hast no knowledge", Allah is basically saying, 'You are not in position to make such declarations; only I, Allah, am capable of pronouncements on the matter.' The verse is not meant to hint at a special group of men, the sufi gnostics, who by way of mental gymnastics are able to comprehend – illegally sharing the 'knowledge' with Allah - the verse as saying 'do not ascribe partners, yet at the same time understand that there is no such thing as an associate if you choose to call Allah by another name.' The words of the Islamic scripture are to be understood literally (unless they are specifically outlined, in the scripture, as a similitude or allegory), instead of the sufi attempt at unearthing esoteric meaning; hence no other names or forms of God are to be taken at even the *superficial* level, unless the individual wishes to be of the "despised":

Do not associate with Allah any other god, lest you sit down despised, neglected. And your Lord has commanded that you shall not serve (any) but Him, and goodness to your parents. If either or both of them reach old age with you, say not to them (so much as) "Ugh" nor chide them, and speak to them a generous word. (Quran 17:22-23)

If the Asura of Falsehood had intended his formulation of Allah to have included multiple names of God, there would have been no need for the countless verses forbidding the practice, and such communications would have been replaced by verses supporting the subtle arguments made by Arabi. Instead, we find numerous verses like the following, in which Gabriel communicated, "Or lest ye should say: '(It is) only (that) our fathers ascribed partners to Allah of old and we were (their) seed after them. **Wilt Thou destroy us on account of that which those who follow falsehood did?**'" (Quran 7:173) Another verse also confirms the practice of associating other deities with Allah as an Islamic "falsehood":

And when they mount upon the ships they pray to Allah, making their faith pure for Him only. But when He bringeth them safe to land, behold! **They ascribe partners (unto Him); Thus they become ungrateful for what We have given them, so that they may enjoy.** But they shall soon know. Do they not see that We have made a sacred territory secure, while men are carried off by force from around them? **Will they still believe in the falsehood and disbelieve in the favour of Allah? And who is more unjust than one who forges a lie against Allah, or gives the lie to the truth when it has come to him? Will not hell be the abode of the unbelievers?** (Quran 29:65-68)

As the Asuric scripture confirms, Ibn Arabi was guilty of forging a lie whereby Allah is, according to the sufi doctrine alleging the existence of *tajalli*, technically one with the "partners" the unbelievers illegally ascribe upon him. The question of Arabi's intent is irrelevant with regards to Islam, because as it is a literal religion, and as he violates one of its cardinal tenets, his apostasy is indisputable. Only the name of Allah should be used for the actual deity, which of course should never be in the form of an "idol"; for to associate different gods or *forms* with Allah in any manner, including Arabi's superficial joining, only leads one to hell:

This is of what your Lord has revealed to you of wisdom, and **do not associate any other god with Allah lest you should be thrown into hell**, blamed, cast away. What! Has then your Lord preferred to give you sons, and (for Himself) taken daughters from among the angels? Most surely you utter a grievous saying. And certainly We have repeated (warnings) in this Quran

that they may be mindful, but it does not add save to their aversion. Say (O Mohammed, to the disbelievers): **“If there were other gods along with Him, as they say, then would certainly they have sought a way against the Lord of the Throne.”** Glorified is He, and High Exalted above what they say! (Quran 17:39-43)

The final verse in the passage unmistakably confirms a much different psychology to the Quran than that of Arabi, the latter seeking to unite, the former viewing religious worship in terms of ambition and competition, with the possibility of worshipping multiple gods only resulting in conflict – a circumstance ironically brought about by Islam, with its so-called monotheism, to the ‘unbelievers’. The previous passage is also another excellent projection of the Asura's most glaring falsehood - that he might somehow usurp the Supreme God. It is a gross ambition far removed from the unity sought after by the sufi mystics, with Hujwari describing that achievement as a “perfect union”:

God is independent of the seeker's acquiescence or anger, and these two qualities depend on consideration of His Unity. And Abu Muhammad Murtaish says... “The Sufi is he whose thought keeps pace with his foot”, i.e. he is entirely present: his soul is where his body is, and his body where his soul is, and his soul where his foot is, and his foot where his soul is. This is the sign of presence without absence. Others say, on the contrary: “He is absent from himself and present with God.” It is not so: he is present with himself and present with God. The expression denotes perfect union (jam al-jam) because there can be no absence from self so long as one regards ones self; when self-regard has ceased, there is presence (with God) without absence. In this particular sense the saying closely resembles that of Shibli: “The Sufi is he that sees nothing except God in the two worlds.” In short, human existence is “other” and when a man does not see “other” he does not see himself and becomes totally void of self, whether “self” is affirmed or denied. (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 39)

This superfluous description of sufic unity certainly appears similar to Hinduism, in which the experience of Self-Realization leads to an unceasing existence as the centralized Jivatman. But as we shall unquestionably see, the non-duality spoken of by the likes of Hujwari does not involve the concrete Union of Consciousness – whereby one Consciously Identifies as God - that instantly arrives with Self-Realization. Instead, sufis like Hujwari describe an “essence” of union, with the following also containing a typical sufi misuse of the Islamic scripture to ‘prove’ their heretical premises:

Thus Abu Ali Rudbari says: “Were the vision of that which we serve to vanish from us, we should lose the name of servanthship? For we derive the glory of worship solely from vision of Him.” This is the beginning of the state of the prophets, inasmuch as separation is inconceivable in relation to them. **They are entirely in the essence of union**, whether they affirm or deny, whether they approach or turn away, whether they are at the beginning or at the end. Abraham, in the beginning of his state, looked on the sun and said: “This is my Lord,” and he looked on the moon and stars and said: “This is my Lord” (Kor. vi, 76-8), because his heart was overwhelmed by the Truth and he was united in the essence of union. Therefore he saw naught else, or if he saw aught else he did not see it with the eye of “otherness” **but with the eye of union (jam), and in the reality of that vision he disavowed his own and said: “I love not those that set”** (Kor. vi, 76). (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, pp. 237-38)

Sufism is only bold enough to speak of – for a good reason as we will shortly expand upon – a vague “essence” of union, whereas the Yogin are Absolutely United with God in Consciousness, a difference that helps to – in addition to the horrific shariat teachings – explain why the sufis can extol the virtues of “unity” with one side of their mouth while lambasting different mortals as “infidels” with the other. Of course, they are themselves infidels, sufikuffar for whom the illegal manipulation of Quranic verses

is commonplace, with Hujweri, in the previous selection, masquerading Quran verses 6:76-78 as proof of Sufism's mystic union with Allah, when the verses in question describe something simpler:

When the night grew dark upon him he beheld a star. He said: "This is my Lord." But when it set, he said: "I love not things that set." And when he saw the moon uprising, he exclaimed: "This is my Lord." But when it set, he said: "Unless my Lord guide me, I surely shall become one of the folk who are astray." And when he saw the sun uprising, he cried: "This is my Lord! This is greater!" **And when it set he exclaimed: "O my people! Lo! I am free from all that ye associate (with Him)."** Surely I have turned myself, being upright, wholly to Him Who originated the heavens and the earth, and I am not of the polytheists. (Quran 6:76-79)

Abraham's eye was not of sufic 'union'; rather, it was one of a cursory Islamic discernment, taking the transient appearances of the sun and moon as a sign that they should not be associated as "gods" along with Allah. Nowhere in this passage do we find Abraham speaking of uniting with *any* of the sun, moon or Allah; the story is merely an account of Abraham's epiphany whereupon he understood one of the reasons *why* that type of *shirk* was disapproved of by Islam, in which he understood that he had made a *mistake* – of an ordinary mortal - in initially associating the Sun and Moon with Allah. Neither does it indicate a dissolution of the standard formulation of the lower self into Allah, a common theme in Sufism, with Rumi envisioning a consummation into Allah that unmask the generally perceived separation between the human and Allah to be merely a "game":

Thou didst contrive this "I" and "we" in order that Thou
mightst play the game of worship with Thyself,
That all "I's" and "thou's" should become one soul and at last
should be submerged in the Beloved.

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book I, 1787-1788)

It is a couplet that brings to mind *Tat Tvam Asi* (Thou Art That) of the Upanishads, even if Rumi and other sufis, as we shall demonstrate, actually have no intention of capturing the Vedantic Truth. In another stanza, Rumi advanced the need for the seeker to perish in his limited mortal self-perception, so that he might raise himself above the dreaded co-partnership, only to subsequently find himself in the equally heretic state of "Unity" with Allah!

This is (constitutes) the derivatives (of the subject), and
its fundamental principles are that to exalt one's self is (to
claim) copartnership with God.

Unless thou hast died and become living through Him, thou
art an enemy seeking to reign in copartnership (with Him)

**When thou hast become living through Him, that (which thou
hast become) is in sooth He: it is absolute Unity; how is it co**

partnership? (*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book IV, 2765-67)

But if co-partnership is certainly rejected in the Quran, similarly is an absolute unity illegal by its mere absence in the scripture. For it is too important a tenet to have been neglected in the Islamic scripture – the sufis clutching at straws to twist Asuric revelations into alignment with their blasphemy. The unity that Rumi describes is also not the same as Hinduism's Unity of Consciousness; and if our later presentation of sufi doctrine on the matter will explicitly confirm this, we also find evidence of the difference from similar writings to Rumi's, especially in reference to "dying" in order to subsequently live with Allah:

So when God creates a human being, His intention is to make him again fully One with Himself. This state explains Junaid's definition of Sufism which draws attention to the fact that: '*Tasawwuf* is that **God should make you die from yourself and should make you live in**

Him.’ (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 55)

Abul Qasim al Junaid Ibn Muhammad al-Khazzaz al-Nihawandi, known as al-Junayd or al-Junaid, was a famous 9th century Persian sufi who was noted for de-emphasizing the ecstatic mystical experiences sought by other sufis. To him, absorption in God - after the departure from the ordinary worldly existence - was fundamental to *tasawwuf*.

If we try to sum up this theory and to describe this highest state of Unification which the worshipper can attain, we find that the worshipper returns to his primordial state where he has been before he was created. That is, he departs from his worldly existence, his normal human existence does not continue and hence he exists in God and is completely absorbed in Him. It is thus that the *muwahhid* can attain the real *Tawhid*. As long as he preserves his individuality he cannot attain this full state of *Tawhid*, as the continued persistence of his individuality means that something other than God is still present. (*Personality and writings of al-Junayd*, p. 79)

If this dissolution into God is also known to the Hindu mystics, the manner in which it is attempted is strikingly different, and once more usually involves the domain of *consciousness*, in the sense that the birth consciousness is simply abandoned to its base functioning while an intensely deep samadhi – in Satchitananda - is occurring. But as the sufis do not seek an integration of the two (Man and God) initially separate *consciousness*’, their absorption is more of the negation than the positive – *Conscious* - affirmation of God, because the sufis do not believe in the Unity of Consciousness, which is living *as* Him (in Conscious-Identity) rather than *in* Him, even if living *as* Him also includes living *in* Him. Asuric Islam, of course, makes no mention of any type of dissolution, as the earthly Muslim is simply fighting jihads and preparing for Judgement Day. There is no call in Islam for the pious Muslim to make any attempt corresponding to the sufi's ideal of the psychological death of the lower self, something for which the latter advocate achieving by way of an escape from “human faculties” into a greater purity:

Purity, then, is a resplendent and manifest idea, and Sufism is an imitation of that idea. Its followers in this degree are of three kinds: the Sufi, the Mutasawwif, and the Mustaswif. **The Sufi is he that is dead to self and living by the Truth; he has escaped from the grip of human faculties and has really attained (to God).** The Mutasawwif is he that seeks to reach this rank by means of self-mortification (mujahadat) and in his search rectifies his conduct in accordance with their (the Sufis) example. The Mustaswif is he that makes himself like them (the Sufis) for the sake of money and wealth and power and worldly advantage, but has no knowledge of these two things. (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 35)

In this we find more similarities to Hinduism, as both it and Sufism are proponents of aspiring to reach some sort of higher level than the standard life. If their experiences of that supreme level certainly differ, the processes of the respective journeys will nevertheless have overlaps. In accordance, we find the sufis rejecting the ordinary earthly desires and passions:

Junayd was asked: “What is union with God?” He replied: “To renounce passion,” for of all the acts of devotion by which God's favour is sought none has greater value than resistance to passion, because it is easier for a man to destroy a mountain with his nails than to resist passion. (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 208)

This, we recall, is the same message as that of Hindu spiritual paths, which describe the process in terms of *gunas* and the renunciation of the tamasic and the rajasic (especially the lower vital) modes, with the resultant predominant expression of the sattvic *gunas* or qualities providing the necessary foundation for higher spiritual experiences. Sufism's deceptively similar aspiration contends the

rejection of earthly passions as critical to their quest, to the extent where desire is described by them as infidelity from Islam, of all things:

Junayd says: “To fulfil the desires of your lower soul is the foundation of infidelity,” because the lower soul is not connected with, and is always striving to turn away from, the pure truth of Islam. (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 200)

While the restraint from desires is certainly a fine practice for even the ordinary mortal without spiritual aspirations, the likes of Junayd and Hujwiri bizarrely misrepresent the “pure truth of Islam”, neglecting to mention the great Mohammed's multiple rapes and voracious fulfilment of earthly cravings. Additionally do they utterly distort the Islamic idea of infidelity, which is simply the adherence to something *different* than Allah and the Asuric Islamic scripture. The Quran and authentic hadith are the only learning available to the Muslim; he is not to pursue the knowledge of himself advocated by Sufism, an endeavour that Arabi considered necessary to achieve the highest understanding of Allah:

The Prophet, peace be upon him, said, “Whoever knows himself knows his Lord.” Such a person is the creature with the most knowledge of Allah. (Ibn Arabi, *Fusus Al-Hikam*, The Seal of the Wisdom of Being Lost in Love in the Wisdom of Abraham)

It is a thesis comparable to Vedantic Reality, except that Arabi was not speaking of the apex of self-knowledge - the Atman (Self) or the Purusha. Nevertheless, the sufi way of seeking self-knowledge is what accounts for some of the most outrageous – to the pious – declarations ever put forth by those professing the Islamic faith, with famous sufi saints including Bayazid Bastami (also known as Abu Yazid), as if they were the Rishis of lore, unequivocally announcing themselves as God!

Abu Yazid was...When he has finally shed his “I” in *fana* “as snakes their skin” and reached the desired stage, his changed self-consciousness is expressed in those famous hybrid utterances (*shatahat*) which so scandalized and shocked his contemporaries: “*Subhani! Ma a'zama sha'ni*” – “**Glory be to me! How great is My Majesty!**”; “**Thy obedience to me is greater than my obedience to Thee**”... “**I saw the Ka'ba walking round me**”...In meditation he made flights into the supersensible world; these earned him the censure that he claimed to have experienced a *mi'raj* in the same way as the Prophet. (*Encyclopedia of Islam*, I, pp 162-63) (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 44)

In another scandalous example, the sufi Abu Sa'id Fazlu'llah bin Abi'l Khair explicitly declared that only God existed under his clothes:

The personal life of the Shaikh also amazed many in Nishapur. Sometimes he wore wool, sometimes silk. **Once Abu Sa'id shocked his audience by declaring, like Hallaj: ‘there is none other than God in this robe.’** (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, pp. 71-72)

While these announcements can obviously mark the offending sufis as guilty of the dreaded *shirk* of Islam, they are not in fact the same as the famous Sanskrit cry of “Aham Brahmasmi” (I am Brahman) (Brihadaranyaka Upanishad 1.4.10), for the Vedantic truth emerges from a Knowledge that includes a Conscious-Identity, with the Upanishads additionally illuminating, “All this is guided by Consciousness, is supported by Consciousness. The basis is Consciousness. **Consciousness is Brahman.**” (Aitareya Upanishad, 3.1.3) Sufism, on the other hand, does not allow for a Unity with God in the form of Her *Consciousness* of Herself *while housed in an earthly person* that has discarded the ego and previous perceptions of individuality. For as we shall see, the grandiose declarations of certain sufis were made from a level of consciousness *inferior* to that of either the Transcendental

Supreme or the Purusha within; they have instead formulated a doctrine of a “Unity of Being” involving peripheral attributes and “Divine Names”, without mention of any attainment of the Central Divine Consciousness or Conscious-Identification:

In reality, there is but One Reality which assumes all these relations and aspects which are designated by the Divine Names. The Reality grants that each of the Names, which manifest themselves without end, has a reality by which it is distinguished from another Name. It is that reality by which it is distinguished which is the Name itself - not that which it shares. (Ibn Arabi, *Fusus Al-Hikam*, The Seal of Wisdom of the Breath of Angelic Inspiration in the Word of Seth)

In a different and unnecessarily complicated Arabi comment on the matter, we find the “Names of the Real” as equal to Allah, as long as the “creature” or mystic has reached the sufic ‘union’ in which the Real can assume the senses of the former:

If the Real is the Outwardly Manifest, then the creature is veiled within Him, and creation is all the Names of the Real, His hearing and seeing, and all His ascriptions and discernments. If the creature is outwardly manifest, then the Real is veiled and hidden in him, and so the Real is the hearing of the creature, and his seeing, hand and foot, and all his faculties as it related in sound hadith. (Ibn Arabi, *Fusus Al-Hikam*, The Seal of the Wisdom of Being Lost in Love in the Wisdom of Abraham)

While the hadith that inspired this Arabi selection will be discussed later, the premise here is that the sufi mystic can become “united” with the “Names” or attributes of Allah, including hearing and seeing and other such *outward* characteristics that are, as will soon be undoubtedly evident, distinct from a Self-Identification *as* God in Central Consciousness (indeed note how the creature and the Real are distinct from each other in both circumstances). This diluted unity is the ultimate aspiration of Sufism, also articulated in the poetry of Rumi:

By God, thou grewest from His (God's) attributes in the beginning: **go back nimbly and fleetly into His attributes.**
Thou camest from the cloud and the sun and the sky; then
didst thou become (diverse) attributes and ascend to heaven.
Thou camest in the form of rain and heat: thou wilt go into
the goodly (Divine) attributes.

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book III, 4182-84)

This desire to live as part of Allah's attributes is the closest Sufism's haqiqa approaches the Sanatana Dharma's experiences of Jivatmas and Godheads, and of the original Overmind Gods and Goddesses. The names and attributes of Allah however, are especially dim imitations of the latter Hindu experience, of Brahma's subtle differentiation into multiple deities, each of whom contain all of the other deities and Brahma within their Central Consciousness, yet nevertheless primarily function to potentially grant *particular* lofty aspirations or prayers of the mortal. Each God and Goddess is a Real, Conscious Being, with the truth of their Consciousness immediately distinguishing the Hindu pantheon from Sufism's limited formulation, which is the *manifested* attribute of a Being rather than any part of the Being's Central – and thus *identifiable* – Consciousness. Narrow indeed is this aspiration, for if mortals are, according to Sufism, capable of progressing towards a state of existence where they belong to a higher “Being” in its peripheral aspect, then why should they not be capable of making a similar ascent in consciousness towards that Being's central Conscious-Identity?

Not only does Sufism's theory – based on markedly limited or *intermediate* occult experiences - of haqiqa fail to reach the Vedic summit of the profound and *Conscious* Truth-Existence, it also makes a mockery of Islam's actual intent behind the myriad names and attributes of Allah. Indeed, like

everything else distorted by the famed heretical cult, there is a much simpler explanation to the Islamic principle than that presented by Sufism. For if the names and attributes of Allah are unquestionably *not* those of other deities, a fact of which the sufis and orthodox Muslims are in complete agreement, neither are they parts of his Sole manifestation that the sufi mystic may then ‘unite’ in ‘Being’ – rather than Central Consciousness – with. Instead, they are most appropriately conceived of as attributes or adjectives, rather than the names of Allah, since the latter term has different connotations including the dreaded Polytheism that even the sufis try to distance themselves – to no avail – from. As we already have mentioned, according to the authentic hadith, Allah has ninety-nine of these adjectives, including “One”:

Allah has ninety-nine Names, i.e., one hundred minus one, and whoever believes in their meanings and acts accordingly, will enter Paradise; and Allah is Witr (one) and loves ‘the Witr’ (i.e., odd numbers). (Sahih Bukhari Volume 8, Book 75, Number 419)

While there is another hadith - Sunan Ibn Majah Volume 5, Book 34, Hadith 3861 - that lists out the entirety of the ninety-nine, it is considered a weak hadith. Consequently, the adjectives are obtained from the Quran verses themselves. In the following example, we find “beneficent” to be one of Allah's “best names”:

Say: “Call upon Allah or call upon, the Beneficent Allah; whichever you call upon, He has the best names; and do not utter your prayer with a very raised voice nor be silent with regard to it, and seek a way between these.” And say: “(All) praise is due to Allah, Who has not taken a son and Who has not a partner in the kingdom, and Who has not a helper to save Him from disgrace; and proclaim His greatness magnifying (Him).” (Quran 17:110-111)

The use of “beneficent” is simply a *qualification* describing part of Allah's nature, similar to calling him “creator” - the passage itself helps to confirm this delineation by, as usual, rejecting partnership of any other deity with Allah. That the ninety-nine attributes mentioned in the Quran are to be believed in – per the hadith cited above - by the Muslim, does not subsequently indicate any sort of resultant ‘unity of being’, because the belief in the attributes is intended, as one should expect from Islam, to lead the Muslim into an afterlife Paradise as a *separate* entity – as far as consciousness or self-identification - from Allah. Beneficent and other attributes are, if they are to be considered part of Allah's Being, yet never communicated as the final state of an earthly union. And since there is no proper Islamic foundation for Sufism's blasphemy of *Wahdat al-Wujud* through Allah's attributes, the sufis by their very distortion of the function of Islamic attributes, commit yet another violation of a specific Asuric verse:

And Allah's are the best names, therefore call on Him thereby, **and leave alone those who violate the sanctity of His names; they shall be recompensed for what they did.** (Quran 7:180)

The sufis can thus expect the explosive hellfire for – among the multiple crimes committed by them - their abject sin of misusing the attributes of Allah as a disingenuous scriptural justification for their heretical *Wahdat al-Wujud*. Indeed by applying the adjectives according to the principles of non-Muslim beliefs, the sufis also arguably go against the tradition of Mohammed, whose prayers are said to have discriminated Allah's numerous exaltations from unbecoming characteristics:

Narrated Aisha:

The Prophet used to say in his bowing and prostrations, “Subhanaka’l-lahumma Rabbana wa bihamdika; Allahumma ghfir li.” (Exalted [from unbecoming attributes] Are you O Allah our Lord, and by Your praise [do I exalt you]. O Allah! Forgive me). (Sahih Bukhari Volume 1, Book 12, Hadith 760)

Unbecoming attributes can include, of course, the idea that the attribute is something the Muslim can unite with while living in the earth. Yet this is precisely what Sufism proposes, including the idea that joining with Allah's attributes leads one to be “present everywhere”:

In his *Ishqiyya*, Qazi Hamidu'd-Din Nagauri says that although Lover and Beloved appear as two separate identities, they are in fact identical. Whoever sees them as two is absurd and whoever does not see them at all is insane. **One who is lost in Being is part of God's Attributes. This state makes sufis present everywhere.** The extinction of ‘I’ leads to the predominance of ‘He’. (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 197)

Sufism's ‘unity’, as we subsequently observe, can only bring the mystic to become “lost” in the mere adjectives of God, not his actual Central Consciousness; the word “lost” is quite appropriate to Sufism's theory, because we will conclusively find their description of ‘unity’ to heavily involve a nothingness and a silence rather than a greater Awareness and Identification. To be lost and simultaneously without the Divine Consciousness, makes it quite difficult to envision the sufis as capable of becoming present everywhere, because that perception must by nature involve an Illimitable Consciousness – a Conscious Unity with *all* Purushas - that the sufis deny themselves from. That ultimate state is what should actually occur with a true Unity; the extinction of the ego ‘I’ leading to the experience of the greatest ‘I’ of Self-Conscious-Being. For to exist in ‘being’ without the core consciousness is in truth an almost useless aspiration, for what is the point of becoming united with a Being without *awareness* of that Unity? That is like living as a human, yet only with the consciousness of the foot instead of the mind and vital.

Existing as the attributes – as part of the ‘He’ mentioned by Nagauri in the previous selection, rather than the ‘I’ of Self-Realization experienced by the Yogin - is not the same as existing *as* God, because the attributes are mere aspects, part of Allah yet clearly recognized as – because of their presence in the manifestation – inferior to Allah himself. The sufis readily acknowledge as much, with Arabi in one poetic flourish describing the subtle separation that Sufism allows to exist between God and humanity:

We are His as our proofs confirm,
and we are ours.

Only my being belongs to Him,
and we are His as we are ours.

**I have two aspects: Him and me,
but He does not have “me” through me.**

However, His place of manifestation is in me,

so we are His - like me. (Ibn Arabi, *Fusus Al-Hikam*, The Seal of the Wisdom of Being Lost in Love in the Wisdom of Abraham)

Rumi was even more direct in his impression of mankind's place in relation to Allah, reducing the mystic to that of a “derivative”:

God has called Himself *Basir* (Seeing), in order that His
seeing thee may at every moment be a deterrent (against sin).

God has called Himself *Sami* (Hearing), in order that thou
mayst close thy lips (and refrain) from foul speech.

God has called Himself *Alim* (Knowing), in order that thou
mayst fear to meditate a wicked deed.

These are not proper names applicable to God: (proper names
are merely designations), for even a negro may have the name
Kafir (Camphor).

The Names (of God) are derivative and (denote) Eternal

Attributes: (they are) not unsound like (the doctrine of) the First Cause. (*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book IV, 215-19)

As Sufism contends the apex of unity to arrive in the adjective names or attributes of Allah, the sufi mystics in truth can only assume a position of a derivative manifestation rather than a profound Conscious Unity. If their strange definition of an ultimate unity is certainly an ignorant pronouncement, other characterizations provide a more comprehensive account of their doctrine of apparent unity:

The one who receives the tajalli will only see his own form in the mirror of the Real. He will not see the Real, for it is not possible to see Him. At the same time, he knows that he sees only his own form. **It is the same as a mirror in the Visible world inasmuch as you see forms in it or your own form but do not see the mirror.** At the same time, however, you know that you see the forms, or your own form, only by virtue of the mirror. Allah manifests that as a model appropriate to the tajalli of His Essence, so that the one receiving the tajalli knows that he does not see Him. There is no model nearer or more appropriate to vision and tajalli than this. When you see a form in a mirror, try to see the body of the mirror as well - you will never see it... **Thus Allah is your mirror in which you see yourself, and you are His mirror in which He sees His Names.** His Names are not other than Himself, as you know. (Ibn Arabi, *Fusus Al-Hikam*, The Seal of Wisdom of the Breath of Angelic Inspiration in the Word of Seth)

As Allah is a mirror to the sufi, and the sufi likewise a mirror for Allah, then neither is *consciously* united – both enduring as reflections for the other. This is certainly distinct to the Ultimate Reality of Self-Realization, in which – to use Arabi's terminology – the Yogi becomes Self-Conscious as not only God, but also the mirror *and* the forms (including his *adhar*), because All is Brahma. The sufi in Arabi's description is actually refused the limited ownership of the attributes; he can only function as a point of reference for Allah, without even joining his outward manifestations (which are not Self-Conscious as Allah, even if they are described as belonging to the 'one true god'). This limited aspiration to be some type of mirror is a common theme in sufi writing, with Rumi also exalting this type of subtle separation from God:

He whose clear breast has become devoid of (any) image
(impression) has become a mirror for the impressions of the
Invisible.

He becomes intuitively and undoubtingly aware of our inmost
thought, because the true believer is the mirror of the true
believer. (*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book I, 3146-47)

The ability to access intuition and an awareness of the thoughts of others, rather than attaining Self-Realization, is what Rumi meant in another stanza in which he describes the sufis as “better” than mirrors:

They give the Sufis the place in front of their countenance,
for they (the Sufis) are a mirror for the soul, and better than a
mirror,
(Since) they have polished their breasts (hearts) in
commemoration (of God) and meditation, that the heart's
mirror may receive the virgin (original) image.

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book I, 3153-54)

But to the Hindu mystic, this is still a severe limitation, the innate glory of man reduced to only slightly more than a mirror of the Soul, when the true individual destiny is to live *Consciously* as the Purusha – the Truth and Power and Consciousness and Being and Joy. The sufis, by virtue of their primary

description of themselves as mirrors, naturally end up in a state directly opposite to the Divine Conscious-Being:

What is the mirror of Being? Not-being. Bring not-being (as your gift), if you are not a fool.

Being can be seen (only) in not-being: the rich bestow
(exhibit) generosity on the poor.

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book I, 3201-02)

As sufis like Rumi conceive of themselves as mirrors of Allah, as vessels of “not-being”, their unity is without substance, unverifiable as there is no tangible awareness of unity because of their open endorsement of a *conscious* separation from Allah. Consequently, their actual difference from the ordinary Muslim or other mortals, is that they speak of the separation – from Allah - in terms of a departure from the everyday human experience (“not-being”), whereas the typical Muslim is disconnected from Allah simply by way of their standard existence. And precisely because the sufis are without Unity in Consciousness, their depictions of the diluted unity of being inevitably assume an ambiguous nature:

The Knowledge of the Truth (Haqiqat) has three pillars - (1) Knowledge of the Essence and Unity of God. (2) Knowledge of the Attributes of God. (3) Knowledge of the Actions and Wisdom of God. (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 14)

In Hujwiri's presentation of haqiqa as an “Essence” of God, we find an appropriate summation of the vagueness behind Sufism's doctrine, because essence is a word often used to account for something that cannot be precisely grasped by the consciousness. In another example, we find the sufi Mas'ud-i Bak, whose real name was Sher Khan, writing of an “Essence of Being” that arrives after an understanding is reached that harmonizes the attributes:

A sufi disciple should not be attached to any particular sect, believed Mas'ud-i Bak, **but adhere to the faith of his pir, in order to guarantee the attainment of his goal. To him the wali (perfect sufi) was one who, during his spiritual progress, crossed to a stage of understanding in the relationship between the divine signs and different attributes, finally reaching the Essence of Being.** In a verse he cried:

From Mas'ud-i Bak there disappeared all the human qualities

Since he in reality was Essence, he ultimately became Essence. (*Nuru'l Yaqin*, II, Rieu, 632, f.44a)

In his *Munajat* he sang:

Oh god, Though pervadeth the soul of every human being,

The blackness of kufr doth emanate from Thee and

Thou art the light of every faith.

Thou maketh the Ka'ba an idol temple and converteth

a tavern into a mosque

Thou art the faith of believers and the

infidelity of a fire-worshipper

Idol worship, prayer, Ka'ba and fire-worshipper's temple,

To me art identical for the essence of each faith art Thou.

How long should I say I am Thou, for only

Thou existeth and not Mas'ud.

In reality I do not recite these verses,

Thou reciteth them. (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, pp. 241-44)

While Rizvi's narrative of Sher Khan certainly highlights – through the sufi's premise that different religions and beliefs, including idol-worship, are equal to Islam – the latter's notorious apostasy, it also again points to “essence” as an amorphous – something sensed by the sufis but not consciously experienced - summit, an ambiguity evident in the use of the word in the second poem. In that particular poem, the different aspects of religion are in the end identical, because Allah is the “essence” of each faith, with the word itself not leading to a *concrete* understanding – the essence cannot be from a Self-Realized Central Consciousness, because the sufis do not speak of their unity in those terms - as to what it precisely means in relation to Allah supporting the equality of different religions. Similarly, the “Essence of Being” is presented enigmatically, unsurprisingly as without Consciousness of, or a Conscious-Identification with, that “Being”, there can be no substantial knowledge of It, and thus the resort to uncertain descriptions. At most, Sher Khan described a mental “understanding” of the external qualities of signs, one quite similar to Hujwiri's derivative knowledge:

Accordingly, when Muhammad b. Wasi said that he saw God in things, he meant, as I have explained above, that **he saw in those things the signs and evidences and proofs of God.** (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 92)

To see God in things, especially in relation to his attributes, is thus to have reached the sufi ‘unity’; but as their idea of mystic sight is that of signs and proofs, one questions the point of venturing into the sufi path if that is the extent of their knowledge. After all, one can live in the world and use the ordinary mind to discover mental evidence of God, whereas the Hindu mystic paths are an attempt at finding *the* Evidence through the living Reality of *Self-Consciousness*. Regarding the former, Arabi wrote that Allah's unity was only integrated by “potentiality”:

As for Divine Unity, no existent possesses any of it because one cannot have one part of it while another has another part. Unity does not admit of divisibility. **His Unity integrates all of Him by potentiality.** (Ibn Arabi, *Fusus Al-Hikam*, The Seal of the Wisdom of Elevation in the Word of Ismail, p. 34)

While the final sentence actually contains some truth, it is only if we use potentiality in terms of *consciousness*, because all of creation is potentially the Divine Consciousness – depending, of course, upon the evolution of the particular form of Prakriti (including those of the Self-Consciousness in which they ‘possess’ Pure Unity). But as the sufis do not speak of members of the manifestation becoming united with God's Central Consciousness, Arabi's use of potentiality offers further evidence of Sufism's lack of profound or higher mystic experiences, whereupon their discourse on ‘unity’ becomes the house of conjecture. It is an ending openly admitted as such, by none other than the infamous Mansur Hallaj, whose verbal announcements are at times quite similar to those of the Yogin. On other occasions, however, we find him presenting a much different understanding of ‘truth’ and ‘unity’:

The knowledge of Tawhid is an autonomous abstract cognizance...The Tawhid is an attribute of the created subject who pronounces it, and it is not an attribute of the Object professed as one. If I being created say ‘I’ did I make Him also say ‘I’? My Tawhid comes from me then, not from Him. **He is free (munazzah) of me and my Tawhid.** If I say ‘The Tawhid returns to the one who professes it’ then I make it a created thing. If I say ‘No, the Tawhid comes from the Object it testifies to,’ then what relation attaches the unifier to his profession of Unity? If I say ‘Then the Tawhid is a relation which attaches the Object to the subject,’ then I have turned this into a logical definition. (Mansur Hallaj, *Kitab al-Tawasin*, The Ta-Sin of the Declaration of Unity, 5-10)

Hallaj's conjectures are only true from the relatively lower standpoint of the higher mind; the Yogic or Vedic Consciousness, on the other hand, *Knows* Unity and Oneness (the two basic definitions of

Tawhid) to be a concrete and eternal experience above the vast mental regions, from where the Yogi is now Conscious of Himself or Herself as That. Hallaj is thus admitting that the *tawhid* he professed to is open to *doubt*, because all abstract concepts are by definition debatable. The Yogin, to the contrary, are absolutely without doubt of their Oneness *as* God, since the Unity involves a Consciousness and Conscious-Identification that by its very Illimitable Pervasiveness is – unlike Hallaj's erroneous thesis that unity can only be conceived from one side of the whole – present on both 'ends', if we are to describe the Jivatman in a two-dimensional sense (the Supreme, is of course, beyond the dimensions of time and space). But this latter fact can also be understood by the mere logical mind, which can recognize that unity is impossible if the fundamental characteristics of the oneness are not joined among the *previously* separate parties. That is why the element of the Central Consciousness or Conscious-Identification is so important, because it is the Conscious Unity that enables the Yogi to Realize Brahma as Himself, Within *and* Transcendent, encompassing all opposites. He no longer sees himself as egoistically divided from the rest of creation, because he now has the Omnipresent Consciousness whereby *everything* is Known as Himself, wherein the Many is the One. The sufis, however, can only speculate, as they lionize “non-Being” and neglect a higher Central Consciousness in their path to ‘unity’: it is a void of knowledge filled by what might be called metaphysical wordplay, as in the following Hallaj excerpt:

Gnosis has no other analogy than itself. Allah has no other analogy than Himself, and He resembles it. He is like it and He is like Himself, as it is analogous to itself. He is only like Himself and it is only like itself. Its edifices are its supports and its supports are its edifices. Those who possess it are those who possess it, and its edifices are to it, in it, and by it. It is not Him, and He is not it. And there is no He except it and no it except Him. There is no gnosis except Him. There is no He except Him! So the gnostic is ‘the one who sees’ and gnosis resides in ‘he who remains.’ The gnostic stays with his act of cognition because he is his cognition and His cognition is him and gnosis is beyond that, and the Object is still further beyond that. (Mansur Hallaj, *Kitab al-Tawasin*, The Garden of Gnosis, 23-24)

If Allah can only “resemble” gnosis, then the sufi gnosis is most certainly not the Self-Realization of Yogin experience. But this is then contradicted by Hallaj's line of “There is no gnosis except Him”, which at the end is once more rejected by the Object's status as “further beyond” gnosis. It is an inevitable confusion emerging out of a lack of Awareness of the Supreme Consciousness, which naturally brings organization to the limited – we must remember that human expression can never fully capture the Unexpressible – ability of earthly language to describe the Satchitananda. As Sufism rejects the ascent of consciousness out of the limited individual or peripheral state, there is consequently no eternally regenerative correcting force available for the sufis against the infrarational defects of the world, including their Islamic inheritance. Therefore the sufis, while managing to maintain some of the light of the ancient mystic methods, have incorporated both the depravities of shariat and other slightly less severe aspects of ignorance into their haqiqat, including remnant doctrines of *avidya* from the old paths:

What is (the meaning of) to exalt and glorify God? To deem yourself despicable and (worthless) as dust.

What is (the meaning of) to learn the knowledge of God's unity? To consume yourself in the presence of the One.

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book I, 3108-09)

While the denigration of mankind is contained in the Quran, it was also present in some of the Polytheistic paths of that era, even if the ideas of the latter were not to the exaggerated extent of sufis like Abu Muhammad Sahl ibn Abd Allah:

Although a withdrawn ascetic, persecution by the orthodox forced Sahl to take refuge in Basra.

It was in Basra that Sahl formulated his ideas on the course of one concerned with the mystic path...**Sahl saw self-punishment in the positive terms of leading directly to union with God.** Orthodox divines accused him of combining the Law (*Sharia*) and Truth (*Haqiqa*) but to Sahl they were never divided. (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, pp. 46-47)

Contrary to the practices of sufis like Sahl, sadhaks have no use for self-mortification, as the ascension of the consciousness is a psychological matter, requiring an intense concentration to rise above the mental and vital whirls. Physical self-punishment is deleterious to their efforts when the sadhak is attempting to ascend *above* the world's dualities, of which error and punishment belong. Similarly are they trying to transcend the base human emotions which the sufis, in their deficient understanding, allow entry:

Allah is very jealous of His slave if He believes that he finds pleasure in other than Him. So man purifies himself by ritual washing in order to return to Him in whom he was annihilated, since that is all there is. (Ibn Arabi, *Fusus Al-Hikam*, The Seal of the Unique Wisdom in the Word of Muhammad)

That Arabi, the prominent force behind the emergence of *Wahdat al Wujud*, could casually describe God as a “jealous” entity, offers yet further evidence of the insufficiency of sufic unity. For a true, Conscious, Unity is void of jealousy, because jealousy only emerges from the perceived separation of consciousness. It is also remarkable that Arabi could envision jealousy under his own diluted terms of unity, because if all of existence is Allah and his attributes, a slave finding pleasure in some earthly matter is just the slave enjoying one of the attributes supposedly belonging to Allah. The operation of such deductive conclusions, however, is surprisingly also rejected within Sufism, just as it is excoriated in the strictly infrarational shariat:

Ibn al-Arabi discredited reason and blamed it for covering man with an opaque veil of ego. This drove man further from the Absolute making him inferior to animals, plants and minerals, which did not have any ego. It was by dispelling reason that man ascended from his lowly position and the light of the Absolute illuminated him. (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 108)

Sufism's inability to attain to the summits above the circumscribed human mentality, and its reverence for the infrarationalism of the Quran and Hadith, leads even the more expansive of sufis like Arabi to fail to properly assign reason the respect it is due. For this function of the mind, as we know, is quite beneficial in lifting the consciousness from the vital base; and if it is understood and applied in a balanced fashion, it can become a very helpful agent on the path towards God by exposing certain deficiencies, including – contrary to Arabi's assertion - that of ego. Sufism's neglect of rationality, however, can only be expected from a heretical sect with a limited idea of the universal Multiplicity:

In regard to the Divine Unity of His being, the shadow is Allah, because He is the One, the Unique; and in respect to the multiplicity of forms, it is the world, so understand and realise what I have explained to you! Since the matter is as I mentioned, the universe is illusory, and it does not have a real existence. This is the meaning of the imagination, that is, you imagine that the universe is an autonomous extra thing outside of Allah. It is not like that in itself. **Do you not see that in the senses, the shadow is connected to the person who projects it**, and it is impossible that it be detached from that connection since it is impossible for something to be detached from its own essence? Recognise your source (ayn), and who you are, what is your he-ness and what your relation to Allah is, and by what You are the Truth and by what you are the universe, “other”, and whatever resembles these expressions. (Ibn Arabi, *Fusus Al-Hikam*, The Seal of the Wisdom of Light in the Word of Joseph)

While Arabi certainly caught on to the reality of the universe's existence within God (disregarding, for

now, his use of the word “illusory”, the importance of which we will soon discuss), the discourse at the end of the citation hints at the limitation similar to his aforementioned multiplicity of forms, since the Yogin experience would directly stress the “he-ness” as in reality a gradual progression towards a “He-ness” or “She-ness”, an aspiration to move from the half-light to *the* Person. In another passage, Arabi directly associates the relationship of the human to Allah in terms of an outright – lower case – “multiplicity in One”:

He, the One, is not the same as the Last. Therefore the two semblances with the gnostic are similar dissimilars. **The one possessed of realisation sees multiplicity in One, as he knows what the Divine Names indicate. Although their realities differ and are numerous, it is yet One Source. It is an intelligible multiplicity in the source of One.** In the *tajalli*, it is multiplicity witnessed in the one source even as it matter which you obtain in the definition of each form. It and the multiplicity of forms and their variety derive, in fact, from one substance (*jawhar*). It is its own matter (*hayula*). Whoever recognises himself with this recognition recognises his Lord. **Allah is in His creation due to His form, rather He is the source of its he-ness and its reality.** (Ibn Arabi, *Fusus Al-Hikam*, The Seal of the Wisdom of the Heart in the Word of Shu’ayb)

The “multiplicity in One” is thus the *partial* reality of “he-ness” in Allah's creation, with Allah the “One source” for whom the human is *not* united in Central Consciousness with, because otherwise Arabi would have described a *Multiplicity* in One. We find this latter experience to be the ultimate aspiration of the Sanatana Dharma, in which the Realization of the Soul leads to the instant Knowledge and *Awareness* as Oneself *and* as Multiple Purushas contained within every human. At the same time, the individual *adhar* Knows Oneself as the Sole, Supreme Brahma– the Source of the Multiplicity or Portions of Himself, along with all inanimate forms that the *Jivatman* subsequently Knows as belonging to Herself in latent Consciousness. Of course, an individual has to be *Conscious* of that Reality; if he or she is not, as is the case of most humans, then certainly that individual can be considered part of a multiplicity rather than a Multiplicity – one does not need Sufism's supposition of a ‘unity’ through manifested attributes in order to intellectually perceive that type of derivative multiplicity.

Indeed, under Sufism's terms, we can already – using the function of the ordinary mind that all mortals are gifted with - declare humans and animals to be ‘united’ with God, because they are only required to become part of a manifested and partially conscious “attribute” to obtain that unity. One hardly needs to undertake the sufi path of harsh asceticism (at times including self-mortification) to achieve that type of diluted unity, when it is available through the capacity of thought that can recognize external “signs” of God even from the perspective of a separative consciousness. Thought, we recall, is something inferior to the Divine Consciousness that is above thought even if thinking is contained within It. In fact, the mechanism of ordinary thought – the whirl of the mind - is something that all mystics – including, ironically, the sufis - seek freedom from in the journey to their particular aspirations. In Sufism's case, the elimination of desire and thought was described in terms of “self-dying” or “self-annihilation” (*fana*), which according to Rumi leads to “existence in non-existence” and the sole presence of Allah's Face:

Although that union (with God) is immortality on
immortality, **yet at first that immortality (baqa) consists in
dying to self (fana).**

The reflexions that are seeking the Light are naughted
when His Light appears.

How should the reason remain when He bids it go?

Everything is perishing except His Face.

Before His Face the existent and the non-existent perish:
existence in nonexistence is in sooth a marvellous thing!

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book III, 4659-62)

Along these lines, we also have Hujwiri quoting al-Sayyari as saying, "Unification (al-tawhid) is this: that nothing should occur to your mind except God." (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 158) But sufic unification, as we know, does not entail the Divine taking Conscious control of the individual's mind and *identity*, since both possibilities are rejected by the sufis: Instead, it involves the annihilation of thought, after which the sufis *presume* they have reached their 'union' through the superficial evidence of the absence of ordinary human activity:

Nuri was the companion of Junayd and the disciple of Sari. He had associated with many Shaykhs, and had met Ahmad b. Abi'l-Hawarf. He is the author of subtle precepts and fine sayings on various branches of the mystical science. It is related that he said: "**Union with God is separation from all else, and separation from all else is union with Him,**" i.e., **anyone whose mind is united with God is separated from all besides, and vice versa: therefore union of the mind with God is separation from the thought of created things, and to be rightly turned away from phenomena is to be rightly turned towards God.** (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 131)

In sweeping poetic imagery, Rumi portrayed this in terms of the dispersal of water into a river:

Thou hast seen the river: spill thy jug in the river: how should
the water take flight from the river?

When the water in the jug goes into the river-water, it
disappears in it, and it becomes the river.

His (the lover's) attributes have passed away, and his essence
remains: after this, he does not dwindle or become illfavoured.

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book III, 3912-14)

The sadhak, however, is seeking Conscious-Identification with the source of the water, rather than a 'disappearance' into the river that flows out of It, with the "separation" from earthly phenomena not enough to obtain the Hindu aspiration of Conscious-Unity with that Source. The sufis, however, mistake this initial – in the mystic path to Conscious-Unity - departure from the standard existence as the actual entry into God's 'Being', with Shabistari of Tabriz, in his replies to Amir Husain of Herat, writing that the venture into "yourself" is a journey that entails "travelling from the phenomenal, non-existent self to the real self, which is one with 'The Truth.' **When a man's phenomenal self is effaced, only the real Self remains**, the control of law over him is rendered ineffective." Similarly did Shabistari define, in the same letter to Amir Husain, Sufism's "secret of unity" as "**achieved by sweeping away everything that separates God and the soul, for true mystical union cannot be achieved when duality and self remain.**" (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, pp. 206-209)

But self-effacement or the removal of earthly phenomena from the mind and heart of the mystic is simply an *intermediate* step, and should not be confused, as the sufis did, with 'Unity of Being'. Freedom from, or the negation of, thought or ordinary emotions should not be the ultimate aspiration, for just because one has managed the relatively difficult task of stilling the mind, does not mean that one has thus immediately found God. The mystic path to the Supreme is more difficult than that, because God has to know the seeker is immeasurably sturdy for the Satchitananda infinitely superior to the serene mind, that the sadhak has the wherewithal to remain unswayed by all that is situated between the freshly-acquired stillness and the Omniscient. The so-called "non-existence" that *initially* develops is simply the negation of the ordinary *earthly* consciousness, the first step to the positive – and

Conscious - affirmation of the Supreme Consciousness, something that might eventually be used by the Jivatman to subsequently transform the lower mental-vital-physical sheaths from their varied rudimentary substance into their secret yet latent Divinity.

The sufis, however, exalt non-existence (from human thought and emotion) to inappropriate levels, with Rumi writing, "I am drunken with desire for non-existence, not for the existent, because the Beloved of (the world of) non-existence is more faithful." (*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book V, 315) In another couplet, he wrote, "**Since God's workshop is non-existence, outside of the workshop there is (only) worthlessness.**" (*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book II, 690) Nevertheless, the sufis do allow for a little more than just a blank void of non-existence, as seen in another Rumi stanza:

Beyond any doubt, negation (not-being) is the opposite of (real) being, (and this is) in order that by means of the (one) opposite you may gain a little knowledge of the (other) opposite.

At this time there is no (means of) making (God) known except (by) denying the opposite: in this (earthly) life no moment is without a snare.

O you who possess sincerity, (if) you want that (Reality) unveiled, choose death and tear off the veil—

Not such a death that you will go into a grave, (but) a death consisting of (spiritual) transformation, so that you will go into a Light. (*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book VI, 736-39)

The "knowledge" of the opposite is both in reference to the derivative attributes and some of the ecstatic experiences of Sufism's marifat stage – which also includes the deceptive "Light" - that, as we shall discuss, nonetheless fails to repudiate the inaccuracy of their conception of unity. For to the sufi, once non-existence is obtained, 'unity' has been achieved, with subsequent ecstatic experiences rendered equivalent to a reward for - and distinct from - haqiqa, unlike the Integrality of Sat and Chit and Ananda. As will be seen, the marifat experiences are in actuality likewise *intermediary* between the ordinary mortal and God, even if they are often superior to the simple haqiqa of negating earthly perceptions. It is because of the lack of integration between haqiqa and marifat – a synthesis that only arrives when Self-Realized – that the sufis can have positive inner occult experiences while describing the principle of union as at best "non-existence", with Hujweri in one paragraph also paradoxically *rejecting* the possibility of union:

In the mystic Path he who says "I have arrived," has gone astray. Since arriving is nonaccomplishment, occupation is (superfluous) trouble, and freedom from occupation is idleness, and in either case **the principle of union is non-existence**, for both occupation and its opposite are human qualities. Union and separation alike depend on the eternal will and providence of God. **Hence it is impossible to attain to union with Him.** The terms "nearness" and "neighbourhood" are not applicable to God. **A man is united to God when God holds him in honour, and separated from God when God holds him in contempt.** (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, pp. 118-19)

Mankind can thus – at least per important sufis like Hujweri – only mentally conceive of union as non-existence, because the reality of the sufic definition depends strictly upon God's preference (the Yogin experience, to the contrary, is that the principle of union is Consciousness). That in the same breath Hujweri states that God must hold man in honour for the latter to be united, shows the sufi's own confusion and inconsistency - and even heresy, because a "Muslim" should not be able to have intimate knowledge on whether God holds him in either contempt or honour. But the particular confusion or

inaccuracy of “non-existence”, a hallmark of Sufism that began with its medieval sufi mystics, was not without similarities to other religions from whom Sufism incorporated much of its doctrine. After all, while we know that the heretical sect did not develop from the authentic Islamic scripture, neither did it emerge miraculously from the ether. Indeed much of Sufism's incomplete aspirations can be traced to the prevailing notions held by a significant portion of Hindu and Buddhist mystics of that era - ideas that were not restricted to the subcontinent, as noted by Rizvi:

Abu Yazid's theory of *fana* or the total destruction of the empirical self in God is not the only point of similarity between his teachings and those of the Upanishads. His advocacy of understanding of the controlled use of breath was also Indian. Some hagiologists suggest that Bayazid learnt the doctrine of *fana* from his teacher Abu Ali Sindi... **The controversy is insignificant because ancient Indian thought and ideas on mysticism had continuously aroused interest in the Khurasanian region and these naturally fused with Bayazid's expression of his own mystical experiences.** (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 44)

The Khurasanian region can be considered an intersection between India and West Asia, with the sufi mystics of medieval times influenced by the prevalent mystic doctrines of the old order in combination with the advancing Islam. This is why the sufi theories of the likes of Abu Yazid could appear similar in word, if not actual content, to that of the Upanishads, since the latter's message had already lightly permeated into the Central Asian crossroads. Of course, the Upanishads illuminate on a renunciation of the ordinary self into *the* Self-Consciousness, rather than Sufism's doctrine of the ordinary self undergoing a nullification of *any* form of consciousness. The shared theme of world-negation was a development *after* Vedantic times, a practice that had entrenched itself by the medieval ages, the point during which Sufism emerged from the rubble of the ancient West Asian Polytheism, ominously fusing with Islam. Indeed the two predominant Asian mystic paths of the time, Hinduism and Buddhism, practised subtly different forms of world-negation; and as their influence was unavoidable by presence and proximity, it was only natural for Sufism to become tinged with the then-conventional neglect of the ordinary existence, an adopted principle that significantly accounts for Sufism's self-assurance with regards to its *Wahdat al-Wujud* and its characteristic experience of non-existence. One aspect of this, *vairagya*, common to all three, has been hinted at in some of the sufi writings presented. This Sanskrit term, in its normal understanding, is simply an active disinclination to earthly pleasures and endeavours; in its extreme interpretation, it is a disgust with the world. With the sufi mystics, one finds *vairagya* manifesting in a natural disinterest to jihad and other prescribed Islamic duties; the severe form of it presented in some of the harsh statements against succumbing to the ordinary life, including the following:

And Abu'l-Hasan Nun also says... **“The Sufis are they whose spirits have been freed from the pollution of humanity, purified from carnal taint,** and released from concupiscence, so that they have found rest with God in the first rank and the highest degree, and have fled from all save Him.” And he also says... “The Sufi is he that has nothing in his possession nor is himself possessed by anything.” This denotes the essence of annihilation (*fana*), since one whose qualities are annihilated neither possesses nor is possessed, inasmuch as the term “possession” can properly be applied only to existent things. The meaning is, that the Sufi does not make his own any good of this world or any glory of the next world, for he is not even in the possession and control of himself: **he refrains from desiring authority over others, in order that others may not desire submission from him.** This saying refers to a mystery of the Sufis which they call “complete annihilation”. (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 37)

This disgust with the world and its “pollution”, often an initial step to an outright rejection of it, is seen

here as precipitating the repudiation of fundamental Islamic tenets, including the Muslim duty to subjugate the disbelievers, making the latter pay the jizya to submissively acknowledge their inferiority, if they have not already been killed or converted. The self-annihilation so desired by the sufikuffar is very close to the world-rejection seen in many of the Buddhists and Hindus of the medieval age, with the differences lying in their respective experiences of the *aftermath* of the negation, with some sufis attempting to portray the outcome as a form of “Love”:

Master Abu'l-Qasim Qushayri says: “Love is the effacement of the lover's attributes and the establishment of the Beloved's **essence**,” i.e. since the Beloved is subsistent and the lover is annihilated (fani) the jealousy of love requires that **the lover should make the subsistence of the Beloved absolute by negating himself**, and he cannot negate his own attributes except by affirming **the essence** of the Beloved. (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 311)

Once more we find the appearance of “essence” - this time as a result of the sufic annihilation or “Love” -, the term inconclusively understood as opposed to Dynamically Realized - the only substantial realization of existence for the sufi, after all, is “non-existence”:

We are as pieces of chess (engaged) in victory and
defeat: our victory and defeat is from thee, O thou whose
qualities are comely!
Who are we, O thou soul of our souls, that we should remain
in being beside thee?

We and our existences are (really) non-existences: thou art
the absolute Being which manifests the perishable (causes
phenomena to appear).

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book I, 600-602)

The language used by the sufis to describe their aspirations and experiences is remarkably similar to that of predominant forms of Buddhism, with Shabistari's reply to Amir Husain's letter in particular emphasizing the closeness. This is seen in a couple of examples, with Shabistari at one point portraying an incipient void when he wrote, “God can withdraw what belongs to Him and all things can fall away into their **original nothingness** contained in the phenomenal self.” In another response to a Husain question, Shabistari replied that “Union means annihilation of the phenomenal element in man.” (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, pp. 206-209) But there is a different purpose for the sufis in their annihilation or non-existence than for the medieval Buddhists with whom previous sufis had significant interchange. It is a distinction present in previous citations, but worthy of further elucidation, with Hujwiri once more helpful:

All the Shaykhs of this Path are agreed that when a man has escaped from the captivity of “stations” and gets rid of the impurity of “states”, and is liberated from the abode of change and decay, and becomes endowed with all praiseworthy qualities, he is disjoined from all qualities. That is to say, he is not held in bondage by any praiseworthy quality of his own, nor does he regard it, nor is he made self-conceited thereby. His state is hidden from the perception of intelligences, and his time is exempt from the influence of thoughts. **His presence with God has no end and his existence has no cause. And when he arrives at this degree, he becomes annihilated in this world and in the next, and is made divine in the disappearance of humanity.** (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 33)

Rumi illustrated this same outcome of annihilation when he wrote, “This world is negation (of reality): seek (reality) in affirmation (of God). **Your form (body) is void (of reality): seek in your essence.**”

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book I, 2241) In another stanza, he put forth the aim of “lost consciousness” as both freedom from the “disgrace” of the body, and a venture towards the Origin:

His soul became united with God: at the moment when he lost consciousness the waves of Mercy began to surge.

When his soul was freed from the disgrace of the body, it went rejoicing towards its Origin.

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book V, 2278-79)

As we can see, sufis are seeking “non-existence” from the world in order that they might unite – sans Consciousness or Conscious-Identity – with the ‘Being’ of Allah in which the sufi does *not* self-identify as Allah. The Buddhists – at least the ones the sufis encountered in the civilizational borders of Central Asia – had precisely the opposite aspiration for their annihilation: Non-Being. The Nihil or Void or Zero sought after by many Buddhists is in truth a more appropriate description to their respective perceptions, because as the sufis do not describe experiencing a higher *Consciousness*, one might intuitively associate such non-existence with a Non-Being that is yet – as opposed to the ordinary negation of mental and vital activity comprising the initial step of the mystic – conceived as transcending the boundaries of humanity. Nevertheless, as the subject matter is beyond the ordinary mental activity, one might *intellectually* accept the sufi conception as hypothetically possible as a spiritual summit, albeit one far removed from the heights of the Yogin and Rishis and Sadhus, who do not experience Satchitananda at the level of the mind; for Brahma is Supramental, not confined by the intellect. Or at least, the initial triumph of Conscious-Unity is obtained at a level liberated above mind; later on, Brahma might descend through the Jiva to utterly transform the mental and even vital and physical regions, to the extent where one might superficially say Satchitananda can be experienced in the mind – the region, of course, now completely metamorphosed from the typical human mentality. Well before that ultimate evolution however, the sadhak must embark on a possibly multi-layered psychological journey towards the Supreme Reality, of which the initial steps closely resemble the *finality* to Sufism's haqiqa.

We refer to the necessity for sadhaks to disengage themselves from the psychological attachments of the ordinary human movements, including mental fastenings. The yogic paths describe particular psychological states related to this *intermediate* requirement, including junctures of quietness, calmness, silence and peace. When reaching the negative state of quietness, the sadhak's mind and vital are absent of significant disturbances; calmness, while similar, also brings with it a positive experience of tranquillity that is very difficult to disturb. The first two are yet lower than the peace or silence achieved as the sadhana goes deeper. The former is characterized by both the positive calmness and a sense of wideness – albeit *without* the Consciousness of the Self, since peace is below That. Nevertheless it, and the experience of silence, are pivotal to the ability of the sadhak to handle the Puissance of the highest Realization: In the silence, the sadhak experiences an absence of *all* thoughts and emotions and even vibrations – a pure stillness is reached. These are the intermediate mystic states – described by many in terms of nothingness - that most resemble the descriptions of Sufism's ‘union’, with the crucial difference resting in Sufism's erroneous exaltation, as seen in the following, of a similar quiescence to an unworthy perfection:

Harith Muhasibi, the author of the doctrine, says: “Satisfaction is the **quiescence** of the heart under the events which flow from the Divine decrees.” This is sound doctrine, because the quiescence and tranquillity of the heart are not qualities acquired by Man, but are Divine gifts...Satisfaction is the result of love, inasmuch as the lover is satisfied with what is done by the Beloved. Abu Uthman Hiri says: “During the last forty years God has never put me in any state that I disliked, or transferred me to another state that I resented.” This indicates continual

satisfaction and **perfect love**. (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 180)

While quiescence and tranquillity are certainly fine foundations for something greater, they are not the Supreme Greatness or perfect love in themselves. Indeed through their misidentification of what constitutes the supreme state of haqiqa or reality, the sufis have both infused the aspired summit of mystic truth with ignorance, *and* inevitably obstructed themselves from reaching the crown of actual Truth or Reality. In one of the best examples of this unwitting impediment to the Supreme Truth, the self-annihilation or *fana al-fana* of Shaikh Ruknu'd-Din – whose life trajectory, as will be shown, is crucial to our understanding of Sufism's ultimate fate - is presented in terms clearly exposing the limitations of the heretical sect:

Repeated experiences of *sultan-i zikr* led to the state of *fana al-fana*. A description of this spiritual experience, given by Shaikh Ruknu'd-Din, would tend to indicate that *sultan-i zikr* was comparable to the Nath Siddha's *nad* (mystical voice) and that *fana al-fana* was a state experienced by the *jivan-mukta*.

Sultan-i Zikr, Shaikh Ruknu'd-Din's description continued, would appear just before waking. During that period external senses were very weak, the inner contemplation made wakefulness and sleep appear identical. Later the state would reappear during consciousness. Initially the contemplative was quite frightened, but gradually he became accustomed to the condition. The seeker of God waited for the reappearance of this state in which he could simultaneously perceive both the entire world and identify those who were obsessed with it. Sometimes the meditator lost consciousness of himself as a spatial entity and was plunged into the state of *fana al-fana*.

Shaikh Ruknu'd-Din **then compared the condition of *sultan-i zikr* with that experienced by the Prophet Muhammad when he received *wahi*. In short, he added that at the commencement of *sultan-i zikr*, the meditator felt as if he were listening to the humming of a bell whose sound then gradually became thunderous. According to Shaikh Abdul-Quddus this had special relevance to *nad* and was a privilege of only a few outstanding sufis.** (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, pp. 342-43)

Before we discuss the description provided by Rizvi of Ruknu'd-Din's experience, we must briefly mention the Islamic justification offered by the sufis in defence of their belief in *fana*. To this end, they portray an infrarational revelation in the 55th chapter of the Quran as saying, “All things in creation suffer annihilation and there remains the face of the Lord in its majesty and bounty.” But this does not really endorse the type of self-annihilation pursued by the sufis, as seen in a better translation of the verse:

Everyone that is thereon will pass away. There remaineth but the Countenance of thy Lord of Might and Glory. (Quran 55:26-27)

While the sufis do not necessarily mistranslate the two verses, they definitely divert the significance to illegally include mystic self-annihilation, when the verses are merely describing the ordinary death of the mortal, who will then see the face of Allah on Judgement Day. Though the sufic emphasis on the “Face” is certainly seen in the passage, and is thus somewhat more justifiably used to defend *that* particular component of their heretical doctrine, neither it nor anything else in the authentic scripture supports even an attempt at the experience of Ruknu'd-Din, with its accompanying *zikr* (invocation or remembrance) leading to a state the sufis likened to the Self-Realization of Hinduism. Besides this astonishing blasphemy, Ruknu'd-Din also erred in daring to compare the experience with Mohammed's *wahi* or inspiration, because as we shall undoubtedly see, *no other human* is to be the recipient of inspiration after the Seal of the Prophets. And if it clearly does not belong to Islam, neither does

Ruknu'd-Din's experience equate with the *ultimate* Realization of the Yogin, because unlike the assertion of the sufis, jivan-mukta is not the same as the *sultan-i zikr* and *fana al-fana* described by the likes of Ruknu'd-Din and Abdul-Quddus, a fact seen in the very details.

For what is presented in Rizvi's account is simply the opening of the inner consciousness, with the humming of bells known to the Yogin – and actually experienced by Mohammed, whose infrarational revelations, as we documented through hadith cited in the previous chapter, were often accompanied by the ringing of bells - as an indicator of basic *progress* in the sadhana, or as the sign of a soon to arrive inner realization (though not necessarily the Realization of Brahma, as Mohammed's example also shows). As one can thus gather, the experience of bells during meditation or worship is a *potentially* excellent development; however it is not the state of the jivan-mukta, for as the name indicates, that individual is *liberated as the* Jivatman, and has thus gone beyond the rudimentary opening of the inner consciousness and into the Supreme Consciousness. The state of the jivan-mukta is the Truth-Power-Conscious-Unity-Bliss, whereas the sufis in the citation had attained to the intermediary state of the wide inner consciousness, seen in both the audition of bells and in the loss of their self-perception as a restricted spatial entity - the latter a clear proof of wideness. The portrayed identification of those obsessed with the world is the only unclear matter, representing a likely exaggeration (consistent with what we will later find in Ruknu'd-Din's boasts), but more importantly is categorical evidence *against* the sufi's having attained to jivan-mukta, for the latter Consciousness is not experienced according to the relatively insignificant pinpointing of the obsessions of other mortals.

Jivatman, we recall, is the Self in a centralized being, United with All; for the Yogin ascending in Consciousness to that state, an Illimitable affinity with others is done through their eternally connected Purushas instead of the frivolous obsessions of the phenomenal mind. Nevertheless, the sufis in question had certainly brought themselves to an excellent position, a potential springboard from which they might have reached the Eternal. But as they were confused followers of the shariat, heeding certain Asuric dictates while ignoring others, the idea that the individual could go from self-consciousness to Self-Consciousness was intrinsically repulsive to them (even if they described their own experiences as *similar* to *jivan-mukta*), and the opportunity was lost. It is a failure of a heretical sect that, if not capable in modern times, was actually able to slightly distinguish themselves to a certain prevailing Hindu notion of the medieval age. We refer, in this regard, to the misconstrued interpretation of *maya* that Adi Shankara was critical in spreading throughout the subcontinent – and beyond. But while Shankara's *maya* is certainly worthy of a critical rejection, he was an absolutely necessary corrective force against – by his time – a subcontinental tendency to view Non-Being as the spiritual summit.

It was an ignorance – as opposed to Islam's Falsehood – that emerged after the life of Buddha and the formation of different Buddhist traditions. These later developments, more so than Buddha himself, were what lead to the introduction of the aspiration of Non-Being. But that is not to assign blame to any party, as the advancement of the Non-Being doctrine is a perfectly natural outcome, beginning with Buddha himself, who did not actually make any particular comments one way or the other on the question of a Conscious-Being transcendent to the earthly individual. His primary emphasis was on the state of Nirvana he experienced, which in its modern understanding is – correctly – associated with a vast, cosmic, peace and stillness. While in the case of the ordinary sadhak this description can be considered an *intermediary* mystic experience, we cannot unquestionably say the same of Buddha, for there is a higher experience of Nirvana, as illuminated in the Bhagavad Gita, in which Sri Krishna imparts upon us, on multiple occasions, the state of *Brahma-nirvanam*. In one verse, the Yogi is described as the one who reaches that particular state after renouncing his lower self:

He who has the inner happiness and the inner ease and repose and the inner light, that Yogin becomes the Brahman and reaches self-extinction in the Brahman, brahmanirvanam. (Bhagavad

Precisely because of the historically experienced Brahma-nirvanam (which is intrinsically linked to the *Consciousness* of Brahma), it remains entirely possible that the Nirvana of Buddha was the Brahma-nirvanam. Nevertheless, a similarly stupendous nirvana of non-Being may also have been what he experienced, since he made no reference to consciousness, for describing a superior state in the language of ordinary mortals was not of interest to Buddha. His decision is completely justified, because the Supreme states of existence are first and foremost to be experienced rather than described. Likewise was it understandable that *some* of his subsequent followers conceived of Non-Being as the pinnacle, because they did not have any discourse to the contrary from the Buddha himself. Yet as this limited aspiration to Non-Being began to exert significant influence, its later decline in popularity would become the most important result of Shankara's brief life, even if he did not necessarily travel the breadth of the subcontinent for that particular purpose: Indeed, one can say that the diminishing of Non-Being as an aspiration resulted out of his incessant emphasis on *Adwaitavada*, that All is One Brahma.

While the latter is certainly a true experience, in the curious case of Shankara it arrived with an almost inexplicable theory of the terrestrial world as an illusion - his particular definition of *maya*. While it certainly presents as a ridiculous proposition, Shankara's *maya* arose as an extreme outcome of a then-pervasive indifference on the part of sadhaks and Yogin to the earthly manifestation, with his hypothesis only additionally fuelling this long-standing stance of simply becoming Self-Realized without trying to then use that Consciousness to transform the outward individual mental-vital-physical sheath. Thus Shankara, in order to harmonize his experience of All as One with a clearly ignorant – in relation to Brahma - world, chose to discard the earthly manifestation as an illusion instead of its rightful place as a consciousness still evolving towards its Origin, a partial reality progressing towards an Ultimate Reality, the conclusion in which it becomes the Multiplicity in One. Shankara's hypothesis is a frankly absurd one, and in actuality diverges from the Vedic Truth that he otherwise so correctly experienced and propagated.

For the *maya* of the Veda, of the Rishis who expressed the sublime Truth, is not that of an illusion, but of a phenomenal consciousness in which the world is viewed according to a limited temporal and spatial fashion, a *maya* that describes the partial reality, but *not* a hallucination. This original *maya* simply refers to the superficial – yet partially real – and unceasingly changing construct of the world as perceived by the ordinary mortal according to the birth mind and the five physical-vital senses. And though the original Vedic truth of *maya* has, at last, revived itself in the modern era, at the time of Sufism's infancy Shankara's *mayavada* was quite popular among occultists influential to the heretical sect's development, and hints of it would intermittently find its way into the works of the sufi mystics, with Rumi writing, “The laboratory and treasure of God is in non-existence. **Thou art deluded by existence:** how shouldst thou know what nonexistence is? (*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book III, 4516) In another stanza, Rumi encourages the renunciation of an illusory existence:

Whence shall we seek (real) existence? From renouncing (illusory) existence. Whence shall we seek the apple (of Truth)? From renouncing the hand (of self-assertion and self-interest).
O best Helper, only Thou canst make the eye that
regards the non-existent to regard that which is (really) existent.
The eye that was produced from non-existence regarded the Essence of (real) Being as wholly non-existent;
(But), if (thy) two eyes are transformed and illumined, this

well-ordered world becomes the scene of the Last Judgement. These realities are shown forth imperfectly (here) because the apprehension of them is forbidden to these raw (ignorant) ones.

Although God is munificent, the enjoyment of the delightful gardens of Paradise is forbidden to him who is destined for Hell. (*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, 824-29)

In Shabistari's letter to Husain, we find the former similarly rendering an illusory nature to the world in response to the latter's question, "Are the eternal and temporal separate. Is one the world and the other God?" In reply, Shabistari wrote, "No, all is One and the eternal and temporal are not two distinct entities. **The temporal is a subjective illusion**, just like a circle of fire which can be seen when a single spark is whirled around quickly." (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, pp. 206-209) Indeed one can see in that comment how Shankara's overemphasis of All as One leads to a complete dismissal of the temporal reality, the Vedic *maya* which – while certainly not *consciously* Brahma – should be afforded its appropriate place in the great scheme of existence as Prakriti's evolving partial reality seeking the Supreme Comprehensive Reality. The sufis however, if not experiencing or aspiring toward the latter Consciousness, cannot be said to have been entirely consumed by the idea of the earth's illusion, as other writings of theirs demonstrate a more nuanced understanding:

God was not increased by (His) bringing the world into existence: that which He was not formerly He has not become now;

But the effect (phenomenal being) was increased by (His) bringing created things into existence: there is (a great) difference between these two increases.

The increase of the effect is His manifestation, in order that His attributes and action may be made visible.

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book IV, 1666-68)

Even with his insistence on attributes and non-existence, Rumi and other sufis were at least periodically able to describe the earthly manifestation in terms distinct from the ubiquitous – to the era – belittlement of illusion that they also occasionally indulged. Indeed, the off and on assignment of the earthly body as the phenomenal being is the only element in which Sufism brought improvement over the *mayavadin* Hindus of medieval times. But even that beneficial point came with it an overriding denigration of the earthly life, as seen in their quite similar repudiation of the inherited mental-vital-physical body as something to liberate oneself from into "non-existence", a 'freedom' that according to Hujwari results in a subsistence without consciousness, whether of union or division:

In short, real annihilation from anything involves consciousness of its imperfection and absence of desire for it, not merely that a man should say, when he likes a thing, "I am subsistent therein", or when he dislikes it, that he should say, "I am annihilated therefrom"; for these qualities are characteristic of one who is still seeking. **In annihilation there is no love or hate, and in subsistence there is no consciousness of union or separation.** (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwari, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 243)

The subsistence mentioned is that of *baqa*, or the original state of God, described by Hujwari according to Sufism's standard belief that Consciousness-Identity as God is an impossibility, with subsistence only occurring in the amorphous 'Being' of Allah. It is an unusual summit achieved after the same rejection of an illusory or pseudo-illusory world done by the majority of medieval Buddhists and the medieval mayavadin Hindus, with the difference lying in the sufic aspiration for an amorphous 'Being'

characterized by an absence of thought (*and* an explicit rejection of unity with a Central Consciousness or Conscious-Identity); the medieval Buddhist seeking the Nirvana of a Non-Being (or at least, they were indifferent to the possibility of a Conscious Being); and the Mayavadin aspiring to a Conscious Divine Being while excluding any importance to the earthly existence or its possible transformation by the Jivatman. And though this neglect of the transformation of Prakriti's creation was shared by all, a crucial fact in differentiating the three involves our recollection that the revolution in Consciousness of the partially aware mortal elements can only be done *after* Satchitananda has been obtained, since it is only that Supreme Truth and Consciousness that is capable of unlocking its *Own* latent Divinity within Prakriti's earthly material.

As Sufism does not even allow for the Ultimate Liberation, for that initial ascension of consciousness into Identity as God, it offers no unique benefit to the future of humanity other than as a reminder of non-Islamic traditions in nations currently captured by Asuric Islam. Unlike the heretical sect, Buddhism has plenty of traditions where worship of a higher conscious being is practised, and at the very least it does not comment one way or the other on the Supreme except to identify Nirvana as a recognizable summit: thus by Buddhism's neutrality the possibility of Divine transformation remains even if the religion places no particular emphasis on it. For Buddhism is not an infrarational religion like Islam, and neither does it connect itself to an Asuric ideology as Sufism inextricably does through the shariat. Sufism also, though presenting a similar status of non-existence (from the ordinary consciousness), does not consistently describe the ineffable peace of Nirvana beloved by Buddhism. Instead, as a direct result of its lack of a substantial summit beyond the quietude they mistake for 'Being', Sufism eventually – even with the marifat experiences we will review - descends into the mire of the Asuric shariat it wrongly exalts, when they should be using their obtained cessation of thought and initiation of quietude or silence to proceed into the Conscious Deity.

But that, of course, would be infidelity towards the 'one Allah' that the shariat stage brainwashes the sufi mystics into accepting as 'truth'. Indeed even the remote possibility of the sufis aspiring to a higher Conscious-Being is likewise curtailed by the basic elements of the shariat, because the constant stress on division and hatred imparted by the Quran and authentic hadith makes it difficult for the mystic to bring about samata, to be able to see all things, including the "kuffar", with equanimity: Samata, we recall, is a psychological precursor to Conscious Equality (in Latency) that automatically emerges when experiencing Self-Realization. Sufi mystics, befitting their shariat indoctrination, do more than implicitly reject that possibility of Unity in Multiplicity, of Self-Realization: they *overtly dismiss* such kuffar notions, incarcerating themselves to their intermediary realizations of haqiqa or "Reality". It is here, in this understanding of Sufism's diluted unity through *attributes*, that we can fully account for its seemingly contradictory statements – as in the following Hallaj selection - that knowledge of Allah is impossible, at least for all humans:

On the side of the pure divinity of Allah, He remains, transcending all dependent things, praise be to Allah who is not touched by any secondary cause. His proof is strong, and His power glorious. He, the Lord of Splendour and Glory and Majesty. The Unaccountable One with arithmetical Unity. No definition nor counting nor beginning nor end touches Him. His existence is a marvel since He is removed from existence. **He alone knows Himself**, Master of Majesty and magnanimity. Creator of souls and bodies. (Mansur Hallaj, *Kitab al-Tawasin*, The Ta-Sin of the Disconnection-From-Forms, 24)

That Hallaj, eventually killed for his apostasy from Islam, could nevertheless reject an ability to truly know God, shows the inaccuracy of equating Sufism with the Sanatana Dharma. And he was not alone in this rejection of a pure or central – rather than the derivative or manifested divinity of attributes - knowledge-consciousness of God, with Arabi, in another example of metaphysical wordplay, similarly leaving the purest knowledge of God to Allah alone:

Perfection is loved for itself. **Allah's knowledge of Himself is His, since He is independent of the worlds. It belongs only to Him.** The perfection of the rank of knowledge only remains by the in-time knowledge which comes from these sources. When the sources of the universe exist, then the forms of perfection appear with timeless and in-time knowledge. Thus the rank of knowledge is perfected by two aspects. In the same way, the ranks of existence are perfected. Existence from it is before-time and not before-time, which is in-time. Pre-temporal (azali) time is the existence of Allah by Himself, and non-pre-temporal-time is the existence of Allah by the forms of the immutable universe. It is called in-time because it manifests some parts to others. **He is manifest to Himself by the forms of the universe, and so existence is perfected.** (Ibn Arabi, *Fusus Al-Hikam*, The Seal of the Wisdom of Sublimity in the Word of Moses)

The forms that comprise the manifestation thus – according to *Wahdat al-Wujud* Sufism - *already* present themselves to Allah as the *ultimate* sufic ‘unity’ with Himself, without need for an evolution of consciousness whereupon the forms – at least the human ones – become manifest *as* Conscious Outposts of God, rather than their current limited materialization. The sufis are to only ‘unite’ according to the already present “*self-revealing*” forms, unable to consciously attain to the Transcendent and hidden Allah:

Like all eminent sufis, Ibn al-Arabi emphasized: ‘He who knows himself knows the Lord.’ The Absolute in His hidden aspect was a mystery and a darkness whose secrets could, under no circumstances, be unveiled. **It was only the self-revealing aspect of the Absolute which human beings could understand.** (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 106)

This is the diluted unity of the sufis - who many consider to be compatriots of the Yogin -, the opening of the mystic sight, by way of annihilation (yet without ascending to a higher Consciousness or Conscious-Identity), to mere objective *signs*. Indeed Hujwari declared this as the “only” type of unity available – the annihilation into substance and attribute, without the Consciousness that they, as we will document, knew was spoken of by the Hindu mystics:

Therefore union can be referred only to His substance and attributes, for union is equality in the fundamental matter and no two things are equal in respect of eternity except His substance and His attributes, which, when they are separated by expository analysis are not united. (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 253)

For God, in the sufi haqiqa, is according to even the likes of Mansur Hallaj, “inaccessible” to the mystic in His sanctity or central or purest form!

Glory to Allah who is holy and by His sanctity inaccessible to all the methods of the gnostics and to all the intuitions of the people of revelations. (Mansur Hallaj, *Kitab al-Tawasin*, The Ta-Sin of the Disconnection-From-Forms, 20)

Only the subordinate and hence unequal attributes are available to mankind, which is why Hujwari – in his comments on an Abu’l-Fayd Dhu’l-Nun B. Ibrahim al-Mirsi statement - wrote of the impossibility of attaining to Allah (in his centralized conscious-existence):

He has many fine and admirable sayings on the verities of mystical knowledge. He says, for example: “The gnostic (arif) is more lowly every day, because he is approaching nearer to his Lord every moment,” inasmuch as he thereby becomes aware of the awfulness of the Divine Omnipotence, and when the majesty of God has taken possession of his heart, **he sees how far he is from God and that there is no way of reaching Him**; hence his lowliness is increased. (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, pp.

Curious indeed is a so-called mystic path that declares it impossible to reach God, but as the sufis are severely hampered by the shariat stage, one can understand the origin of their preposterous contention that an intermediate mystic state is the pinnacle, that achievement arrives in a derivative – or a cessation of ordinary thought - instead of Identification and Unity with His Consciousness. Their failure is present from the outset, with the sufis - in perhaps the ultimate belittlement of mankind – deriding humans as incapable of Knowing God:

He who says: ‘The object alone knows Himself’ - He confirms that the gnostic is tied by his difference, because the object never ceases to know Himself in Himself. **Oh Marvel! Man does not know before a hair of his body how it grew black to white. So how will he know He who made things exist?** He who does not know the summary or the analysis, nor the First and the Last, nor changes, nor causes, nor realities, nor devices, **it is not possible for him to have knowledge of He who does not cease to exist.** (Mansur Hallaj, *Kitab al-Tawasin*, The Garden of Gnosis, 13-14)

But the Yogin indeed *Know* it possible for the mortal to grow out of the ignorance broadly illustrated by Mansur Hallaj, rising out of his half-primate level into the different gradations of consciousness, including the silencing of the mind, until he fully transcends the ego into the Divine Consciousness, finally Self-Knowledgeable as That or He or She or I or It. The sufis, having vainly presumed their limited peak for the Supreme, display shocking – at least to those accustomed to Hindu mysticism – pronouncements on significant spiritual principles such as love:

Since He is not to be attained in this world or the next, the heart can never have rest from the palpitation of love; and since indifference is unlawful to those who love Him, the heart can never have rest from the agitations of seeking Him. This is a firm principle in the path of spiritual adepts. (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 97)

To the classical mystic found throughout the ancient world, whose truth remains in the survival and ongoing resurgence of the Sanatana Dharma, the declaration that one's love for God is unattainable makes a mockery of the very purpose of mysticism. For God can be Attained, can be Realized as the lover, either in the suprarational intuitive or revelatory levels to be outlined later, or in the highest and ultimate manner through pure Unity, when the previous division between lover and beloved is permanently discarded, the purest Conscious-Love prevailing. While Hujwiri, thanks to the confines of his intermediary mystic experiences, failed to understand these principles, he was not alone, as other sufis similarly distort different precepts of the spiritual path, with Hallaj confusing the true nature of Divine Power:

He who says: ‘I know Him by His reality’ - he makes his existence superior to that of the Object. Because whoever knows something in its proper reality becomes more powerful than the simple object of which he has knowledge. (Mansur Hallaj, *Kitab al-Tawasin*, The Garden of Gnosis, 18)

An existence or power or joy or love or consciousness superior to God is impossible, only fantasized by the Asura of Falsehood, his instruments, or those heavily influenced by him. As such, Self-Knowledge as God cannot lead to one becoming more powerful than God, because one can only ascend to the Divine Puissance or Will after liberation from the human's limited self-will or ego. The Yogi who has arrived will not act according to a greater power than God, but instead one comprehensively equal to the Puissance that is now the *same* as the Yogi's, though individually centralized as the Jivatman. The previous mental-vital personal egoistic power has to have been long discarded (in attachment) for this ascension to have occurred, and any revival of that limited personal will is understood by the Yogi to

confer a huge risk of a 'fall' from the Supreme Consciousness, a hazard that persists until the ego, instead of remaining simply *disengaged*, is utterly transformed by the now *descending* Satchitananda, which through unlocking Brahma within the very substance of mind and vital and physical (the three of which comprise the *egoistic* formulations of identity), permanently eliminates that risk.

Hallaj also erred, within the previous selection, in confusing the nature of an object when applying the term to God, because God as the Object does not function in the same fashion as an earthly object confined to psychological or physical restrictions. For once the "Object" of God is Realized, the very concept of objectification is dissolved into a Supreme Consciousness beyond the phenomenal constructions – which are absolutely necessary at a certain level of evolution - of subjectivity and objectivity, a Divine whose Puissance is Illimitable and incapable of being surpassed. But the sufis do not believe in that ascension into Self-Consciousness, confusing the narrow negation of the earthly whirl as the peak of mystic aspiration and 'reality', an ignorance that not only causes them to assign inappropriate limits to mystic love and power, but also to the ecstasy of which their marifat stage is so preoccupied, of which they – though more justifiably than with their deficient haqiqa – assume "union with God" has commenced:

Sound union is that which God produces in a man when he is in the state of rapture and ecstasy, and when God causes him to receive and fulfil His commandments and to mortify himself. This was the state of Sahl b. Abdallah and Abu Hafs Haddad and Abu'l Abbas Sayyari, the author of the doctrine. Abu Yazid of Bistam, Abu Bakr Shibli, Abu'l- Hasan Husri, and **a number of great Shaykhs were continually in a state of rapture until the hour of prayer arrived; then they returned to consciousness, and after performing their prayers became enraptured again...** You must know, in short, that union does not involve any peculiar "station" or any peculiar "state", **for union is the concentration of one's thoughts upon the object of one's desire.** (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, pp. 257-58)

As one can see here, not only is union incorrectly associated with the transitional phase of controlling – or initially exceeding – thought, the state of rapture – which is Sufism's commensurate to Ananda – is presented as something distinct from the ordinary consciousness, yet crucially without any identification of it *with a Supreme Consciousness* (observe the "returned to consciousness" *after* the ecstasy was obtained). Void of that intrinsic connection, one can easily see here that the sufic rapture, as presented by the majority of sufis, cannot be the same (at the very least, as we will discuss, with regards to intensity and especially duration) as the Divine Ananda experienced by the Yogi, because the sufic ecstasy is absent Consciousness and *permanence*. But that omission should be completely expected, because the *Wahdat al-Wujud* sufis – and obviously the more orthodox sufis like Sirhindi – have openly rejected the Yogin Realities in a language directly identifying the latter's experiences, as seen in the case of al-Sayyari:

An indelible mark was left on the people of Marv by Abu'l-Abbas Qasim bin al-Mahdi al-Sayyari. Although he died there in 342/953-54, for centuries his tomb at Marv was visited by devotees. According to him unification with God involved the complete absences of any other thoughts but God. His explanation of the doctrine of *jama* (union) and *tafriqa* (separation) deeply influenced later sufis. According to al-Sayyari: 'Union is that which He unites by His attributes and separation is that which He separates by His acts.' ...***Jama did not involve the mingling (imtizaj) of God with created beings or God-made objects (ittihad) with His own works or His becoming incarnate (hulul) in things.*** (*The Kashf al-Mahjub*, 1936, pp 157-58, 251-60) (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 39)

The experience of *hulul* is directly equivalent to the Self-Realization of the Yogi (or the rare cases of an Avatar), whereby God assumes the previously solely human mental-vital-physical sheaths as an

Outpost of his Consciousness. Similarly, as Sri Krishna illuminated in the Bhagavad Gita on karmayoga, can God help the seeker eventually Unite with Him through Works, by the process of the human individual renouncing all attachment to action and its fruits. Al-Sayyari's opinion, however, was shared by Hujwari, whose commentary on the former was what Rizvi had documented. Data Ganj Baksh, or the "Master who bestows Treasures" as Hujwari is popularly known in rump Pakistan, would in the same passage reaffirm an inflexible adherence to the belief that God is exclusively transcendental:

But it is impossible that God should be mingled (imtizaj) with created beings or made one (ittihad) with His works or become incarnate (hulul) in things: **God is exalted far above that, and far above that which the heretics ascribe to Him.** (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 254)

Such is the infection of Islam's severe separation of mankind, that even *Wahdat al-Wujud* sufis like Hujwari spoke of "heretics", with the aspersion cast on those who believed in Hindu concepts like Incarnation and Self-Realization. In that regard Hujwari and similar sufis, the ones lauded for their intermediary mystic discoveries, share common ground with the more pious Muslims, including orthodox subcontinental sufis like Shihabud-Din Suhrawardi:

Like other orthodox sufis, the Shaikh considered people misguided who believed that gnosis absolved them from a need to obey Sharia. The law and Haqiqa (Reality) were interdependent. **Similarly Shaikh Shihabud-Din Suhrawardi condemned sufis who...believed in the doctrine of incarnation (hulul).** Sufis who spoke of submerging themselves into the ocean of Divine Unity, said the Shaikh, were misdirected...

The heart (*qalb*), Suhrawardi believed was different to the rest of the human body although it was part of it. The heart of a true believer was like a pure soul and was illuminated by a shining light; but the heart of the unbeliever, said the Shaikh, was dark and made of a lowly substance. The heart of the hypocrite was shrouded in a veil... (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, pp. 89-90)

While Suhrawardi – whose order, we recall, is widely followed in the subcontinent – was certainly closer to the actual Islamic doctrine, he still promoted the very concept of haqiqa as something, if interdependent, yet also distinct from shariat, which we know is supposed to stand alone without any partners. While that certainly marks him among the hypocrites he so despised, his was a milder form than both the hululis he condemned, and Hujwari, who although a hypocrite himself, likewise abhorred the hululis. Ironical indeed is this turn of events, the blasphemous sect of Sufism containing further sub-sects of heretics who fling accusations of apostasy towards one another, with Hujwari taking the time to categorize and denounce two subgroups of sufis in particular:

The two condemned sects are, firstly, the Hululis, who derive their name from the doctrine of incarnation (hulul) and incorporation (imtizaj) and with whom are connected the Salimi sect of anthropomorphists; and secondly, the Hallajis, who have abandoned the sacred law and have adopted heresy, and with whom are connected the Ibahatis and the Farisis. (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 131)

As Hujwari did *not* – as will be shown – believe Mansur Hallaj to be a heretic, the Hallajis in question are those who deviated from Hallaj's teachings, which we already know to include a *rejection* of mankind's capacity to Know God in Self-Identity. Hujwari did not convey many details on this second set of heretics within the apostate sect of Sufism other than a few exceptions such as documenting their shared - with the hululis – belief in the eternal Spirit (or Self in yogic terminology):

The spirit, then, is a subtle body which comes and goes by the command of God...**Here we**

are at variance with the heretics, who assert that the spirit is eternal and worship it, and regard it as the sole agent and governor of things, and call it the uncreated spirit of God, and aver that it passes from one body to another. **No popular error has obtained such wide acceptance as this doctrine**, which is held by the Christians, although they express it in terms that appear to conflict with it, and by all the Indians, Tibetans, and Chinese, and is supported by the consensus of opinion among the Shi'ites, Carmathians, and Ismailis and by the two false (Sufi) sects mentioned above. (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, pp. 262-63)

Once again we find the sufis displaying an ignorance of spiritual truths and a lack of understanding as to what constitutes the Sanatana Dharma; for the Hindu does not worship the subtle body, knowing it to be *distinct* from the Spirit or Self (Hujweri ignorantly equated the subtle body with spirit) that is indeed worshipped. The subtle body, on the other hand, is to the Hindu considered a suprasensory – but *not* Divine – aspect of being that also includes the ordinary mental-vital-physical triple sheath, perhaps helpful – if accessed - in enlarging the earthly existence or even opening the inner consciousness, but not something to be worshipped. The hululis, while openly aligning themselves with unquestionably Hindu precepts, desperately tried to justify their extreme apostasy along the lines of the moderate heretics like Hujweri, through an attempt at categorizing Hindu beliefs such as reincarnation (metempsychosis) as the attributes of Allah. But Hujweri derided such arguments in a paragraph that stands as one of the clearest examples of conventional Sufism's rejection of core Hindu beliefs:

If, again, they say that the spirit is an eternal attribute and this is the doctrine of the Hululis and those who believe in metempsychosis and call it an attribute of God, I reply that an eternal attribute of God cannot possibly become an attribute of His creatures; for, if His life could become the life of His creatures, similarly His power could become their power; and inasmuch as an attribute stands by its object, how can an eternal attribute stand by a non-eternal object? Therefore, as I have shown, the eternal has no connexion with the non-eternal, and the doctrine of the heretics who affirm this is false. (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 264)

The Yogin experience is not of the Spirit as an “attribute”, but as the Whole, the thing itself: reincarnation might be termed an attribute, not technically of the Self but of the Purusha migrating through different triple sheaths. It is that immortal Purusha, in Itself not an “attribute” but God *within* the individual unit of Prakriti, that allows – contrary to Hujweri's ignorant assertion - for “His life” and “His power” to eventually become the Life and Power of the individual, as long as the sadhak has shed his or her *egoistic* attachments. The Life and Power and Wisdom will not belong to the mortal; they will choose to cast off their limited egoistic function and let the Supreme assume Governorship. The incredibly limited knowledge of Hujweri and the majority of sufi ‘saints’ is utterly exposed here, for if God is the creator of mankind, why should not God be able to possibly take control of his creation? The argument of Hujweri against that notion is one that subsequently rejects the possibility of God's Omnipotence, that God has created mankind but is incapable of transforming his own invention, that he has lost “connexion” with it.

But that is a precept of outright ignorance or avidya, a deficit in knowledge that the mystic path is – in its highest aspiration – designed to provide concrete *experience against*, by way of the Conscious Unity with one's Soul. For the Purusha contained within all mortals is the connection to - although veiled -, and *is*, the Eternal Source. Indeed the Soul (through the Psychic) is what suggests to mankind that he *allow* – because man is granted the relatively narrow capacity of free self-will or choice – himself to be progressively conquered by God, the Real Sovereign of the triple-sheaths. Sufism however, contends the “reality” as a choice to embark on a simple negation of the ordinary mental and vital whirl into an ambiguous ‘unity’. The heretical sect's distorted truth also moves beyond the basic ignorance seen in

the previous Hujwari passage to embrace the ugliness and falsehood of Islam, including the denunciation of those daring to believe in something different than what the sufis consider 'truth'. In one example, Hujwari asserts that those believing in reincarnation and incarnation are merely pretending to be sufis, and are thus infidels in agreement with Hindus:

The same vicious opinion is held by another sect of Anthropomorphists, **who pretend to be Sufis, and admit the doctrines of the incarnation of God and His descent (into the human body) by transmigration (intiqa), and the division of His essence...The sects to which I am now referring claim to be Moslems, but they agree with the Brahmans in denying special privileges to the prophets; and whoever believes in this doctrine becomes an infidel.** (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 236)

Hujwari would further castigate those believing in hulul, calling them wicked and cursing them:

All the Sufi Shaykhs, however, have recognized the wickedness of such practices, which the adherents of incarnation (hululiyān) - **may God curse them!** - have left as a stigma on the saints of God and the aspirants to Sufism. (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, pp. 416-17)

That 'saints' could have a stigma associated with them by a difference in a non-violent belief shows the toxic inheritance received by Sufism from its partnership with Islam. For an enlightened person or saint does not call another wicked or curse them simply because of their belief in Divine incarnation. Neither should these persons be labelled infidels, a spiteful charge that according to Islam brings with it the cruel punishments of genocide and hell. Sufism, however, is littered with such intolerance and rage towards those even hinting at Hindu beliefs similar to hulul, with Hujwari relating an absurd example of the sufi Harith al-Muhasibi, 9th century founder of the Baghdad School of Islamic Philosophy:

One day Abu Hamza of Baghdad, who was Harith's pupil and an ecstatic man, came to see him. The bird piped, and Abu Hamza gave a shriek. **Harith (Muhasibi) rose up and seized a knife, crying, "Thou art an infidel," and would have killed him if the disciples had not separated them.** Then he said to Abu Hamza: "Become a Moslem, O miscreant!" The disciples exclaimed: "O Shaykh, we all know him to be one of the elect saints and Unitarians: why does the Shaykh regard him with suspicion?" Harith replied: "I do not suspect him: his opinions are excellent, and I know that he is a profound Unitarian, **but why should he do something which resembles the actions of those who believe in incarnation** (hululiyān) and has the appearance of being derived from their doctrine? If a senseless bird pipes after its fashion, capriciously, why should he behave as though its note were the voice of God? **God is indivisible, and the Eternal does not become incarnate, or united with phenomena or commingled with them.**" (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, pp. 182-83)

Whether or not this story actually happened, Hujwari offered no critique of the paranoia and quick resort to violence for a barely plausible – a shriek! - link to hulul. Also displayed is a superficial understanding of God's Indivisibility, because the sufis forget that God is not defined according to human perceptions of time and space – therefore just because the Purusha is contained *within* the human, does *not* prove its separation from God, because the Purusha is both *within* the human and forever United with – and exactly the same as – the transcendental Brahma. Unable to see beyond the ordinary structure of time and space – the Purusha is a "Portion" of God that is not defined according to the ordinary human idea that portions are *physically* restricted -, sufis like Ibn Arabi reject the secret capacity of mankind to become "one with God" in the manner that the Yogin experience the Ultimate Unity:

Mystical union, to Ibn al-Arabi, did not amount to becoming one with God, rather it was

the realization of an already existing union. (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 108)

Rizvi was both referencing the dissimilarity between sufic union and Hindu Union, and distinguishing the proper sufi method of identifying attributes, something expanded upon by Arabi in his writings, with the following bringing up the important example of Jesus:

When he brought the dead to life, it was said that it was him and not him. The onlookers fell into bewilderment (hayra) just as the man of intellect becomes bewildered in his logical reflection when he sees an individual human being bringing the dead to life, as that is one of the divine qualities - bringing to life with speech, not mere bringing with animation. The beholder is bewildered because he sees the form of a man who possesses a divine effect. **That led some of them to speak of that as “incarnation” and say that Isa was Allah since it was by Him that Isa brought the dead to life. Thus they are charged with disbelief (kufr) which is the veil because they veil Allah, who brings the dead to life, by the human form of Isa.** Allah said, “They are unbelievers who say, ‘Allah is the Messiah, the son of Maryam.’ ” **They fell into both error and disbelief at the end of all they said, not because they say that he is Allah nor by calling him the son of Maryam. But they made the attribution that Allah, insofar as He brought the dead to life, was contained in the human form** of the nasut which is called the son of Maryam. (Ibn Arabi, *Fusus Al-Hikam*, The Seal of the Wisdom of Prophethood in the Word of Jesus)

Jesus, as we know, is held by Islam to have been a mortal prophet, whereas Christians believe him to be the “son of God”, divine incarnate. Arabi, the influential sufi behind the popular *Wahdat al-Wujud* that remains central to most subcontinental sufic orders, is in this selection rejecting the principle of incarnation, which in Hinduism is a possibility for all humans, even if the path is difficult and the ascension – or Descent – rare. In this repudiation, Arabi specifically dismisses the idea that God can exist within the human form, an argument not only ignorant of the Purusha, but also the ultimate aspiration of the Divine Transformation of the triple-sheath according to *His* Truth and Consciousness (with absolutely no element of the previous – and deficient - individual self-will). However much partial light his writings were able to recapture of the ancient non-Indian mysticism submerged by the imposition of Islam's dark falsehood, Ibn Arabi was nevertheless unable to proceed beyond a bounded understanding of ‘union’, one that he shared with Mansur Hallaj, whom Arabi openly defended against the charge of hulul that precipitated the former's demise:

I have exposed a secret here which the People of Allah have guarded jealously, for it contains a refutation of their allegation of being the Real. For the Real is never unconscious of anything, and the slave must be unconscious of something in favour of something else. **Inasmuch as he preserves that which he has created, he says, “I am the Real,” but he does not maintain it the way the Real maintains it that is the difference.** Inasmuch as he is unconscious of any form and its presence, the slave is distinguished from the Real. He must be distinct, although all the forms are maintained by his preservation of a single one of these in the presence of which he is conscious. (Ibn Arabi, *Fusus Al-Hikam*, The Seal of the Wisdom of Being Lost in Love in the Wisdom of Abraham)

“I am the Real” is what Hallaj had declared, a proclamation that understandably led to a charge of heresy by an Islamic religion that only allows for a slave to proceed to Paradise if he appropriately fears Allah and understands the strict separation between the slave and Allah. Arabi is once more refuting the possibility that the individual can become “the Real” in Conscious-Identity, and correctly – as we have seen from Hallaj's own rejection of hulul – analyses Mansur's statement as the result of his ‘union’ with the derivative or *attributes* of the “Real”, not in the same way that the Yogi calls himself God in non-egoistic, *Central-Identity*. Similarly, Rumi also rejected the accusation of the orthodox

against Hallaj, with the difference that the poet ironically linked him with an inner mystic *attribute* of “Light” - which subsequently made, *without* the need of incarnation, the “I” of Mansur into the “He” of God - that is nowhere mentioned in the Islamic scripture as attainable for Muslims:

A Pharaoh said “I am God” and was laid low; a Mansur (Hallaj) said “I am God” and was saved.

The former “I” is followed by God's curse and the latter “I” by God's mercy, O loving man;

For that one (Pharaoh) was a black stone, this one (Hallaj) a cornelian; that one was an enemy to the Light, and this one passionately enamoured (of it).

This “I,” O presumptuous meddler, was “He” (God) in the inmost consciousness, through oneness with the Light, not through (belief in) the doctrine of incarnation.

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book V, 2035-2039)

The sufic – or any mystic, for that matter – experience of light, one that Sufism intellectually associates with haqiqa and as one of Allah's attributes, belongs in substance to the marifat stage, and represents – in their rejection of incarnation *while* experiencing “Light” – a sign that the light obtained by them was characteristic of an *intermediary* opening of the inner consciousness rather than a complete ascension to the Supreme, with the “inmost consciousness” in truth an incomplete imitation of Yogic Conscious-Identification, as the inmost consciousness in Hinduism is the Purusha, whose Realization is precisely that of Incarnation, because one Realizes the Consciousness of God *within* the individual unit of Prakriti. But we will discuss this in detail later; for now, it is crucial to note Rumi's rejection of both Self-Realization and *ittihad*, a more substantial type of mystic union that went beyond the notion of oneness with either the attributes or a vague essence:

But since he was (an example of the saying that) whoso has not tasted does not know, his intelligence and imaginations (only) increased his perplexity.

How should this “I” be revealed by thinking? That “I” is revealed (only) after passing away from self (*fana*).

These intellects in their quest (of the real “I”) fall into the abyss of incarnation (*hulul*) and *ittihad*.

O Ayaz who hast passed away (from self) in union (with God) like the star in the beams of the sun -

Nay, (but rather) transmuted, like semen, into body - thou art not afflicted with *hulul* and *ittihad*.

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book V, 4145-49)

Incarnation however, is neither the abyss nor the domain of intellect; it is the ultimate aspiration of the spiritual seeker, from which the greatest of all aspirations, the Divine Transformation – the Unlocking of Prakriti's human unit to express its secret divinity –, can be sought. That Rumi failed to even appreciate the mystic capacity to initially ascend into the Divine Consciousness shows a severe limitation contrary to popular assumptions of his spiritual realizations. Of course, those assumptions usually come from the Hindus, who are naturally inclined to presume mystics to have experienced the highest of states, even when their writings explicitly contradict the notion. It is a tendency that like most things, has both positives and negatives; the latter involving the continued worship of some Hindus at sufi shrines, even while Sufism is hostile to the Sanatana Dharma; the former represented by their very curiosity and acceptance of spiritual seekers who are searching for a supraphysical experiences. Overall, it is a much better stance than the inflexible position of the rationalist, who

refuses any possibility of existence besides the ordinary intellect. The Hindu only needs to develop intuition and discrimination to subtly identify the complete charlatan from the mystic with partial and intermediate light, and most importantly, to distinguish the Guru from the former two. Sufism, however, rejects the possibility of the Guru whose birth consciousness has been replaced by the Consciousness of God (as opposed to their mortal pirs who 'replace' their ordinary consciousness with a *negation* combined with intermediate marifat experiences). Instead, the majority of sufis, including the martyrs accused – often incorrectly - of hulul by the orthodox, propagate a doctrine that at best grants mankind the ultimate status of a mere instrument lacking in Conscious-Unity:

From the Burning Bush, on the side of Sinai what he heard speak from the Bush was not the Bush nor its seed but Allah. **And my role is like this Bush.** So reality is reality and the created is created. Reject your created nature, that you may become Him, and He, you - in respect to reality. (Mansur Hallaj, *Kitab al-Tawasin*, The Ta-Sin of Purity, 6-8)

Instead of unity with God in his central consciousness, Hallaj only permits the possibility of consciousness as the bush, which in the example presented is an instrument by which Allah spoke. But while it is true that Hinduism acknowledges man's ability to become an instrument, that is *prior* to the removal of the veil or the opening of the Golden Lid. Once the consciousness ascends beyond the ordinary whirl, past the silence and the higher mental regions, the ego is shed and the consciousness becomes Consciousness. At that point, the triple-sheath is Consciously used as an instrument, with the *identity* now the Self or Atman, unlike Hallaj's assertion of one's identity *as* the instrument. At most, Hallaj is only describing the status of a *vibhuti* that intellectually understands himself to be an instrument, but does not Realize himself as Atman. This is the peak of Sufism's 'knowledge' of "reality", one that actually opens themselves up to further charges of heresy, because there is no need for Allah to have *occult* instruments after Mohammed, whom the sufis theorize to have been the finest example of the "Perfect Man", a completeness that they yet specifically deny as corresponding to the Divine incarnate:

Sufis of all schools rejected the idea of Divine infusion or incarnation (*hulul*) and to them the Perfect Man, although endowed with Divine Attributes, was unequivocally not Divine. (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume II, p. 394)

In support of this crucial distinction between the vast majority of Sufism's schools – Rizvi neglects to mention the two groups of sub-heretics identified by Hujwari - and the Sanatana Dharma, Rizvi appropriately cited the following Rumi stanza:

I am not a congener of the King of kings - far be it from Him! - but I have light from Him in (His) self-manifestation.

Homogeneity is not in respect of form and essence: water becomes homogeneous with earth in the plant.

Wind (air) becomes homogeneous with fire in consistency; wine at last becomes homogeneous with the constitution (of the body).

Since my *genus* is not the *genus* of my King, my ego has passed away (*fana*) for the sake of His ego.

Inasmuch as my ego passed away, He remained alone: I roll at the feet of His horse, like dust.

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book II, 1170-74)

Once again we find the boundaries of the sufic experience as defined by the attributes (this time of "light"), with Rumi only granting some awareness of light from the inner consciousness, rather than the ascension to congener or pure Conscious-Unity with the Supreme. Thus even the most celebrated of

sufi mystics, Rumi, could in truth only philosophize on matters divine, since he unequivocally rejected the Union of Consciousness or Conscious-Identity reached by the Yogin. But before we discuss an appropriate description of Sufism as a school of philosophy, exemplified by the theory of the Perfect Man outlined by Rizvi, we must recall Sufism's ironic hatred of philosophizers, with Shabistari dismissing their competency in his letter to Husain, having written, "Whatever philosophers and theologians may say of God merely serves to prove their own incapacity to understand him." (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, pp. 206-209) Sirhindi, who as we might expect refrained from such a broad critique of theologians, nevertheless similarly lambasted philosophizers:

My dear brother! It is understood that the author of this book has deviated into the way of philosophers. He almost holds them equal to prophets. The meaning which he gave to an ayat of hud Sura has caught my eye. He interprets the ayat like philosophers, disagreeing with prophets' way. He holds prophets' word and philosophers' word equal as if they were of the same value, and says, "according to the unanimity of prophets and philosophers" about the ayat, "For them there is none in the next world," and says, "By feeling, or mentally, theoretically..." concerning the ayat, "Torment by fire only." What value would philosophers' unanimity ever have at a place where there is prophets' 'alaihimus-salawat-u wat-tahiyyat' unanimity? What importance could their words have which inform of the torment in the next world, especially when they disagree with prophets' words? Philosophers say that Hell torment is mental and theoretical, and he says so, too. These words of theirs show that they disbelieve the fact that the body will feel the torment. However, prophets have communicated unanimously that torment will be felt. The book, also in its other parts, writes the ayats of the Qur'an as philosophers say. On account of its writings which disagree with those who follow prophets' way, the book bears secret, even very obvious, harm. Seeing that it would be necessary to inform you of this fact, I have caused your head to ache with a few words. I send my salam. (*The Collected Letters of Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindi*, Volume III, Letter 101)

Sufism, by virtue of its inescapable attachment to the shariat constituting its entry stage, will never be able to appreciate the value of philosophy or its presence as an equal aid in esoteric paths. For they have allowed vessels – the Quran and Mohammed's tradition – of infrarationalism to invade a domain that should be seeking complete disengagement from those base qualities. Philosophy, on the other hand, can be a useful means to explore higher forms of thoughts and ideas, partial truths that can service the beginning of a greater fulfilment; the scepticism it promotes can also be a effective discriminatory tool against entering Asuric paths like Islam. The sufis in their narrow world-view reject the partial truth of philosophy for a doctrine that predominantly includes a cruder set of dictates, the shariat that hinders their advance, forcing them – ironically like the philosophizers they despise – to grasp at God with inadequate tools. Hence their frequent characterization of their 'unity' according to an essence, as in the following Rumi stanza:

You speak of (external) relations, (but) I transcend (all) relations. In union (with God) where are signs or evidences?
The man that is debarred (from the Essence) sees the (Divine) action (as proceeding) from the Attributes: he that has lost the Essence is in (confined to) the Attributes.
Inasmuch as those united (with God) are absorbed in the Essence, O son, how should they look upon His Attributes?
When your head is at the bottom of the river, how will your eye fall on the colour of the water?
And if you come back from the bottom to the colour of the water, then you have received a coarse woollen garment

and given (fine) fur (in exchange).

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book II, 2811-2815)

But as Rumi's other writings show, the essence spoken of is only understood by them in a philosophical manner, according to the higher mind instead of *above* mind, for Rumi and other sufis clearly reject Incarnation and Unity of Consciousness. As the sufis have no *concrete* occult Knowledge of God or Conscious-Identification with Him, instead only experiencing the negation of the ordinary mind and partial realities of an intermediary opening of the inner consciousness (both of which they confuse for the summit of mysticism), they are ironically best categorized as part-philosophizers, resorting to descriptions such as “essence” and “absorbed”, and an overall metaphysical wordplay. For after rejecting a Unity of Consciousness, they are left with their own abyss of wisdom, one requiring further exploration due to their limited mystic experiences. In lieu of this chasm between their “Essence” of unity and the actual Conscious-Truth-Bliss-Power Unity, some sufis were indeed compelled to approach the matter of mysticism exactly by the means of ancient philosophical traditions!

According to the *Tabaqat al-Sufiyya*, Sari was the ‘first in Baghdad to teach unification (*Tawhid*) through the path of mysticism, the first to teach the knowledge of Reality, and he was also the leader of the Baghdadis in the use of symbolic utterances (*isharat*)’. **A great leader, he chose the Socratic method of instruction through the posing of thought-provoking questions.** Sari's influence converted the Baghdad school of sufism into a group known as the Masters of Unification (*Arbab al-Tawhid*). **Their theories were based on academic knowledge and their approach to mysticism was intellectual.**

Sufism, Sari said, meant to a sufi the following three things: ‘...that the light of his gnosis did not extinguish the light of his abstinence (*wara*), that his **inward speculations did not make him opposed to the outward conduct taught by the Qur'an and the Sunna**, and that the favours of God bestowed on him did not lead him to tear aside the veil from what God had made unlawful to him.’ (extract translated in *An early mystic of Baghdad*, p 39) (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, pp. 50-51)

Abu'l-Hasan Sari ibn al-Mughallis al-Saqtī and the Baghdad school are in this selection emphatically shown to follow the methods of philosophy, from the very application of the ancient philosopher Socrates' instruction by questions, to similar approaches such as speculation, which is a process characteristic of the growing philosophical mind rather than an unquestioning, infrarational belief in Islamic falsehood. Additionally, their school was the house of “theories” instead of *experienced* Conscious Truths, and their knowledge was both “academic” and “intellectual” - all of this unquestionably confirming the importance of philosophy to their esoteric endeavours, because question and answers and other forms of intellectuality are anathema to Islam's infrarational structure of a rigid, unthinking religion demanding a master-slave obedience to the scripture and Imam. Indeed Islam (the Quran and the authentic hadith – rather than the fabricated hadith utilized by the sufikuffar) is, contrary to premise of Sari and many other sufi heretics, supposed to entirely comprise *both* the inward and outward conduct of the so-called Muslim.

That Sari and his school were so worried about deviating from the expected conduct was what also made them – astonishingly for those claiming to be mystics – *fearful* of tearing aside the veil separating the ordinary consciousness from the Divine. It is another example of how the shariat stage of Sufism hampers the natural tendency of mystics, because that group of mankind should be actively seeking to remove *all* veils between themselves and God: the addition of the shariat to such an antithetical position only serves to introduce fear into the path of mysticism, and also, by the very status of the admixture automatically makes these type of sufis guilty of apostasy – because of the specific ‘crime’ of religious innovation - from the Islamic shariat. This inappropriate - and ‘illegal’ - combination of philosophy and infrarational Islam, the former outwardly rejected by Sufism yet in actuality practised

by its vast majority to account for the *intermediate* nature of their occult knowledge and experiences emerging out of the haqiqat quietude, is also found in the teachings of the sufi Husri, especially in his presentation of the Sufism's five principles of 'unity':

And Husri says: "Our principles in unification are five: **the removal of phenomenality, and the affirmation of eternity, and departure from familiar haunts, and separation from brethren, and forgetfulness of what is known and unknown.**" **The removal of phenomenality consists in denying that phenomena have any connexion with unification or that they can possibly attain to His holy essence; and the affirmation of eternity consists in being convinced that God always existed,** as I have already explained in discussing the saying of Junayd; and departure from familiar haunts means, for the novice, departure from the habitual pleasures of the lower soul and the forms of this world, and for the adept, departure from lofty stations and glorious states and exalted miracles; and separation from brethren means turning away from the society of mankind and turning towards the society of God, since any thought of other than God is a veil and an imperfection, and the more a man's thoughts are associated with other than God the more is he veiled from God, because it is universally agreed that unification is the concentration of thoughts whereas to be content with other than God is a sign of dispersion of thought; and forgetfulness of a thing which is known or unknown means the unification of that thing, for unification denies whatever the knowledge of mankind affirms about it; and whatever their ignorance affirms about it is merely contrary to their knowledge, for ignorance is not unification, and knowledge of the reality of unification cannot be attained without denying the personal initiative in which knowledge and ignorance consist. **A certain Shaykh relates: "While Husri was speaking to an audience, I fell asleep and dreamed that two angels came down from Heaven and listened for some time to his discourse. Then one said to the other, 'What this man says is the theory of unification, not unification itself.' When I awoke he was explaining unification. He looked at me and said, 'O So-and-so, it is impossible to speak of unification except theoretically.'**" (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, pp. 281-82)

The five principles outlined can only lead one to a state of nullification, whereby phenomena is removed but "unity" is only obtained through a *conviction* of God's existence. As becoming convinced of something – in this case the "affirmation of eternity" – is a form of mental or vital belief, it cannot be the true Conscious-Unity, and can also be obtained *without* the sufi practice of earthly negation seen in the other four principles. Once again, we find inadequacy to the sufi path, because their haqiqa or reality is deficient in its *ultimate* level, not requiring anything more than what can be obtained by the birth faculties of the mortal, whose mind can theorize just as Sufism does. Indeed the story of Husri's interaction with an audience further entrenches the actual reality that Sufism is at least a part-philosophical path, for when the sadhak becomes Consciously United with God, he speaks of this unification from *experience* rather than theory. The sufis, on the other hand, describe unity of attributes without *central* unification, establishing a partial reality that does not transcend the ordinary mind or the intellect – even if the sufis are able to conversely establish quietude of their mind on an individual level – that relies on theory instead of Conscious experience.

As philosophy is integral to their apostasy, the sufis – if they were honest – should, just as they lambaste those they accuse of philosophy, be condemning themselves, because the difference between sufis and the philosophers they hate is meagre, resting in Sufism's stress on quieting the mind to obtain a few marifat experiences below the level of Satchitananda, whereas ordinary philosophers are not concerned with – or do not believe in – such measures or outcomes. While the sufis can potentially advance higher (or deeper) in consciousness than the simple philosopher because of the sufic insistence on negating the earthly mental whirl, they fail to realize their promise by stopping at the *intermediary*

stages of haqiqa and marifat. And though the marifat experiences are unobtainable to the ordinary philosophers because of their *choice* to not partake in occult paths, the stage – as outlined by the sufis themselves – is nevertheless below the Supreme Consciousness, and the haqiqa (unlike the marifa which is strictly the domain of intermediate *experiences*) theorized by the sufis is equally reachable by the philosophizer, because it is a mere intellectual unity for which the cessation of thought is *unnecessary* to its understanding.

Sufism then, is a bastion of philosophy, even if the atypicality to their marifat experiences of the inner – but not Divine – consciousness lead the sufis to boast of their freedom from philosophy along with their superiority to rationalists and similar philosophers. Yet are their multiple theories also undeniable accretions onto pure Islam by the blasphemous sect, because the sufis fail at the outset to adhere to the strict regulations of the Islamic scripture. This is a consequence of simply entering a path whereupon they follow a shaykh, himself guided by ideas and works and beliefs different than those permitted by the Quran and authentic hadith. From this nascent fluidity, it was inevitable that philosophy – often friendly to esoteric quests – would enter and increase the religious innovations of Sufism, including the aforementioned theory of the “Perfect Man” that, if somewhat minor in comparison to other sufi bidats (such as the *shirk* of pir worship), is nonetheless helpful in confirming Sufism's identity as a school of philosophy, as evidenced in Rizvi's succinct explanation of a theory most finely elucidated by Ibn Arabi:

Ibn Arabi rejects the notion of mystical union with God in the sense of becoming one with God; what he sees is the realization by the Perfect Man of the meaning of his essential unity with the Divine Being. (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume II, p. 49)

At once we find the Yogin experience of Conscious-Unity rejected, with the characterization of essential unmistakably used in an abstract or philosophical manner, befitting those without any ascension beyond the frontiers of the external or internal mental regions, or even the outer and inner vital (the Atman and the Purusha are beyond these regions). Sufism's “Perfect Man” then, cannot be the same as the corresponding Hindu experience, because the latter views perfection in terms of Self-Consciousness or Conscious-Identity, whereas the understanding of non-hululi sufis (in other words, the vast majority of the sufi heretics) is restricted – as Rizvi summarizes below – to ordinary aspects of psychology, enclosed in the “human specie”:

The very first form in which the Absolute begins manifesting itself by corresponding to the unified state of a permanent archetype is the Reality of Muhammad (*haqiqa al-Muhammadiyah*). This is the active principle upon which the existence of all archetypes depends and on which the creative activity of the self-revealing aspect of the Absolute operates. According to Ibn Arabi, each prophet is a logos of God, but Muhammad is *the Logos or leader of the prophets...who finally historically acquired human form...In Plotinian terminology, Muhammad as the first self-determination of the Absolute is the First Intellect...Ibn Arabi says, “He was the most perfect of human species.”* (*Fusus al-Hikam*) (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume II, p. 43)

If there was any doubt, Sufism's perfection is here described as contained within the element of basic humanity, whereas Self-Realization is the transcending of ordinary humanity into Satchitananda. *Wahdat al-Wujud* and its associated theory of the “Perfect Man” thus belong to the realm of philosophy, with Mohammed as the human archetype by which Allah *self-reveals* as part of his mere “signs” or “attributes”, but not as a Self-Revelation which, per Sufism and Islam, is impossible. Mohammed can only function as an archetype, the human – and thus automatically insufficient – sign of God at the lower level of humanity, but not One with Allah's Consciousness. He was never meant, according to Sufism, to rise above mankind's ordinary mentality – his life purpose was for Allah to present mortals with the finest ‘evidence’ of himself:

That is why the Prophet, peace be upon him, said, “Whoever knows himself knows his Lord.” If you wish, you can say that this tradition is the forbidding of gnosis and stating the inability to attain to Him - and that is a permissible statement; and, if you wish, you can say that it is the affirmation of gnosis. The first is that if you do not know yourself, so you will not know your Lord. The second is that you recognize yourself, so you do recognize your Lord. **Muhammad was the clearest proof of his Lord.** Every part of the world indicates its root which is its Lord, so understand! (Ibn Arabi, *Fusus Al-Hikam*, The Seal of the Unique Wisdom in the Word of Muhammad)

At best, Arabi was assigning to Mohammed the corresponding – to Hinduism - status of a vibhuti, who as we recall are confined to the human level of consciousness. Of course, because Mohammed was under the occult command of the Asura of Falsehood, he is better identified as an *Asuric* vibhuti, an apt medium of falsehood, a centrifuge for the Asura's message. The Prophet was similarly never portrayed by Arabi as a god, which helps to explain why subsequent sufis like Hujwari and Rumi, who believed in the same principles, chastised hululis and other extreme heretics who believed in Hindu experiences. Unlike those transgressors, Arabi did not, when formulating his theory, take the writings or experiences of Hindus or Buddhists for assistance, because his philosophy, as hinted in the following selection, was based on Abrahamic doctrine:

Muhammad's wisdom is uniqueness (fardiya) because he is the most perfect existent creature of this human species. For this reason, the command began with him and was sealed with him. He was a Prophet while Adam was between water and clay, and his elemental structure is the Seal of the Prophets. (Ibn Arabi, *Fusus Al-Hikam*, The Seal of the Unique Wisdom in the Word of Muhammad)

Mohammed, in Arabi's philosophy, is clearly not a Godhead or Avatar analogous to the Yogin Reality; his function instead, is as a “mirror” or “image” of God similar to Judaism's presentation of Adam:

Ibn al-Arabi attached a high importance to the cosmic significance of man. He believed that the universe was a ‘Big Man’ created by God in order to see himself, while Man was a small universe, a well-polished mirror reflecting objects as they really were. In man were found all the attributes which the universe embodied, while a Perfect Man was the epitome of all understanding and the vicegerency of God on earth...**His arguments were based on the Jewish tradition that God created Adam in his own image...** Thus in relation to the Absolute, Muhammad was both a ‘servant’ and ‘passive’, but in relation to the world he was ‘lord’ and ‘active.’ (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, pp. 107-108)

In Arabi's theory, Mohammed was the utmost – and human – *self*-revelation of Allah, the leader of men yet unequal to Allah, rather than Hinduism's Realized Godhead who is Consciously United with Brahma. Arabi's seminal idea, a theory limiting the arc of human perfection, is an understandable result of a sect that cannot aspire to a consciousness beyond the negation of human thought and the boundaries – though wider than ordinary human capacity – of their inner marifat experiences. This perfect man or *insan-i kamil* was to be slightly expanded upon by different sufis, to the extent where “perfection” was granted to mortals other than Mohammed, as long as they followed the sufic paths. These mortals are to then, per Shabistari in his letter to Husain, return to the world and follow the law, with an expected yield from the correct adherence:

Q. Who is the traveller and who is the Perfect Man?

A. The traveller is one who journeys to God. But the Perfect Man is one who does not rest at this ecstatic union with ‘The Truth.’ He journeys back down to the phenomenal world where he confirms to outward laws and by doing so brings forth the fruit of good works. Perfection in the saintly state would be seen in the Mahdi, ‘the seal of the Saints’ who would have attained the

‘Truth’ in a perfect way. (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, pp. 206-209)

While this sounds reasonable, the problem rests in the outward law the mystic is to follow, which to the sufi is the shariat. Thus Sufism's *Wahdat al-Wujud* and *insan-i kamil*, the diluted unity of being by which man arrives at the “perfection” of imitating an Asuric vibhuti known as Mohammed, leads to a strange state of affairs whereby “perfection” and “unity” result in “laws” and “good works” such as the genocide of Hindu kuffar simply because they refuse to say that Allah is the only name of God. And though Sufism cannot not even bring about samata by way of its corrupted unity, it nevertheless certainly adds to the idolatry of Mohammed, the seed of which was already present in the Quran and Hadith, which if not describing Mohammed literally as the perfect man, still labelled him the seal of the prophets and the exemplar for mankind, whose tradition is to be followed – all enough for Sufism to inevitably take it to the very next step of attributing perfection to the Asuric medium. This theory of the perfect man became so popular that it was deemed admissible by even the more orthodox of sufis, including Sirhindi:

An exalted person who will take from Allahu ta'ala and give to men should be two-dimensional. Because man is very mean and evil-natured, he cannot have a relationship with Allahu ta'ala. **A two-dimensional intermediary is necessary, and this intermediary is an insan-i kamil (perfect man).** (*The Collected Letters of Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindi*, Volume I, Letter 61)

Sirhindi confirms the status of Sufism's pinnacle as that of an intermediary truth, whether described in their terms of perfection or mirror, or if we view them – per Yogin experience – according to their transitional spiritual level which rests in a mental silence and an initial aperture into the inner consciousness. While Sirhindi basically agreed with Arabi's theory of the perfect man (and its secret idolatry that he would, if questioned, deny ever existed in Islam), he spared no criticism for Arabi's *Wahdat al-Wujud*, which he thought equivalent to Hinduism:

Deeply concerned that Indian sufis should pay allegiance to the *Wahdat al-Wujud*, which he believed differed little from the Unity of Being of the yogis, he urged that, like yogis they should not attach any importance to severe mystical exercises. Writing to Sufi Qurban...the Mujaddid said that the meditational and ascetic exercises of misguided people (Hindu yogis) did them little good for they did not obey the laws of the Sharia (Maktubat, I, 114)...to Saiyid Husain Manikpuri, the **Mujaddid wrote that although yogis, Brahmans and Greek philosophers performed hard ascetic exercises, perdition and ruin were their only rewards.** (Maktubat, I, 221) (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume II, p. 407)

Even though Arabi and other initial proponents of *Wahdat al-Wujud* irreparably differentiated - by rejecting *hulul* and reincarnation and Unity of Consciousness and other principal experiences associated with Yogin Self-Realization – their theory from Hinduism, the distinctions made were not enough to satisfy the more orthodox of Muslims - an inevitable outcome, because their intermediary spiritual goals require the use of mystical practices far too similar to those used by Polytheists. Therefore even if the likes of Sirhindi might appreciate the difference between the aspiration of Satchitananda versus the diluted unity of moderate heretics like Arabi, the mere incorporation of Hindu practices by the latter group is enough to repudiate them as blasphemers. Additionally, subsequent accretions to Arabi's original theory, made by subcontinental sufis who introduced blatantly Hindu practices that more obviously exposed the theory's implicit *shirk*, only strengthened Sirhindi's opposition to the doctrine:

The similarities between the *Wahdat al-Wujud* and the philosophy of the yogis and Brahmans (Vedantists) were so remarkable that even the Mujaddid was prompted to argue that **because such a concept was taught by Greek philosophers as well as yogis and Brahmans, it would have no meaning for him.** (Maktubat, I, no. 266) **He refused to allow any association**

between Rama and Krishna and Rahman (the Merciful), arguing that although Hindu gods acknowledged a Supreme Creator, they had invited people to worship themselves, asserting that the Supreme Being was infused into and united with them (*hulul*). He stated that considering Rama as Rahman was a stupid blunder and amounted to calling the Emperor a sweeper. (Maktubat I, no 266) (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume II, p. 392)

Hindus, however, do not worship “themselves”, or at least its definition according to the ignorant mentality of the likes of Sirhindi. Rather, the worship is of the Purusha within, a Soul *distinct* – but at once containing all within It - in Consciousness from the admixed consciousness of the normal human governed by ego. Thus even if the Hindu worships the Purusha within, he is *not* worshipping himself, because the bhakta has not *yet* reached the state of liberation, and thus his worship is of the Unblemished (by ego or anything else) Portion of the Supreme Power – though contained deep *within* instead of Transcendent – rather than his current *egoistic* perception of self. And once the sadhak consciously attains to Self or Soul, worship automatically ceases because the Object has become Subject - *and* Beyond both principles; at this point, as the Upanishads illumine, the Supreme Consciousness begins, thanks to the previous worship of the God (Purusha) – rather than man or the individual ego - within:

The Great Lord is the beginning, the cause which unites the soul with the body; He is above the three kinds of time and is seen to be without parts. **After having worshipped that adorable God dwelling in the heart**, who is of many forms and is the true source of all things, man attains final Liberation. (Svetasvatara Upanishad 6:5)

Thus egoistic self-worship is impossible when one understands the true aspiration of the Sanatana Dharma. Indeed, the charge levelled by Sirhindi against Hinduism is, as we shall see, better placed against sufis like Hallaj who uttered “I am God” when they openly *rejected* an ascension of consciousness into Atman, or a Conscious-Unity with the Purusha within. But Sirhindi was doing his best to remain a good Muslim, hunting for possible bidats and entries into the dreaded *shirk*, and in doing so using the proper, literal interpretation of the Quran and appropriate application of the authentic hadith. Unlike the moderately heretical *Wahdat al-Wujud* sufis and others, he did not seek to distort or bend the scripture in support of a blasphemy (as opposed to its alternative use for taqiyyah against the non-Muslim), a practice infuriating to the ‘purest’ of all mortals more orthodox than he, further motivating them to bring forth accusations of apostasy. While we have already presented a few examples of this particular crime, there are others specifically relating to *Wahdat al-Wujud*, with Rizvi (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 340) documenting a couple selections of Islamic scripture that reference the sufic idea of the “Face” of Allah, with one verse – also mentioned in this chapter - describing, “Everyone that is thereon will pass away; There remaineth but the Countenance of thy Lord of Might and Glory.” (Quran 55:26-27)

Another verse similarly reveals, “And cry not unto any other god along with Allah. There is no Allah save Him. Everything will perish save His countenance. His is the command, and unto Him ye will be brought back.” (Quran 28:88) But as this second selection recounting the “face” of Allah helps clarify, the purpose of such infrarational communications was not to establish a doctrine of ‘unity of being’, but to instead remind the Muslim that the earthly life pales in comparison with the Judgement Day when they will be “brought back”. Allah’s “countenance”, in these examples, is language used to remind the Muslim slave that his lord will be present, ready to cast judgement immediately after their death. Sufism’s use of those verses for *Wahdat al-Wujud* also fails when we consider that its ‘unity of being’ is something its ‘saints’ profess as capable of attaining *during* the earthly life – the previous verses, on the other hand, are describing the physical death of the human, not an allegorical or subtle passing in which the previous earthly nature is replaced by something psychologically greater such as

‘unity’ with Allah.

In another, more dishonest example of their habitual practice, sufis propose the Quran verse, “We will soon show them Our signs in the Universe and in their own souls, until it will become quite clear to them that it is the truth,” as proof of that their belief in a diluted unity with Allah and his attributes is the ultimate haqiqa. But when we view the verse and that preceding it, we discover the appropriate interpretation:

Say: “Tell me if it is from Allah; **then you disbelieve in it, who is in greater error than he who is in a prolonged opposition?**” **We will soon show them Our signs in the Universe and in their own souls**, until it will become quite clear to them that it is the truth. Is it not sufficient as regards your Lord that He is a witness over all things? (Quran 41:52-53)

The verse distorted by the heretical ‘saints’ thus assumes a much different nature than Sufism's esoteric impart upon it; it instead becomes another example of the endless warnings delivered by the Asura of Falsehood to mankind demanding that they believe in the message of the Quran (rather than sufi haqiqat), with the “signs” in the universe consequently understood to include – among many ominous messages - all of the towns communicated to have been destroyed. While Sufism's corruption of the infrarationally revealed verses certainly marks them as apostates, we also find the Hadith to be another avenue for their subtle machinations, with the following Sahih Muslim selection assisting them in their assertion that meditative concentration should be used to bring about ‘unity’ with Allah:

Abu Huraira reported Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) as saying: “**The truest word spoken by an Arab (pre-Islamic) in poetry is this verse of Labid: ‘Behold! Apart from Allah everything is vain.’**” (Sahih Muslim Book 028, Number 5604)

While this hadith is much more relevant to Sufism's doctrine than its manipulations of the Quran, a solitary hadith like this, when viewed in combination with the entirety of the Quran and the rest of the authentic hadith, cannot really justify a theory of ‘unity of being’ with Allah. For not only does the hadith neglect to specify an actual ‘unity of being’, it is better interpreted along with Quran and Hadith injunctions decrying the glorification of material wealth and other activities inimical to Islam and Allah. It is also, while an example of the *relative* futility of the earthly life, absolutely not a command to then proceed off to a forbidden khanqah and lead a life of asceticism, because that is explicitly outlawed in the Quran, the book dominant to all hadith selections. But as the Asura of Falsehood's scripture provides the scarcest of testimony to Sufism's heretical *Wahdat al-Wujud*, the sufis have no choice but to scour the Hadith, in which they find only a minimal amount of *authentic* selections that even lightly favour them, with the exception of a sole hadith offering more robust substantiation:

Narrated Abu Huraira:

Allah's Apostle said, “Allah said, ‘I will declare war against him who shows hostility to a pious worshipper of Mine. And the most beloved things with which My slave comes nearer to Me, is what I have enjoined upon him; **and My slave keeps on coming closer to Me through performing Nawafil (praying or doing extra deeds besides what is obligatory) till I love him, so I become his sense of hearing with which he hears, and his sense of sight with which he sees, and his hand with which he grips, and his leg with which he walks;** and if he asks Me, I will give him, and if he asks My protection (Refuge), I will protect him; (i.e. give him My Refuge) and I do not hesitate to do anything as I hesitate to take the soul of the believer, for he hates death, and I hate to disappoint him.’” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 8, Book 76, Hadith 509)

This is the singular hadith that prompted Rumi, in the only example from his Mathnawi, to actually declare man capable of uniting with a Divine “consciousness” - the word itself specifically chosen by

the poet:

O ye who are rotten with death (in your hearts)
underneath the skin, return from non-existence at the voice of
the Friend!

**Absolutely, indeed, that voice is from the King (God), though
it be from the larynx of God's servant.**

**He (God) has said to him (the saint), "I am thy tongue and
eye; I am thy senses and I am thy good pleasure and thy
wrath.**

**Go, for thou art (he of whom God saith), 'By Me he hears and
by Me he sees': thou art the (Divine) consciousness (itself):
what is the occasion (propriety) of (saying), 'Thou art the
possessor of the (Divine) consciousness'?**

Since thou hast become, through bewilderment, 'He that
belongs to God,' I am thine, for 'God shall belong to him.'

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book I, 1935-39)

While on the surface, the lines referring to the sufi saint as possessor of the Divine consciousness (including "though art the consciousness") certainly sound equivalent to the Yogin experience of "Thou art That", we not only have for repudiation of such a thesis the explicit – including multiple times by Rumi in the same Mathnawi – rejection of *hulul* and *ittihad* and transmigration, but also the distinctions presented in the passage itself. For prior to quoting the singular Bukhari hadith, Rumi describes the sufi saint as "God's servant", indicating the subtle separation that exists in identity even if they are possessor of the Divine "consciousness" (note its lower case wording). We thus find – and it is corroborated by the very use of Divine "consciousness" in partnership with a hadith describing "sight" and "hearing" – Rumi's poetry to be detailing an *appendage* of God's consciousness rather than the Central Consciousness-Identity experienced by the Yogi, the experience of which automatically leads the Yogi to declare – without apologizing as we will soon find many sufis to have done after their most outlandish statements – "I am Brahma".

To these sufis, the only 'Divine consciousness' the mystic is capable of experiencing is a manifested or *peripheral* form of consciousness; the sufis "see" and "hear" as one with Allah, but *remain* distinct from Allah in Conscious Identity or Central Consciousness – they "unite" with the speech (by way of the "larynx") rather than God Himself. Indeed, their association of consciousness with the ordinary human understanding – sense perceptions of sight and hearing – exposes their deficient knowledge, because the Consciousness of Brahma is beyond the mental-vital understanding, and cannot be defined according to the limited human perceptions which often confuse it with experiences of the periphery. For the sufis, any possible *centrality* to Consciousness is left to a vague essence, and the hearing and sight spoken of become additional attributes, this time of the 'Divine consciousness' of the limited self-revelation rather than the Pure Self-Consciousness. The distinction is clearly seen in another Rumi stanza pertaining to God's "consciousness" and "essence", the latter of which, as we have previously shown, is purported by them to be the closest to Allah's centrality that they are able to identify with:

**Where in existence is (anything) more remote from
understanding and mental perception than the consciousness
and essence of God?**

Since that does not remain hidden from (His) familiars, what
is the essence and attribute that should remain concealed?

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book III, 3652-53)

If Sufism's experience of the Divine consciousness was actually one of a Conscious Self-Identification

with God, Rumi would not have persisted with the continued mention of essence, and would have written “Consciousness” instead of the peripheral “consciousness” of “hearing” and “seeing” only the sufi ‘saints’ are capable of accessing. The consciousness of Allah as experienced by the sufi mystic is divided, maintaining the subtle separation by which the sufi can declare himself ‘united’ with the particular sense-perception attributes of “hearing” and “sight”, but not with the actual identity of Allah, which would encompass the dreaded *hulul* or *ittihad*. It is a form of ‘Divine consciousness’ similar to a child obtaining the fully developed eyesight and audition of an adult, yet without the adult’s intelligence. It also neglects to appreciate the natural progression of self-awareness, the yogic experience of going from “i” to “I”, for as humans *do* have a perception of their individuality, one would expect an ascension above all regions of the mind to include a similar – in basic principle only – Awareness of Self, rather than the amorphous sufi theory of ‘being’ that does not specifically include an awareness or consciousness of a superior identity.

That the sufis instead strongly believe in their ability to unite with derivative and superficial attributes of hearing and sight, the attributes equivalent to their intermediate formulation of a ‘Divine consciousness’, is because of their marifat experiences involving occult visions and auditions greater than the ordinary existence, even if those heightened states of reality fail to help them reach the Summit. It was this pattern – confusing the intermediate for the Whole - that Rumi followed, one that prevented him from truly understanding what the Divine Consciousness is, as seen both in his previously cited selections and others, including the following couplet where he describes the “senseless” ones as rediscovering their ordinary senses:

God gives back to the senseless ones their (lost) senses: (they return to consciousness) troop
after troop, with rings (of mystic knowledge) in their ears
(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu’d-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book I, 3674)

If the celebrated sufi mystics had actually ascended to a Pure, Central, Divine Consciousness, they would not have spoken of *returns* to consciousness or a *separate* God restoring their ordinary senses, and instead would have recounted the Supreme Reality whereupon their actual identity – which arrives from an awareness or consciousness – permanently became that of God, through which the ordinary understanding of sense-based consciousness became insignificant in comparison to a Supreme Consciousness well beyond the limited vital-physical functions. But sufis fail to ascend – nor do they aspire to It, because they do not *believe*, as their writings show, Self-Realization possible - to a ‘Divine consciousness’ greater than a derivative ‘unification’ with sight and hearing that they perceive as part of Allah’s ‘Being’: these are the marifat experiences of visions and auditions that if in some cases belong to the native inner consciousness *closer* to God, are nevertheless not United – in Consciousness - with Him. This deficiency of mystic experience was further highlighted by Rumi in different couplets, such as when he wrote, “He who has become acquainted with the secrets of *Hu* (God), what to him is the secret (inmost consciousness) of created beings?” (*The Mathnawi of Jalalu’d-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book II, 1481)

This poetry shows us that, even after visions and other openings of the inner consciousness, sufis like Rumi did not break beyond the horizon of mortality into the actual Divine Consciousness, for the ultimate “secret” of humans is the Purusha, which is the United Portion of God that is instantly *Known* if one sheds his ego into Brahma. Thus we find Rumi’s declaration of knowing the secrets of *Hu* to be incomplete, an inadequacy seen in another couplet - “When his consciousness went without delay from his body, at that moment his inmost soul was united with God” (*The Mathnawi of Jalalu’d-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book V, 2275) – describing a negation of the ordinary consciousness without the necessary *ascent* into Consciousness that should always accompany a purported unity with God, with Rumi confusing the quietude for ‘unity’. Similarly does the couplet err in presuming the Soul to have *not* been previously united with God, because the Purusha is eternally One with the transcendent

Brahma. Rumi's insufficient knowledge of the Soul – whereas an actual understanding automatically arrives with the Divine Consciousness rather than Sufism's partial 'Divine consciousness' or 'unity' with Allah's visual and auditory attributes – is observed again in another stanza:

What is soul? (Soul is) conscious of good and evil, rejoicing
on account of kindness, weeping on account of injury.
Since consciousness is the inmost nature and essence of the
soul, the more aware one is the more spiritual is he.
Awareness is the effect of the spirit: any one who has
this in excess is a man of God.

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book VI, 148-150)

Rumi, however, is here at best only describing the qualities of the growing Psychic; if he had truly been united with a central Divine Consciousness – instead of the manifested sight and hearing – he would have experienced the Purusha as absolutely immune from human dichotomies of “good” and “evil”. Simultaneously, he would have had knowledge of an utmost “consciousness” that involves Self-Identity *as* the Soul, the ultimate Awareness that only arrives with Consciousness *as* God – rather than the mere “man of God” which effects a subtle separation. This division, one obscured if reading Rumi's couplet on ‘Divine consciousness’ without a full analysis, is articulated in Arabi's commentary on the aforementioned pivotal sight and hearing hadith:

The khalifate is only valid for the Perfect Man, whose exterior form comes from the realities of the universe and its forms, and whose inner form is based on His form, may He be exalted! **For that reason, Allah has said of him, “I am his hearing and his sight.” He did not say, “his eye and his ear.” So He differentiated between the two forms.** (Ibn Arabi, *Fusus Al-Hikam*, The Seal of Divine Wisdom in the Word of Adam)

That Sufism speaks of any sort of differentiation is further evidence that - acknowledging their heretical idea that the particular hadith suggests a ‘unity of being’ - the ‘Divine consciousness’ mentioned in a solitary Rumi verse as belonging to the ‘saint’, is inequivalent to the yogic reality in which the Yogi knows himself *as* Brahma in Totality (including Awareness of His *latent* Consciousness within inanimate physical forms like the eye and ear), a Consciousness dissimilar in *centrality* from limited earthly attributes of vision and audition that account for the diluted sufic unity. The Self-Realized, in this Supreme Consciousness, Knows *Everything*, whether animate or inanimate or beyond the duality of the former two, to be contained within Himself. If Sufism's *Wahdat al-Wujud*, through the avenue of the sight and hearing hadith, does not reach the Truth illumined to us within the Veda or Upanishads or Bhagavad Gita, it also fails to appropriately interpret the hadith according to the principles of the Islamic religion it claims to represent, even if this solitary hadith is for once somewhat congruent to Sufism's doctrine. Indeed, there are two interpretations of the hadith more consistent with the rest of Islam - the first explanation requiring us to revisit Islam's premise that the unbelievers are blind, deaf and dumb, as seen in numerous Asuric revelations including the following:

Therefore rely on Allah; surely you are on the clear truth. **Surely you do not make the dead to hear, and you do not make the deaf to hear the call when they go back retreating. Nor can you be a guide to the blind out of their error;** you cannot make to bear (any one) except those who believe in Our communications, so they submit. And when the word shall come to pass against them, We shall bring forth for them a creature from the earth that shall I wound them, because people did not believe in Our communications. (Quran 27:79-82)

In another passage, the disbelievers are said to have chains on their necks as a result of a barrier *prearranged* for them, a covering that makes them unable to witness the ‘truth’ of the Quran:

Ya Seen. I swear by the Quran full of wisdom. **Most surely you are one of the messengers On**

a straight path. A revelation of the Mighty, the Merciful. That you may warn a people whose fathers were not warned, so they are heedless. Certainly the word has proved true of most of them, for they do not believe. **Surely We have placed chains on their necks, and these reach up to their chins, so they have their heads raised aloft. And We have made before them a barrier and a barrier behind them, then We have covered them over so that they do not see.** And it is alike to them whether you warn them or warn them not: they do not believe. You can only warn him who follows the reminder and fears the Beneficent Allah in secret; so announce to him forgiveness and an honourable reward. (Quran 36:01-11)

Similarly, a different selection shows disbelievers as unable to properly listen to the Prophet's message, because they have had “seals” placed on their hearts by Allah himself:

What! Is he who has a clear argument from his Lord like him to whom the evil of his work is made fair-seeming. And they follow their low desires. A parable of the garden which those guarding (against evil) are promised. Therein are rivers of water that does not alter, and rivers of milk the taste whereof does not change, and rivers of drink delicious to those who drink, and rivers of honey clarified and for them therein are all fruits and protection from their Lord. **(Are these) like those who abide in the fire and who are made to drink boiling water so it rends their bowels asunder. And there are those of them who seek to listen to you, until when they go forth from you, they say to those who have been given the knowledge: “What was it that he said just now?” These are they upon whose hearts Allah has set a seal and they follow their low desires.** (Quran 47:14-16)

By making the unbelievers deaf, dumb and blind, with seals over their hearts, the Asura of Falsehood was historically trying to prevent self-doubt in the mind of Mohammed, and is perpetually attempting to negate any pretence of truth behind the arguments of the kuffar – disputations that could lead to the demise of his religion of falsehood and fear and terror. The believer is able to brush aside whispers of doubt by taking refuge in the scripture, which dismisses all arguments of the kuffar as arising from their inherent dumbness, deafness and blindness – all of which make the infidels unable to understand and believe in Islam. This particular falsehood of Islam helps us to accurately conceptualize the first orthodox interpretation of Sufism's favourite hadith, especially when we consider the portion saying, “and My slave keeps on coming closer to Me through performing Nawafil (praying or doing extra deeds besides what is obligatory) till I love him, so I become his sense of hearing with which he hears, and his sense of sight with which he sees, and his hand with which he grips, and his leg with which he walks.”

When we compare that segment with the scripture deriding the unbelievers as blind, deaf and dumb, we find the hadith as documentation allowing the real Muslims – by virtue of their increased prayer and deeds - to see and hear the ‘truth’ of the Quran, as opposed to the blind and deaf kuffar who are forever blocked from the Asura's inversion of truth. The believers, contrary to Sufism's interpretation of the particular hadith, are *not*, in this analysis, becoming ‘united’ with the derivative attributes of Allah; rather, they are unlocking their potential to mentally understand - by way of the ordinary senses - Islam's straightforward and literal ‘truth’. Of course, the first type of interpretation is likely too subtle to be the primary reading; the second analysis, simpler in scope, is probably more suited, even if the first one can also be accepted. For the second explanation, we must focus on the final part of the hadith, which says, “and if he asks Me, I will give him, **and if he asks My protection (Refuge), I will protect him;** (i.e. give him My Refuge) and I do not hesitate to do anything as I hesitate to take the soul of the believer, **for he hates death, and I hate to disappoint him.**”

We find here the elementary matter of protection or refuge, with Allah promising his most pious of believers, the ones who outperform the ordinary expectations, simple preservation of their hearing, sight, hands and legs, and even a postponement of everyone's final corporeal destiny of death. Or, if we

combine the two interpretations, Allah is shown as the guardian of the believers against unwanted physical outcomes *along* with safeguarding them from hearing and seeing things - such as disputations against the Quran or the religious scripture of Infidels - that would send them into the territory of disbelief. Accordingly, Allah would want to shield his favourites from other inappropriate doctrines, including *Wahdat al-Wujud* - which if not reaching the Unity of Consciousness experienced by the Yogin, is nevertheless mutinous against pure Islam, and supports itself through a deceitful and incorrect symbolic reading of the scripture. The outcome of this duplicity is both an obscuring of the irreconcilable – as understood through the legitimate literal reading of the Quran – positions of the Asura of Falsehood's Islam and the Sanatana Dharma, *and* additional ammunition for charges of heresy against the sufis, because the manipulation of - or incomplete adherence to - the Quran is alone enough for one to be guilty of apostasy. Plentiful indeed were the accusations of blasphemy against the *Wahdat al-Wujud* sufis, with noted Chishtiyya sufi Gisu Daraz stridently inimical to them, reviling their very assimilation into Sufism:

Gisu Daraz's many works criticizing the teachings of Ibn al-Arabi **appear to have had little impact on the Indian sufis.**

Gisu Daraz was particularly **opposed to the theories of Ibn al-Arabi and his followers which to him implied that the Divine Being, having descended into particular human beings, was manifested in them as One Being.** His idea of Creator was not a Being at all, and **therefore the question of a union of the One Being with other created beings did not arise. Amazed that Ibn al-Arabi's followers should call themselves sufis,** to him they failed to recognize God's true transcendent form in which they and all other creatures dependent on His grace could not share...**He interpreted Paradise as none other than an awareness of the divine form which was hidden in human beings...But to Gisu Daraz there were no secrets contained in the Day of Resurrection and the rewards and punishments mentioned in the Quran were not allegorical...**Many other Chishti traditions were also strictly followed by Gisu Daraz such as avoiding the company of the wealthy, maintaining a veil of secrecy around **mystical accomplishments**, and the necessity for a disciple to avoid trying to acquire supernatural power and **to consider one's pir as the greatest spiritual figure of his age.** (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, pp. 253-55)

That Rizvi notes Daraz's critiques as ineffectual in curtailing the popularity of *Wahdat al-Wujud* reminds us, once again, of the historical failure of subcontinental Muslims to – in the majority - accurately practice Islam. It is a bankruptcy of which, ironically enough, Daraz similarly displayed in his adherence to the sanctity of the heretical tariqat of the pir-murid relationship, and in his belief in the religious innovation of “mystical accomplishments” that a “Muslim” might achieve beyond the rigid thought control of the Quran and authentic hadith. Returning to Rizvi's analysis, we find it offering additional evidence - of the unceasing deviancy of subcontinental Muslims - in a peculiar detail of their version of *Wahdat al-Wujud*: that of an actual *descent* of the “Divine Being” into certain humans, a facet of the theory never advocated by Ibn Arabi himself. That his subcontinental followers would arrive at such a belief is of course unsurprising, considering their frequent interaction with Hindu mystics and the propensity for them to shamelessly innovate into Islam some of the principles (often superficially understood) of the Sanatana Dharma.

But all of that is a transgression from Islam, and Gisu Daraz, while evidently not immune from bidats himself, was at least able to correctly distinguish *Wahdat al-Wujud* as – even in its original Arabi formulation – blasphemous, because the Islamic scripture does not describe Allah as either a ‘Being’, or – more importantly - a ‘Being’ that the “Muslim” can unite with upon earth, for Allah is transcendent to all mortal slaves, including the prophets. Likewise did Daraz correctly reject an allegorical understanding of Islamic rewards and punishments, an interpretation obvious enough to those who read

the sadistic details within the scripture: that Daraz would then interpret Paradise as an awareness of one's "divine form" is somewhat curious, because the Quran is full of physical rewards to be found in Paradise, including goblets and maidens. Yet if Daraz was unable to completely practice the pious or orthodox position of Islam, he was at least able to reject the *more* heretical *Wahdat al-Wujud* sub-sect of Sufism, having been influenced by the aforementioned and highly influential Shaikh Ala'u'd-Dawla Simnani:

During the reign of Firuz Shah the dominance of the ulama led, not only to the introduction of legislation tending towards the religiously fanatical, of which the Sultan himself was proud, **but also to the persecution of sufis who publicly advocated the *Wujudi* doctrines.** A second, and even more severe, challenge to *Wahdat al-Wujud* came from the Iranian sufi, Shaikh Ala'u'd-Dawla Simnani.

Simnani, a diehard opponent of Ibn al-Arabi's doctrines, had a large number of disciples some of whom visited India. Their ideas even influenced Gisu Daraz, one of the leading disciples of Shaikh Nasiru'd-Din Chiragh-i Dihli...Simnani became Islam's leading opponent of Ibn al-Arabi's *Wahdat al-Wujud*. The crux of his argument was that Ibn al-Arabi identified Being with God. To him Being was an attribute of God, and thus, from His essence. According to Simnani the final stage of sufi ascent was *ubudiyya* or servanthship, whereas to Ibn al-Arabi, service to God was a means through which His creative power could act. **So a logical extension of the Unity of Being theory was that the servant was the Lord, and the Lord was the servant.** Simnani preached that the Unity of Being was merely an initial stage in the sufi journey, and **the final stage was a belief that the relationship between all creation and the Oneness or the Divine Essence was distant, the latter being far exalted above the former.** This theory came to be later known as *Wahdat al-Shuhud* or *Wahdatus-h-Shuhud* (Unity of Appearance) and was distinct from the *Wahdat al-Shuhud*, the (Oneness of Witness), of the Hallaj school. **Members of the Hallaj school believed that the *Wahdat al-Shuhud* is not only 'sight' or 'look', but an actual presence which is total witness: it is God witnessing to Himself in the heart of his votary.** (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, pp. 248-49)

Simnani was certainly correct, from the Islamic perspective, in concluding that Arabi's diluted unity of being was better understood as an initial avenue to an even greater understanding of Man's inferiority to Allah, a mere attribute of Allah's nature which Arabi should not have claimed possible to be united with. One might even say that Simnani, through altering the theory into a unity of "appearance", subconsciously assigned it to its appropriate mystic reality: After all, because the *Wahdat al-Wujud* sufis do not experience an ascension into the Unity of Consciousness, and as their deluded idea of a peak is the relatively minor silence of the mind and partial inner opening, they in truth can only experience an *appearance* of unity. Simnani, a more pious follower of Islam than the moderate sufi heretics, was likewise correct in maintaining distance between the consciousness *and* being of the human from the transcendent Centrality of Allah. Indeed Simnani even rejected Arabi's proposition – which was, as we have seen, shared by Mansur Hallaj – that the Muslim can be an instrument by which Allah's creative power acts - once again Simnani is closer to Islam, because the first obligation of the Muslim is to be a thought-slave to Islamic doctrine, only afterwards engaging in the genocide of non-Muslims by which he might claim instrument status.

If Simnani was of the orthodox variety of sufis, the ones who will possibly find themselves spared from execution, the Hallaj school of sufis are at the extreme end of an already rebellious sect of Islam, where they even find themselves divorced from the martyr who inspired them, Mansur Hallaj. The Hallajis, object of Hujweri's pathological rage, took Hallaj's own theories to a higher level more fitting to the mystic path. The contents of their mysticism – and unabashed blasphemy from Islam – are seen in Rizvi's description of their *Wahdat al-Shuhud*, which shared a name, but nothing else, with Simnani's

theory. Instead, their doctrine emerged from an inherent tendency of the mystic to follow an intuition that tells him that Something is missing, that there is still more truth to be discovered. As such, the mystic will view the unity of being without a Central Consciousness or Conscious Identity as ludicrous, an insult to the obvious signs of Prakriti's evolution, with Arabi's *Wahdat al-Wujud* equivalent to living in the human body while *unable* to self-identify as a human. The followers of the Hallaj school, limited in influence and number, took the concept of unity – either by their own experience or by their contact with Hindu mystics – to its appropriate sublimity, with Rizvi's summation of their doctrine almost exactly similar to the Yogin experience of the Purusha, with the extreme heretics describing “an actual presence which is total witness: it is God witnessing to Himself in the heart of his votary.” This is indeed the Reality of the Yogin, with the Truth of God as the Witness best articulated in the Upanishads, beginning with the identification of the Purusha – rather than the different vantage of transcendent Atman – as seated in the heart of man:

The Purusha, no bigger than a thumb, is the inner Self, ever seated in the heart of man. He is known by the mind, which controls knowledge and is perceived in the heart. (Svetasvatara Upanishad 3:13)

Realizing the Purusha within the heart is, just as consciously ascending to Atman above, an avenue to immortality and Unity: “His form is not an object of vision; no one beholds Him with the eyes. They who, through pure intellect and the **Knowledge of Unity** based upon reflection, realize Him as abiding in the heart become immortal.” (Svetasvatara Upanishad 4:20) The *maya*, or phenomenal reality, is of a dichotomy between Prakriti who acts and Purusha who Witnesses, having veiled Himself within the mortal:

It is He who, in proper time, becomes the custodian of the universe and the sovereign of all; **who conceals Himself in all beings as their inner Witness**; and in whom the sages and the deities are united. Verily, by knowing Him one cuts asunder the fetters of death. (Svetasvatara Upanishad 4:15)

The death cast asunder is the ordinary perception of death that is attached to the ego; the Self-Realized, on the other hand, *Consciously* leave the triple-sheath after a certain amount of time upon earth, discarding it while remaining completely Immortal in Consciousness (rather than as an individualized form of Prakriti). For the Self-Realized have become Brahma, knowing themselves as both beyond the Prakriti-Purusha duality, and also the secret Truth of the two, the Animator and the Witness:

The non-dual and resplendent Lord is hidden in all beings. All-pervading, the inmost Self of all creatures, the impeller to actions, abiding in all things, He is the Witness, the Animator and the Absolute, free from gunas. (Svetasvatara Upanishad 6:11)

The Purusha, however, is only active according to its Psychic Being, known in Vedantic terminology as the manomaya and pranamaya purushas. In its original status, the “unborn” Soul is purely the Witness, looking on, as the Upanishads brilliantly and concisely illuminate, “without eating”, after having attached itself to one of the units of Prakriti:

There is one unborn Prakriti—red, white and black—which gives birth to many creatures like itself. An unborn individual soul becomes attached to it and enjoys it, while another unborn individual soul leaves it after his enjoyment is completed. Two birds, united always and known by the same name, closely cling to the same tree. One of them eats the sweet fruit; **the other looks on without eating.** (Svetasvatara Upanishad 4:5-6)

As we can thus conclude, the Hallaj school is more appropriately categorized as a Hindu sect, a more outrageous deviance than the moderate types of heretical factions that comprise the majority of Sufism's adherents. That the Hallaj school is in reality inconsequential to Islam or its polity, makes

them both dangerous and also useless to the Hindus, at least in the public sphere. The hazard lies in their ability to confuse Hindus into thinking that Sufism is actually fraternal with the Sanatana Dharma; the uselessness lies in their absolute inability to transform the Islamic religion, because these sub-heretics are easily exposed as apostates and then either ostracised from mainstream Muslim thought, or murdered in case their promotion of Vedantic realities spread throughout the Muslim masses. Indeed the persecution of these extreme sufis is to be expected, as even the moderately heretic *Wahdat al-Wujudis* are persecuted and killed - including, of course, the most infamous of their martyrs: Mansur Hallaj. His followers, by advocating truths equivalent to yogic realities, in actuality established themselves as unfaithful to the mystic, because Hallaj himself openly rejected the Self-Conscious experiences of the Yogin. It is – if we were to only superficially analyse the sufi martyr's most scandalous declarations - a surprising conclusion, since his execution was justified by the legal opinion that he was proposing *hulul*. But that is a 'crime' denied by both Hallaj and his numerous *moderately* heretic sufi supporters, including Rizvi, who after providing a brief overview of Hallaj's life, proceeds to offer documentation in which the sufi saint is shown to divide himself – in conscious identity - from Allah:

Hallaj...wandered through India and Turkistan, where he acquainted himself with Buddhism and Manichaeism...After this, his final pilgrimage, Hallaj remained in Baghdad. There he uttered his famous theopathic cry: *Ana'l-Haqq* (I am [God] the Truth). Orthodox opinion was sharply divided as to what discipline should be meted out to one who uttered such alleged profanities...His enemies denounced him for claiming mystical union with God and for causing moral instability among the people...**The basis for the case against Hallaj which finally secured his condemnation was that he rejected the transcendence of God and preached infusion theories or incarnation (*hulul*). Ultimately on 29 Zu'l-Qa'da 309/1 April 922 Hallaj was hung on a gibbet after various revolting and merciless tortures had been inflicted...**

Hallaj's concept of *Ana'l-Haqq* does not imply that human nature (*nasut*) is identical or interchangeable with the Divine (*Lahut*)...the following lines by Hallaj are most expressive:

'I am He whom I love, and He whom I love is I.

We are *two* spirits dwelling in one body,

If thou seest me, thou seest Him;

And if thou seest Him, though seest us both.'

Elsewhere Hallaj writes: "We are two spirits fused together (*halalna*) in a single body." This, however, also does not prove his belief in *hulul*. Hallaj's concept is identical with that of the leading Christian mystic, St. John of the Cross: "Two natures (God and man) in a single spirit and love of God!" - Actually Hallaj meant that his "I" was 'acted upon' by divine grace. (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, pp. 57-58)

While Rizvi's selections, similar to the ones cited earlier in this chapter, certainly show the subtle difference between Hallaj's beliefs and those of the Hindus, one can also comprehend why the orthodox non-sufis would consider Hallaj a traitor to Asuric Islam, because statements like "I am God", made frequently and without caveats, become unreserved declarations of apostasy. The pious, after all, are not really interested in reading the religious writings of sufi mystics for explanation, because they already have the final 'Word' of Allah for jurisprudence along with specific examples of the mystic making illegal verbal pejoratives against the sanctity and transcendence of Allah. And if the purest of Muslims were to actually inspect the works of Hallaj, they would find a diversity of evidence to pursue a charge of blasphemy, because he wrote of different heresies besides the dreaded *hulul*. In one example, Hallaj mentioned occult visions:

He was not satisfied with its light nor with its heat, so he leapt into it completely. Meanwhile,

his fellows were awaiting his coming so that he could tell them **of his actual vision** since he had not been satisfied with hearsay. But at that moment, he was being utterly consumed, reduced and dispersed into fragments, and he remained without form or body or distinguishing mark. Then in what sense can he return to his fellows? And in what state now that he has obtained? He who had arrived **at the vision** became able to dispense with reports. (Mansur Hallaj, *Kitab al-Tawasin*, The Ta-Sin of Understanding, 4)

In a similar crime against Islam, Hallaj wrote, “Allah enunciated my knowledge with me from my heart. He drew me near to Him after I had been so far from Him. **He made me His intimate and chose me.**” (Mansur Hallaj, *Kitab al-Tawasin*, The Ta-Sin of Purity, 12) In both examples we find Hallaj transgressing the assigned boundaries granted by the Asura of Falsehood to mortals; the first selection relates his visions, experiences of which – as we will soon undoubtedly understand – are prohibited by the Quran; the second documents another heresy, because declaring oneself an intimate of Allah presupposes a status equivalent to the Prophet, which as we know is absolutely forbidden by the Islamic scripture for those born after Mohammed. Allah has set his “seal” on prophethood and other mystic intimates; and the Quran is the final ‘Word’ of Allah, which means there is no need for Allah to continue – at least according to Islam's absurd and Asuric shackles upon God – attempts at *directly* guiding, through occult contact, the earth's progress. The believers have been left the dictates from the Quran and authentic hadith, with the additional scrap of simple prayer – there is thus no ensuing need for additional support from Islam's laughable restriction of an Omnipotent God.

But those violations against Islam were not the main reasons for Hallaj's merciless torture and hanging. His conviction was chiefly the result of his *hulul*-like statements, from his notorious “I am the Truth,” to the following:

I saw my Lord with the eye of my heart

I saw: ‘Who are You?’ He said: ‘You!’ (Mansur Hallaj, *Kitab al-Tawasin*, The Ta-Sin of the Point, 12)

While it is obvious that poetry like this can be interpreted as *hulul* and subsequently deemed illegal, what requires continued explanation is Hallaj's superficially paradoxical rejection of *hulul* or Self-Realization or Unity of Consciousness. For that, we must again remember that mystic revelations and visions – including those of Sufism's marifat – do not necessarily indicate an actual ascension into the Consciousness of Brahma; secondly, the shariat that Hallaj believed in would have, at the very least subconsciously, prevented him from *wanting* to reach a stage where he felt – irrespective of other people's accusations - himself violating the Quran and Hadith. Indeed Hallaj was consistent – at least in his writings rather than verbal declarations – in drawing a line between himself and Allah:

He left his heart there and drew nigh to his Lord. He was absent when he saw Allah, yet he was not absent. How was he present and not present? How did he look and not look? From amazement he passed to lucidity and from lucidity to amazement. **Witnessed by Allah he witnessed Allah. He arrived and was separated.** He reached his Desire and was cut off from his heart, and ‘his heart lies not of what it saw.’ (Mansur Hallaj, *Kitab al-Tawasin*, The Ta-Sin of the Point, 13-14)

If this passage is blasphemous just in his assertion of witnessing Allah during the life, it is yet additionally clear in dividing the sufi – who arrived but was then “separated” - from Allah. That Hallaj was opposed to the Yogin Truth of Self-Realization, of the Jivatman, of living as the Purusha, is unquestionably confirmed in another of his writings, one that forever dismisses the possibility that Hallaj's *Ana'l Haqq* makes him equivalent to the Yogin and Rishis and Sages of the Sanatana Dharma - for in it we find him categorically rejecting an *identity* as God:

Oh you who are uncertain, do not identify ‘I am’ with the Divine ‘I’ - not now, nor in the

future, nor in the past. Even if the ‘I am’ was a consummated gnostic, and if this was my state, it was not the perfection. Even though I am His I am not He. (Mansur Hallaj, *Kitab al-Tawasin*, The Ta-Sin of Understanding, 6)

The actual verdict is clear – Mansur Hallaj, the infamous martyr of Sufism, was *not* an advocate of *hulul* or Self-Realization or moksha, even if there were other reasons for pious Muslims to charge him with, and execute him for, blasphemy. Accordingly, we can view his statement “Ana'l-Haqq” in its appropriate interpretation, one not of *hulul*, but of a mystic who believed himself ‘united’ – as defined by the diluted haqiqat of Sufism – with God, a bizarre unity whereby the sufi retains a separate conscious-identity from the Supreme and Illimitable Consciousness. It is a far cry from the Vedantic or Upanishad Reality, in which the sadhak, after intense concentration and renunciation, finally ascends to Brahma, who “is not female, it is not male, nor is it neuter. Whatever body it takes, with that it becomes united.” (Svetasvatara Upanishad 5:10) The unity of the Hindu Rishis and Yogin and Sadhus is that of Conscious Identity with Brahma, the Supreme Mother, the Sole Existent, the “That” of “Thou art That”, the Satchitananda beyond the phenomenal dualities including the very perception of being:

When there is no darkness of ignorance, there is no day or night, neither being nor non-being; the pure Brahman alone exists. That immutable Reality is the meaning of “That”; It is adored by the Sun. From It has proceeded the ancient wisdom. (Svetasvatara Upanishad 4:18)

The Yogin, Self-Realized as Brahma, in turn comprehensively understand the meaning of the “Face” of God, another mystic reality diluted by Sufism. For unlike the sufis, the Yogin *experience* Unity with the all-pervading, unborn, Brahma upholding a universe and phenomenal nature that belong to Himself, albeit in different stages of consciousness. In this experience, “His face” is the indwelling Portion, the Multiplicity that equally exists with the Oneness:

And when the Yogi beholds the real nature of Brahman, through the Knowledge of the Self, radiant as a lamp, then, having known the unborn and immutable Lord, who is untouched by ignorance and its effects, he is freed from all fetters. He indeed, the Lord, who pervades all regions, was the first to be born and it is He who dwells in the womb of the universe. It is He, again, who is born as a child and He will be born in the future, He stands behind all persons and His face is everywhere. (Svetasvatara Upanishad 2:15-16)

Although Mansur Hallaj's unity superficially appears equivalent to the yogic reality, it was in truth removed from it, evidenced both by his own writings and those of his admirers, a group encompassing a wide spectrum of sufis, from the degenerate Hallaj school to even, as we shall see, the orthodox! In between these poles, we find the poet Rumi, whose defence of Hallaj was so strong that he deemed the martyr's orthodox executioners as *traitors* to Islam:

**When the pen (of authority) is in the hand of a traitor,
unquestionably Mansur is on a gibbet.**

When this affair (dominion) belongs to the foolish, the
necessary consequence is (that) *they kill the prophets.*

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book II, 1398-99)

Rumi, of course, is here exposing his own blasphemy, because not only were the pious justified in murdering the apostate (irrespective of the fact that Hallaj openly rejected *hulul*), a real Muslim should not dare associate anyone born after Mohammed with prophethood, for they should know the Quran to have declared Mohammed the “seal of the Prophets”. That Rumi ignores the ‘Word’ of Allah again proves that he was more attached to a half-Islamic doctrine than actual Islam; if he was nevertheless spared a similar sentence to Hallaj, it is only because of the latter's more persistent and provocative *vocal* announcements, along with circumstances favouring an orthodox drive to eliminate the real traitors to Islam. But there were nevertheless substantial sufic – rather than Islamic - reasons, based on

both haqiqat and marifat, why Rumi rejected the charges against Hallaj. And he was not alone in doing so, because as Hujweri demonstrates in a lengthy but comprehensive commentary, Hallaj was viewed favourably by other sufis like Abu Sa'id b. Abi'l-Khayr, Abu'l-Qasim Gurgani, Abu'l-Abbas Shaqani, Shibli and Khattif. Hujweri, like many of the other defenders of Hallaj, contends that the martyr had a distinct reason – the ecstasy of marifat – for voicing his erroneous claims:

ABU'L-MUGHITH AL-HUSAYN B. MANSUR AL-HALLAJ.

He was an enamoured and intoxicated votary of Sufism. He had a strong ecstasy and a lofty spirit. The Sufi Shaykhs are at variance concerning him. Some reject him, while others accept him...Others, again, suspend their judgement about him, e.g. Junayd and Shibli and Jurayri and Husri. Some accuse him of magic and matters coming under that head, but in our days the Grand Shaykh Abu Sa'id b. Abi'l-Khayr and Shaykh Abu'l-Qasim Gurgani and Shaykh Abu'l-Abbas Shaqani looked upon him with favour, and in their eyes he was a great man. The Master Abu'l-Qasim Qushayri remarks that if al-Hallaj was a genuine spiritualist he is not to be banned on the ground of popular condemnation, and if he was banned by Sufism and rejected by the Truth he is not to be approved on the ground of popular approval. Therefore we leave him to the judgement of God, and honour him according to the tokens of the Truth which we have found him to possess. **But of all these Shaykhs only a few deny the perfection of his merit and the purity of his spiritual state and the abundance of his ascetic practices.** ...Some persons pronounce his outward behaviour to be that of an infidel, and disbelieve in him and charge him with trickery and magic...**Do you not see that Shibli said: "Al-Hallaj and I are of one belief, but my madness saved me, while his intelligence destroyed him"? Had his religion been suspected, Shibli would not have said: "Al-Hallaj and I are of one belief." And Muhammad b. Khafif said: "He is a divinely learned man."** Al-Hallaj is the author of brilliant compositions and allegories and polished sayings in theology and jurisprudence. I have seen fifty works by him at Baghdad and in the neighbouring districts, and some in Khuzistan and Pars and Khurasan. All his sayings are like the first visions of novices; some of them are stronger, some weaker, some easier, some more unseemly than others. **When God bestows a vision on anyone, and he endeavours to describe what he has seen with the power of ecstasy and the help of Divine grace, his words are obscure,** especially if he expresses himself with haste and self-admiration: then they are more repugnant to the imaginations, and incomprehensible to the minds, of those who hear them, and then people say, "This is a sublime utterance," either believing it or not, but equally ignorant of its meaning whether they believe or deny. **On the other hand, when persons of true spirituality and insight have visions, they make no effort to describe them,** and do not occupy themselves with self-admiration on that account, and are careless of praise...**Some orthodox theologians reject him on the ground that his sayings are pantheistic (ba-ma'ni-yi imtizaj u ittihad), but the offence lies solely in the expression, not in the meaning. A person overcome with rapture has not the power of expressing himself correctly; besides, the meaning of the expression may be difficult to apprehend, so that people mistake the writer's intention, and repudiate, not his real meaning, but a notion which they have formed for themselves.** I have seen at Baghdad and in the adjoining districts a number of heretics who pretend to be the followers of al-Hallaj and make his sayings an argument for their heresy and call themselves Hallajis. They spoke of him in the same terms of exaggeration as the Rafidis (Shi'ites) apply to Ali...**In conclusion, you must know that the sayings of al-Hallaj should not be taken as a model, inasmuch as he was an ecstatic, not firmly settled, and a man needs to be firmly settled before his sayings can be considered authoritative.** Therefore, although he is dear to my heart, yet his "path" is not soundly established on any principle, and his state is not fixed in any position, and his experiences are largely mingled with error. **When my own visions began I derived much**

support from him, that is to say, in the way of evidences...Expression only produces an unreal notion and leads the student mortally astray by causing him to imagine that the expression is the real meaning. (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, pp. 150-53)

This lengthy apologetic for Hallaj, while unhelpful in assuaging the orthodox, who can still easily denounce him and other sufis as apostates because of their claims of mystic experiences (which are made illegal by specific Quran verses that we will document in the upcoming marifat discussion), it at least offers an understandable rationale. For Hujwiri is, in summation, absolving Hallaj of guilt due to the internal upheaval caused by the marifat experiences – specifically the ecstasy. While in this state, the sufi – at least per this kind of apologia – cannot be expected to behave according to any outwardly imposed law of conduct, *including* the Quran and Hadith, both of which forbid even the vocal expression of *shirk* (except for a taqiyah inapplicable in this case). While Hujwiri's logic is plausible, at least for non-Muslims who do not follow an Asuric code of conduct like the shariat, and while Hallaj himself rejected Self-Realization or its equivalent of *hulul*, the commentary is also supplemental proof of Data Ganj Baksh's *own* apostasy – the result of both defending a traitor to Islam via explanations that, whatever their merit, *still* fail to absolve Hallaj of apostasy, and in Hujwiri's admission of having had visions that are prohibited to the actual Muslim.

Hujwiri's principal excuse for Hallaj, that “intoxication” and its subsequent instability lead to erroneous expressions, is not the same as the previously discussed scenario whereby certain Yogin – instead of taking the next step after Self-Realization in which Brahma (now themselves) descends into the triple-sheath – completely ignore their outward natures, enjoying themselves as Satchitananda while abandoning the triple-sheath. The latter situation usually leads to a state of outward *incoherence*, which is distinct from the unsound – according to the tenets of both Sufism and Islam – yet *entirely comprehensible* declarations of Hallaj. For even though both he and his apologists deny that he *meant* his expressions in the manner they came off, the statements themselves were nevertheless organized. The intelligible structure of Hallaj's pronouncements also exposes the ineptitude of Hujwiri's sophistry that expression can only yield an “unreal notion”, because even human communication, while certainly at a lower level than the Consciousness of God, can still be useful in at least partially conveying the Supreme Reality, even if Brahma is to be ultimately experienced rather than discussed, intellectually perceived, or worshipped.

Hujwiri's specific rationale for a rebellion to the orthodox Muslim position on Mansur Hallaj is almost universally shared by other sufis; an opinion that, in most cases, ratifies their legitimate status as non-Muslims. For the majority of Sufism's apologia for Hallaj proceeds in a manner completely negating the importance of the shariat, a theme hinted at in Hujwiri's lengthy scribe on the martyr, and better explicated in the following Rumi absolution – at least after the mystic enters the final stage of marifat - of the sufi's requirement to follow Islamic law:

**I am sane and maddened by God: remember (this), and
(since I am) in such a state of selflessness, hold me excusable.**

**He that eats carrion, that is to say, (drinks) date-wine - the
(religious) Law enrolls him amongst those who are excused.**

The drunkard and eater of beng has not (the right of) divorce
or barter; he is even as a child: **he is a person absolved and
emancipated.**

The intoxication that arises from the scent of the unique
King - a hundred vats of wine never wrought *that*
(intoxication) in head and brain.

To him (the God-intoxicated man), then, how should the

obligation (to keep the Law) be applicable? The horse is fallen (out of account) and has become unable to move.

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book III, 670-74)

This principle, held by the majority of Sufism's adherents including Rumi, arguably its most globally celebrated mystic, confirms their heretical status, because the shariat should be the most important, indeed the *only* stage, of the actual Muslim. The Asuric law of the Quran and authentic hadith is not to be subjugated after the experiences of marifat intoxication; there is no excuse, at least according to actual Islam, for the final 'Word' of Allah to be deemed inferior to *anything* else, irrespective of ecstatic "intoxication". There are no excuses for disobedience in an infrarational thought and belief-control religion, other than Asurically revealed exemptions such as disabled Muslims granted a reprieve from jihad. As there are no infrarational revelations or authentic hadith describing a four-fold stage of ascension that includes concepts beyond shariat, and as so-called mystic intoxication is undocumented as a scriptural justification for a Muslim to release himself from a mandated slavish obedience to the Quran and authentic tradition of Mohammed, Rumi has once more exposed himself and similar "Muslim" mystics as sufikuffar, worthy of the same earthly and afterlife punishment as Hindus.

While the treacherous call of moderately heretic – and thus fully non-Muslim – sufis like Rumi and Hujweri to absolve themselves and their confederates from – subsequent to obtaining marifat ecstasy - shariat is a 'crime' that certainly corroborates their apostasy, we nevertheless find support for Hallaj from the most unlikely of sources – the sufi orthodoxy. Of course, their opinion of Hallaj, exemplified by the following account of Sirhindi's position, is much more palatable to pure Islam, without the disrespect to the shariat expressed by the likes of Rumi and Hujweri in their dismissal of Islamic law after the ecstasy has been experienced:

Shaikh Ahmad (Sirhindi) dealt in detail and at length with the views of Ibn Arabi and what he saw as their unethical implications in letters to his disciples. But to members of the nobility and others who were not closely connected with Sufism, Shaikh Ahmad explained the controversy in simple words. To Shaikh Farid Bukhari he wrote that a belief in the *Wahdat al-Wujud*, **which incorporated total rejection of the external and the acceptance only of the reality of the One Being, was contrary to reason and the Sharia**, whereas *Wahdat al-Shuhud*, calling attention to a **perception** of the One, did not violate any principle. Repeating the old sufi analogy of the sun and the stars he argued that it was not correct to state that at sunrise the stars became extinct and no longer existed. One could say that the stars were not visible at some times. In fact, if one was unable to see stars that was because of the predominance of the light of the sun and the feebleness of human vision. **Sufi phrases such as 'I am God' and 'Glory be to me' should be interpreted as confirming the truth of Wahdat al-Shuhud. When mystics like Hallaj or Abu Yazid made such ecstatic utterances they perceived nothing external but God. The phrase 'I am God' meant 'only God is here and not I.' The saint who could not see himself was unable to make any statement about himself. Were he to make such a statement with consciousness of himself, ignoring God, he would be an infidel.** (Maktubat, I no. 43) (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume II, pp. 210-11)

Sirhindi, as we expect, did not present his defence of Hallaj as a means to unseat the supremacy of the shariat, even if *his* arguments are unlikely to appease the *non-sufi* orthodox Muslims. After all, declarations of "I am God", done on multiple occasions verbally and by the pen, should be easily understood by all as analogous to associating one's identity with God. That the sufis deny a substantial union of Conscious-Identity does not excuse their outrageous statements, because if they were really trying to announce, as Sirhindi contends, the sole *presence* of God, they could have simply uttered in their ecstasy, "Only God is Here". That they chose instead say "I am God", only to later reject the indicated unity of consciousness, is actually evidence that their egos had not been fully subdued or

transformed, and that the opening of their inner consciousness had the negative effect of aggrandizing their ego whereupon they – *in the moment of rapture* – felt themselves as God even if they subsequently re-evaluated otherwise. And though Sirhindi refused to chastise Hallaj or Abu Yazid for this crime of *shirk*, exonerating them on account of the frenzy arriving with their type of “intoxication”, he nevertheless damned other recalcitrant sufis, including those who tried to contort their way out of a true adherence to the Islamic shahada in a fashion that results in the same ‘crime’ of *shirk*!

One of the never-changing principles which all Prophets stated unanimously is not to worship anything other than Allahu ta'ala, not to attribute a partner to Allahu ta'ala, not to idolize creatures for others to worship. Only Prophets stated this fact. No one was honoured with this fortune except those who followed them. No one except Prophets stated this fact. **A group of those who disbelieved Prophets said that Allahu ta'ala is one; yet they either said so by hearing it from Muslims or meant that the one with indispensable existence is one. They did not say that only He is to be worshipped. However, Muslims say that He is the only One who is both indispensable and deserves being worshipped. “La ila-ha il-l-Allah” means that there is no deity besides Allahu ta'ala who is to be worshipped.** He, alone, is to be worshipped. (*The Collected Letters of Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindi*, Volume I, 63)

Sirhindi is here articulating the tendency of sufis, especially of the subcontinent, to take Arabi's *Wahdat al-Wujud* and extrapolate a justification for intellectualized *shirk* (as opposed to the vital aggrandizement producing the *shirk* of ecstatic sufis illegally partnering themselves with Allah), whereby they partner Allah with other names of god whom these sufis allege worthy of worship, even if the individual sufi might only use the name of Allah during his own worship. For it is not enough to just worship Allah in name, as the real Muslim must simultaneously establish the presumed fallacy of different names of gods or types of devotion that includes a belief that an indwelling Allah can be worshipped. This latter belief, though certainly prominent in subcontinental sufis, was also seen in the West Asian mystics who developed the sect, with Abu Abdullah al-Haris ibn Asad al-Muhasibi, in one example, having expressed an aspiration toward an indwelling of Allah:

‘By relentless and unceasing self-examination he (Muhasibi) had come to know his own soul and its besetting sins; by self-discipline he had learnt to be master of his soul, to cope with its temptations and to get the better of its tendency to sin...and had given himself entirely into the hands of God, merging his own personal will in the divine will, becoming empty of self **in order that his soul might be open to the revelation and indwelling of God.**’ (*An early mystic in Baghdad*, p 26) (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 53)

While the idea of an indwelling God – inspired, in Muhasabi's case, by the oppressed West Asian mysticism seeking to emerge from under Islam's weight – is certainly *hulul* and comparable to Hinduism, al-Muhasabi cannot be said to have attained his aspiration, because he associated the Soul with sin and temptation, when the Purusha is Witness and free of all mortal imperfections. Neither is his premise of the Soul becoming mastered correct, because the Soul is God and thus the real Master or Sovereign. What is actually being described is Muhasibi engaging in a tapasya by which he obtained control over the vital and its sins and temptations. But as he promoted the mere aspiration of the “indwelling” of God, he was both a heretic and a justifiable precedent for subcontinental sufis who could also, if they wished, twist the following words of Arabi for their blasphemous purposes:

So look at this effector when Allah descended into a Muhammadan form. Allah Himself informs His slaves of that, and none of us said that of Him, rather He said it of Himself. His report is true, and it is obligatory to believe it whether or not you perceive the knowledge of what He said, being a knower or believing Muslim. (Ibn Arabi, *Fusus Al-Hikam*, The Seal of the Wisdom of Intimacy in the Word of Ilyas)

One can understand how the subcontinental *Wahdat al-Wujudis* had, through their distortion of Ibn Arabi's own writings, brought themselves to the point where the likes of Gisu Daraz accused them of believing that Allah could descend into humans, because they had 'evidence' in passages like the previous one. But Arabi, as we know, was not a proponent of incarnation or *hulul*, and his intent behind such statements was to display Allah's *self*-manifestation into the world as the "Perfect Man", who was *not* Allah incarnate. That the wording could be then used to support *shirk* shows a lack of understanding, or a *wilful* desire to find endorsement of their apostasy, on the part of the subcontinental sufis who advocate their own version of *Wahdat al-Wujud*, one that – per Rizvi – is heavily inspired by the Nath Yogi Gorakhnath, also known as Guru GorakshNath. The consequence of his imprint, as one might expect, is an outrageous situation in which sufi "Muslims" are trained to contemplate God through names like Shiva or utterances like Onkar!

The knowledge of some Indian sufis, such as Shaikh Abdul-Quddus and his Rudauli pirs, was not limited to understanding and practising pranayama or *pas-i anfas* and to some semantic similarities and dissimilarities. The Shaikh's Rushd-Nama, which consists of his own verses and some of his pirs, identify sufi beliefs based on the *Wahdat al-Wujud* **with the philosophy and practices of Gorakhnath. In fact some verses with slight variations are included in Nath poetry as well as in that of Kabir and Gorakhnath...The term Sabad used by Shaikh Abdul-Quddus identifies mystic contemplation with Shakti as well as Shiva and their union as the course of the existence of the three worlds. In other words the union of Shakti, the sun, and Shiva, the moon, according to the Shaikh, is the *salat-i-ma'kus* of the sufis...**The Nath describes the Supreme Creator as Alakh-Nath (the Incomprehensible or Unseeable One) or as Niranjana. **Shaikh Abdul-Quddus also uses the name Alakh Niranjana in the same sense...Like the Naths, Shaikh Abdul-Quddus attaches great importance to Onkar...Shaikh Abdul-Quddus expects sufis to absorb themselves in Onkar through *zikr*. To him Onkar is the Absolute Oneness, is interchangeable with Niranjana and indicates the state of *sunyata* (void).** (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, pp. 336-37)

Salat-i ma'kus is a *namaz* or prayer that the sufis perform upside down, but whose physical position fails to protect them from becoming guilty of *shirk*, an automatic result of praying to Shakti and Shiva and Niranjana. Similarly does their use of Onkar, a variation of OM (AUM), further confirm their egregious apostasy. For Onkar, while not in truth indicative of a void, is certainly the "Absolute Oneness" and "Niranjana" and, if we take *sunyata* in a different context, non-Being, since God can be both Being and Non-Being (and beyond the two). The centrality of AUM to Brahma is seen in the Upanishads, with Mandukya illuminating on the Word's eternal unity with Brahma or Atman:

The same Atman explained before as being endowed with four quarters is now described from the standpoint of the syllable AUM. AUM, too, divided into parts, is viewed from the standpoint of letters. The quarters of Atman are the same as the letters of AUM and the letters are the same as the quarters. The letters are A, U and M. Vaisvanara Atman, whose sphere of activity is the waking state, is A, the first letter of AUM, on account of his all-pervasiveness or on account of his being the first. He who knows this obtains all aspirations and becomes first among the great. Taijasa Atman, whose sphere of activity is the dream state, is U, the second letter of AUM, on account of his superiority or intermediateness. He who knows this attains a superior knowledge, receives equal treatment from all and finds in his family no one ignorant of Brahman. Prajna Atman, whose sphere is deep sleep, is M, the third letter of AUM, because both are the measure and also because in them all become one. He who knows this is able to measure all and also comprehends all within himself. The Fourth (Turiya) is without parts and without relationship; It is the cessation of phenomena; It is all good and non-dual. **This AUM is**

verily Atman. He who knows this merges his self in Atman - yea, he who knows this.
(Mandukya Upanishad, VIII-XII)

It is precisely because AUM is the expressive and at once *United* vantage of Brahma - corresponding to his Immortal Consciousness upholding the triple earthly consciousness of waking, dream sleep and superconscious sleep, along with the fourth state beyond all awareness - that we find the Word ubiquitous to Hindu mantras. For the invocation or *mantra* of AUM while engaged in meditation is often used as a mystic avenue to ascend in consciousness and unite with Brahma. That the sufic orders of the subcontinent dare to then use it in their religious practices is unquestionably *shirk*, the worship of another name of god besides Allah. Yet that is exactly what sufis of the subcontinent have historically done, with Shaikh Qutb Ali Qutban using multiple Hindu names of God in his practice, including Onkar:

Like other sufis the author, Shaikh Qutb Ali Qutban, describes the Essence as Light and **using Hindu terminology he calls Him Niranjan, Kratar, Vidhata, Pramesh, Ek-Onkar, Alakh. Defining Muhammad as the cause of creation, the author draws on the concept of Shiva and Shakti as two bodies.** (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, pp. 366-67)

The sufi Amir Husaini, in his *Zadu'l-Masafirin*, equated the Hindu invocations – which as we have mentioned, undoubtedly contain the AUM of Brahma – as suitable examples of worshipping Allah!

In the *Zadu'l-Masafirin*, Amir Husaini said:
'Hindu, who always worships idols,
Every morning makes invocations.
On his tongue there is nothing but Thy *zikr*;
Brahmanical thread he wears and the names he takes are only intermediaries
All these are part of his religion and faith,
In reality he sees nothing in his faith but Thou.' (Ethe, 1832, f. 8b.) (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, pp. 209-210)

In further instances of the type of *shirk* consistent with *hulul*, we find subcontinental sufis, as in the case of Shah Madar, claiming that they “shared” the very nature of Allah:

According to Shaikh Abdul Haqq, Shah Madar (Shaikh Badi'u'd-Din) **disciples claimed he had attained the mystic stage in which he shared in the nature of God, the Creator.** They also reported that he took no meals for twelve years...Anyone who glanced at him would instantly fall to the ground (AA, p 164). **Shah Madar's followers asserted that their pir had obtained spiritual training directly from Muhammad.** (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, pp. 318-19)

If the claim of a shared nature with Allah is undoubtedly blasphemous, the proclamation of receiving spiritual instruction from Mohammed is only a slightly less problematic offence, since there is no mention in the scripture of Mohammed being able to – as if he were an angel – posthumously instruct mortals. But this assertion of some form of communication with Mohammed is common to subcontinental sufis; one sufi, Baba Ratan Hajji, went beyond the normal claims, with Rizvi noting that he “was identified with Gorakhnath **and it was asserted that the Prophet had learnt Yoga through the Baba.** (*Dabistan-i Mazahib*, pp. 179-80)” (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 354) Such a declaration, of course, is false for numerous reasons, including the obvious fact that the Prophet did not practice Yoga, which is the pursuit of Self-Knowledge rather than an enslavement to the Asura of Falsehood: And from the Islamic perspective, declaring oneself a teacher of Mohammed is the equivalent of raising oneself to the status of an angel. But these sufis, including the aforementioned Kabir, cannot help but stray into heresy when they are so influenced by Hinduism:

Kabir's concept of Absolute Reality was founded on the *dvaitadvaita-vilakshana-vada* of the Naths. Its compatibility with the *Wahdat al-Wujud* was responsible for Kabir's fame as a *muwahhid*...Another of Kabir's hymns states:

'When a stream is lost in the Ganges,
It becometh the Ganges itself;
Kabir is similarly **lost in God by invoking Him**;
I have become as the True One and need not go elsewhere.
The perfume of the sandal is communicated to other trees;
They then become as the sandal itself. ...
So Kabir having met the saints,
Hath become as God.' (Macauliffe, p 259) (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, pp. 375-76)

If this selection of Kabir's, with its imagery of losing oneself in God and its elevation of 'saints' to a level closer to God, a position that transgresses the infrarationally revealed status of Muslims as slaves of Allah, is neither descriptive of Self-Realization (for becoming "as" God is here in reference to becoming lost in his 'Being' rather than Consciously Identifying as Brahma) nor appropriate for Islam. But if the above poem is relatively minor in its heresy, the following Kabir stanza is absolutely *shirk*, indisputable evidence for him to be labelled a non-Muslim:

'Kabir, call Him Ram who is omnipresent;
we must discriminate in mentioning the *two Rams*;
The one Ram (God) is contained in all things;
the other (Ram Chandar) is only contained in one thing, himself.' (Macauliffe, VI, p 308)
(S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 377)

While this is a fine poetic expression of mystical truths – the existence of God within All, and the individualized vantage of God, whether as the Purusha or Jivatman -, it is not Islam, because the poetry invokes the name of another deity besides Allah. But that was the inevitable result of someone influenced by Gorakhnath, various Hindu Naths, and the Hindu Siddhas, for these groups all followed – and in many cases, experienced – the Supreme realities of the Veda and Upanishads and Bhagavad Gita. The affinity of subcontinental sufis – whether or not they actually aspire to experience them - for these realities, including the ultimate state of Satchitananda beyond dualities and human conceptions, is what leads the likes of Shaikh Abdul-Quddus and similar sufis to misconstrue *Wahdat al-Wujud* into something that Ibn Arabi had rejected as possible, something that even *he* deemed blasphemous!

Shaikh Abdul-Quddus finds the teachings of the Naths identical to the *Wahdat al-Wujud*. According to Gorakhnath the Absolute Truth realized in the highest spiritual experience is above the concept of bhava (existence) and abhava (negation of existence), absolutely devoid of origination and destruction, and beyond the reach of all speculation and imagination. This is Para-Brahma, which is without name, form, ego, causality or activity, self-manifestation or internal and external differences. This philosophy of Gorakhnath and the Siddhas called the *Dwaita-dwaita-vilakshana-vada* or *Pakshapata-binirmukta-vada* is nearest to the *Wahdat al-Wujud*. (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, pp. 339-40)

If the *Wahdat al-Wujud* practised by certain subcontinental sufis is proximate to the worship of and ascension toward Brahma, if the subcontinental sufis are unable to condemn the invocation of different deities or their *Wahdat al-Wujud* theory as *shirk*, then they are deserving of execution, because they are in actuality sufikuffar practising a foreign religion after having professed fidelity to Islam. That *Wahdat al-Wujud* does not advocate the same Self-Consciousness experienced by the Yogin is irrelevant to the "ancient fire" of Islam in its bloodlust. Indeed are there gruesome historic precedents for what should

await modern subcontinental sufis – and their followers – who deviate into both moderate and extreme blasphemy, with the majority of subcontinental sufic orders, including the Chishtiyya, quite vulnerable, given that their doctrines – as Rizvi mentions in a different summary of Abdul Quddus' practices – continue to incorporate hathayoga and pranayama and multiple names of God:

Shaykh Nasiru'd-Din Chiragh-i Dihli observed that controlled breathing is the essence of Sufism. Controlled breathing is initially a deliberate action but later becomes automatic. **He urged practising articulated breathing like the perfect yogis, known as siddhas. Yogic postures and breath control became an integral part of Chishtiyya sufic practice, and controlled breathing was incorporated finally as a vital aspect in all the sufi orders except the Indian Naqshbandiyyas.** The sufi theory of *Wahdat al-Wujud* and sufi analogies for it were remarkably similar to those of the yogis. Shaykh Hamidu'd-Din Nagauri's Hindi verses reflect this yogic influence. The Nath doctrines had a far-reaching influence on the Chishtiyya Shaykh Abdul Quddus Gangohi (d. 1537). His Hindi nom de plume was Alakh (Imperceptible). His *Rushd-nama* contains Hindi verses composed by himself and his spiritual guides and is designed to support the truth of the *Wahdat al-Wujud* doctrine. **The Imperceptible Lord (Alakh Niranjana), he says, is unseeable, but those who are able to perceive Him are lost to themselves.** In another verse the Shaykh identifies Niranjana (the Imperceptible) with God (Khuda). **References to the yogi saint Gorakhnath in the *Rushd-nama* equate him with Ultimate Reality or Absolute Truth.** Some references to these names imply 'perfect man' or 'perfect Siddha'. The union of Shakti, the sun, and Siva, the moon, is according to the Shaykh symbolized by prayers performed hanging upside down with the legs suspended from a roof or the branch of a tree. **Here we find very clear evidence of the practices of Hindu tantricism influencing sufi beliefs.** (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The Wonder that was India*, Volume II, pp. 257-58)

The fusion of Hindu tantricism - which is simply a set of subtle variations from the multiple traditional paths of Yoga, yet having the same ultimate destiny of Self-Realization – into Sufism sounded the death-knell on any final sufi claim of representing Islam, because pure Islam demands complete fidelity to its primary scripture. Thus the invasion of different deities other than Allah, along with the pronounced association of yogic practices such as hathayoga and pranayama (Prana itself is another Aspect of Brahma, with Isa Upanishad XVII informing, "Now may my breath return to the all-pervading, immortal Prana!") – both designed in their earthly functions for regulating the ordinary vital forces and helping to concentrate the mind toward the aspiration of Self-Realization, which we know is banned in Islam as *hulul* and as a variation of *shirk* – with the "essence" of Sufism, become the rope by which the orthodox Muslims can hang the sufi mystics. Indeed the life-trajectory of Shaykh Chirag i-Dihli is useful in demonstrating the futility of Sufism's accretion of yogic tenets, for as Rizvi notes, Dihli failed, with inevitably tragic consequences, in convincing the orthodox subcontinental Muslims that *Wahdat al-Wujud* was compatible with Islam:

By the time Shaikh Nasiru'd-Din Chiragh-i Dihli died, his efforts to establish co-existence with the ulama had ceased bearing fruit because of the controversy over the mystic philosophy of *Wahdat al-Wujud*. This had been accepted with great fervour by the Chishtis who regarded it as the greatest of all developments in mystic thought. The ulama girded their loins to suppress the doctrine and beheaded two Bihari sufis...

The pioneer of Delhi's *Wahdat al-Wujud* movement was Mas'ud-i Bak. His real name was Sher Khan...a mystical experience prompted him to adopt asceticism and he began to live with sufis...His outspoken dissemination of the *Wahdat al-Wujud*, in the form of both prose and poetry, made him hated by the ulama...a later authority writes that **Sher Khan was beheaded, on a fatwa from the ulama.** There is no reason to doubt the validity of this statement for it was not unusual for the Sultan to find himself helpless in religious matters against the power of the

ulama...the prose section of his *Mir 'atu'l-Arifin* and his *Diwan*, entitled the *Nuru'l-Yaqin*, still exist. The *Diwan* was a favourite text in Chishti khanqahs between the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries and later sufis, both followers and opponents of *Wahdat al-Wujud*, drew on it heavily. (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, pp. 241-44)

The ultimate lesson is that the actual Muslims know fully well the heresy of the Sufism and its Hinduized (in the subcontinent) *Wahdat al-Wujud*; that they in turn have historically only applied selective action to sufi pretenders is based on both strategic necessity and the extent of the heresy. The examples of beheading presented above were – as seen in the following selection - only due to the persistence of the sufis in question, with their public avowals similar to the disturbances caused by Hallaj - if the sufis had kept their thoughts and announcements to their illegal khanqahs, they would have likely escaped the most severe of censure:

However, Shaikh Sharafu'd-Din Ahmad was soon to be disappointed by (Sultan) Firuz's use of his judicial powers which led to the execution of the Shaikh's friends and fellow sufis, Shaikh Izz Kaku'i and Shaikh Ahmad Bihari. **The two were outspoken in their ideas on the *Wahdat al-Wujud* and gave vent to their thoughts enthusiastically. The people of Delhi believed they were crazy and this, along with the fury of the *ulama* at what they believed to be quite unacceptable, unorthodox Islamic beliefs, prompted Sultan Firuz to convene a mahzhar. They were condemned in a fatwa issued by the *ulama* and later executed.** (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 231)

If Rizvi's account of the executions might promote the notion that Sultan Firuz Shah Tughlaq, the ruler of the Delhi Sultanate from 1351 to 1388, was helplessly acting at the behest of a more influential *ulama* or approved leadership of Islamic scholars, that impression is extinguished when we read the Sultan's autobiography, in which we find Firuz Shah to exude confidence in his prosecution of the sufi traitors to Islam:

Yet another group was used to mislead people into a form of disbelief, renouncing worldly life and practising celibacy. They cultivated disciples and indulged in blasphemy. The leader of this group was Ahmad Bihari who lived in the city and was considered by some of its inhabitants as God. This group were brought before me in fetters. It was reported of their leader that he was disrespectful to the Prophet and used to say: "what weight can thereby in the claim to Prophethood of man who had nine wives?" **One of his disciples asserted that God, that is Ahmad Bihari, had manifested in Delhi. Once the charges against these two were duly established, I ordered them imprisoned in fetters, and the rest of the group to recant and renounce their false beliefs.** Each of them was banished to a different city, and the mischief of this misguided sect was thus dispersed and dissipated. (Sultan Firuz Shah Tughlaq, *Futuh-i Firuz Shahi*, 2009, p. 24)

Indeed we find the autobiography of Firuz Shah Tughlaq to be a self-recorded testimony of his 'good' Islamic deeds, a record that perhaps Allah will peruse before making a decision on the Sultan's worthiness to escape the hellfire. Befitting a book reporting 'good' Islamic actions, we naturally find accounts of the persecution of Hindus because of their alleged idol-worship: "In the township of Gohana, some Hindus had put up a new temple where they had engaged in idol worship. They were arrested and brought before me. **I ordered that the crimes of those who instigated this corruption should be publicly proclaimed that they may be executed before the gates of the Royal Palace.** Their books of unbelief and all objects associated with idol-worship were brought with them and were publicly burnt at the Sara-i-A'la. The remainder were admonished and rebuked in order to serve as a warning to others, so that no *zimmi* living under Muslim rule would dare to act in a similar fashion." (Sultan Firuz Shah Tughlaq, *Futuh-i Firuz Shahi*, 2009, p. 27) But from the outset of his autobiography, the Sultan made clear that his targets also included the so-called Muslims who were

corrupting austere Islam through religious innovations:

All praise and immense gratitude to the Merciful Creator (of the worlds) who enabled this humble and insignificant Firuz bin Rajab...to rejuvenate the traditions of the Holy Prophet, **to stop people innovating heresies (*bid'at*) and indulging in prohibited actions**, and to check things tabooed and, to encourage (people) to fulfil their religious duties and obligations...One of the innumerable gifts of the Creator and Provider bestowed upon this servant was that while innovations and practices contrary to the Shariat had become second nature of the people, who had started to turn away from the example of the Prophet, Almighty God enabled this humble servant to regard, stopping people from committing innovations and to prevent them from committing actions contrary to the Shariat...And he struggled for this until by the help and grace of God false customs and practices contrary to the Shariat were eradicated and truth was set clearly apart from falsehood. (Sultan Firuz Shah Tughlaq, *Futuh-i Firuz Shahi*, 2009, pp. 19-20)

As one can readily conclude, it was only natural that the Asuric Firuz Shah Tughlaq, having the 'spiritual' ambition of eliminating heresy from the outset, would proceed to hunt sufi heretics to execute, by which he might then set an example for others to refrain from either practising or following their blasphemies. Accordingly, the fates of sufis like Ahmad Bihari and - as detailed in the following selection from the Sultan's autobiography – Shaikh Ruknu'd-Din were to reflect the degraded nature of the Quran and Hadith:

Also a certain individual in Delhi named Rukn was acclaimed by some and by himself as the Mahdi. He said: "I am the *Mahdi* who was (predestined) to come before the end of time. **I have been given Divine knowledge and have not been taught by anyone.** I know the names of all the creatures which none of the Prophets knew except Adam (upon him be peace). I know the secrets of the alphabet revealed to no one else." He had published books to support these pretensions and had sought to lead people toward error and falsehood. **Nevertheless, he has also claimed to be a pillar of the religion of the Prophet of God.** The *mashaikh* (saints) testified to this effect before me, that he had indeed said such things and that they had heard him do so. **When he was brought before me, I questioned him personally about his erroneous beliefs. He admitted to having innovated in religion and confessed his heresy. The *ulama* declared: "He has become an apostate and his execution is lawful."**

Disorder and mischief had arisen in Islam, particularly amongst the Sunni Muslims, on account of this man. **If this evil was not crushed forthwith, God forbid, many Muslims might have been led to renounce their faith.** Such disorder would have been unleashed (due to this) that it would have caused considerable loss of life.

I ordered that the heretical deviation and evil of this wicked man be announced in the assemblies of the *ulama* of the world, so that all people, high and low alike, should hear of it. And I ordered that he should be punished according to the decision of the *ulama* and the guardians of the *sharia*. **He was accordingly executed along with his followers and accomplices. All the people, high and low, gathered and cut his body to pieces, flesh and skin.** The evil of this man was thus removed (in so dire a manner) in order to serve as a warning to others. **It was a blessing and favour of God, the Exalted and Almighty, that I, a lowly servant, was able to revive the Traditions of our Prophet. My purpose in narrating these matters is to declare my thankfulness to God. Anyone desirous of purity and clarity in religion should, on hearing or reading of things contrary to the *sharia*, adopt the same path, and earn spiritual reward.** (Sultan Firuz Shah Tughlaq, *Futuh-i Firuz Shahi*, 2009, pp. 24-25)

The importance of the Sultan's rationale cannot be overstated, especially when we consider the sufi mystic Ruknu'd-Din's claim to be the "pillar" of Islam while at once alleging himself the recipient of "Divine knowledge" (a paradox similarly observed in his aforementioned castigation of Hindus while appropriating Hindu mystical practices), a boast of which equally blasphemous variations are found in the majority of sufis. Consequently, we find the Asuric justification for Ruknu'd-Din's execution to be equally applicable for most of the sufi heretics. Of course, the Sultan's very words help us to conversely explain why there has not *yet* been a widespread massacre of sufis. For though the barbarous killing of Rukn was designed to serve "a warning to others", there was another crucial element, one that we find time and again among the subcontinental "Muslims", including the ones capable of adhering to the Islamic call to 'purify' the world of Hindus. We refer, of course, to the unconscious apostasy of these Islamic leaders themselves, a heresy that while not as extreme as the likes of Ruknu'd-Din and others, is yet enough to allow for entry of significant innovations to the Islamic religion, with Firuz Shah Tughlaq, ironically, actively facilitating the process:

The blessings of God on this lowly servant enabled him to construct works of public use and benefit. I had large numbers of mosques, colleges, and *khanqahs* (hospices) built so that scholars, saints and pious men who devote themselves to prayer may worship their true Lord at these places...**Sandalwood was used to make the door and the latticed screens of the mausoleum of Sultan-ul Mashaikh Nizamul Haq wa Din (Shaikh Nizam-u'd-Din Auliya).** ...Similarly, all the forts of the Delhi Sultanate constructed by previous rulers were renovated. **Likewise, I reinstituted the grant of villages, land, former endowments attached to the madrasahs, mausoleum and tombs of respected former rulers and famous *shaikhs* so that the needs of these holy places and those who visit them would be provided for.** (Sultan Firuz Shah Tughlaq, *Futuh-i Firuz Shahi*, 2009, pp. 28-30)

Here we discover again the tendency of Islamic rulers to patronize the sufis, including their graves, the centre of the heinous innovation of tomb worship and additional deviations from Islam. Instead of destroying the tombs where the heresy occurred, or the *khanqahs* which we know are specifically outlawed by the Quran, the genocidal Sultan entrenched these innovations. It is a reminder that all of the bloodshed committed by "Muslims" does not necessarily mean that they are actual Muslims, even if Asuric Islam is certainly preoccupied with killing "unbelievers". It is a pattern that continues to play out in the subcontinent, where Sufism continues to exert a powerful influence over "Muslims", confusing them into thinking that certain actions are enough to establish themselves as 'pure' followers of Islam. The pattern manifests not only in the macabre paradox of violent jihadis failing to appropriately follow the scriptural demands, but also in more simple inconsistencies such as the aforementioned Shaikh Sharafu'd-Din Ahmad, who though on the one hand was upset over Firuz Shah Tughlaq's execution of his sufi friends, on the other hand ironically rebuked the failure of sufis to remain obedient to the shariat:

In a letter Shaikh Sharafu'd-Din wrote that there were some sufis who found the Sharia superfluous...the main purpose of prayers to them was to dispel negligence from the heart and make it totally attentive to God. As they had already acquired those qualities there was no use in offering prayers. To the Shaikh this was the line of *Iblis* (the Devil) who had refused to prostrate himself before Adam, and he believed the Quranic story to be a lesson for such misguided Sufis. (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 234)

If the shaikh was certainly correct in chastising sufis who absconded from the mandatory Islamic prayers, he was nevertheless hypocritical in his stance towards the *Wahdat al-Wujudis* and their Hindu-Sufi-Muslim mixture. For as we know, the decision to selectively apply certain parts of the Islamic scripture (including the mandatory prayers), while refusing to criticize proponents of *shirk*, is the hallmark of a pretender or hypocrite or *munafiq*, a category of mankind who are by definition non-

Muslim. But the sufis, perhaps by the very fact that only a small number – relative to the total amount of “Muslims” who adhere to at least some of their principles – of them have been historically persecuted or executed, in turn at least subconsciously confuse this paucity of orthodox pressure for Allah's *approval* of their blasphemies. The reality, however, is that in most cases the orthodox have more pressing matters to attend to, usually involving the continued existence of outright kuffar like the Hindus: as a result, they prefer to manage the sufis by periodic “warnings” involving selective executions or assassinations.

Half-Muslims like the sufis can be comprehensively dealt with at a more opportune time, when Islam's ascendancy is secure and the orthodox can subsequently devote themselves to perfecting the thought and belief patterns of their flock (perhaps for the purpose of jihad), including preventing – after a thorough examination of the doctrine – Sufism's tenets from either a continued acceptance, or gaining future approval, within the Muslim populace. When this process takes place, the charges of apostasy naturally emerge in greater frequency toward the sufis. Nevertheless, it remains relatively difficult to emphatically justify their execution or other earthly punishments on the sole basis of their haqiqat theories, because there is not much by way of affirmative evidence in the Quran to negate Sufism's premises on “reality” - unless of course, the sufis expand on the original doctrine to the point of *hulul* or *ittihad*. The problems of evidence and Islamic ‘justice’, however, are readily removed when the orthodox begin to discover and understand the astonishing heresies the sufis assign to the marifat stage of their mystic path - blasphemies of which the Quran is unequivocally certain.

* * * *

As the preceding explanations of Sufism's reality or haqiqat certainly confirm, the pinnacle of sufi knowledge is quite different to that experienced by the Yogi, who unlike his counterpart, aspires – and attains – to a level *beyond* the boundaries of the ordinary understanding of identity. And as part of the ultimate Conscious-Identity he arrives in, the Yogi also moves beyond the restrictions that surprisingly demarcate the final stage – marifat - of Sufism's mystical experience and doctrine. For the sufi, while certainly reaching a level of infinite possibilities upon entering the inner consciousness, does not then progress into a state where even the reality of infinity is experienced as inferior to the Supreme Consciousness from which the perception of infinity flows. It is a distinction illuminated when we expand upon the different gradations of the inner fields of consciousness, the vast intermediate zones betwixt the ordinary consciousness and the Supreme Brahma. As part of our understanding, we must approach these regions according to two formulations based on Yogin experience: the concentric and the linear.

While both pathways reach the same Illimitable Brahma, the directions towards them are different, with the concentric approaching Brahma as the Purusha, whereas the linear approaches the transcendent Brahma or Atman. As the Purusha is contained *within*, the former pathway proceeds, as previously discussed, from the ordinary outer mind and vital inward toward the inner mind and vital, from which the consciousness continues deeper into the Psychic Being (a combination of the *manomaya* and *pranamaya* purushas), at last fully realizing Oneself as the Purusha. This is done – as in the other formulation – through both the renunciation of ego by sincerity, consecration, humility, abandoning ambition and vanity and lust; and the practice of meditation through which the concentration finds its deepest point of the Purusha. It is a finale that, if representing the greatest of evolutions, is for our purposes *at times* less helpful in outlining the difference between the Yogin experience and that of the sufi mystics. For that discernment, we must examine the linear (or vertical) configuration outlining the gradations of consciousness that reaches the summit of Brahma, a series of levels that also best

captures the position of the Asura of Falsehood. It is a classification that is often spoken of - though different Seers and Yogin and Rishis experience it differently – as consisting of seven layers, with Mundaka Upanishad presenting it accordingly:

From Him have sprung the seven pranas, the seven flames, the seven kinds of fuel, the seven oblations and also the seven planes where move the pranas, lying in the cave, which are seven in each living being. (Mundaka Upanishad I:8)

If we are to then expand upon the broad categories of the seven, we will of course mention the Supreme state of Existence as the very origin, with the first three – that of Sat, Chit and Ananda respectively - of the seven levels corresponding to the Pure, Unmanifested, Illimitable Brahma. That the three – in this particular categorization, because as we know Satchitananda in its Static purity has often been experienced in four aspects - are, when experienced in the Supreme state, absolutely connected in both *Function* and Consciousness, does not negate their differentiation for both the purpose of human classification and in the actual Truth of their respective Aspects. The fourth of the levels, in the seven layered understanding, has been experienced as *Vijnana*, the Creative Consciousness or Supramental or Supermind (above all mental regions either at the Golden Lid or below), a Totality of Knowledge that also leads to manifested action, without the separation of *function* found in the Consciousness of the Gods – for this *Vijnana* is of Brahma and is thus Absolute in Function and Knowledge and Consciousness and Power.

The Supermind is in reality the same as Sat and Chit and Ananda; it is just that It – Brahma, the Supreme Mother – assumed another Aspect of Itself as the Supramental, an Aspect that is decidedly Dynamic and Creative *in the manifestation*, whereas the levels of Sat and Chit and Ananda can be perceived as Silent or Witness Brahma. The Supramental takes – as they are the same – its Satchitananda in the Active or Dynamic poise, working to bring – or unlock - the ultimate transformation that is already latently belonging to Itself in varying levels of manifestation. The Supramental, while free of all of His – as Satchitananda – creation (yet at once supporting Prakriti and Her works), is nevertheless working from a foundation above to change the very substance of all that is below It. The Supramental experience, then, is different from the frequent historic (especially in the medieval ages) experience of Brahma or Satchitananda that many Yogin had – but only because those particular Yogin preferred the Supreme Truth and Bliss and Consciousness of Satchitananda *in God's own Plane*, without Consciously assuming the Supermind Aspect of Satchitananda or Brahma or the Supreme Mother that can direct the substantial metamorphosis of the *adhar* or jiva and the very global consciousness.

The Dynamicity of the Supermind, the Vijnana of Brahma, is different from that of the *typal* Gods and Goddesses who work from the Overmind region, because the latter group, as we have mentioned, have a specificity in function even as they remain United in Consciousness with the Satchitananda they are Personalities of. The Supermind, on the other hand, is Illimitable *in function*, as it is *entirely* the Satchitananda, without division of labour; thus when it descends in the rare Yogi, it is with a comprehensive Totality, enabling It to enact the profound transformation that is the secret destiny of Prakriti. The Gods and Goddesses are nevertheless still Dynamic in their assigned actions, with the Overmind region of Gods and Goddesses similar to the eternal seeds and soil from which the root leads to the tree and the branches and fruit: The Supermind is yet greater than that, the Dynamic Aspect of Satchitananda from which *all* of that is produced and contained within. And if It is described with the component of “mind” or “mental”, it is because Brahma's Supermind activity has the cursory similarity to ordinary mind's efforts at transforming and creating: the obvious distinction, of course, is the vastly differing level from which Supermind and *ordinary mind* go about their respective creations – the former from Satchitananda, the latter from the limited receptive nature of thought.

In between the levels of Supermind and ordinary mind rest quite a few planes of consciousness (most

of which can be broadly included in the fifth level of seven), with the aforementioned Overmind just below – in the linear model – the Supramental region. The Gods and Goddesses or Personalities of Brahma, while immortal and containing the very Brahma within themselves, are technically working from a Consciousness native to the realm of Prakriti's manifestation, though near its very apex of the Golden Lid that is unlocked when the Yogi reaches the Supreme – Isa Upanishad having illumined, “The door of the Truth is covered by a golden lid. Open it, O Nourisher! Remove it so that I who have been worshipping the Truth may behold It.” (Isa Upanishad XV) The immortality of the Gods and Goddesses is a thus different one to the Pure Satchitananda and the Supermind, and is actually somewhat similar, as we have mentioned, to the Asuras in the sense that they are both *typal*, with the tremendous difference of course resting in the Gods and Goddesses having an eternal, Conscious, intrinsic and substantial unity with Brahma – thus they work from the principle of Sat or Truth-Existence whereas the Asuras work in opposition to That. The Satchitananda, in comparison to the Gods, is not constrained by any *function* or other limitations of the manifestation (seen in Brahma's ability to – *unlike* the Gods or Goddesses - incarnate), and its Supermind aspect is the source of the Gods and Goddesses who were the initial manifested way that the Supreme Mother sought to bring correction to the Ignorance and Falsehood represented by hostile entities like the Asuras.

The Gods and Goddesses and the Asuras and other subliminal emanations in between are not able to – unlike the Supreme Brahma – enter a human triple-sheath as themselves, since they do not have an intrinsic connection to the Psychic Being that is mandatory – even if undeveloped as in the cases of Hitler and Mohammed – for the *human* birth. For that Psychic Being is the material manifestation of the Soul or Purusha, which is of course Brahma within (rather than Transcendent). Thus the Satchitananda, by way of both the linear model and *through* the Purusha, has always been capable of descending by way of the Supramental; that It has only rarely done so is because Brahma is, as one might expect, infinitely patient, and the matter of the Supramental descent has to be sought by the Yogi. God has, we recall, allowed for the matter of choice (even in the manifestation of Himself as the Yogi or Guru), and even after a Self-Realization the choice – though this type of decision is now of a much different nature than the ordinary human free will - can still be made, in God's Infinite Wisdom, to refrain from enacting the Supramental descent in the particular Yogi. Nevertheless, as the Supramental Consciousness increasingly subtly pervades Her manifestation, the substantial descent of the Supermind will progressively take place in more and more individual Yogin, proceeding first to the Overmind region and then down to the Intuitive Mind.

This Intuitive Mind is the one region that the sufi mystics may well have – in some cases – accessed; for the region, while certainly much greater than the ordinary mind, is the first to have lost the inherent and unbreakable connection to Brahma that defines the Overmind. The sufis, after all, deny a Unity of Consciousness with God, a rejection that while blocking them from even becoming aware of the Overmind and Golden Lid, does not obstruct their ability to have Intuitive Mind experiences, which are known to the Yogin and Rishis as having a four-fold component - that of the previously mentioned Revelation (often experienced as higher visions), Inspiration (often experienced as higher auditions), Discrimination, and the higher Intuition that immediately understands or directly grasps a matter. This region can certainly include visions or auditions from the actual Higher Gods or Goddesses (as opposed to what many mortals, such as Muslims with their Asuric Allah, attribute as “God”), or even Brahma in an Overmind manifestation (such as mystic sight of Sri Krishna). The experiences of the Intuitive Mind are nevertheless from a *separate* perspective of consciousness, even if the mystic is moving increasingly closer to the Self-Conscious-Identification with the Supreme Mother.

As such, it is quite possible that the famous sufi mystics – and we will shortly examine their writings on *marifat* – were reaching the level most proximate to what would have actually constituted Union; of course, as they were – and modern sufis are likewise afflicted - clouded by Islamic shariat and did not

entirely practice the consecration and humility accompanying the concentric path to the Purusha, it is also – and we will discuss this – possible that a significant majority of their visions and auditions were of Vital beings masquerading as higher entities. For the vast Vital worlds (the sixth of the seven linear levels), as the example of “Gabriel” shows us, can certainly be the source of occult experiences that mimic those of the Intuitive Mind regions – infrarational revelation and inspiration pretending to be genuine revelation and inspiration. In that particular characteristic, the Vital markedly differs from a few of the other mental regions below the Intuitive region, including the rational mind governed by the slow process of deduction, logic, neutrality and organization, or the higher mind that is highlighted by its philosophy and mental ideals and archetypes.

While the rational and higher minds are incapable of supraphysical experiences, just above – in the linear model - the latter is the Illumined Mind, which as one might have already understood, can include the mystic experiences of light. Occult light, however, is perhaps the most dangerous type of mystic vision, because just as the material world – from its electric lights to the light of the sun, and all between – has different forms of illumination, so too are there varying lights in the occult planes, from the Supreme Light of Brahma down to even a false light that can be projected by Asuras of the Vital. The question of occult light is a prime example of the importance of the Guru – along with the benefits of Discrimination and Intuition - to the mystic path, in order that one may not become confused and misled, sent astray from the path to God by presuming whatever false or partial light envisioned is confirmation of an ‘ultimate truth’. The Guru and the Intuitive Mind qualities, and the flowering of the Psychic attributes, are also important in preventing the *mixture* of exaggerated Vital movements – especially the feeling that one is now a ‘great’ mystic – that attempt to attach itself to genuinely profound spiritual experiences.

The mystic or occultist – and both Mohammed and Hitler, with their infrarational occult endeavours, certainly qualify – are always more vulnerable to the amplification of the Vital, especially after an initial aperture into the inner fields: the sufis, with their tolerance of the Asuric scripture of Islam, and the vanity apparent in their writings (a magnified sense of self, we recall, that occurs while they explicitly *reject* a conscious-identification with God) certainly succumbed to this common mixture, one that has caused the failure of many a sadhak. That is not to say that all of the Vital inner experiences are bad, because in fact, many such experiences can be helpful toward the concentric path, as long as the Psychic humility and consecration are present, along with the genuine Guru: Indeed certain vital emanations might even be quite helpful – unlike the Asuras or Rakshasas or Pishachas – in directing the sadhak further inward (or if not of the Vital, helpful entities might be located in the inner Psychic worlds of the concentric formulation), even if the utmost benefit arrives from the Supreme Mother and the Guru. The Realization of the Purusha – the aspired denouement of the concentric path - is also an excellent first means – depending upon the Conscious (now in front of the discarded veil) Soul's *command* – to call upon the Transcendent Supermind to begin descending.

That stupendous descent, the precursor to the establishment of a new golden age – this time of progressively elevating levels of global consciousness -, is one that – within the individual – continues on from the Intuitive Mind down to the Illuminative Mind, replacing the light natural to the inner and elevated mental regions with the greatest Supramental Light. The descent also further strengthens the natural powers of the Illuminative Mind, which is a region higher than thought, a surety to mind that goes beyond thinking, one which if the mystic (before gaining the most superior of centralities to his consciousness) centralizes himself in, leads to an increased ability to receive experiences of the Intuitive Mind directly above it. Consequently, from the point of view of the mystic, including those of the sufi paths, the Illuminative mind is the beginning of the *mental* regions that can be considered “Unseen” (the inner vital planes are certainly another domain of the “Unseen”), beyond the typical grasp of the ordinary mortal that usually lives by the senses and the vital mind, with a select minority of

them governed by the rational or higher mind that is nevertheless incapable – unless exceeded - of accessing the “Unseen” experienced by a proportion of mystics.

That same Unseen however, with its varied experiences and forces and entities, from the Vital to the elevated regions of the mind all the way to the Golden Lid, to the Soul and the Supreme Self beyond the manifestation, is in its vast entirety ordained as inaccessible to the pious Muslim, the community the sufis claim membership in. This is the infrarational word of the Quran, the final message to humanity that all mortals are supposed to follow, *especially* if they allege themselves, like the sufis, to be Muslims. The message of the unavailability of the Unseen is one presented on multiple occasions in the Quran, with the prophet Noah documented as - like any Islamic apostle should – saying that he did not know the Unseen:

And certainly We sent Noah to his people: “Surely I am a plain warner for you: That you shall not serve any but Allah. Surely I fear for you the punishment of a painful day.” But the chiefs of those who disbelieved from among his people said: “We do not consider you but a mortal like ourselves, and we do not see any have followed you but those who are the meanest of us at first thought and we do not see in you any excellence over us; nay, we deem you liars.” Noah said: “O my people! Tell me if I have with me clear proof from my Lord, and He has granted me mercy from Himself, and it has been made obscure to you, that we constrain you to (accept) it while you are averse from it? And, O my people! I ask you not for wealth in return for it; my reward is only with Allah and I am not going to drive away those who believe. Surely they shall meet their Lord, but I consider you a people who are ignorant. And, O my people! who will help me against Allah if I drive them away? Will you not then mind? **And I do not say to you that I have the treasures of Allah and I do not know the unseen, nor do I say that I am an angel,** nor do I say about those whom your eyes hold in mean estimation (that) Allah will never grant them (any) good - Allah knows best what is in their souls - for then most surely I should be of the unjust.” They said: “O Noah! Indeed you have disputed with us and lengthened dispute with us, therefore bring to us what you threaten us with, if you are of the truthful ones.” He said: “Allah only will bring it to you if He please, and you will not escape.” (Quran 11:25-33)

If one of the great prophets like Noah admitted his ignorance of the “Unseen”, that alone should be enough for Muslims to similarly refrain from opening such forbidden doors, resigning themselves to the literal ‘truth’ of the Quran. The sufis, however, try to ignore multiple unambiguous messages like the above in their effort to provide ‘evidence’ in support of their marifat, unseen (to ordinary sight), experiences. One such attempt involves a supposed Quran justification for the auditions or inspirations the sufis allege themselves recipients, with the verse in question informing us, “We verily created man and We know what his soul whispereth to him, and We are nearer to him than his jugular vein.” (Quran 50:16) While this verse seems reasonable enough, if read superficially, to allow for certain marifat experiences, not only will we present different verses explicitly forbidding the possibility of the final sufi stage, this specific Asuric revelation is – in particular when it mentions what the soul “whispereth” to man – actually referring to non-occult *suggestions*, especially those thoughts or beliefs that exhort Muslims to engage in non-Islamic activities.

A different selection, similarly used to support Sufism's premise of a veil hiding “mysteries” that can be uncovered by the “Muslim” mystic, is more obviously rebutted, once we view the entire passage rather than the sole verse, 50:22, that the sufis like to use, one which says, “Now We have removed from thee thy covering, and piercing is thy sight this day.” Displayed alone, it certainly sounds like a mystic pronouncement on the removal of the veil separating ordinary man from the stupendous light of God; but the passage it is contained within demonstrates a much simpler Islamic reality:

And the trumpet is blown. This is the threatened Day. And every soul cometh, along with it a driver and a witness. (And unto the evil-doer it is said): “Thou wast in heedlessness of this.

Now We have removed from thee thy covering, and piercing is thy sight this day.” (Quran 50:20-22)

As we can see, the “covering” is that which previously prevented the non-Muslim, the “evildoer”, the hypocrite like the sufi ‘saint’, from seeing the hellfire that is his deserved recompense on the Day of Judgement. It is not the “piercing” sight of a greater mystic light, because the Asura of Falsehood inherently recoils from his Origin that is the source of the highest Light. To claim the verses as supporting something other than a description of Islamic Judgement day is a taqiyah of omission commonly practised by the sufis, including their use of a similar Quran passage, of which they dissect the solitary line, “The near event draws nigh. There shall be none besides Allah to remove it.” The event the sufis purport this line to hint at, is the mystic ‘unity’ or unveiling of the veil from which the marifat experiences can then commence. The entire passage encompassing the line, once again, explains the actual ‘reality’ Islam desires to impose upon mankind:

And that He did destroy the Ad of old. And (the tribe of) Thamud He spared not. And the people of Noah before, surely they were most unjust and inordinate. And the overthrown cities did He overthrow, So there covered them that which covered. Which of your Lord's benefits will you then dispute about? This is a warner of the warners of old. **The near event draws nigh. There shall be none besides Allah to remove it.** Do you then wonder at this announcement? And will you laugh and not weep While you are indulging in vanities. Rather make obeisance to Allah and serve (Him). (Quran 53:50-62)

While the sufis claim this “near event” to be that of an entry into the ‘unseen’, the marifat or gnosis, the actual context differs greatly, with only two possibilities allowed by genuine Islam – either the “near event” is another earthly destruction for disbelief (such as in Ad or Thamud), or it again refers to the Judgement Day. Both are *nowhere* close to the visions or intuitions or light or revelations of the mystic, whether those experiences are infrarational, or of the Psychic or suprarational greatness. Neither this passage nor anything else in the Quran, actually validate Sufism's premise of a marifat stage through which suprasensory experiences are available for the enjoyment of a “Muslim” subsequent to Mohammed. And if the previously cited verses are contextually proven as actually *opposing* Sufism's blasphemous doctrine, they at least – unlike the following – were more readily sliced into a small portion the sufis could use for their fraudulent doctrine. What we find with the next selection is something much more feeble:

(He is) the Knower of the Unseen, and He revealeth unto none His secret, Save unto every messenger whom He hath chosen, and then He maketh a guard to go before him and a guard behind him. (Quran 72:26-27)

Shockingly, these verses have been used by Sufism to justify the heresy that Mohammed was *Nur* and blessed with Divine faculties, a quite tangential interpretation of the passage's mention of “Unseen” and “secret”. The problem for the sufis, is that the “Unseen” and “secret” communicated in the verses were primarily referring to the infrarational word of Allah that Mohammed was tasked with faithfully conveying to mankind, a fact thoroughly understood when we view the passage the two previous verses are contained within:

Say: “Lo! none can protect me from Allah, nor can I find any refuge beside Him. **(Mine is) but conveyance (of the Truth) from Allah, and His messages; and whoso disobeyeth Allah and His messenger, lo! his is fire of hell, wherein such dwell for ever.**” Till (the day) when they shall behold that which they are promised (they may doubt); but then they will know (for certain) who is weaker in allies and less in multitude. Say (O Mohammed, unto the disbelievers): “**I know not whether that which ye are promised is nigh, or if my Lord hath set a distant term for it.** (He is) the Knower of the Unseen, and He revealeth unto none His

secret, Save unto every messenger whom He hath chosen, and then He maketh a guard to go before him and a guard behind him **That He may know that they have indeed conveyed the messages of their Lord. He surroundeth all their doings, and He keepeth count of all things.**" (Quran 72:22-28)

As evident by the verses, Mohammed is only to *convey* or communicate "His messages" - a far different matter than Mohammed either knowing the Unseen himself or existing as a substance of divine light. The verse immediately preceding 72:26 and subsequent to 72:27 are crucial to our understanding; the former shows the Prophet to be relaying these statements in connection to the hellfire promised of the disbelievers (as opposed to the verses having any relation to mystic precepts like *Nur*); the latter instantly corrects any misconception that the "secret" was a comprehensive knowledge of the Unseen, because the verse again refers to the messenger's duty to simply propagate the message. In addition to contravening sufi assertions that the verses are proof of Mohammed possessing Unseen knowledge or existing as divine light, by *only* mentioning Allah's "chosen" messengers – the sufis, as we know, are posthumous to the "seal" of Mohammed, the *final* apostle -, neither can these infrarational revelations be used for proof of the claims that ensuing sufi 'saints' are worthy recipients of the "secrets" of the "Unseen". Indeed different Quran passages have Mohammed undoubtedly admitting that the "Unseen" was inaccessible to *himself*, the greatest of all Muslims, with a previously cited verse informing, "Say: 'I do not say to you that I have with me the treasures of Allah, **nor do I know the Unseen**, nor do I say to you that I am an Angel. **I do not follow aught save that which is revealed to me.**'" (Quran 6:50) A similar Asuric revelation once again has Mohammed documenting for all of eternity his ignorance of the "Unseen":

Say: "I do not control any benefit or harm for my own soul except as Allah please; **and had I known the Unseen** I would have had much of good and no evil would have touched me; I am nothing but a warner and the giver of good news to a people who believe." (Quran 7:188)

In another verse declaring the same restricted reality of Islam, one that is remarkably different to Sufism, Mohammed specifically declares – at the behest of Gabriel's infrarational command - knowledge of the Unseen as belonging to Allah alone:

Say (O Mohammed): **None in the heavens and the earth knoweth the Unseen save Allah;** and they know not when they will be raised (again). (Quran 27:65)

It is thus a major extrapolation for the sufis to use the previously mentioned verses 72:26-27 as justification for their kufr innovations, because the 'Unseen knowledge' infrarationally revealed to Mohammed is one that should be considered *external* to the Prophet, not belonging to him even though he was granted the opportunity of Gabriel's occult contact and the status of the only man to have been presented with Allah's closing words to humanity. Mohammed's function was not as someone ascending to a higher state of knowledge or 'unity': Instead, he was a simple *relayer* of the Unseen *in the form* of Allah's final words, but did *not* actually know the Unseen beyond those particular words. The Prophet was not a *possessor* of the Unseen knowledge or substance; he was just a deliverer of the only words that mankind needs for their understanding of it, which is not a full knowledge as the infrarational Quran revelations, including the following, indicate:

Say: "Allah knows best how long they remained; **to Him are (known) the unseen things of the heavens and the earth.** How clear His sight and how clear His hearing! There is none to be a guardian for them besides Him, and He does not make any one His associate in His Judgement." (Quran 18:26)

The Muslims, including the exemplar for mankind, Mohammed, are not to genuinely know such Unseen things in the occult realm, and the Prophet's status is supposed to be that of a simple conveyor of the minimal *words* Allah provided to the world. It is why Mohammed said "*had* I known the

unseen”, because he did not have a ‘unity’ or totality of the Unseen: thus he understood that the infrarational revelations given to him through Gabriel did not really mean that he, the Prophet, was aware of the Unseen. He had simply received the ‘truth’ (in the terrestrial form of words) as Allah saw fit for the *world* to follow; the rest of the Unseen was – and is - to belong solely to Allah, as multiple verses, including the following, plainly state:

And they will say: “If only a portent were sent down upon him from his Lord!” **Then say, (O Mohammed): “The Unseen belongeth to Allah.** So wait! Lo! I am waiting with you.” (Quran 10:20)

This possession of the Unseen as the sole domain of Allah is why other infrarational communications to Mohammed mocked those who dared to claim knowledge of the Unseen, with the following mentioning the disbelievers who thought themselves capable of obtaining the world's rewards:

Have you, then, seen him who disbelieves in Our communications and says: “I shall certainly be given wealth and children?” **Has he gained knowledge of the Unseen, or made a covenant with the Beneficent Allah? By no means!** We write down what he says, and We will lengthen to him the length of the chastisement. (Quran 19:77-78)

The sufis fall in the same category, because they follow a religion – one that dares to believe itself capable of unveiling the Unseen – that is not sanctioned by Allah:

Or have they partners (of Allah) who have prescribed for them any religion that Allah does not sanction? And were it not for the Decree of Judgement, decision would have certainly been given between them. And surely the unjust shall have a painful punishment. (Quran 42:21)

The sufis however, are persistent in their efforts at pretending that their religion is ordained by Allah, that Sufism is a genuine form of Islam. As part of this multifaceted camouflage, they not only twist the Quran verses to advocate the Unseen or Unveiled as something permitted by Islam to “Muslims” subsequent to Mohammed, but also assume the antipodal position by which they – as they should be *consistently* doing – assign the Unseen as the exclusive domain of Allah:

“It is You”, so He brought distinction and support to confirm the proof and dependence on Him, since **Allah only knows the Unseen.** (Ibn Arabi, *Fusus Al-Hikam*, The Seal of the Wisdom of Prophethood in the Word of Jesus)

While Arabi – who undoubtedly, as we will shortly see, exposed himself as a hypocrite by way of his marifat experiences (let alone the haqiqat heresies already documented) - chose to boldly adopt the opposite pronouncement to his actual blasphemous beliefs, Hujwari took a more subtle position:

Knowledge of the Law involves your knowing that God has sent us Apostles with miracles of an extraordinary nature; that our Apostle, Muhammad (on whom be peace!), is a true Messenger, who performed many miracles, **and that whatever he has told us concerning the Unseen and the Visible is entirely true.** (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 15)

Hujwari provided himself an escape route by which his admitted visions and marifat Unseen experiences might be permitted, but through the deceitful *interpretation* (and use of forged statements) of the Islamic scripture practised by the sufis, which allows them to fraudulently claim that whatever Mohammed and Allah have said about the Unseen is the same as what Sufism claims. But if Hujwari and Arabi and other medieval sufis had actually been honest about Islam's and Sufism's respective doctrines, they would have never speculated so much on the Unseen or dared to assert themselves capable of occult experiences. These sufis should have understood – by their own writings no less – that they were transgressing the boundaries of Islam when seeking the experiences of their marifat

stage. But this is what hypocrites do, and the sufis are the quintessential pretenders, trying to take a “middle course” in a religion that demands a singular way of belief and thought – the sufis on the one hand superficially agree with Allah's pronouncements on the restricted Unseen, on the other write of being able to penetrate barriers and “read” that very Unseen:

When the barrier in front and the barrier behind are removed,
the eye penetrates and reads the tablet of the Unseen.

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book IV, 2904)

Rumi, forgetting that the Muslim already knows – through the idols of the Quran and the authentic hadith – all that needs to be understood of the Unseen (whose possession is strictly for Allah according to that same scripture), in another stanza described the wine of the Unseen as capable of becoming “manifest” and “evident” to the initiate of the sufi paths:

The wine belongs to the Unseen, the pot to this world:
the pot is apparent, the wine in it is very hidden:

Very hidden from the eyes of the uninitiated, but manifest and evident to the adept.

O my God, our eyes have been intoxicated. Forgive us: our
burdens have been made heavy.

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book V, 3305-07)

In another couplet, Rumi curiously purports the beholder of Unseen mysteries as having a body that becomes the spirit, writing, “Heedlessness was (derived) from the body: when the body has become spirit, it inevitably beholds the mysteries (of the Unseen).” (*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book III, 3565) It is unlikely that Rumi was referring to spirit in the same manner as the Yogin outline the Self, since we already know Rumi to have been highly critical of the doctrines of *hulul* and transmigration. Instead, his “body” becoming “spirit” can be understood under the already discussed guidelines of Sufism's diluted unity, one in which Rumi believed the initiate capable of – like Mohammed – learning Unseen secrets if sealing his lips:

To learn the secret of the Unseen is fitting for him (alone)
who can seal his lips (and refrain) from speech.

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book III, 3387)

It is a couplet that instantly brings to mind the Asuric revelations telling Mohammed, “Do not move your tongue with it to make haste with it, Surely on Us (devolves) the collecting of it and the reciting of it.” (Quran 75:16-17) These communications, as we have previously explained using the Hadith, were commanded to Mohammed so that he might physically keep his lips and tongue still in order to thoroughly receive the occult correspondence. The principle is the same for all occultists or mystics, whether they are receiving infrarational Asuric revelations or something much higher. And if there is any question on whom Rumi was referencing in the previous couplet, different parts of his Mathnawi confirm that he was not speaking of the Prophet Mohammed alone: Indeed he identified at least two post-Mohammed figures who had gone through the process of sealing their lips to – just like the Prophet, who should have instead been the *final* person to obtain these occult secrets – access the Unseen. One of these was Bayazid Bastami, of whom Rumi wrote, “This topic hath no end. Return (to the story), that (we may see) **what that holy man (Bayazid) said, (moved) by inspiration from the World Unseen.**” (*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book IV, 1833) Another of these post-Mohammed discoverers of the Unseen was the famed Persian sufi Attar:

I have given a half-raw (imperfect) explanation of it, (like)
the Turcomans' illboiled meat: hear (it) in full from the Sage
of Ghazna.

In the *Ilahi-nama* that **Sage of the Unseen** and Glory of them that know (God) explains this (matter).

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book III, 3749-50)

While these might be a harmless descriptions on their own, to describe “Muslims” subsequent to Mohammed as even minutely capable of knowing the Unseen – the private dominion of Allah -, is to commit blasphemy, because the Quran is quite clear on the topic. Yet Rumi was persistent in this heretical doctrine, with another stanza of his more specifically establishing the different components of the Unseen:

When one sense in (the course of its) progress has
loosed (its) bonds, all the rest of the senses become changed.

**When one sense has perceived things that are not objects of
sense-perception, that which is of the invisible world becomes
apparent to all the senses...**

(That) every sense of thine may become an apostle to
the senses (of others), and lead all senses into that Paradise;
(And then those) senses will tell their secret to thy senses,
without tongue and without (conveying either) the proper or
the metaphorical meaning;

For this proper meaning admits of (different) interpretations,
and this guesswork is the source of (vain) imaginings;

(But in the case of) that truth which is immediate and
intuitive, there is no room for any interpretation.

When (all) senses have become subject to thy sense, the
heavenly spheres cannot avoid (obedience to) thee.

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book II, 3240-49)

While this is an excellent description of the entry into the Intermediate Zone *between* the ordinary sense-based consciousness and the Supreme Consciousness, it is nevertheless blasphemous to Islam, which has forbidden entry into the Unseen (that includes this, as categorized by the Yogin, Intermediate Zone) for the actual Muslim. The sufis, however, assert multiple heresies related to matters of the Unseen, with perhaps the most extravagant - or magical - of them involving a group known as the “Men of the Unseen”, of whose capabilities Nizamuddin Auliya elaborated to his disciples:

Having returned to Delhi with the imperial army from Khizrabad, I obtained the benefit of kissing the master's feet. **The topic of conversation turned to Men of the Unseen, their capacity to intuit events and to exercise high spiritual resolve in acts of devotion and striving. At this time the master told about a youth named Nasir in Badaun. “It has been reported about him that he once said, ‘My father became a person united with God (wasil). One night they summoned him before the door to our house. He came out. From inside I heard the exchange of greetings, and then I heard my father say, ‘I will bid farewell to my children and family.’ But they replied: ‘The moment is fleeting.’ After that I learned nothing more about where they or my father went.’ ”**

...On the same occasion the master told another story. “There was a man named Ali, the door of whose prayer cell men of the Unseen regularly visited. Each time they would exchange greetings, and this went on for some time till one day they came and greeted Ali as usual: ‘Peace be upon you!’ **But Khwaja Ali replied: ‘O men of the Unseen, you are always saying ‘Peace’ and speaking out loud but you never become visible!’** After he spoke thus, he never again heard their voices.”

At this point I interjected: “But was not Khwaja Ali rude to speak in this manner?” “Indeed, he was,” replied the master, “and it was for this very reason that he was deprived of the future benefit of their presence.” **After that, the master explained: “Men of the Unseen first speak with, and listen to, a devout person; then they meet him, and only at the end do they vanish with him!”** (*Fawa'id ul-Fauid. The conversations of Hazrat Khwaja Nizamuddin Auliya as recorded by Khwaja Amir Hasan 'Ala Sijz, Assembly 15*)

None of this fanciful narrative is documented in the Quran or authentic hadith, which indeed holds the opposite to be true, and makes no mention of the idea that there exist “Men of the Unseen”. In one pertinent hadith, Mohammed informs mankind that there are five components to unseen knowledge – none of which are known to anyone *except* Allah -, with the quintet disclosed to be quite ordinary in nature:

Narrated Ibn Umar:

Allah's Messenger said, “**Keys of the unseen knowledge are five which nobody knows but Allah...**nobody knows what will happen tomorrow; nobody knows what is in the womb; nobody knows what he will gain tomorrow; nobody knows at what place he will die; and nobody knows when it will rain.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 2, Book 17, Hadith 149)

This crucial hadith clearly does not affirm the notion of unseen men who control the events of mankind; yet is this innovation precisely what Sufism alleges to be a reality of the world, with Arabi mentioning a similar gift of invisibility along with the somewhat related topic of “spirits” controlling the outward forms of the world:

The complete gnostic veils himself from the Prophet and Messenger and their heirs. He commands himself to leave that form which the Messenger of the moment left in order to follow the Messenger desiring Allah's love for them by His words, “Say: if you love Allah, then follow me and Allah will love you.” (3:31) He called on a God to whom one has recourse and Who is known in respect to the whole and is not witnessed, “nor do the eyes perceive Him, but He perceives the eyes” (6:103) by His lutf and His diffusion in the source of things. **The eyes do not perceive Him as they do not perceive their spirits which govern their shapes and outward forms.** “...He is the Latif, the All- Aware.” (Ibn Arabi, *Fusus Al-Hikam*, The Seal of the Wisdom of the Imam in the Word of Aaron)

The command mentioned by Arabi, that of “if you love Allah, then follow me...”, is but another example of the duplicitous sufic interpretation of the scripture, for the very next Quran verse fully frames the nature of what Muslims are following, informing them, “Say: ‘Obey Allah and the Messenger; but if they turn back, then surely Allah does not love the unbelievers.’” (Quran 3:32) The verses are not justification for the fantastical – at least per the Islamic scripture - sufic doctrine of leaving one's form to enter the Unseen; nor do they propose an ability of “spirits” to govern the “shapes” of things, since that is likewise unmentioned according to the Islamic idols, with the infrarational scripture – as we have documented – informing Muslims that they are “vouchsafed but little” knowledge of the spirit (Quran 17:85), a paucity of information that fails to confirm the spirit's supposed control of outward forms. Thus to assert such doctrine is to be guilty of innovating in religion; but such bidats, including the belief in the “Men of the Unseen,” are so popular within Sufism's orders that they even infect the most orthodox of sufis, the ones who should have a complete adherence to Islamic scripture:

It is understood that as this task was assigned to angels, so Baba Abriz's soul was assigned the task of pouring water. When his own body came to the world or, rather, when he reached perfection, he was informed that his soul had done the task. **It is possible for Allahu ta'ala to give souls the power of taking the shapes of objects and acting like the living before**

entering their bodies or after leaving their bodies. Some great men of din stated that they had done important great duties centuries before they had come to the world; these events happened in the same manner. That is, their souls did these deeds without bodies, and they were informed of the task after coming to the world. Some people have considered souls acting in the shapes of objects as metempsychosis. It is never, never metempsychosis. That is, souls have not entered other bodies. (*The Collected Letters of Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindi*, Volume II, Letter 28)

That Sirhindi could even succumb to the bidat of the Men of the Unseen is likely in relation to the pervasive sufi belief in the invisible existence of Khizr, whose continued presence – let alone his invisibility – is not actually authorized by the Quran. But Sirhindi should have known better, because neither the Quran nor the authentic hadith speak of souls being able to perform deeds prior to their entry into a particular body; indeed the Quran restricts the Soul well beneath the limited (as one can see in the previous citation, the sufis refuse to accept reincarnation even though they believe the soul capable of acting for centuries prior to arriving in the world!) power Sufism grants it:

So let not their riches nor their children please thee (O Mohammed). Allah thereby intendeth but to punish them in the life of the world and that their souls shall pass away while they are disbelievers. (Quran 9:55)

Multiple other verses previously cited, along with additional ones like the following, similarly propose the Soul as something capable of “passing away”: “Let not their wealth nor their children please thee! Allah purposeth only to punish them thereby in the world, and that their souls shall pass away while they are disbelievers.” (Quran 9:85) These so-called sufi saints, deprived – due to the shariat inspired, self-imposed restrictions upon their mystic aspirations – of the ultimate knowledge, could not even mentally understand the reality of the Purusha contained within the triple-sheaths, the comprehensive reality that instantly – after the Soul's Realization – displays the previous lives that It inhabited. The heretical supposition of the Unseen presented by Sirhindi is not the purview of the Purusha, which inherently looks to re-enter – perhaps after a sojourn in non-material planes between lives – the materialization within a different triple-sheath, because it is constantly seeking *different* experiences for the growth of the Psychic Being. The kind of scenario outlined by Sirhindi would in fact be more consistent with a typical God or Goddess, or lower emanations who all act from the subtle regions; the broad range of types who initially entered the cosmos without a Purusha – and thus were unable to reside in the outward vital-physical world, because the Purusha is what upholds humans in that particular plane.

But the jihad-advocating Sirhindi would not dare hold such a Polytheistic premise (in this particular scenario, a type of *incarnation* in which a typical God or Goddess is seeking to subliminally join a highly developed Psychic Being for the purpose of completing a specific work within the manifestation), because his endorsement of the “Men of the Unseen” was already blasphemous enough, a proposition that raised the “great men of din”, who can only have been sufi pirs, to a status far too close to Allah. That Sirhindi accepted the illegal assertions of the famous sufi ‘saints’, shows that even orthodox Sufism must eventually face censure from the real orthodoxy of Islam, especially when such elevated men of “din” or faith are – according to Sufism – associated with occult experiences of “light” that the sufis consider proof of their greatness. Yet the very nature of that light must be placed into question, especially when we consider that sufi visions of “light” help provide the foundation for their un-Psychic, exaggerated confidence. In one example of this, Rumi describes a spiritual “food” of “Light” that the sufi mystics nourish themselves with:

Any one whose food is the Light of (Divine) Majesty,
how should not lawful magic (wondrous eloquence) spring
from his lips?

Any one who, like the bee, has been given (Divine) inspiration as a prize, how should not his house be full of honey? (*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book VI, 2925-26)

In another passage of his Mathnawi, Rumi describes the sufi as “naked” of all but the Divine light:

Those who wear clothes look to the launderer, (but) the soul of the naked hath (Divine) illumination as its adornment.

Either withdraw (and turn) aside from the naked, or like them become free from body-garments.

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book II, 3523-24)

While this could hypothetically be interpreted as the illumination from the Quran and Hadith, the context of Sufism and Rumi's own Mathnawi instead indicate the *occult* witnessing of light that can occur after a period of tapasya and meditation, including the harsh asceticism the sufis engage in. It was a vision of light that the sufis often held to be the perceivable substance of God (hence their extrapolation of Mohammed's eternal *Nur* from Allah), with one sufi hinting at it with his comment on the “illumination concealed at the door of the Divine”:

Mu'tazila says, Mas'ud-i Bak continued to believe that the vision of God was impossible, **but to perfect sufis the idea of seeing anything other than God was absurd. A true devotee...was concerned with the illumination concealed at the door of the Divine, not the veil hiding it.** ...The author argued by assuming that all names referred to the One Name, that in all forms, only the One Face was hidden and that in all religions only One Road was concealed. If the subtle truth of this path, gleaned from different forms, was to be understood, all the different religions would appear identical. (*Mir'atu'l-Arifin*, Ethe, f. 160a) (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, pp. 241-44)

That the words of Sher Khan arrived with the different heresy of an equality between all religions, when Islam falsely contends itself to be the only true religion, shows that the light he experienced may well have been, if not the transcendental or Purushic light, at least the higher light of the illumined mind, the type of light explained by the Bhagavad Gita as strengthening the sattvic guna within the individual:

When into all the doors in the body there comes a flooding of light, a light of understanding, perception and knowledge, one should understand that there has been a great increase and uprising of the sattvic guna in the nature. (Bhagavad Gita 14:11)

The predominance of the sattvic guna, we recall, does not by itself indicate a Self-Realization, because the increase of its qualities can only lead to a firm foundation upon which greater spiritual experiences can occur. But one of the initial stages of that ascendancy of consciousness is the very opening of the higher mental light, the increase in the power of the illumined mind, whether that involves the mystic sight of light flashes, or simply through the aforementioned sureness in thought. This type of light, however, is not the same as the Light of Satchitananda – a delineation also confirmed in the Bhagavad Gita, in which Sri Krishna says, “**He is the light of all lights** and luminous beyond all the darkness of our ignorance. He is knowledge and the object of knowledge. He is seated in the hearts of all.” (Bhagavad Gita 13:18) God, the Illuminant of all illuminations, has in his Transcendental, Original Purity a Supreme Light that cannot be safely envisioned by the vast majority of mortals, a Light so powerful that dissolution is possible for those not sturdy enough to receive it. Hence His manifestation of varying gradations of light, similar to the differing levels of self-consciousness within Prakriti's creatrix.

This calibration of his Presence, whether in terms of varying levels of consciousness or light or power

or knowledge or joy, is again why the earthly, Self-Realized, Guru is crucial to the spiritual discipline (sadhana), because the Guru is helpful in honing the visions, revelations, intuitions and discrimination of the sadhak, and by doing so increasing the power of their Psychic Being within. These are the means by which the mystic experiences of light can be differentiated, the tools of the sadhak that prevent him or her from becoming overwhelmed by the vast inner fields, the knowledge that reminds him or her of the highest mission. For the ultimate quest of the mystic is the Unity of Conscious-Identity with God; all light or other experiences of the inner fields must be subsequently viewed dispassionately – without immediately jumping to a conclusion that the light experienced represents the pinnacle of unity - along the path to the Supreme, including the illumination of the heart spoken of by the sufis:

Lawami. The manifestation of (spiritual) light to the heart while its acquisitions continue to subsist.

Tawdli. The appearance of the splendours of (mystical) knowledge to the heart. (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 385)

These terms, from Hujwiri's glossary, were depicted in stylistically different fashion by other sufis, with Rumi mentioning the appearance of "Light" upon the sufi's heart in relation to Gabriel's message to Mohammed of the expansion of the latter's breast:

If those mysteries (of spiritual poverty) are in the traveller's heart, knowledge of the mystery is not yet possessed by the traveller.

(Let him wait) until the expansion (illumination) of his heart shall make it (full of) the Light: then God saith, "*Did not We expand ...?*"

For We have given thee the expansion (illumination) within thy breast, We have put the expansion into thy breast."

Thou art still seeking it from outside; thou art a source of milk: how art thou a milker of others?

There is an illimitable fountain of milk within thee: why art thou seeking milk from the pail?

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book V, 1065-69)

The initial portion of this infrarational revelation of Allah, the part italicized by Rumi, is indeed a genuine communication from the Quran, taken from the 94th chapter, which reads as follows:

Have We not expanded for you your breast, And taken off from you your burden, Which pressed heavily upon your back, And exalted for you your esteem? Surely with difficulty is ease. With difficulty is surely ease. So when you are free, nominate. And make your Lord your exclusive object. (Quran 94:01-08)

While the chapter can be used to endorse the sufic practice of *zikr*, or complete focus upon Allah, it does not specifically mention a light that emerges from the heart's expansion; but more importantly, there is no authorization for Rumi's poetic license to take the particular verse and subsequently forge further 'words' of Allah from it. If the sufi's fabrication is just another among countless examples, his use of the verse for evidence on his point regarding light is somewhat reasonable – but only if we exclusively focus on the Hadith. The Quran however, leads to a different understanding of the type of expansion, one based on ordinary psychology rather than occult experiences, as seen in the above "exalted for you your esteem" indicating an increase of *confidence* and earthly *prestige*, and in a different manner through the following verse, one discussing the broadening of a believer's heart:

And whomsoever it is Allah's will to guide, **He expandeth his bosom unto the Surrender**, and whomsoever it is His Will to send astray, He maketh his bosom close and narrow as if he were engaged in sheer ascent. Thus Allah layeth ignominy upon those who believe not. (Quran

The expansion of the breast, at least per the Quran, is thus also one of an abject psychological enslavement to the Asura and his Islamic doctrine, to the Lord of Falsehood who captured Mohammed in an intermediate stage of the latter's occult practice. The sufis, to the contrary, assert this expansion to consist of an inner light, using for justification a Sahih Muslim hadith:

Abdullah b. Shaqiq reported: I said to Abu Dharr: "Had I seen the Messenger of Allah, I would have asked him." He (Abu Dharr) said: "What is that thing that you wanted to inquire of him?" He said: "I wanted to ask him whether he had seen his Lord." **Abu Dharr said: "I, in fact, inquired of him, and he replied: 'I saw Light.'**" (Sahih Muslim Book 001, Number 0342)

Mohammed's reported vision of light was certainly – due to his psychology and from what we will review of hadith and sufic examples – from the "heart" or Vital region, because the occult Vital worlds *do* have a unique type of light, including a light that can actually be seen by the *ordinary* eye, often confusing mortals into believing that they have witnessed something 'Divine', when in fact the Divine or Psychic lights are only visible to the inner eye. And if visions of light are certainly possible in the higher mental regions along with the Vital and Psychic regions, the crucial point is that these intermediate zones are the fields of much diversity, including that of light. Of them, the Vital, as it encompasses the "heart", is most vulnerable to the schemes of non-Psychic, non-Divine, Vital emanations who reside in that world, which we recall to be – after the physical - the lowest level of consciousness of the linear model, the second most superficial of the concentric. Indeed the very fact that the sufis – and Mohammed, as a hadith will describe – had experiences that they located to the heart, *in combination* with their rejection of a Conscious-Union or Identification with either the Purusha or the transcendental God, indicates that their experiences of light were often likely the result of a distorted projection - a false light from an Asura of the Vital world, instead of a luminous emanation from the Psychic world.

Indeed, though the Vital region can *also* be a pathway to that Psychic world and the Purusha deep within, it is a far-reaching, extraordinarily vast domain, containing within it multiple intermediate zones and beings, including the Asuras and other hostiles. Therefore any entry into the Vital will bring with it precisely that feeling of vastness, a wideness that while greater than the ordinary world, can for an individual with either a poorly evolved ego or a lack of *Psychic* (we are now discussing the concentric model containing the Vital, Psychic and Purusha) Discrimination or Intuition, lead to the delusional vanity equating this expansion with reaching the Divine truth. Hence Mohammed, who like Hitler was a fantastic Asuric medium, could believe the "expansion" of his heart – one that he *experienced* – to be a signal of the 'Divine truth' he was to convey to mankind. At least the Prophet, in a rare example of discrimination, did not – as we will unquestionably see - equate his vision of light with that of Allah; in that distinction he distinguished himself from the sufis, even if it is ultimately inconsequential, since Mohammed already believed the Asuric revelations to be the word of 'God'. Nevertheless, for the matter of Sufism's assertion of an Islamic identity, it helps to once more expose a blasphemy, because the fact of Mohammed envisioning - per the hadith - light, *does not* grant the sufis the right to that same experience, because the Quran fails to provide permission for ensuing Muslims to obtain such experiences, including the "suns" witnessed by the sufis after they enter "non-existence":

They have lifted up their heads again from non-existence,
saying, "Behold us if thou art not blind from birth,"
**That you may know that in non-existence there are suns, and
that what is a sun here is (only) a small star yonder.**
How, O brother, is existence (contained) in non-existence?
How is opposite concealed in opposite?
He brings forth the living from the dead: know that the hope

of (His) worshippers is non-existence

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book V, 1016-19)

This particular experience of Rumi and other sufis is for once a substantial sign that some of these mystics were capable – if only they *believed* in it – of obtaining the Self-Realization experienced by the Yogi and Rishi and Sadhu. But as they only believed in a diluted unity, as they consciously rejected the premise of *hulul*, they inevitably mistook the inner suns they witnessed for the *totality* of mystic experience, when in fact these suns – as the Upanishads long ago told us – are just the beginning:

Fog, smoke, **the sun**, wind, fireflies, lightening, crystal moon; these are the images that **appear as manifestations of Brahman in the beginning stages of the Yoga**. (Svetasvatara Upanishad 2:11)

The appearance of the sun, in the subtle inner and higher regions, is a perfect example of the varied quality and meaning to internal experiences, for there are multiple types of suns that can be seen, some indicating the Satchitananda Light, others a type of light relative to the plane it is witnessed in. Even the colour of the highest light is varied, including – to name a few - the golden sun, the white sun, and a red sun (the latter corresponding to the truest form of the physical consciousness); and of course there is a vast array of subtle light in general, from the white, gold and bluish hues of the higher cosmic regions and even the Satchitananda, to the pinkish light of the Psychic. The higher or Psychic lights are both meant to symbolize their origin by the appearance, *and* to engage in the subtle transformation of the adhar. For that is why the Upanishads informed of the sun and other similar spiritual experiences as belonging to the “beginning stages”, because they have arrived as not only markers of progress, but actual powers – often the sign of the Gods and Goddesses working, if it is not the transcendental Light of Brahma - that help to transform the triple-sheath, *preparing* the foundation for the Greatest of all experiences.

That certain sufis have mystic experience of the suns helps to distinguish the heretical sect from Islam, because the “light” that Mohammed is recorded as seeing can only have been Asuric. For otherwise humanity would have been presented with a decidedly different Islamic religion, one transformed in accordance to the very nature of a Psychic or higher light – such lights would have changed Mohammed's response to his interaction with the Asura of Falsehood, and would – by their transformative quality - have given him pause to his depraved actions of genocide and rape and propagation of hatred and violence. That his nature did not metamorphose for the better, that he never questioned the character of Gabriel's message, is evidence of the false Asuric projection of an unsubstantial and impotent light Mohammed saw betwixt the Lord of Falsehood's visits. This is the occult “light”, we recall, that can so deceive the poorly evolved mortal whose ego is unable to calmly receive or discern the vast energy and force and – especially - ‘wisdom’ that arrives with the Asura, from the actual Truth and Light of Brahma that the Asura of Falsehood obstinately covers.

To open oneself into the broad inner regions is usually done by the sadhak through a discipline utilizing meditation and consecration, practices that can involve the channels of different earthly – sublimated - senses than simply the ocular function (and its perception of light) that is frequently used in meditation. In accordance with this, the use of audition is beneficial in opening the mystic to the inner fields, a helpful means by which an intense concentration can take place, one that in the Hindu mystic paths can include listening to the recitation of scripture, the Immortal AUM, and the multiple names of God. It is a Polytheistic nature that is similarly conspicuous to Sufism's *sama* rituals, the heretical sect's famous group activities involving singing, music and dancing – all designed to more intensely engage in *zikr*, the devotional remembrance of Allah that they practice in order to reach their diluted unity and the associated marifat experiences. Indeed befitting this Polytheistic element, Sufism in the Indian subcontinent has, since the thirteenth century, blatantly incorporated Hindu songs within their *sama* rituals:

From the thirteenth century onward **Hindu mystical songs were recited at sama gatherings and many of the most talented musicians were newly converted Muslims...**The recitation of Hindawi music at *sama* was popular at all sufi centres...An object could assume hundreds of different forms and be known by the same number of names but this did not alter the fact that they all emanated from One. Although earlier sufis had expressed this idea in many different ways in both Persian poetry and prose, **the latter use of Hindawi in further explanations of this concept was most probably a significant factor in the arousal of Hindu interest in Sufism.** (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, pp. 326-27)

As one can observe in Rizvi's account, the Hindu influence on Sufism, a sect which claims to be Islamic, went beyond the mere idea of multiple names of God – or at least it did in the subcontinent, where we observe the outright use of Hindu songs during “Muslim” sufi rituals, with the former's poetry and *bhajans* historically always containing the invocation of multiple deities not named Allah. The use, by the sufi orders, of these Hindu songs is but further confirmation of their blasphemous ideology, a transgression that has long been the topic of furious orthodox revilement, which the sufis have often countered with the most specious of logic:

The popularity of Vaishnavite themes used in sufi sama rituals of Hindi speaking regions is a most remarkable development. The sufis regarded them as welcome additions to their devotional poetry to induce ecstasy. In 1566 Mir Abdul-Wahid Bilgarami compiled a Persian dictionary of Hindi songs which had been well-known to sufis giving prominence to those known by Vaishnavites...**The Mir justifies the popularity of the names of kafirs used in sufi sama on the grounds that the Quran itself uses the names of both kafirs and enemies.** (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 359)

The Quran, of course, identifies the name of the kuffar and enemies in order that the Muslim can be informed of whom they are to ‘legally’ murder in jihad – or at least the set of people that will find themselves engulfed in the flames of hell. The names of the kuffar – including the Gods invoked through Hindu songs - are not intended to be used in a positive religious manner by Islam, with the potential invocation of *Hindu* deities in sama rituals explicitly rejected by the Quran, as it is a crime without “proof”, which will certainly lead the sufis to a terrible fate even though they believe it helps them attain marifat experiences:

So exalted be Allah, the True King. No god is there but He, the Lord of the honourable dominion. **And whoever invokes with Allah another god-- he has no proof of this - his reckoning is only with his Lord. Surely the unbelievers shall not be successful.** (Quran 23:116-117)

That the orthodox did not brush aside the laughable logic offered by sufis to account for their Polytheistic practices, and conversely engage in a persecutory missive using Quran verses like the above for support, is due to the facts raised in the first Rizvi selection on sama. For even with the heretical use of *Hindu*, *Polytheistic* songs by the sufis, they were at least obtaining Hindu converts, with most of the musicians identified as recently converted Hindus. The orthodox of the time, faced with a situation of vast numerical inferiority, knew that they needed to at least bring some of the populace into the Islamic fold by way of a half-conversion (recall Khilji's pardon of “half Hindu” Muslims from the genocide he handed out to self-identified Hindus), with the half-Muslims perhaps later transformed into full-blooded jihadis – or at least their children might be raised in a genuinely Islamic fashion. This was the calculated gambit of the pious of the medieval subcontinent, as even the genocidal activities of the Muslim rulers in that dark age, had not been enough to gain a substantial percentage of the population for Islam.

That this increase in total population has only come about through the Muslim reproductive jihad of

later times, does not negate the continued benefit, to the orthodox (but only in regions where the Hindu population is large), of Sufism and its use of religious devotional music that incorporates Hindu themes. What better way, after all, to convert the Hindu than to pretend that Islam is Sufism, and that Sufism is just another version of Hinduism? With the sufi music so heavily developed by Hindu themes and culture, the sufis – and the orthodox who tolerate the presence of such heretics – can continue to conjure up converts – from Hinduism - under false premises. Or if not obtaining a significant amount of converts, they can at least promote the illusion of a “tolerant” Islam, a myth that reduces Hindu alertness to the Asuric danger of the religion, weakening their resistance. That the sufis are themselves apostates from Islam is irrelevant when Islam is overall a minority in a particular nation, because the deceptive nature of these ‘saints’ is helpful in allowing for the growth of the real Asuric Islam within Infidel lands.

Also insignificant to the most pious of Muslims, the ones most faithful to Asuric falsehood, are the sufi arguments justifying their polytheistic sama rituals, with the latter's incorrect rationale simply channelled (rather than granted any sort of respect), in certain circumstances, to the non-Muslims alone for the purpose of taqiyah. For if the disputations of subcontinental sufis in defence of sama are quickly dismissed on the grounds of *shirk* due to the use of songs that invoke multiple names of God besides Allah, the rituals can also, irrespective of the Hindu or Polytheist element, be easily rejected on the grounds of different tenets from the austere Islamic scripture. The orthodox can display, in one of the most robust passages of evidence, the previously cited hadith disparaging the use of musical instruments as a lawful activity:

Narrated Abu Amir or Abu Malik Al-Ash'ari:

That he heard the Prophet saying, “**From among my followers there will be some people who will consider illegal sexual intercourse, the wearing of silk, the drinking of alcoholic drinks and the use of musical instruments, as lawful.** And there will be some people who will stay near the side of a mountain and in the evening their shepherd will come to them with their sheep and ask them for something, but they will say to him, ‘Return to us tomorrow.’ Allah will destroy them during the night and will let the mountain fall on them, and He will transform the rest of them into monkeys and pigs and they will remain so till the Day of Resurrection.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 7, Book 69, Number 494)

Another hadith - this one, while from the lesser Sunan Ibn Majah, is nevertheless considered a good hadith – presents a similar tradition, with the same Abu Malik Ash'ari reporting Mohammed as having said, “People among my nation will drink wine, calling it by another name, and musical instruments will be played for them and singing girls (will sing for them). Allah will cause the earth to swallow them up, and will turn them into monkeys and pigs.” (Sunan Ibn Majah Volume 5, Book 36, Hadith 4020) These two selections in particular should have been internalized by the medieval sufis, the founders of the orders which continue to kidnap countless “Muslims” from the strict Asuric path of actual Islam. Instead, we find the likes of Amir Khusraw, famed sufi and biographer of multiple genocidal stalwarts of – mostly - pious Islam, engaging in the religious innovation of music, with Khusraw believed to have *invented* the sitar:

It is believed that Khusraw invented the musical instrument, the sitar, and several melodies for it by a mixture of Persian and Indian tunes. Popular Indian melodies such as Qawl are undoubtedly the invention of Amir Khusraw. **They were designed to produce novelty in sufi sama rituals, in which he himself participated.** (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 172)

Indeed Khusraw took the concept of bidat to the physical-material plane, not only disobeying the Prophet's declaration on the illegality of musical instruments, but actually creating his own. Similarly

did he – as do all sufis indulging in the heresy – violate the Prophet's recorded actions when daring to take part in sama rituals, because there is no Islamic documentation of the Prophet – either prior to his occult correspondence with Gabriel, during those meetings, or afterwards with his companions – participating in gatherings that incorporated music, singing and dancing. The best the sufis can hope for in defence of their ‘crime’ is a solitary hadith in which Mohammed grudgingly permitted the singing of others:

Narrated Aisha:

That once Abu Bakr came to her on the day of Id-ul-Fitr or Id ul Adha while the Prophet was with her and there were two girl singers with her, singing songs of the Ansar about the day of Buath. Abu Bakr said twice. “Musical instrument of Satan!” But the Prophet said, “Leave them Abu Bakr, for every nation has an Id (i.e. festival) and this day is our Id.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 5, Book 58, Hadith 268)

Notice, however, that Mohammed did not contradict Abu Bakr's declaration of Satan's liaison with the act of singing; neither was there any mention here of music – only *singing* is documented, and there is no record of musical instruments - itself, a subtle but important distinction that makes Khusraw's invention of the sitar even more isolated from actual Islam. Nevertheless, the sufikuffar persist to this day with their use of music, because they believe it capable of opening up the regions of marifat ecstasy to them, fields that they – as we have already shown – believe superior to the shariat. This belief of theirs is also why many of them, including Gisu Daraz (whom we recall was stridently opposed to *Wahdat al-Wujud*), specifically incorporate Hindu poetry within their sama rituals:

The Haqa’iq-i Hindi by Abdu’l-Wahid (d. 1608) of Bilgram (near Lucknow) was intended to crush orthodox opposition to the use of **Vaishnavite** themes in the Hindi poetry recited by the Chishtiyya sufis to arouse ecstasy. **To Gisu Daraz, Hindi poetry was more subtle and elegant and transported the sufis to higher planes of mystical ecstasy than Persian verses did** (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The Wonder that was India*, Volume II, p. 258)

This is not to say that the sufis entirely neglect Islam during their blasphemous rituals; it is just that they promote different religions, and bidats, to an equal place with Islam, including mixing the Quran verses with music, as seen in the example of Nizamuddin Auliya:

I obtained the honour of kissing the master's feet. He began to speak about reciting the Qur’an and the deeper perception of Truth that comes from reading and and chanting it. From his blessed lips came the statement: “When the reader of the Qur’an experiences a taste (for God) and derives a sense of peace from a particular verse, he should keep repeating that verse and prolong the sense of peace.

“In the practice of Quran recitation and listening (to music),” he went on, **“the devotee experiences a sense of spiritual bliss** which may be manifest as celestial lights, mystical states, and physical effects. Each of these three derives from three worlds: the present world, the angelic sphere, and the potential realm, this last being intermediate between the first two. And these three manifestations of spiritual bliss may occur in one of three places: the spirits, the hearts, or the bodily limbs. At first celestial lights descend from the angelic sphere on the spirits, then mystical states descend from the potential realm on the hearts, and finally physical effects from the present world alight on the bodily limbs. **In other words, during the state induced by listening to music, celestial lights descend from the angelic sphere upon the spirits.** What subsequently appear in the heart are called mystical states, because it is from the potential realm that they descend on the hearts. **Next, crying, movement, and agitation appear, and they are called physical effects** because they alight from the present world on the bodily limbs. Praise be to God, the Lord of the universe.” (*Fawa'id ul-Fauid, The conversations*

This example brings up the fact – because of the incessant emphasis on the Quran verses observed - that irrespective of how much poetry they write, or devotional music they create, the sufis are extremely unlikely to become truly tolerant or broad-minded – at least with respect to the Hindu. For their use of Hindu poetry is simply designed to benefit the individual sufi's occult aims (rather than any sign of his tolerance of the Hindu population), and is thrown into a heretical mixture that includes the Asuric Islamic scripture which the sufis *fail to comprehensively reject*. The latter doctrine, as we know, desires the murder or subjugation of Hindus, if conversion has not been achieved. That the sufis in turn neglect to follow the other tenets of the Islamic religion while adhering to the anti-Hindu ones, is a different matter, one that can arguably be demonstrated in the topic of music beyond the already cited hadith. For if – unlike the explicit clarity of those hadith – the Quran does not specifically condemn music, there are a couple of passages which are reasonably interpreted by Islamic scholars and Imams as enveloping a harsh critique of music, with one infrarational revelation saying, “Marvel ye then at this statement, And laugh and not weep, **While ye amuse yourselves?** Rather prostrate yourselves before Allah and serve Him.” (Quran 53:59-62) The other one similarly chastises the purchase of idle talk:

And of mankind is he who payeth for mere pastime of discourse, that he may mislead from Allah's way without knowledge, and maketh it the butt of mockery. For such there is a shameful doom. (Quran 31:06)

Music has been interpreted by the scholars and Imams as falling within the confines of “amusement” and “pastime of discourse”, with singing and dancing similarly adjudged to be included. These are frivolities that distract Muslims from the Asura of Falsehood's religion, diverting them from becoming slavish automatons to his message of hatred and violence and destruction. It is why he gave his medium *just* enough ‘Divine words’ to warrant the banishment of music and similar pleasures, for they are capable of introducing – the sufis with their Hindu devotional songs are the perfect example – non-Islamic ideas and beliefs into the ‘true religion’. The Asura, of course, wants to keep the Muslim mentality in a state of permanent division and hatred, in order that he maintains chaos in the world, preventing the ultimate aspiration towards the Supreme Unity of Consciousness in the Multiplicity. And if the believer wants a hedonistic outlet, there remains the Islam-permitted rape of unbelieving sex-slaves, a depraved pleasure that suits the Asura, since it is the result of war and suffering and the perpetuation of division and chaos and falsehood, rather than an inherent and natural enjoyment – potentially from the Psychic - that music can express. Indeed the Islamic prohibition of music is a great example of the religion's original falsehood, because in it's most sublime form – as many sufis, to their credit, understand – music can lead to something higher than the ordinary consciousness (or, if music does not direct the consciousness towards stupendous experiences, it can at least calm the vital turbulence and promote internal peace and other Psychic qualities abhorred by the Asura of Falsehood) – therefore it's illegality in Islam is a direct distortion of reality. This Asuric perversion of wisdom, as one would expect, is found in both the orthodox of actual Muslims and the more pious of sufis, including Sirhindi, who described music and singing in terms of “poison”:

A person with iman should not waste his time [playing musical instruments]. He should not waste his precious life even on unnecessary mubahs. It is certainly necessary not to waste it on the haram. We should not busy ourselves with taghanni, singing or songs. We should not be deceived by the pleasure they give our nafs. These are poisons mixed with honey and covered with sugar. (*The Collected Letters of Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindi*, Volume III, Letter 34)

Sirhindi – unlike with his belief in the Men of the Unseen – was cognizant enough of the actual Islamic

dogma to chastise the sufi heretical practice - which continues to this day – of devotional music, one that many Hindus deem as evidence of *Islam's* similarity to the Sanatana Dharma! The sufis, however, are but one of the many 'Islamic' sects that are in actuality a collection of unbelievers deluded with the self-belief that they are Muslims. In the matter of music, the heresy of the sufis is further exposed by their efforts in rationalizing their treasonous behaviour, with Hujwari attempting to absolve the sama rituals under the premise that the music does not distract the sufis from Allah:

Those who prohibit music do so in order that they may keep the Divine commandment, but theologians are agreed that it is permissible to hear musical instruments if they are not used for diversion, and if the mind is not led to wickedness through hearing them. (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 401)

Hujwari, as hypocrites are capable of doing in furthering their survival, presents a very clever argument in favour of the use of music, because the Quran verses allow for a slight laxity, but only if one can prove that the music being listened to is not for amusement or as a distraction from Allah. That, however, is difficult for the *sufis* to prove, not only because their rituals are guilty of *shirk*, but also because the marifat outcomes are described as bringing with them a joyous experience that is undocumented – in the Quran and authentic hadith – as granted to Muslims; nor is ecstasy communicated as a specific aspect of Allah's that can be 'united' with. Therefore it can easily be argued that the sufis are diverted, while indulging the sama rituals, from the true fidelity to Allah. Hujwari also deliberately ignored the tradition of Mohammed, the one undoubtedly banning musical instruments, in his thesis, a 'crime' similar to his own implicit admission that he was – unlike the proper Muslims who actually outlaw music – straying from a 'Divine' commandment. It is a violation, this act of enjoying music (which falls under the domain of "worldly increase"), that Hujwari and other sufis will certainly be held accountable for on Judgement Day:

Rivalry in **worldly increase** distracteth you, Until ye come to the graves. Nay, but ye will come to know! Nay, but ye will come to know! Nay, would that ye knew (now) with a sure knowledge! **For ye will behold hell-fire.** Aye, ye will behold it with sure vision. **Then, on that day, ye will be asked concerning pleasure.** (Quran 102:01-08)

Additionally will the sufis – at least according the actual Islamic religion's inversion of Truth – find themselves interrogated, on that fateful day, for the inner experiences that the sama rituals help bring about; experiences that include auditions received by the inner, non-corporeal ear beyond the realm of the ordinary physical-vital hearing. Among these inner occult auditions is the aforementioned hearing of the bell, which the sufi Abdul-Quddus associated with the highest of mystic experiences. While he was, as we discussed, certainly in error to describe the intermediary – though excellent – nature of the mystic inner audition of a bell as an ultimate state, he was also guilty - from the Islamic perspective - of straying toward the enemy's ruler by his exaltation of the experience:

Abu Huraira reported Allah's Messenger as saying: **"The bell is the musical instrument of the Satan."** (Sahih Muslim Book 24, Hadith 5279)

If the physical bell is the instrument of Satan, then any inner experience or dream of it should be – to the genuine Muslim – a sign of Satan's presence, perhaps an indicator that the particular Muslim has done something wrong. It is but another deliberate distortion of the Asura, to take something that can actually have tremendous spiritual significance (the bell, we recall, is a symbol indicating the progressive opening of the inner consciousness), and invert it into falsehood, a pattern that brings to mind the Nazi mutilation of the Swastika. But the Lord of Falsehood knows that he must twist the meaning of inner visions and auditions, even at the risk of causing confusion, for we recall that Mohammed himself initially heard bells when receiving the Asuric revelations. Indeed in that very example we find another purpose for the Asura's damnation of the bell, for by denouncing this potential

experience of the mystic, the Asura of Falsehood has found another means by which to try and prevent further mysticism – which can bring superior truths to the infrarational mysticism of Islam - by linking the bell as a positive experience for Mohammed, yet a ‘Satanic’ audition for anyone else. The distortion of meaning to occult sights and sounds is crucial, because the flowering of these two domains is a sign that the individual is close to the Self or the Soul, either of whose obstruction is the cardinal ambition of the Asura of Falsehood (with regards to humans). These experiences, often of the Intuitive Mind (the peak of the actual mental region, as the level of the Gods is considered Overmind), include the domain of inspiration, something that is often associated with the inner hearing, as Rumi poetically informs:

So that thou mayst understand those riddles of His, so
that thou mayst apprehend (both) the secret sign and the open.

Then the spiritual ear becomes the place where *wahy* (inspiration) descends. What is *wahy*? A speech hidden from sense-perception.

The spiritual ear and eye are other than this sense-perception,
the ear of (discursive) reason and the ear of opinion are
destitute of this (inspiration).

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book I, 1460-62)

Indeed, the inner eye is often related to experiences of light and visions; the inner ear associated with auditions and inspiration; and both domains can receive the element of revelation. Of course, there is always the complication of whether these experiences are genuinely of the Intuitive Mind, or if they are an usurpation from the Vital world and its Asuras, Rakshasas and Pishachas, who might present – especially in the case of the devious Asura of Falsehood - to the mystic in the appearance or voice of God. It is the latter ‘voice’ of God – whether or not it really is God is irrelevant to the orthodox, because Islam only cares about its authentic scripture rather than sufi mystic experiences – that the sufis have historically taken for inspiration, proof that Allah is speaking directly to them, evidence that their path is the correct one. For past examples of these outrageous – at least for individuals self-identifying as Muslim – assertions, Hujwiri's principal work is a great resource, documenting historical examples of multiple sufi ‘saints’, including Junayd, having heard the voice of Allah:

Jafar relates that he went to Junayd and found him suffering from a fever. “O Master,” he cried, “tell God in order that He may restore thee to health.” **Junayd said: “Last night I was about to tell Him, but a voice whispered in my heart, ‘Thy body belongs to Me: I keep it well or ill, as I please. Who art thou, that thou shouldst interfere with My property.’”** (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 157)

This, at least from the Islamic perspective, is of course nonsense, because Allah has severely restricted the domain of the “Unseen”, of which his voice certainly belongs, from all believers subsequent to Mohammed. Such inspiration is thus forbidden to those posthumous to the final prophet; it is an illegality more provocative when we remember that Mohammed himself, the greatest of all Muslims, is only once authentically documented as having heard the voice of Allah – it was Gabriel who instead spoke to the slavish medium, from whom *all* of the infrarational revelations were occultly voiced. But Hujwiri completely ignored authentic Islamic scripture on the matter of the Unseen (of which there are more to be displayed), both failing to criticize the stories he presented, and in turn providing this heresy with additional glory through his recollection of other examples such as the sufi Ali Rudbari:

Abu Ali Rudbari was for some time afflicted with distracting thoughts in purification. “One day,” he said, “I went into the sea at dawn and stayed there till sunrise. During that interval my mind was troubled. I cried out: ‘O God, restore me to spiritual health!’ **A voice answered from the sea: ‘Health consists in knowledge.’”** (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 293)

In further corroboration of Sufism's perpetual blasphemy, the sufi Shibli is recorded as having heard the voice of Allah at the entrance to a mosque:

One day Shibli purified himself. When he came to the door of the mosque a voice whispered in his heart: "Art thou so pure that thou enterest My house with this boldness?" He turned back, but the voice asked: "Dost thou turn back from My door? Whither wilt thou go?" He uttered a loud cry. The voice said: "Dost thou revile me?" He stood silent. The voice said: "Dost thou pretend to endure My affliction?" **Shibli exclaimed: "O God, I implore Thee to help me against Thyself."** (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 294)

Hujwiri even accredited such receptive capacity to ordinary mortals, with "a certain man" granted the tremendous boon of hearing the voice of Allah:

A certain man, having repented of sin, returned to it and then repented once more. "How will it be," he said, "if I now turn to God?" **A heavenly voice answered, saying: "Thou didst obey Me and I recompensed thee, then thou didst abandon Me and I showed indulgence towards thee; and if thou wilt return to Me, I will receive thee."** (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 298)

That Hujwiri, unlike with his censure of the hululis, failed to chastise these heretics, is further example of his teeming apostasy, one that he shares with the majority of sufi mystics, who usually fall within the range of moderate – which in itself is enough to confirm their status as kuffar – blasphemy. Included in this category is the great poet Rumi, who similarly exalted the capacity for sufis to hear the voice of Allah, devoting a lengthy portion of his Mathnawi to the story of the sufi Muhammad Sar-razi of Ghazna, who eventually came to hear the voice of Allah:

In Ghazna there was an ascetic, abounding in knowledge (of divinity): his name was Muhammad and his title Sar-razi.
....his object was (to behold) the beauty of the King.

That man who was surfeited with himself went to the top of a mountain and said, "Appear, or I will fall (throw myself) to the bottom."

He (God) said, "The time for that favour is not (yet) come, and if thou fall down, thou wilt not die: I will not kill thee."

He, from love (of God), threw himself down: he fell into the depths of a (piece of) water.

When he (found that he) was not dead, on account of the shock (of disappointment) that man who was sick of life made lament over himself for having been parted from death; For this (present) life seemed to him like a (state of) death: in his view the thing had become reversed.

He was begging death (as a gift) from the Unseen, he was crying, "Verily, my life is in my death."

He had embraced death as (other people embrace) life, he had become in full accord with the destruction of his life...

A Voice came (to his ear), "Go from the desert to the city" - a wondrous Voice transcending the occult and the manifest.

He cried, "O Thou that knowest my secret, hair by hair, tell me, what service am I to do in the city?"

It (the Voice) said, "The service is this, that for the

purpose of self abasement thou shouldst make thyself (like)
Abbas (the seller) of date-syrup.
For a while take money from the rich and then deliver it to the
lowly poor.

This is the service thou must do for some time.” He replied,
“To hear is to obey, O Thou who art my soul's refuge.”

**Many questions and answers and much conversation passed
between the ascetic and the Lord of mankind,**

Whereby earth and heaven were filled with (spiritual) light:
all that is recorded in the *Maqalat*.

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book V, 2667-2684)

While this sufi's direct communication with “Allah” is unquestionably a violation of the Quran injunctions related to Unseen experiences, Rumi's recollection is notable for the unbefitting – as far as mystic paths – theatrics of Sar-razi's ultimatum, because God does not prefer His creation – especially the sadhak – to consciously take his own life. Indeed this is the precise opposite of what God prefers (the reason it is only a preference is because all mortals have the capacity for choice, and thus God will only provide an *influence* of varying strength to the Unrealized mortal), because God knows that each individual, by virtue of their Purusha deep within, is a potential adhar for Himself. But for that adhar to be an appropriate vessel of the Supreme, it must be psychologically stable, full of peace and inherent equality, untroubled by the vicissitudes of thought and emotions, the steady receptacle for a Supramental transformation. The impetus to suicide, which is the manifestation of internal unsteadiness, is a technique used by hostile Vital emanations to either derive perverse pleasure in the self-destruction, or to obtain fidelity from the particular spiritual seeker by “saving them” from the suicide, perhaps by way of an occult directive. This pattern, seen in the example of Mohammed who indulged a similar melodrama, and in Hitler who went through with his Asura-instructed self-demise, was certainly possible with Sar-razi, especially when we consider elements presented in Rumi's continuation of the story, even if the details indicate a lesser vital entity than an Asura:

For two years that man of (high spiritual) accomplishment
carried on this business (of begging); **after that (time) the
command came to him from the Creator -**

**“Henceforth continue to give, but do not beg from any one:
We from the Unseen World have bestowed on thee this
power.**

**Whoever begs of thee (any amount), from one (piece of
money) to a thousand, put thy hand beneath a (certain) mat
and produce (what he wants).**

Hark, give (it) from the incalculable treasure of (Divine)
mercy: in thy hand earth will become gold: give (it)!
Give whatsoever they ask of thee: have no anxiety as to
that: know that the bounty of God is more than (every) more.

In Our bounty there is no retrenchment or reduction; no
sorrow or regret for (having shown) this generosity.
Put thy hand beneath the mat, O trusted man, in order to
blindfold (deceive) the evil eye.

Fill thy fist, therefore, from beneath the mat and give (the
money) into the hand of the beggar whose back is broken (by
poverty).

Henceforth give from the wage that is not grudged: give the

hidden pearl to every one who desires (it).

Go, be thou (what is signified by) *the Hand of God is above their hands*: do thou, like the Hand of God, scatter the daily bread recklessly.

Release those in debt from their responsibility: like rain, make the carpet of the world green.”

During another year this was his work, that he was always giving gold from the purse of the Lord of the Judgement

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book V, 2786-2797)

Instead of the most glorious of experiences, that of Self-Realization and the relinquishment of the limited personal will, Sar-razi was instead the recipient of an aggrandizement of his *own* power and esteem, now capable of materializing money out of thin air (or, if we are to read this allegorically, dispense *personal* ‘spiritual’ power). Neither personal power yields a progressive elevation or deepening of the consciousness towards the Self or Purusha (the sufis do not believe that to be possible); both simply result in an enlargement of vital power accompanied by the vanity of becoming a dispenser of charity (or allegorically by dispensing a spiritual type of force). Indeed philanthropy has historically been a domain of mortal activity frequently infiltrated by the Asura or other vital entities due to its association with narcissism and unbalanced authority between the donor and beneficiary. But this inability of the sufis to discriminate between the actual higher (and inner) regions from the Vital usurpations, is unsurprising, for neither they nor their pirs are actual Gurus, and from the outset they deny the possibility of Conscious Unity or Identification with the Soul or Self. And if they obstruct themselves from the reality of the Yogin on the one hand, on the other they incessantly deviate from the actual message of Islam, with Rumi going as far as to assign mystic inspiration to Umar, an important companion of the Prophet and the second Caliph of Islam:

Then God sent such a drowsiness upon Umar that he was unable to keep himself from slumber.

He fell into amazement saying, “This is (a thing) unknown. This has fallen from the Unseen, tis not without purpose.”

He laid his head down, and slumber overtook him. **He dreamed that a voice came to him from God: his spirit heard That voice which is the origin of every cry and sound: that indeed is the (only) voice, and the rest are echoes.**

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book I, 2104-07)

If there is any doubt that Rumi is referring to the historic Caliph Umar, it is removed later in the same book, with a subsequent stanza on Umar – one that again presents him as the recipient of Allah's voice – preceded by an identification of him as the Commander of the faithful. Accordingly, the couplets mention *Allah* as directly instructing Umar to remove money from the “public treasury”:

The voice (of God) came to Umar, saying, “O Umar, redeem Our servant from want.

We have a servant, a favourite and highly esteemed one: take the trouble to go on foot to the graveyard.

O Umar, spring up and put in thy hand full seven hundred dinars from the public treasury.

Carry them to him (and say), ‘O thou who art Our choice, accept this sum now and excuse (Us for offering such a small gift).

Spend this amount on the price (purchase) of silk: when it is spent, come here (again).’ ”

Then Umar in awe of that voice sprang up that he might gird his loins for this service.

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book I, 2162-67)

As one might expect, there is no authentic tradition of Umar, the historic Global Imam of Islam, having heard the voice of Allah within his lifetime, although there is non-authentic folklore that a voice – not attributed to Allah – from Mount Arafat warned him of his impending assassination. That there is no assertion of supernatural audition beyond this folklore is absolutely consistent with Islam, for why would the trusted Umar, the second Caliph and known companion of Mohammed, dare claim special insight into the Unseen, when he already knew that the Quran had already rejected the possibility of anyone after Mohammed to have the capacity to access the Unseen? After all, Umar, the second commander of the faithful, tasked with continuing the Asuric mission of Islam, would have memorized all of the Quran verses (the Hadith were to be compiled after his time), especially the ones previously cited regarding the Unseen. Similarly would he have known of certain infrarational revelations denying post-Mohammed believers *specific* aspects of the Unseen, including an outright rejection of mystic inspiration:

Who is guilty of more wrong than he who forgeth a lie against Allah, or saith: “I am inspired”, when he is not inspired in aught; and who saith: “I will reveal the like of that which Allah hath revealed?” If thou couldst see, when the wrong-doers reach the pangs of death and the angels stretch their hands out (saying): “Deliver up your souls. **This day ye are awarded doom of degradation for that ye spake concerning Allah other than the truth**, and used to scorn His portents.” (Quran 6:93)

As the verse makes abundantly clear, nobody else during the Prophet's lifetime, nor anyone afterwards, is to be capable of receiving occult inspiration or revelation, with one hadith supplementing this Islamic ‘knowledge’ with Ali's confirmation that “Divine Inspiration” does not exist in any book other than the Quran:

Narrated Abu Juhaifa:

I asked Ali, “Do you have the knowledge of any Divine Inspiration besides what is in Allah's Book?” Ali replied, “No, by Him Who splits the grain of corn and creates the soul. I don't think we have such knowledge, but we have the ability of understanding which Allah may endow a person with, so that he may understand the Qur'an, and we have what is written in this paper as well.” I asked, “What is written in this paper?” He replied, “(The regulations of) blood-money, the freeing of captives, and the judgement that no Muslim should be killed for killing an infidel.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 52, Number 283)

Thus the sufis, by way of their persistent claims of inspiration, of hearing the voice of God, of having a unique connection to Allah forbidden to Muslims, are unquestionably violating commandments that specifically contravene their assertions. They are not, if they truly desire to be known as Muslims, to either seek or allege – since Islam, as we readily observe in its infrarational scripture, denies the veracity of Sufism's experiences, calling them “other than the truth” - inspirations, intuitions, revelations or any other component potentially of the Intuitive Mind (but with the sufis, usually of the Vital), for that is restricted territory. Yet the sufis constantly speak of these sort of experiences, daring to proclaim themselves the rare breed of mankind capable of receiving Allah's inspiration, with the sufi Baba Farid, in one example, directly “inspired” by God in the selection of some of his successors:

Later authorities give a long list of the khalifas of Baba Farid, but Amir Khwurd lists only seven. According to Baba himself, the khalifas were chosen in three different ways. The most

outstanding were those **whom God inspired the Shaikh to select. These were the Rahmani khalifas.** (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 150)

A later sufi, the aforementioned Shah Waliullah, who as we know demanded the humiliation and subjugation of the Hindu kuffar, nevertheless violated Islam by claiming “Divine inspiration” to be possible for Muslims born after the life of Mohammed:

To the descendants of leading Sufis, Shah Waliullah posed the question why they had splintered into various groups, each directed along a different path. **He believed these sufis had abandoned God's way and that of the Prophet Muhammad, and that they had assumed instead their own leadership, thereby challenging God's...** Ecstatic utterances, said the Shah, came from those who were not engrossed in the Divine; rather people should learn *ihsan* **in order to receive Divine inspiration.** (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume II, pp. 385-86)

If these sufis were not punished for their openly admitted apostasy, it was only a matter of circumstance, for the hammer of orthodoxy has, under the right circumstances, found the appropriate victims. In the notorious example of Dara-Shukoh, eldest son of Mughal Emperor Shah Jahan, we find a champion of Sufism's multiple heresies, including a belief that the Prophet's companions were the equivalent of *murids*, and that “Divine inspiration” was possible for the Muslim born after Mohammed:

Divine inspiration, said Dara-Shukoh, led him to complete the *Risala-i Haqq-numa* in the following year (1646-47). In this work he asserted that the form of Sufism he outlined was patterned on the daily religious life of the Prophet. **In Muhammad's time, he wrote, disciples were not called *murid* but *yars* (companions or sahaba)** and in his *Risala* he also had chosen to use this term. (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume II, p. 135)

His execution, while officially for the crime of apostasy, is reasonably viewed as an act undertaken for political motives, since his brother Aurangzeb and he were fighting each other for the right to assume the throne of their father. Defeated by Aurangzeb in the Battle of Samugarh, Dara-Shukoh was eventually captured and then assassinated under the banner of apostasy, a charge that if certainly convenient, was nevertheless *accurate*. For the real Muslim knows that the infrarational word of the Quran is unchangeable, and must be followed in its entirety; thus to disobey a particular verse that *forbids* the claims of inspiration by mortals subsequent to Mohammed (or to forge a lie against Allah's Prophet by alleging his involvement in the bidat of tariqa), is to expose oneself as an apostate. That his execution was politically motivated is irrelevant, because as we know, the majority of Sufism's followers can legally be killed for their apostasy – it is only the matter of practicality that determines whom the pious Muslims will murder: and as his brother Aurangzeb was better suited to bring actual Islam to the subcontinent, the execution of Dara-Shukoh was expedient, even if his heresy of “Divine inspiration” was shared by countless other sufis, such as Hujwiri, who escaped the appropriate penalty:

Now, when God causes anyone to attain perfect sincerity and exalts him to the rank of fixity he waits for Divine inspiration, that it may guide him. (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 71)

Hujwiri even assigned Divine inspiration to minor daily matters, including customs associated with greetings:

When we arrived at Tus I attended his (Abu Said Muhammad al-Mayhani) meeting and asked him to tell me the difference between suggestions of the Devil and Divine inspiration. He answered: **“It was a Divine inspiration that urged you to tear your futa into two pieces for the sake of warming my feet; and it was a diabolic suggestion that hindered you from doing so.”** (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson,

1936, p. 166)

The obsessive – and thus questionable – nature of these inspirations, where even minor acts raise the spectre of Satan, was likewise hinted at by Rumi, who wrote, “Just as both (Satanic) suggestion and Divine inspiration are intelligible, and yet there is a (great) difference (between them).” (*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book III, 3490) To Rumi, Divine inspiration was the remedy for the ordinary human activities: “The common folk of the city do not know the deceit of the fleshly soul and of the body: it (the fleshly soul) is not subdued save by (Divine) inspiration in the heart.” (*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book III, 2560) Although the Quran never advises Muslims to restrain themselves from lust (it instead organizes and canonizes it by way of a ‘Divine’ sanction for sexual slavery and rape of unbelieving women), Rumi and other sufis insist on this premise, for they regard the earthly soul as unworthy of being followed, a dead entity that can only be revived through “God's inspiration”:

This assembly (the world) is well-adapted for fleshly
souls: the grave and shroud are suitable to the dead.
Although the fleshly soul is sagacious and acute, its *qibla*
(objective) is this world, (therefore) regard it as dead.
(But when) the water of God's inspiration has reached this
dead (soul), the living (soul) comes into view (rises) from the
tomb of a corpse.
Until inspiration comes, do not thou (meanwhile) be duped by
that rouge (vanity) of “May his life be long!”
(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book IV, 1655-58)

According to Rumi, the problems of the world can be solved through this inspiration, with the sufi, in one example, capable of acquainting himself with a voice from above:

**He was (engaged) in this (prayer) when inspiration came to
him and these difficulties were solved for him by God,**
Saying, “It (the Divine intimation) told you to put an arrow to
the bow, (but) when were you told to pull the bowstring
(hard)?
It did not tell you to draw the bow hard: it bade you put (the
arrow) to the bow, not ‘shoot with your full strength.’ ...
(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book VI, 2347-49)

This same inspiration was helpful in explaining the curious powers assigned to certain sufis, with Rumi relating the story of Shaykh Aqta, bequeathed by the “Divine” a miraculous gift for basket-weaving, with the “Divine” voice informing him that his powers were granted to him to prevent his followers from lapsing into disbelief:

His name amongst the people came to be Shaykh Aqta...
A visitor found him in his hut...
He (the Shaykh) said to him, “O enemy of thine own life,
thou hast come putting thy head into my hut.
Why hast thou made such hot haste?” He replied, “From
excess of love and longing.”
Then he (the Shaykh) smiled and said, “Now come in, but
keep this (thing) secret, O noble sir.
Till I die, do not tell this to any one, neither to a comrade nor
to a beloved nor to a worthless fellow.”

**Afterwards other folk, (looking) through his window,
became acquainted with his weaving.**

He said, "O Creator, Thou knowest the wisdom (the purpose in this). I conceal (my secret), Thou hast revealed it."

**The Divine inspiration came to him: "There were a number of
people who were beginning to disbelieve in thee in
(consequence of) this affliction,**

Saying, 'Perchance he was a hypocrite in the Way (of God),
so that God made him infamous among humankind.'

**I do not wish that that party should become infidels and in
thinking evil (of thee) fall into perdition;**

**(Hence) We divulged this miracle- (namely), that We
give thee a hand in thy working-time-**

**To the end that these wretched evil-thinking men may not be
turned back from the Lord of Heaven.**

Erstwhile, indeed, without these miracles I was giving thee
consolation from My Person;

This miracle I have given thee for their sake, and on that
account have I bestowed on thee this (spiritual) lamp..."

(The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book III, 1704-18)

From the yogic perspective, this boon of basket-weaving is the domain of some sort of vital power (not necessarily a hostile one); from the point of view of actual Islam, this Rumi passage is also notable for multiple heresies, including the *shirk* that a non-Prophet was so important that failing to have *faith* in him was tantamount to infidelity, and of course the presumption that a non-Imam can ever lead the Muslims, with Aqta's reported "Divine inspiration" only confirming the deviancy of Rumi's recollection. Yet if this particular Shaykh's inspiration was likely from the same vital being that offered him the peculiar gift, it is still possible for sufis to experience the actual inspiration of the Intuitive Mind, because their doctrine at least allows for this potentiality, and because the Intuitive Mind experiences occur beneath the level of the Conscious Union they deny. It is an inspiration that, although marking them closer to the Hindu kuffar their shariat so denounces, is ironically an element that they describe in relation to Islamic terminology, including the Quran's dislike of disputation, which Rumi specified as antithetical to sufic inspiration:

Go, become quit of this foot and this intellect: seek the eye
appertaining to the invisible (the inward eye) and enjoy
(contemplation).

How should one subservient to a preceptor and in pupillage to
a book find, like Moses, light from (his own) bosom?

From this (scholastic) study and this intellect comes
naught but vertigo; therefore leave this study and adopt (in its
stead) expectation.

**Do not seek (spiritual) eminence from disputation: for him
who is expectant (of Divine inspiration) listening is better
than speaking...**

(The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book IV, 3313-16)

Along the same lines, Rumi also wrote, "(Be silent) in order that he may speak whose innermost garment is (Divine) inspiration which lays the dust and does not stir up trouble." *(The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book VI, 2647)* But not only can disputation and the use of

the intellect be helpful to the spiritual life (as long as it is proportional and applied to mystic - rather than mental - activity and experiences) in its own right, the discriminating qualities of the mind can also be sharpened into the finer discrimination of the Intuitive Mind. This quality can then help delineate between the Vital inspirations experienced – yet often called “Divine inspiration” – by the sufis, and the actual sublime inspirations and voices from the Intuitive Mind region or Psychic worlds. Of course we cannot eliminate the possibility that some of the sufi experiences are from these latter regions – it is just that they lack a healthy discrimination between the different types of inspiration and other qualities which in their purest forms are from the Intuitive Mind or Psychic. Indeed to the sufis, most of what they experience as *kashfs* (mysteries) are worthy enough to be deemed from “God”, leaving the sufi fully unveiled to all mysteries:

After much inquiry in (the course of their) travel, a Shaykh
endowed with insight disclosed the mystery,
Not (verbally) by way of the ear, but (silently) by inspiration
...to him (all) mysteries were unveiled.

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book VI, 3787-88)

To the proper Muslim, or at least the orthodox of sufis, none of these mysteries are to be attained by the believer, with Sirhindi not only criticizing this historic practice, but going as far as to pray to Allah for protection from such sufis and similar blasphemous “Muslims”:

Most of the irreligious and blasphemous people of our time do not worship and claim that their hearts have gained safety and that they even have kashfs. In this way, they deceive credulous Muslims. May Allahu ta'ala, as an alms of His beloved Prophet ‘alaihissalatu wassalamu wattahiyya’, protect us all against believing such heretics! Amin. (*The Collected Letters of Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindi*, Volume I, Letter 39)

Among the *kashfs* Sirhindi would have desired protection from, is the function of intuition that has long been understood by mystics as an important sign of progress, with Rumi correctly identifying it in terms of an immediate nature:

Without brain and mind they were full of thought,
without army and battle they gained victory.

That immediate intuition (intuitive knowledge) in relation to them is thought; else, indeed, in relation to those who are far (from God) it is vision.

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book II, 175-176)

Rumi also – intermittently governed as he was by the same intuition that inspired his poetry on Prakriti's evolution – correctly identified a hierarchy whereby the Intuitive Mind elements of vision – which we will shortly discuss – and intuition are placed above the certainty of the illuminative mind, the latter of which he considered greater than ordinary knowledge:

For in the tested Way knowledge is inferior to
certainty, but above opinion.

Know that knowledge is a seeker of certainty, and certainty is
a seeker of vision and intuition.

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book III, 4120-21)

If Rumi's organization of the mental regions – one in which he unfortunately could not, due to his Islamic heritage, aspire toward Conscious-Union with a Supreme transcending the Cosmos – was magnificent in perception, it was nevertheless blasphemous to the Islamic religion he supposedly followed. Indeed, all of the Intuitive Mind qualities are denied to believers born subsequent to the

Prophet, with the aforementioned Quran 6:93, the verse upbraiding those claiming to have Divine inspiration, likewise mocking those who allege themselves the vessel for Allah's revelation. It is an illegality the sufis attempt to circumvent through their habitual desecration – by deliberate misuse - of the Islamic scripture, with certain sufis utilizing a verse that outlines Allah's communication with mortals by way of infrarational revelation:

And it was not (vouchsafed) to any mortal that Allah should speak to him unless (it be) by revelation or from behind a veil, or (that) He sendeth a messenger to reveal what He will by His leave. Lo! He is Exalted, Wise. (Quran 42:51)

If read alone, this infrarational communication can certainly justify the sufic insistence on their revelatory gifts. But the ensuing two verses help confirm that the revelations referenced by this verse are those specific to Mohammed, the messenger of an “inspired book”:

Thus did We reveal to you an inspired book by Our command. You did not know what the Book was, nor (what) the faith (was), but We made it a light, guiding thereby whom We please of Our servants. And most surely you guide men to the right path - The path of Allah, Whose is whatsoever is in the heavens and whatsoever is in the earth. Now surely to Allah do all affairs eventually come. (Quran 42:52-53)

The reality of the passage is therefore one that confirms the finality of Mohammed, the conclusion of ‘Divine’ activity (at least *in the occult domain*, with regards to Allah communicating with a specific human), and the extreme importance of the Quran idol. The above verses were simply Gabriel speaking to Mohammed in the *present* tense of their historic occult interaction, whereby the *previous* – to Mohammed – messengers of Islam are mentioned as having been ‘inspired’ or spoken to from behind a veil from where the infrarational revelations originated. While the tense was present for Mohammed, the verses can only continue to be read as a historic confirmation of Mohammed's termination of prophethood and revelation and inspiration and all other occult necessity, for we have in addition the critical Quran verse of Mohammed's eternal status as the “seal” of Prophets:

Mohammed is not the father of any man among you, but he is the messenger of Allah and the Seal of the Prophets; and Allah is ever Aware of all things. (Quran 33:40)

As Mohammed is the last of the prophets, and as Allah only communicated through such messengers by way of infrarational revelation, it is absolutely impossible – according to the Islamic ‘reality’ - for any other mortal posthumous to Mohammed, including the self-professed sufi ‘saints’, to *ever* receive revelations from Allah. The Quran is all that a Muslim needs; subsequent revelation has been deemed illegal, and thus any proclamations of it represent the signs of a kafir. Yet this is precisely what the sufis assert themselves capable of experiencing, with Rumi describing it in terms of an instrument:

O youth, the Shaykh is he that is without a burden and is like
a bow in the hand (a mere instrument) in receiving (the
command of) God.

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book III, 1789)

But the need for commandments, per Islam, has ceased since the time of Mohammed, the last of the servants Allah was pleased enough with to communicate infrarational revelations:

Allah's commandment has come, therefore do not desire to hasten it. Glory be to Him, and highly exalted be He above what they associate (with Him). **He sends down the angels with the inspiration by His commandment on whom He pleases of His servants**, saying: “Give the warning that there is no god but Me, therefore be careful (of your duty) to Me.” He created the heavens and the earth with the truth, highly exalted be He above what they associate (with Him). (Quran 16:01-03)

In light of the ‘knowledge’ that Mohammed is the last Prophet, infrarational revelations such as this only confirm the *history* of Allah's occult work upon certain individuals; it does not justify any ensuing allegations of ‘saints’ who are privy to inspiration and commands and revelation. That would defeat the Asura of Falsehood's purpose with the Quran, which was to consolidate his abhorrent psychology into one book that could be perpetually used – in a relatively quick fashion - to instigate chaos and violence and death. Allowing the competition of different potential “messengers” to Mohammed could well diffuse the Asuric message, *even if* such rivals were – or are - likewise under the Lord of Falsehood's spell (in varying intensity); worse still is if the occultists or mystics promote the Psychic values the Asura despises, whether through intuition or visions or the revelations that were supposed to cease with Mohammed. While the sufis often fail to reach the profundity of the latter category of ‘competition’, they certainly meet the former criteria, diverting the attention of potential Muslims into aberrant formulations of Allah:

The controversy around Zu'n-Nun stemmed from his conception of the mystic states (*ahwal*) and the stations (*maqamat*) of the mystic way...He was the first to teach the real nature of gnosis (*marifa*) and described it as: ‘...knowledge of the attributes of the Unity, **and this belongs to the saints, those who contemplate the Face of God within their hearts, so that God reveals Himself to them in a way in which He is not revealed to any others in the world.** The gnostics are not themselves, but in so far as they exist at all they exist in God.’ (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 47)

While this form of revelation might – in their own minds – absolve the sufis of the label of apostasy through the fact that the revelation is not the ‘Word’, but rather the “Face” of Allah, their crime of religious innovation is inescapable, because revelation is an all-encompassing feature of Allah. Consequently, if Allah decided that his final revelation to mankind was to be in the *form* of his ‘Word’, and that this revelation was to be his last, then there should be no other possible *form* of revelation available posthumous to Mohammed, whether that be a ‘Face’ or a ‘Word’ or anything else. Yet the sufis insist on speaking of multiple types of revelation, with Hujwari describing Allah's “favour” as something revealed to the sufi: “His favour is not procured by any act of human acquisition, but is miraculously revealed to men's hearts.” (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 270) Similarly, Hujwari declares – in direct contradiction to his own writings - Sufism's ‘unity’ as something inexpressible according to human phrases, necessitating its revelation by Allah to the sufis:

I, Ali b. Uthman al-Jullabi, declare that unification is a mystery revealed by God to His servants, and that it cannot be expressed in language at all, much less in high-sounding phrases. The explanatory terms and those who use them are other than God, and to affirm what is other than God in unification is to affirm polytheism. (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 285)

This sort of heresy negates the whole objective of the final – infrarational - revelations to Mohammed, which are supposed to encompass, in the human *language* of Arabic, all possible ideas of ‘unity’. This unity, however, is in the scripture best understood as the Muslim's submission to Islam and Allah, rather than some sort of nebulous and heretical unity proposed by the sufis. The submission itself is designed, rather than for obtaining a mystic knowledge *of* Allah, to enlighten the believer as to what Allah *wants* his separative slaves to do within the earthly life, including jihad. But if such explanatory terms of actual Islamic ‘unity’ - the ‘union’ of a Master with his slave - are understood through the Quran, when we evaluate the different matter of Hujwari's opinion on the use of phrases and definitions, we find an ironic turn of events whereby rump Pakistan's favourite sufi can arguably be deemed guilty of his own definition of “polytheism”, for Data Ganj Baksh frequently used explanatory terms in detailing elements of the ‘mysteries’, including, for example, “Qabd denotes the contraction of the heart in the

state of being veiled **and bast denotes the expansion of the heart in the state of revelation.**” (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 374) Indeed Hujweri went as far as to outline a precise definition for revelation itself:

Intoxication, then, is to fancy oneself annihilated while the attributes really subsist; and this is a veil. Sobriety, on the other hand, is the vision of subsistence while the attributes are annihilated; **and this is actual revelation.** (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 187)

Actual revelation according to Islam, is to the contrary, strictly the domain of Allah's ‘Word’ in the Quran, not some heretical cult's ideas of “intoxication” and “sobriety”. If Hujweri's phrases on revelation, an element related to ‘unity’, confirmed – per his *own* definition – his crime of “polytheism”, it nevertheless failed to stop him from continuing to categorize the nature of revelation, with another part of his work describing the “organs of the sensual part, **which is the centre of veiling, whereas the spiritual part is the centre of revelation.**” (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 149) Rumi held the same premise, though he explained it in a slightly different fashion, contending that the sufi who progresses in spirituality becomes able to attract the revelations and inspirations and other ‘Divine’ characteristics:

(Theirs is) the heart by which (all) hearts are made
drunken, (theirs is) the nonexistence whereby these existences
of ours are made existent.

**He (the saint) is the amber (magnet) of (all) thought and of
every voice; he is the (inward) delight of revelation and
inspiration and (Divine) mystery.**

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book I, 2080-81)

Rumi would take this alleged sufi capacity for revelation to the ultimate blasphemy, crossing a line that even Hujweri refused to transgress, when he illegally claimed the sufis as worthy recipients of the *final* ‘Divine’ word, of revelations that Allah apparently failed to address to Adam and Abraham!

I am thinking of rhymes, and my Sweetheart says to me, “Do
not think of aught except vision of Me.
Sit at thy ease, My rhyme-meditating (friend): in My presence
thou art rhymed with (attached to) felicity.
What are words that thou shouldst think of them? What are
words? Thorns in the hedge of the vineyard.

I will throw word and sound and speech into confusion,
that without these three I may converse with thee.

**That word which I kept hidden from Adam I will speak to
thee, O (thou who art the) consciousness of the world.**

**(I will tell to thee) that word which I did not communicate to
Abraham, and that pain (love) which Gabriel does not know.”**

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book I, 1727-1732)

To even write this under the caveat of poetic license is to commit the most horrendous of heresies, because the *only* “word” that Allah would have “kept hidden” from Adam and Abraham and Jesus and the other prophets prior to Mohammed, were the very infrarational revelations of the Quran! Therefore, if these hidden words were at long last communicated to Mohammed in the form of Allah's ‘final Word’ to humanity, and if Mohammed was also Asurically revealed to be the Seal of the prophets, then Rumi is clearly guilty of an outright lie against Allah, a fabrication that Allah will reveal words - hidden from the early prophets - to the sufi mystics, when the Quran unquestionably rejects that possibility. It is a

principle of Islam that Rumi and his fellow sufis are certainly aware of, even if their heresy is, as in the above stanza, occasionally self-exposed. For though there are clear instances in which the sufis explicitly divulge the blasphemy of their doctrine, it is nevertheless not always as easily uncovered. And this concealment of the true nature of their occult activities - experiences that if described too frequently in their proper character, are quickly unmasked as apostasy by the orthodox - is by design, as Rumi openly confessed:

The inspiration of God is not (like) astrology or geomancy or dreams—and God best knoweth what is right.

The Sufis in explaining (their doctrine) call it (the Divine inspiration) the inspiration of the heart, in order to disguise (its real nature) from the vulgar.

Take it to be the inspiration of the heart, for it (the heart) is the place where He is seen: how should there be error when the heart is aware of Him?

O true believer, thou hast become seeing by the light of

God: thou hast become secure from error and inadvertence.

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book IV, 1852-55)

Nowhere is this concealment or disguise of Sufism's actual principles (one intended to prevent further persecution and martyrdom by the hands of the orthodox) more evident than in their characterization of a different type of mystic experience - that of occult vision, including the vision of Allah. It is a vision the sufis claim they are capable of experiencing, one which – as we will shortly see – is almost comprehensively rejected by the Islamic scripture, with Sufism fortunate to have a minute opening through which they can dissimulate their experiences as permissible to Islam. This small sliver of justification, hinted at in the above Rumi stanza, is better understood through Hujwari's definition of *tajalli*, one in which he discerns between different types of vision:

***Tajalli*. The blessed effect of Divine illumination on the hearts of the blest, whereby they are made capable of seeing God with their hearts. The difference between spiritual vision and actual vision is this, that those who experience *tajalli* (manifestation of God) see or do not see, according as they wish, or see at one time and do not see at another time, while those who experience actual vision in Paradise cannot but see, even though they wish not to see; for it is possible that *tajalli* should be hidden, whereas *ruyat* (vision) cannot possibly be veiled.** (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 389)

This is of course sophistry designed to obscure sufi blasphemy from prying orthodox eyes, for once something is seen, it is a vision, whether or not it is physical or occult sight. Hujwari is here, in a classic sufi dissimulation, trying to say that Islam only forbids claims of a vision which one has *no choice* in seeing, but allows for the “spiritual vision” (of Allah in the manifestation) of the sufis, even if that vision is literally identified as “seeing God” (rather than observing *signs*, as one would expect of *tajalli*). But the words “seeing God” instantly conjures up kuffar Polytheists like the Hindus, rather than obedient Muslims who only seek to become thought and action slaves of an Imam and the scripture. The sufis however, in their first of two dissimulations with regards to mystic vision (both of which are present in the above Hujwari citation), seek to defend their experiences through, as Hujwari did above, the placement of the vision “with their hearts”. The visions of the heart are of course being differentiated from the ocular vision, with two Sahih Muslim hadith somewhat helpful in justifying their *location* of the vision; the traditions in question are sorted according to a chapter asking the question, “Did the Apostle see his Lord on the night of his journey (to heaven)?” Two of the hadith under this category record Mohammed envisioning Allah at the level of the heart, with the first saying,

“It is narrated on the authority of Ibn Abbas that he (the Holy Prophet) saw (Allah) with, his heart.” (Sahih Muslim Book 1, Number 334) The second presents a similar understanding, additionally using two Quran verses as evidence for Mohammed witnessing *Allah* with the heart:

It is narrated on the authority of Ibn Abbas that the words: “The heart belied not what he saw” (al-Qur’an, Iiii. 11) and “Certainly he saw Him in another descent” (al-Qur’an, Iiii. 13) imply that he saw him twice with his heart. (Sahih Muslim Book 1, Number 335)

However, as one might recall, the particular verses used throw this recollection into doubt, with the contradiction even seen in the same section of Sahih Muslim, which presents different hadith showing the vision to have been of *Gabriel* rather than Allah. One of these nullifying Sahih Muslim hadith, narrated by Al-Shaibani on authority of Zirr on authority of Abdullah, tells us, “ ‘The heart belied not what he saw’ (al Qur’an, Iiii. 11) imply that he saw Gabriel (peace be upon him) and he had six hundred wings.” (Sahih Muslim, Book 1, Hadith 331) In another Sahih Muslim hadith documented in response to the same question posed, that of whether Mohammed saw Allah, Aisha confirms Gabriel as the entity witnessed by Mohammed in the verses mentioned; she also emphatically denies that Mohammed ever saw Allah, albeit with the caveat – and this is where the sufi heretics pounce – that the Prophet never saw Allah with his *ocular* vision:

It is narrated on the authority of Masruq that he said: “I was resting at (the house of) Aisha that she said: ‘O Abu Aisha (kunya of Masruq), there are three things, and he who affirmed even one of them fabricated the greatest lie against Allah.’ I asked what they were. **She said: ‘He who presumed that Mohammed (may peace be upon him) saw his Lord (with his ocular vision) fabricated the greatest lie against Allah.’** I was reclining but then sat up and said: ‘Mother of the Faithful, wait a bit and do not be in a haste. Has not Allah (Mighty and Majestic) said: ‘And truly he saw him on the clear horizon’ (al-Qur’an, lxxxi. 23) and ‘he saw Him in another descent’ (al-Qur’an, Iiii. 13)?’ She said: ‘I am the first of this Ummah who asked the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) about it, and he said: ‘**Verily he is Gabriel.** I have never seen him in his original form in which he was created except on those two occasions (to which these verses refer); I saw him descending from the heaven and filling (the space) from the sky to the earth with the greatness of his bodily structure.’... She said: ‘He who presumes that the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) concealed anything, from the Book, of Allah fabricates the greatest lie against Allah.’ Allah says: ‘O Messenger! deliver that which has been revealed to thee from thy Lord, and if thou do (it) not, thou hast not delivered His message’ (al-Qur’an, v. 67)...” (Sahih Muslim Book 1, Number 337)

Even in the face of this evidence (with Aisha's comments also, as we have documented, contained within Sahih Bukhari), the sufis persist in their claim to mystic sight (whether or not the visions are from the “heart”), using for plausible justification another hadith, this one of the lower grade of “good”, in which Mohammed is recorded as claiming that he “saw” Allah:

Narrated Mu’adh bin Jabal:

One morning, the Messenger of Allah was prevented from coming to us for Salat As-Subh, until we were just about to look for the eye of the sun (meaning sunrise). Then he came out quickly, had the Salat prepared for. The Messenger of Allah performed the Salat, and he performed his Salat in a relatively quick manner. When he said the Salam, he called aloud with his voice saying to us: “Stay in your rows as you are.” Then he turned coming near to us, then he said: “I am going to narrate to you what kept me from you this morning: I got up during the night, I performed Wudu and prayed as much as I was able to, and I dozed off during my Salat, and fell deep asleep. **Then I saw my Lord, Blessed and Most High, in the best of appearances. He said: ‘O Muhammad!’ I said: ‘My Lord here I am my Lord!’ He said: ‘What is it that the**

most exalted group busy themselves with?’ I said: ‘I do not know Lord.’ ” And He said it three times. He said: “So I saw Him place His Palm between my shoulders, and I sensed the coolness of His Fingertips between my breast. Then everything was disclosed for me, and I became aware. So He said: ‘O Muhammad!’ I said: ‘Here I am my Lord!’ He said: ‘What is it that the most exalted group busy themselves with?’ I said: ‘In the acts that atone.’ He said: ‘And what are they?’ **I said: ‘The footsteps to the congregation, the gatherings in the Masajid after the Salat, Isbagh Al-Wudu during difficulties.’** He said: ‘Then what else?’ I said: ‘Feeding others, being lenient in speech, and Salat during the night while the people are sleeping.’ He said: ‘Ask.’ I said: ‘O Allah! I ask of you the doing of the good deeds, avoiding the evil deeds, loving the poor, and that You forgive me, and have mercy upon me. And when You have willed Fitnah in the people, then take me without the Fitnah. And I ask You for Your love, the love of whomever You love, and the of the deeds that bring one nearer to Your love.’ ” The Messenger of Allah said: “Indeed it is true, so study it and learn it.” (Jami al-Tirmidhi Volume 5, Book 44, Hadith 3235)

As this only graded *hasan* (good), we - as expected – find it inconsistently in the hadith collections, and – this is most important – find an absence of corroborating *sahih* (authentic) hadith relating this particular “vision” of Allah by Mohammed. Nevertheless, from the sufi perspective, these rare sort of hadith, whether authentic or not, when combined with elements including their distortion of the Quran verses and the aforementioned Night Journey authentic hadith, are enough to convince themselves that Islam approves of their *own* heresy! The crucial fact they ignore, however, is that even if these experiences of Mohammed and early prophets did occur (and certainly with the question of audition, the authentic Night Journey hadith confirm Mohammed as having had a minor amount of *direct* audition from “Allah”, and Moses is purported in the Quran to have directly heard Allah), they are yet *never* applicable to the sufis, because the Quran has made it *illegal* for those born after Mohammed to have auditions or visions – as we shall shortly document - of Allah, let alone any other sort of mystic experience such as revelation.

Nevertheless, at this point in our analysis, the sufis might still dispute their blasphemy of envisioning Allah as a premise without overt opposition from the Asura of Falsehood's scripture, because their visions are from their heart or vital region, instead of the eye, and are thus permitted. But before we categorically expose their allegation of *any* type of vision of Allah as completely unfounded according to Islam, we must take a look at this second type of dissimulation (mentioned in the most recent Hujwari citation), whereby they try to further distinguish their visions “of the heart” from the demarcated ocular vision, the precise and solitary field of vision that is unauthorized (at least according to Sufism's fraudulent interpretation of authentic Islamic scripture). In doing so, they seek to use subtle psychological precepts, including things like the spiritual eye or spiritual vision, or the “vision” of Allah in his manifestation (also seen in the previously cited Hujwari writing on *tajalli*), or the use of “contemplation” and “imagination”:

Then their trouble is changed into glory, and their glory into a spiritual state, and their spiritual state into love, and their love into contemplation, **so that finally the brain of the aspirant becomes wholly a centre of vision through the predominance of his imagination: he sees without eye, and hears without ear.** Again, it is glorious for a man to bear the burden of trouble laid upon him by his Beloved, for in truth misfortune is glory, and prosperity is humiliation. Glory is that which makes one present with God, and humiliation is that which makes one absent from God. (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 27)

Hujwari's association of spirituality with imagination, which can certainly condone the use of meditation, is a thesis further complicated by his subsequent *critique* of imagination in relation to its

use in spiritual vision:

Some Sufis have fallen into the mistake of supposing that spiritual vision and contemplation represent such an idea of God as is formed in the mind by the imagination either from memory or reflection. This is utter anthropomorphism and manifest error. God is not finite that the imagination should be able to define Him or that the intellect should comprehend His nature. Whatever can be imagined is homogeneous with the intellect, but God is not homogeneous with any genus, although in relation to the Eternal all phenomenal objects subtle and gross alike are homogeneous with each other notwithstanding their mutual contrariety. **Therefore contemplation in this world resembles vision of God in the next world, and since the Companions of the Apostle are unanimously agreed that vision is possible hereafter, contemplation is possible here.** (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 332)

While the initial part of this passage is certainly correct in attributing error to an anthropomorphic and imaginative conception of God as His *entire* Reality, the discrepancy is notable between the two selections with regards to imagination, with the terms of “contemplation” and “imagination” and “reflection” all capable of being interpreted in different fashions, *including* the meditative imagery used by sufis in their *shirk*. It is a pattern that, because they are attempting – as Rumi so plainly stated – to “disguise” what they wish they could express without burden, inevitably leads to *apparent* contradictions, with certain portions providing them a ready defence for the other sections that more evidently unmask their actual doctrine. It is why their writings contain the element of sophistry, whereby contemplation only “resembles” spiritual vision, when in fact it is often used to establish the sufis internal *shirk*: The sufis here are consciously and subconsciously seeking to describe their actual doctrine according to words palatable enough to the orthodox or - to use Rumi's appropriate description - “vulgar”. But the use of words to cleverly disguise the apostasy they hold dear, is a very difficult task to sustain, and in a different section of Hujwiri's book we find contemplation directly linked to an *earthly* “spiritual vision” of God:

God said to David: “Dost thou know what is knowledge of Me? It is the life of the heart in contemplation of Me.” **By “contemplation”, the Sufis mean spiritual vision of God in public and private, without asking how or in what manner. ...One sees the act with his bodily eye and, as he looks, beholds the Agent with his spiritual eye; another is rapt by love of the Agent from all things else, so that he sees only the Agent.** (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, pp. 329-30)

That this particular passage similarly contains a different ready-made defence against heresy, in the form of a different interpretation of the public and private “spiritual vision”, whereby the vision described is similar to seeing the “Attributes” and “Signs” of Allah's manifestation (rather than actual sight of him), can nevertheless be superseded by the frequent use of the actual word vision. For the question can be easily raised as to the necessity of associating terms such as contemplation and imagination, along with ordinary elements like witnessing Allah's earthly signs, with the very concept of “spiritual vision of God”. After all, functions like contemplation and imagination are more easily argued as non-heretic as opposed to obtaining “vision” of Allah; there is no need for the “Muslim” to then try to tinge the concepts with *vision* of God, unless it is a slight of hand, a *taqiya* through which they express their belief in vision of God in terms allowing them to later deny that “vision of God” is what they are documenting. But irrespective of Sufism's clever dissimulations, there is absolutely no infrarationally revealed support – as the following makes clear - for *any* sort of vision of Allah other than his earthly ocular signs, which are best understood as peripheral *reminders* of Allah (as opposed to visions of his central presence in the world):

And when Moses came at Our appointed time and his Lord spoke to him, he said: **“My Lord!**

show me (Thyself), so that I may look upon Thee.” He said: “You cannot (bear to) see Me but look at the mountain, if it remains firm in its place, then will you see Me”; but when his Lord manifested His glory to the mountain He made it crumble and Moses fell down in a swoon; then when he recovered, he said: “Glory be to Thee, I turn to Thee, and I am the first of the believers.” (Quran 7:143)

Not only does this Quran verse unmistakably reject an actual sight of Allah, it is also poor evidence for Sufism's marifat stage of mystic sight, because an earthly sign of God visible to the ordinary eye cannot be the same as the type of inner vision that is the domain of the mystic or occultist, even if the location of their occult visions are mostly of the Vital, confused for the greater Psychic or Intuitive Mind visions. An earthly sign of “God” cannot be a “vision of God”, because it is simply a rudimentary perception of *a sign of Allah*. That is the language the sufis should be using, instead of trying to immediately attribute – and thus debase the Quran – every little thing as a spiritual vision of God. For the Quran is more appropriately read as an all-encompassing rejection of any possible vision of Allah, as seen in the following Asuric revelation:

Vision comprehendeth Him not, but He comprehendeth (all) vision. He is the Subtle, the Aware. (Quran 6:103)

So important is this infrarational revelation that Aisha used it as justification to denigrate – by calling them liars - those who dared allege the Prophet to have seen Allah:

Narrated Masruq:

Aisha said, “If anyone tells you that Mohammed has seen his Lord, he is a liar, for Allah says: ‘No vision can grasp Him.’ (6.103) And if anyone tells you that Muhammad has seen the Unseen, he is a liar, for Allah says: ‘None has the knowledge of the Unseen but Allah.’ ” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 93, Number 477)

As the Quran is the last ‘Word’ of Allah, the comprehensive nature of the verse (6:103) – which at no point makes distinctions between *forms* of envisioning Allah – is final; as a result, the sufikuffar are condemned as liars who dare to twist the Quranic ‘knowledge’ to suit their blasphemy. This particular Asuric revelation helps us to relegate the principle of Allah's signs into its appropriate place, that of proofs which only confirm - to the ordinary thought and belief and sight - the veracity of the ‘Divine Word’ of the Quran, rather than signs intended to authorize the believer some type of *vision* of Allah. The signs are merely designed to increase the real Muslim's ordinary mental understanding and rigid adherence to the scripture, not to open up his inner mental and vital regions as the heretical sufi mystics contend. Neither, of course, do these signs or anything else in the Quran indicate an Overmind or Psychical vision of God, the characteristics of which – a deity, when mystically seen, must at least be haloed, without a shadow, unblinking, and with their feet never touching the ground – can certainly be envisioned by the rare sadhak firmly entrenched in the Intuitive Mind or Psychic levels.

That both Islam and Hinduism note the almost impossible ability – even to the mystic - of the direct vision of the *transcendental* (above the Golden Lid) appearance of God, has no bearing on Islam's Asuric status, since the reality of such matters is always annexed by the Asura to help ‘prove’ the ‘divinity’ or ‘truth’ of whatever falsehood he is saying or presenting. And just as the the Asura of Falsehood desecrates knowledge and truth in order to promote the opposite falsehood with his Islamic religion, so too did he distort the reality of a Divine light (by projecting his own false occult light, one that is instantly discriminated - by only those with a strong Psychic - according to its lack of clarity) in order to convince Mohammed of the ‘truth’ of the latter's inner vital experiences. It is a topic – Mohammed's recorded occult vision of light, along with his occult interaction with “Gabriel” – that while deceptively helpful in supporting the sufic allegations of their own mystic experiences, yet also utterly dismisses the notion that Islam allows for the sight of Allah within the earthly life, a finality

seen in the Sahih Muslim hadith on the matter:

It is narrated on the authority of Abu Dharr: **I asked the Messenger of Allah: “Did you see thy Lord?” He said: “(He is) Light; how could I see Him?”** (Sahih Muslim Book 1, Hadith 341)

While this hadith certainly confirms the distinction made between the “Light” he saw, and an actual vision of Allah, with Mohammed's incredulous “how could I see him?” response, the preceding “(He is) Light” is better explained as the “His veil is Light” documented in additional hadith, including the following:

Abu Musa reported:

The Messenger of Allah was standing amongst us and he told us five things. He said: “Verily the Exalted and Mighty God does not sleep, and it does not befit Him to sleep. He lowers the scale and lifts it. The deeds in the night are taken up to Him before the deeds of the day, and the deeds of the day before the deeds of the night. **His veil is the light.**” In the hadith narrated by Abu Bakr (instead of the word “light”) it is fire. **If he withdraws it (the veil), the splendour of His countenance would consume His creation so far as His sight reaches.** (Sahih Muslim Book 1, Hadith 343)

Another hadith, along with confirming the first four declarations of Mohammed, agrees that the fifth declaration described Allah's veil as “light”:

A'mash has narrated this hadith on the same authority and said:

The Messenger of Allah was standing amongst us and he told us four things. He then narrated the hadith like the one reported by Abu Mua'wiya, but did not mention the words “His creation” and said: “His veil is the light.” (Sahih Muslim Book 1, Hadith 344)

It is unquestionably clear then, that subsequent to the Asura of Falsehood's occult display of false light, one likely accompanied with Gabriel's explanation of God's inability to fully display himself, Mohammed was – befitting his childish, impressionable nature – misled into believing this Asuric light to be the veil of God, when the Overmind and Supramental Lights of Yogin experience are known to be substantial aspects of Himself, both working upon the adhara and gradually revealing Himself until the Conscious-Identification emerges. That Mohammed's experiences of “light” have been described as “with his heart”, and just as importantly, as the psychology of his religion is fundamentally that of Asuric falsehood, it is impossible that the “veil of light” he saw was that of the Overmind or Psychic, especially when we consider that to access the former region, one will inevitably encounter the Overmind Gods and Goddesses, emanations who per Islam are nonexistent. And while this “veil of light” seen by Mohammed must be admitted as part of the orthodox Islamic reality because of the documentation in Sahih Muslim, it nevertheless does not provide the sufis with the ‘evidence’ they presume to have obtained in support of their *own* mystic experiences.

For nowhere in the scripture do we find this “light” as something Mohammed – or any other Muslim – consciously *united* with; nor do we find any Quran verses infrarationally revealing mankind as able to see this “veil of light” (which is, once again, *not* Allah Himself). That the Prophet was able to see this veil does not authorize ensuing Muslims the same capacity, with the initially paradoxical nature of the discrepancy explained by his very status as the most important of prophets – therefore Mohammed, the final human granted indirect (remember, Mohammed is only authentically judged to have heard Allah on one occasion, and *never* directly received revelations from Allah) occult access to Allah by way of Gabriel, was especially privileged in experience, worthy of what he witnessed due to his function as the “Seal” of messengers. Nobody after him is deserving of the same entitlement to occult experiences, and thus the sufis remain guilty of blasphemy when they allege otherwise, because their only duty as Muslims is a rote mental obedience to the infrarationally revealed Quran, the entire ‘truth’ of existence

for which their mystic endeavours are unnecessary and illegal diversions within the life, whether in terms of marifat or different violations of shariat principles, and also because they *will* eventually be able to see Allah, even that is only to occur after their death:

Abu Sa'id al-Khudri reported: Some people during the lifetime of the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) said: **"Messenger of Allah! shall we see our Lord on the Day of Resurrection?"** The Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) said: **"Yes"**, and added: "Do you feel any trouble in seeing the sun at noon with no cloud over it, and do you feel trouble in seeing the moon (open) in the full moonlit night with no cloud over it?" They said: "No, Messenger of Allah!" He (the Holy Prophet) said: "You will not feel any trouble in seeing Allah on the Day of Resurrection any more than you do in seeing any one of them." (Sahih Muslim Book 01, Number 352)

As Muslims are to see their Lord on Judgement Day, as they – and Sufism concurs on this point – do not believe that God can incarnate or be Self-Realized, and as their scripture both forbids seeing Allah within the lifetime and mandates participation in earthly jihad as the greatest Muslim activity, there is neither a sharia-based, nor even a practical need for "Muslims" to seek such visions during the life when sight will become shortly available in the afterlife. Indeed, the very veil of "Light" so described by Mohammed is awaiting the believers on the Day of Resurrection, with the specific mention of it additionally confirming – by a corresponding absence of it from the earthly occult sight of mortals – Sufism's blasphemy of daring to allege *human* vision of Allah or his light:

Safwan b. Muhriz reported that a person said to Ibn Umar:

How did you hear Allah's Messenger as saying something about intimate conversation? He said: "I heard him say: 'A believer will be brought to his Lord, the Exalted and Glorious, on the Day of Resurrection **and He would place upon him His veil (of Light) and make him confess his faults** and say: 'Do you recognise (your faults)?' He would say: 'My Lord, I do recognise (them).' He (the Lord) would say: 'I concealed them for you in the world. And today I forgive them.' And he would then be given the Book containing (the account of his) good deeds. And so far as the non-believers and hypocrites are concerned, there would be general announcement about them before all creation telling them that these (people, i.e. non-believers and hypocrites) told a lie about Allah.'"

 (Sahih Muslim Book 37, Hadith 6669)

The sufikuffar know quite well that their mystic experiences are only made legal by Islam once they *literally* – rather than their desired symbolic death – pass away from the earthly body; it is a reality of Islam that they only occasionally acknowledge, with Hujwiri in one instance citing a sufi named Sahl b. Abdallah who assigned vision of a "non-incarnate" Allah to the "next world":

It is related that Sahl b. Abdallah said: "Unification is this, that you should recognize that the essence of God is endowed with knowledge, **that it is not comprehensible nor visible to the eye in this world**, but that it exists in the reality of faith, infinite, incomprehensible, **non-incarnate**; and **that He will be seen in the next world**, outwardly and inwardly in His kingdom and His power; and that mankind are veiled from knowledge of the ultimate nature of His essence...(Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, pp. 283-84)

This understanding of the vision of Allah - that it is strictly a quality during the afterlife - is additionally reflected in an authentic hadith detailing the best of Muslims, who although finely representing the Islamic religion, are nevertheless unable to see Allah, nor Paradise, nor the hellfire during their brief time upon earth:

Narrated Abu Huraira:

Allah's Apostle said, **“Allah has some angels who look for those who celebrate the Praises of Allah on the roads and paths.** And when they find some people celebrating the Praises of Allah, they call each other, saying, ‘Come to the object of your pursuit.’” He added, “Then the angels encircle them with their wings up to the sky of the world.” He added. “(after those people celebrated the Praises of Allah, and the angels go back), their Lord, asks them (those angels) - though He knows better than them - **‘What do My slaves say?’ The angels reply, ‘They say: Subhan Allah, Allahu Akbar, and Alhamdulillah’, Allah then says ‘Did they see Me?’ The angels reply, ‘No! By Allah, they didn't see You.’**

Allah says, ‘How it would have been if they saw Me?’ The angels reply, ‘If they saw You, they would worship You more devoutly and celebrate Your Glory more deeply, and declare Your freedom from any resemblance to anything more often.’ Allah says (to the angels), ‘What do they ask Me for?’ **The angels reply, ‘They ask You for Paradise.’ Allah says (to the angels), ‘Did they see it?’ The angels say, ‘No! By Allah, O Lord! They did not see it.’** Allah says, ‘How it would have been if they saw it?’ The angels say, ‘If they saw it, they would have greater covetousness for it and would seek It with greater zeal and would have greater desire for it.’ **Allah says, ‘From what do they seek refuge?’ The angels reply, ‘They seek refuge from the (Hell) Fire.’ Allah says, ‘Did they see it?’ The angels say, ‘No By Allah, O Lord! They did not see it.’** Allah says, ‘How it would have been if they saw it?’ The angels say, ‘If they saw it they would flee from it with the extreme fleeing and would have extreme fear from it.’ Then Allah says, ‘I make you witnesses that I have forgiven them.’” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 8, Book 75, Number 417)

If the sufis are able – as the example of Abdallah confirms – to mentally understand the restriction placed upon viewing Allah, and the extreme importance of the boundaries created by Islam, they should then refrain from daring to misuse the Islamic commandments on vision. For if they are actually honest in their assertion of a fundamental difference between ocular sight and their “vision of the heart”, between the “vision of the heart” and the sanctioned sight of Allah in the *afterlife* only, and if they genuinely respect the Islamic scripture, then they should not even use the term vision. After all, “reflections” and “contemplation” are terms that can be associated with different mental aspects instead of vision, even if the former two are often means to describe the meditative process through which the sufis attempt polytheistic visions of their pirs and Mohammed and Allah. Yet the sufis, as Rumi blatantly put it, disguise their actual intentions, with the resulting confusion only a superficial one: For the sufis are dishonest, deliberately ignoring – or at times paying superficial heed to - the real meaning of the Islamic scripture in order to conjure a means to dissimulate their visions and inspirations and other mystic experiences into terms potentially palatable to austere Islam. That they proceed in this manner is an unmistakeable sign that they, unlike actual Muslims, do not fear Allah or his hellfire, and consider themselves immune from Islamic ‘justice’, because otherwise they would – as the hadith they ignore indicate – present a ‘vision’ of Allah in the earth as a stringently symbolic undertaking:

Narrated Abu Huraira:

One day while the Prophet was sitting in the company of some people, (The angel) Gabriel came and asked, “What is faith?” Allah's Apostle replied, “Faith is to believe in Allah, His angels, (the) meeting with Him, His Apostles, and to believe in Resurrection.” Then he further asked, “What is Islam?” Allah's Apostle replied, “To worship Allah Alone and none else, to offer prayers perfectly to pay the compulsory charity (Zakat) and to observe fasts during the month of Ramadan.” **Then he further asked, “What is Ihsan (perfection)?” Allah's Apostle replied, “To worship Allah as if you see Him, and if you cannot achieve this state of devotion then you must consider that He is looking at you.”** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 1, Book 2, Number 47)

The key words here are “as if you see Him”, which of course helps to confirm the illegality of concretely envisioning Allah during the human life, for otherwise Mohammed would have encouraged his followers to obtain actual vision during the prayer. The sufi Ibn Arabi, on the other hand, chose to formulate the prayer according to different guidelines, audaciously superseding Mohammed's unambiguous tradition with the blasphemy of – for those capable - envisioning Allah during prayer:

The prayer is then a secret conversation (munajat). It is remembrance/invocation (dhikr). When someone mentions Allah, he sits with Allah and Allah sits with him. **It is a sound divine transmission that Allah said, “I sit with the one who mentions Me.” Whoever sits with the One he mentions and has sight, sees the One with whom he sits.** This is contemplation (mushahada) **and vision.** If he does not have sight, he does not see Him. Thus the one who prays knows his rank, and whether or not he sees Allah with this vision in the prayer. **If he does not see Him, then let him worship Him by belief (iman) as if he saw Him,** imagining Him to be in the qibla of his conversation, and let him listen for Allah's reply. (Ibn Arabi, *Fusus Al-Hikam*, The Seal of the Unique Wisdom in the Word of Mohammed)

Not only is the cited statement of Allah - “I sit with the one who mentions Me” - not technically divine transmission, since its source is Ibn Majah and not the Quran, its veracity is substandard to the authentic Bukhari hadith documenting Mohammed's “as if you see Him” tradition, and more importantly, does not in itself confirm vision of Allah. After all, God sitting in a prayer, so to speak, is not the same as God allowing himself to be envisioned by the worshipper, because God can easily be present at a prayer without being *seen* by the devotee. Arabi not only provided meagre evidence in his allegation that the “Muslim” can have “vision” of Allah during the prayer, he also insulted the sanctity of the authentic hadith by denigrating the believer - who worships “as if he saw Him” - to a rank lower than the sufis who have illegal mystic sight. It is a pattern he similarly repeated in further explicating his blasphemous contentions, taking both his misuse of scripture and his disrespect of pious Muslims to a greater level of provocation:

Allah says on the tongue of the slave, “Allah hears whoever praises Him.” Look at the sublimity of the rank of the prayer and where it takes the one who has it! **Whoever does not achieve the rank of vision in the prayer has not reached the goal** nor does he have the coolness of the eye in it because he does not see the One he addresses. If he does not hear the answer of Allah, he is not one of those who listen. **Whoever is not present in the prayer with his Lord, and does not hear nor see Him, is not one who prays at all,** and he is not along those “who listen well, having seen the evidence.” (30:37) (Ibn Arabi, *Fusus Al-Hikam*, The Seal of the Unique Wisdom in the Word of Mohammed)

This is in direct opposition to Mohammed's tradition, as the Prophet considered worship of Allah “as if” he was seen, to be “perfection” (ihsan) itself; thus to slander the actual Muslim and belittle his type of worship as insufficient, is to provide further evidence of one's own apostasy. Compounding his crime, Arabi once again distorts the intent of a sacred Quran verse (30:37), one whose meaning – decidedly not in support of an earthly vision of Allah – is clarified when seen in relation to the Asuric revelations preceding it:

And when harm afflicts men, they call upon their Lord, turning to Him, then when He makes them taste of mercy from Him, lo, **some of them begin to attribute partners with their Lord,** So as to be ungrateful for what We have given them. **But enjoy yourselves (for a while), for you shall soon come to know. Or, have We sent down upon them an authority so that it speaks of that which they associate with Him?** And when We make people taste of mercy they rejoice in it, and if an evil befall them for what their hands have already wrought, lo, they are in despair. Do they not see that Allah makes ample provision for whom He pleases, or straitens? Most surely there are signs in this for a people who believe. (Quran 30:33-37)

The “signs” or “evidence” misused by Arabi in support of his heretical *vision* of Allah, are in actuality mere external proofs of Allah's earthly punishment for those refusing to follow his religion, rather than any actual “sight” of him during prayer that might lead to a diluted sufic unity. Even the isolated words of “having seen the evidence” on their own do not necessarily – unlike Arabi's allegation - confirm sight of him. But Arabi considered himself and other sufis to be the rightful heirs to the gnostics of old, a kuffar faith that sufis zealously seek to legitimize under the banner of Islam, to the extent of linking gnosticism and “vision” of God with Allah, as Arabi did when he wrote, **“The gnostic calls to Allah by inner sight, and the non-gnostic calls to Allah by limitation and ignorance.”** (Ibn Arabi, *Fusus Al-Hikam*, The Seal of the Wisdom of Divine Unity (Ahadiyya) in the Word of Hud) The pious then, according to the sufis, are limited and ignorant, without the “inner sight” that Islam has conversely commanded them to avoid; little wonder that the sufis, as we will fully examine, continuously establish themselves, in the eyes of the faithful, as arrant disbelievers, worthy of scorn – and more. It is a reputation that the sufis struggle to correct, because they have difficulty in restraining their tendency for outrageous declarations, in no small part because they often obtain inner experiences that – somewhat reasonably, at least for those with ego – inflate their vanity, especially as their visions and auditions are usually from the Vital world which easily aggrandizes the unrefined egos of the sufis. Indeed Ibn Arabi's own experiences are what made him feel secure in his denigration of the respectively “limited” ordinary Muslim, for Arabi claimed that his major work, *Fusus al-Hikam*, was dictated to him by the Prophet Mohammed!

Of Ibn Arabi's sufic works, the most important are *Fusus al-Hikam*...**The *Fusus al-Hikam*, the epitome of sufi esoteric teaching was, according to Ibn Arabi, dictated to him by the Prophet Mohammed at Damascus in a dream in Muharram 627/Dec. 1229.** (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume II, p. 36)

If the envisioning of the Prophet Mohammed in a dream is – only by an absence of admonishing comment in the scripture – not considered as heretical as seeing Allah, not only will we shortly find countless examples of sufis alleging that they directly saw Allah, we also find Arabi committing an even worse crime in *Fusus al-Hikam* – in which he dares to claim that Allah sent him a revelation, by way of mystic vision no less:

Know that Allah revealed to me and caused me to witness in a vision, which I received in Cordoba in 586, the sources of His Messengers and all His Prophets, from Adam to Muhammad, may Allah bless him and grant him peace. None of this group spoke to me except for Hud, peace be upon him. He told me why they were gathered together. I saw that he was a very large man of good appearance, subtle in reply, gnostic in matters of unveiling. My proof of his unveiling is His words, “There is no creature He does not hold by the forelock. My Lord is on a Straight Path.” (11:56) What gift to creatures is greater than this? Then it is from the bestowal of favours on us by Allah that this speech reached us from Him in the Qur’an. (Ibn Arabi, *Fusus Al-Hikam*, The Seal of the Wisdom of Divine Unity (Ahadiyya) in the Word of Hud)

As we know revelation to have ceased with Mohammed, the Seal of the Prophets, Ibn Arabi has – inevitably because of the wideness of his experience, the extraordinary nature of which convinced him to ignore the actual commandments of Islam – utterly confirmed his apostasy from the Asuric religion of Islam. His obscene assertion helps to explain why the minority orthodox sufis of the subcontinent were so concerned that his philosophy was becoming accepted by medieval subcontinental sufic orders, because Ibn Arabi himself was quite obviously *munafiq*. If in this case Arabi was not speaking of a “vision of God”, he was nevertheless transgressing the boundaries authorized by Islam to Muslims posthumous to the Prophet, by alleging visions and revelations from Allah. But Arabi was not alone in his deviancy, with another famous sufi, al-Ghazali, similarly writing of “revelations and visions”

consisting of the prophets – and angels for good measure:

Ghazali's own ascetic exercises opened for him the door to mysticism. He describes the mystic path, or *Tariqa* this way:

‘...With this stage of the ‘way’ there begin **the revelations and visions. (They)...behold angels and the spirits of the prophets**...Later a higher stage is reached...they come to stages in the ‘way’ which it is hard to describe in language...In general what they manage to achieve is nearness to God...’ (al-Ghazali, *al Munquiz min az-zalal*, ‘Deliverance from Error’, tr. By W.M. Watt, *The faith and practice of al-Ghazali*, 1963, pp 60-61)

Through his own experiences with the mystic path, **Ghazali claimed to have achieved the true and unique nature of revelation.** (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 65)

While Ghazali at least did not speak of complete unity with God, nor the direct vision of Allah, he nevertheless violated the Quran verses in his claim of revelations and visions, which like all forms of occult experiences are specifically banned. Indeed the language of the Quran is clear enough that *every* class of inner experience, every type of mystic vision or inspiration or revelation, is to be rejected by the real Muslim. But the sufis refuse to conform to the religion they assert membership in, with Hujwari on multiple occasions – including the following account of his conversation with Shaykh al-Gurgani – alleging “visions” and other mystic experiences, with this selection absent of any specific mention of seeing Allah:

One day I was seated in the Shaykh's presence and was recounting to him my experiences and visions, in order that he might test them, for he had unrivalled skill in this. He was listening kindly to what I said. The vanity and enthusiasm of youth made me eager to relate those matters, and the thought occurred to me that perhaps the Shaykh, in his novitiate, did not enjoy such experiences, or he would not show so much humility towards me and be so anxious to inquire concerning my spiritual state. The Shaykh perceived what I was thinking. “My dear friend,” he said, “you must know that my humility is not on account of you or your experiences, but is shown towards Him who brings experiences to pass. They are not peculiar to yourself, but common to all seekers of God.” (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 169)

Gurgani helps to confirm the pervasiveness of inspirations, visions and revelations to Sufism, with the acceptance of the experiences – while certainly commonplace to mystic paths – simply another sign of Sufism's deviancy from Islam. For the Asura of Falsehood's religion forbids *any* sort of mystic experiences after the last – infrarational – mystic, the Prophet Mohammed. Indeed, the previously cited hadith are quite clear in their rejection of the mortal's ability to have non-material sight of things like heaven or hell, a commandment that Abu Yazid – as told by Hujwari – violated in his allegations of envisioning both of those regions along with his mystic sight of “eternity” and the “tree of oneness”, the latter of which were obtained after his occult transformation into a bird to whom Allah spoke with:

Abu Yazid was asked about the state of the prophets. He replied: “Far be it from me to say! We have no power to judge of them, and in our notions of them we are wholly ourselves. God has placed their denial and affirmation in such an exalted degree that human vision cannot reach unto it.” Accordingly, as the rank of the saints is hidden from the perception of mankind, so the rank of the prophets is hidden from the judgement of the saints. Abu Yazid was the proof of his age, and he says: “I saw that my spirit was borne to the heavens. It looked at nothing and gave no heed, though Paradise and Hell were displayed to it, for it was freed from phenomena and veils. Then I became a bird, whose body was of Oneness and whose wings were of Everlastingness, and I continued to fly in the air of the Absolute until I passed into the sphere of

Purification, and gazed upon the field of Eternity and beheld there the tree of Oneness. When I looked I myself was all those. I cried: 'O Lord, with my egoism I cannot attain to Thee, and I cannot escape from my selfhood. What am I to do?' **God spake: 'O Abu Yazid, thou must win release from thy 'thou-ness' by following My beloved i.e. (Muhammad). Smear thine eyes with the dust of his feet and follow him continually.'**" (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 238)

That Abu Yazid's remarkable vision concluded with the voice of "God" telling him to follow Mohammed, not only speaks to his blasphemy in audaciously asserting such experiences when they are in fact illegal for "Muslims", but also helps to confirm – at least in this case – the Vital nature of the majority of Sufism's non-material experiences. For to have the voice tell him, of all things, to follow the depraved tradition of Mohammed, is to confirm that the voice was neither of the Psychic world, the Soul, the Overmind or the Supreme Brahma. Auditions from those respective regions and entities would never tell the mortal – especially one who specifically aspired to liberation from the ego – to turn, in response, to the extreme Asuric ego manifested in the medium of Mohammed. After all, Islam, the religion propagated by the Prophet at behest of his evil master, exaggerates the egoistic tendencies of mankind, inciting its followers to violence over mere differences of opinion and other slights that anger the ego; and that only scratches the surface, with the brute egoistic nature of rape, slavery, murder, and the vanity of belonging to the 'one true religion' all intensified by the Asura of Falsehood through Mohammed's example.

Also present, again, in Hujwiri's account is the lack of a substantial, conscious unity to Sufism's haqiqa and marifa, with the descriptions of "Purity" and "Oneness" and "Eternity" accompanied by the frank admission of an inability to "attain to Thee". Abu Yazid's account, however, does indicate the progress – one halted by the Vital voice of "God" directing him permanently downward to the mystic nadir of Mohammed – he had made in his spiritual discipline. For to experience oneself as the bird – or to see a bird – is often, among many mystic realities the bird can symbolize, the sign of the subtle aspiration toward something higher. While the occult sight of the bird can also indicate a power of the Soul or a symbol of it, the passage in question certainly directs us towards the simple aspiration that was usurped by a hostile emanation, which prior to that was representative of a helpful inner opening on the part of Abu Yazid. Similarly is the vision of the tree a good indicator of the inner consciousness' opening, with Rumi documenting, in his story of Daquqi, a related type of vision, one also unfortunately degraded by the Asuric influence upon Sufism:

He (Daquqi) said, "I, the fortunate one, pushed forward; again
all the seven (trees) became one tree

At every moment they were becoming seven and (also) a
single one: (you may imagine) what I was becoming like,
through bewilderment.

After that, I beheld the trees (engaged) in the ritual prayer,
drawn up in line and (properly) arranged like the
congregation (of Moslems):

One tree (was) in front like the Imam, the others (were)
standing behind it. ...

The Divine inspiration came (upon me), saying, 'O illustrious
one, art thou still wondering at Our action?'

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book III, 2046-53)

The tree as a mystic vision, in its purer form, can be a symbol of life, or the creation of a new life of progressive consciousness, or even the universe itself. But as the sufis are at least partially beholden to the Asura even as they stray from properly following the dictates of Islam (the Asura of Falsehood, we

recall, is not bound to one book or ideology or level of fidelity), this potentially lovely vision has been turned into a mere vital affirmation of Islam's supposed veracity, of the uniformity of vital thought and action leading all trees to become as one in external conformity, rather than a Multiplicity of Realized-Souls, all Consciously United as One. While it certainly cannot be considered – but only after the seven trees in one was supplanted, since that initial vision might well have been representative of the seven levels of consciousness united as One – analogous to the profound experiences of the Yogin, the precise nature of any vision is irrelevant to actual Islam, which rejects *all* post-Mohammed mystic “sight” or “hearing” or “revelation” or “inspiration”, especially the “visions of God” that Hujweri attempted to justify according to a Quran verse pertaining to the most rudimentary of topics:

It is related that he explained the verse, “Tell the believers to refrain their eyes” (Kor. xxiv, 30) as follows: “O Muhammad, tell the believers to refrain their bodily eyes from what is unlawful, and to refrain their spiritual eyes from everything except God,” **i.e. not to look at lust and to have no thought except the vision of God.** (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 156)

But Hujweri, in agreeing with the commentator's opinion on the verse, is completely disregarding the intent of the scripture, which was simply designed to establish an outward code of conduct, with the lust in question narrowed – albeit not by much due to the second criteria of concubines – to wives taken in marriage along with sex slaves whom the Muslim is allowed to rape. Indeed when we examine the verse in question and those immediately following it, the external nature – one having nothing to do with mystic contemplation or the heretical occult vision of Allah – becomes evident, with the literal interpretation – as with everything in the Quran except the rare passages *explicitly* identified as similitudes – appropriate:

Say to the believing men that they cast down their looks and guard their private parts; that is purer for them; surely Allah is Aware of what they do. And say to the believing women that they cast down their looks and guard their private parts and do not display their ornaments except what appears thereof, and let them wear their head-coverings over their bosoms, and not display their ornaments except to their husbands or their fathers, or the fathers of their husbands, or their sons, or the sons of their husbands, or their brothers, or their brothers' sons, or their sisters' sons, or their women, or those whom their right hands possess, or the male servants not having need (of women), or the children who have not attained knowledge of what is hidden of women; and let them not strike their feet so that what they hide of their ornaments may be known. And turn to Allah all of you, O believers! so that you may be successful. And marry those among you who are single and those who are fit among your male slaves and your female slaves; if they are needy, Allah will make them free from want out of His grace; and Allah is Ample-giving, Knowing. (Quran 24:30-32)

The corporeal character of the verses is clear, as the passage is simply demanding that the believer – male and female - follow a proscribed external code of conduct, including an option to marry one's slave and a demand that the female wear a material head-covering over their bosom unless in the presence of approved company. This latter demand is further corroborated by another infrarational revelation, one that similarly points to a literal interpretation – thus any thought of misusing the verse as evidence of the mystic “veil” should be discarded:

O Prophet! Tell thy wives and thy daughters and the women of the believers to draw their cloaks close round them (when they go abroad). That will be better, so that they may be recognized and not annoyed. Allah is ever Forgiving, Merciful. (Quran 33:59)

That the verses do not command the male gender to refrain from desire and its occasional consequence of harassment of females, is understandable when we consider Islam's Asuric origins, because the

Asura of Falsehood overtly does *not* want humanity to raise their consciousness. After all, that elevation – in its highest manifestation - could lead to a Conscious-Unity with God, a Power whose Reality is opposite to the Asura even if the same Consciousness-Puissance contains the Asura and everything else within It. If the Quran had even a modicum of the higher forces in life (elements seen in Sufism which at least seeks to renounce lust), Islam would not cast the burden on the object instead of the instigator. The real difficulty with these verses, however, is the irreparable problem of Islam's demand that the entire Quran be followed literally and *without change*, which means such verses can never be ignored. Islam, then, can only remain a regressive vehicle in humanity's progressive – albeit slow – march toward gender samata, one that was seen in the ancient mystic paths (though not entirely reflected in ancient *society*) where female mystics were common.

Indeed Sufism, at least in comparison to Islam, has shown some amount of equanimity, having had a handful of female mystics in its history, even if the majority – as in other religions – has been generally comprised of males. Yet these mystics, irrespective of their gender, are vainly exaggerated by the sufis as the chosen ones who, per Rumi, are to “Become spirit and know spirit by means of spirit: become the friend of vision (clairvoyant), not the child of ratiocination.” (*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*, tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book III, 3192) The sufikuffar are near-unanimous in their pursuit of visions, with Hujwari interpreting a statement of the sufi Abu Abdallah Ahmad B. Yahya al-Jalla as encouraging the direction of all thoughts toward that illegal vision: “He associated with Junayd and Abu'l-Hasan Nun and other great Shaykhs. It is recorded that he said: ‘The mind of the gnostic is fixed on his Lord; he does not pay attention to anything else,’ because the gnostic knows nothing except gnosis, and **since gnosis is the whole capital of his heart, his thoughts are entirely bent on vision (of God)**, for distraction of thought produces cares, and cares keep one back from God.” (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 134)

Hujwari quoted another sufi, Abu Said Muhammad al-Mayhani, as similarly stating that “Sufism is the subsistence of the heart with God without any mediation,” which Hujwari understood as an **“absorption of human attributes in realizing the vision of God**, and their annihilation by the everlastingness of God.” (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 165) Hujwari, as one would expect, interpreted another – Abdallah b. Mubarak – sufi's rather benign statement of Gnosis into a call to obtain sight of Allah: “I will mention some of the numerous sayings which the Shaykhs have uttered on this subject. Abdallah b. Mubarak says: ‘Gnosis consists in not being astonished by anything,’ because astonishment arises from an act exceeding the power of the doer, and inasmuch as God is omnipotent it is impossible that a gnostic should be astonished by His acts. If there be any room for astonishment, one must needs marvel that God exalts a handful of earth to such a degree that it receives His commands, and a drop of blood to such an eminence that it discourses of love and knowledge of Him, **and seeks vision of Him, and desires union with Him.**” (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 274)

While the interpretation is certainly tangential from Mubarak's actual statement, it is nevertheless consistent with mainstream sufi principles, teachings which continue to this day thanks to the orders established by the likes of Hujwari. These are the sufic orders that persist, in defiance of real Islam, in seeking things like the “vision of the majesty of God” that Hujwari associated with an annihilation that he also held to be a “revelation” of Allah's power: “Now I, Ali b. Uthman al-Jullabi, declare that all these sayings are near to each other in meaning, although they differ in expression; and their real gist is this, **that annihilation comes to a man through vision of the majesty of God and through the revelation of Divine omnipotence to his heart**, so that in the overwhelming sense of His majesty this world and the next world are obliterated from his mind, and ‘states’ and ‘stations’ appear contemptible in the sight of his aspiring thought, and what is shown to him of miraculous grace vanishes into

nothing: he becomes dead to reason and passion alike, dead even to annihilation itself; and in that annihilation of annihilation his tongue proclaims God, and his mind and body are humble and abased.” (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 246) In this statement Hujwiri finds himself in solidarity with Rumi, who similarly extolled the inner vision that beholds God, with the inner audition likewise engaged in discourse with the Lord:

This mouth of him is speaking on subtle points (of religion) to those sitting beside him, **while the other (mouth) is (engaged) in discourse with God and intimate (with Him).**

His outward ear is apprehending these (external) words, while his spiritual ear is drawing (into itself) the mysteries of (the Creative Word) *Be*.

His outward eye is apprehending human forms and features, while his inward eye is dazzled in (the glory of) *the eye did not stray*. (*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*, tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book V, 3602-04)

These resplendent sublimities are undoubtedly characterized by a direct sight and presence of God, with Hujwiri quite explicit in making the blasphemous claim - visions of God that he alleged are frequent to the sufis:

You must know that all the veins in the bodies of gnostics are evidences of the Divine mysteries, and that their hearts are tenanted by visions of the Most High. (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 325)

Indeed, these visions were recollected in detail and passed down through generations of sufic orders, with the favourite sufi of “Pakistan” chronicling multiple examples, including an allegation made by Abu Yazid of direct sight of Allah:

And Abu Yazid also says: “On my first pilgrimage I saw only the temple; the second time, I saw both the temple and the Lord of the temple; **and the third time I saw the Lord alone.**” (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 327)

Hujwiri also documents Abu Yazid's fabrication – per the Islamic perspective at least – of having seen Allah in the later years of his life:

...when Abu Yazid was asked how old he was, he replied: “Four years.” They said: “How can that be?” He answered: **“I have been veiled (from God) by this world for seventy years, but I have seen Him during the last four years: the period in which one is veiled does not belong to one's life.”** (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 331)

Rizvi recounts the story of a lesser-known sufi, al-Hafi, who turned to Sufism after seeing Allah in a dream – the dream state, as we know, is often the timeframe of supraphysical experiences:

Abu Nasr Bishr ibn al-Haris al-Hafi was another prominent sufi in Marw. In his youth he was alcoholic. Once while staggering along the road, he picked up a piece of paper on which was written: ‘In the name of God, the Merciful, the Compassionate.’ Bishr deposited it reverently in his house. **The same night God visited him in a dream, extending His approval.** This prompted Bishr to turn to asceticism. (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, pp. 38-39)

Hujwiri also noted many cases of sufi vision during the dream state, with one notable recollection involving Hasan Basri (also known as Hasan of Basra), quite proximate in Sufism's silsilas (lineages) to the the alleged architects of the heretical sect. The sufis contend these founders to be either

Mohammed himself or the Prophet's cousin and son-in-law Ali, the source of the *political* rationale for the Sunni-Shia split. Of course, neither of the two actually permitted the types of mystic practices of Sufism for those *after* the time of Mohammed; but facts have never stopped the sufis in persisting with their blasphemy, one in which they use Hasan's experiences for defence:

...The same night, Hasan dreamed that he saw God and said to Him: "O Lord, wherein does Thy good pleasure consist?" and that God answered: "O Hasan, you found My good pleasure, but did not know its value: if...you had said your prayers after Habib, and if the rightness of his intention had restrained you from taking offence at his pronounciation, I should have been well pleased with you." (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 88)

Of the famous early sufis, Sari and Junayd were likewise guilty of the same 'crime' of alleging personal sight of Allah during the lifetime, with Hujwiri intimating direct contact between Sari and God in relation to a vision that Junayd had of the Prophet Mohammed:

As is well known, Junayd refused to discourse to his disciples so long as Sari was alive, until one night he dreamed that the Apostle said to him: **"O Junayd, speak to the people, for God hath made thy words the means of saving a multitude of mankind."** When he awoke the thought occurred to him that his rank was superior to that of Sari, since the Apostle had commanded him to preach. At daybreak Sari sent a disciple to Junayd with the following message: "You would not discourse to your disciples when they urged you to do so, and you rejected the intercession of the Shaykhs of Baghdad and my personal entreaty. Now that the Apostle has commanded you, obey his orders." Junayd said: "That fancy went out of my head. I perceived that Sari was acquainted with my outward and inward thoughts in all circumstances, and that his rank was higher than mine, since he was acquainted with my secret thoughts, whereas I was ignorant of his state. I went to him and begged his pardon, and asked him how he knew that I had dreamed of the Apostle. **He answered: 'I dreamed of God, who told me that He had sent the Apostle to bid you preach.'**" (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, pp. 128-29)

While this does not exactly detail the vision of God, sight is implied, and since the story contends a revelation from the Prophet to Junayd that the latter should become a messenger tasked with saving mankind, along with Sari hearing the voice of Allah (also a blasphemy for those posthumous to Mohammed), it is unquestionably heretical - and from the Hindu perspective, displays the dangerous vanity of the sufic competition for "superior" ranks of spirituality. Nevertheless, the citation leaves some room for doubt with regard to Sari having claimed an actual vision of what he presumed to be God, an uncertainty that is subsequently removed after we examine a different recollection:

Junaid describes one of Sari's dreams in which **he saw God speaking to him in these words:**

"O Sari, I created mankind, and all of them claimed to love Me. Then I created the world, and nine-tenths of them deserted Me, and there remained one-tenth. Then I created Paradise, and nine-tenths again deserted Me, and one-tenth of the tenth remained with Me. And I imposed upon them one particle of affliction, and nine-tenths of those who were left deserted Me, and I said to those who remained, 'Ye did not desire the world, nor seek after Paradise, nor flee from misfortune; what then do ye desire and what is it that ye seek?' They replied, 'It is Though Thyself that we desire, and if Thou dost afflict us, yet will we not abandon our love and devotion to Thee.' **And I said to them, 'I am He who imposes upon you affliction and terrors which even the mountains cannot abide. Will ye have patience for such affliction?'** They said, 'Yea, verily, if Thou art the One Who afflicts; do what Thou wilt with us.' These indeed are My servants and My true lovers." (*An early mystic in Baghdad*, p 40) (S.A.A. Rizvi,

Sari's apostasy is undoubtedly confirmed in this passage, especially when we recall that the Prophet never directly saw Allah within his lifetime, referring instead to a "veil of light" that he described as blocking him from direct sight of the jealous 'god'. Therefore if the sufis are to be considered actual Muslims, they should be disinclined to such outrageous possibilities: That they fail to do so simply adds further impetus to the most pious to kill them for apostasy, as long as the circumstances necessitate the act. From the Hindu perspective, the fact that the experiences of these sufis – who remain revered in subcontinental orders – neglect to mention a Conscious-Unity, and instead envision – or hear – a God that warns them of "terror" and "affliction", is once again proof of the Vital (as opposed to the inner Psychic or the elevated Intuitive Mind) quality of their experiences, the intrusion of the darker regions of the netherworlds into their consciousness. For to be in the presence of an entity claiming to be God, and to subsequently have that being encourage the emotion of fear, is a clear sign of the non-Divine identity of that emanation.

These encounters are further confirmed as belonging to the Vital when we consider that many of them occur in the dream state, a period of sleep in which a good portion is spent – by the subtle body - traversing the Vital worlds. With the sufi practice of concentration on Allah, the inner vital worlds are more likely to be opened up for them during – if not the awakened state – the sleep consciousness, allowing them an increased ability to recall the nightly experiences that are usually forgotten by mankind due to a normal deficiency in the *subtle* concentration required to first become aware of the experience, and to then remember it. Of course, as the vast netherworlds are the home of the Asura of Falsehood, as the sufis do not have the Guru for guidance, and as they inescapably incorporate the Asuric message of the Quran by their insistence on a shariat stage, they are quite vulnerable to mistaking the vision or word of an Asura or another hostile (towards realization of the Soul or Self) vital entity, with that of God. Faced with experiences promoting the base qualities of the ego, the sufis inevitably maintain the same psychology during the waking state:

...Hasan replied: "My patience is misfortune and **my submission proclaims my fear of Hell-fire**, and this is lack of fortitude; and my asceticism in this world is desire for the next world, and this is the quintessence of desire. How excellent is he who takes no thought of his own interest! So his patience is for God's sake, not for the saving of himself from Hell." (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 86)

Hasan, who claimed to have seen God, could not – nor did he desire to – entirely free himself from the chain of fear, the psychology of which – especially with regards to an apprehension of the myth of an *eternal* hellfire – is alone enough to prevent the sufi or other mystic from ascending through the Golden Lid forming the boundary of a Cosmos characterized by a separation in identity. But if the insufficiency of the sufis - to discern the infrarational vital origin of most of the voices and visions of 'God' they are experiencing - is certainly in relation to multiple factors including their shariat education, their lack of a Guru resulting in an inadequate amount of Intuition and Discrimination, and of course their conscious rejection of Self-Realization, there is also another element contributing to their misinterpretation of occult experiences, one seen in a Rizvi citation and commentary of Junayd's work, in which we find the latter similarly alleging his own visions of Allah:

'The obliteration of the consciousness of having attained **the vision of God at the final stage of ecstasy when God's victory over you is complete**. At this stage you are obliterated and have eternal life with God, and you exist only in the existence of God because you have been obliterated. Your physical being continues but your individuality has departed.' (*Personality and writings of al-Junayd*, p 81)

...To Junaid, Unification was the highest state of enlightenment; **it was a fresh kind of**

knowledge he called *marifa*. It was revealed to devotees who had reached the state of Tawhid and were termed *arifs*. According to Junaid the *arif* was not the seeker but the *muwahhid* (one endowed with the knowledge of Unification) **to whom God in His grace had revealed Himself.** (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, pp. 56-57)

That these visions are occasionally associated with – as indicated by Junayd's comment – the *marifa* experience of ecstasy, naturally reinforces the sufi belief in the origin of his sight and revelation and inspiration, strengthening his belief that he is seeing 'God'. For the powerful experience of ecstasy in combination with visions and auditions can certainly confuse the naive and indiscriminating mystic into misinterpreting these intermediate states for what he presumes to be 'God'. Nevertheless, because of the difficulty in comprehensively determining – since ecstasy, while similarly a subjective feature, has far fewer identifiable parameters than revelations and visions and auditions – the precise nature of the ecstasy described by sufi mystics, we must first acknowledge the minute possibility of the sufis experiencing the profound type of samadhi. The problem with that, of course, is their *explicit* rejection of *hulul*, the sufi term equivalent to Self-Realization. For otherwise they would have spoken of the consciousness transforming into the Divine Consciousness during that samadhi, the pursuit of which – at least during the epoch of the sufi mystics who established the current subcontinental orders – was without any attempt at bringing the Supramental down to convert the ordinary nature.

As the vast majority of sufis refuse to acknowledge the possibility of Self-Realization, it is unlikely that the medieval sufis experienced the classical samadhi that arrives with that particular elevation of Consciousness; what instead seems most likely to have occurred, is the downrush or torrent of Ananda *alone*, without the concurrent Sat or Chit of which Self-Conscious-Identity as Brahma is forever confirmed. The purpose of these inpourings of Ananda is multiple, foremost of which is a simple manifestation of the Joy in Life that naturally emerges from the spiritual path; it is a bliss so powerful that it must only arrive intermittently if the spiritualist is not fully prepared to receive its *infinite* immensity. As the inner and higher worlds to the ordinary human life are characterized by their vastness, one need not have attained to the Self or Purusha prior to receiving some of the Supreme Ananda, as long as the openings are present between the developing consciousness of the mystic and the Satchitananda above the Golden Lid; somewhat similar is this phenomenon to the progressive appearance of higher lights to the mystic's consciousness, with the developing adhar increasing his or her solidity to receive even grander experiences, of which there is no fixed order to their arrival, with some individuals more amenable to Ananda, others to visions or auditions or light.

While the origin of their lights and visions and auditions are questionable in direct relation to *their own writings* on the particular experiences, their writings on ecstasy are certainly congruent with that of mystics experiencing the *intermittent* downpour of Ananda. While there is also an additional possibility that some of the sufi joy was that of a mere vital intoxication (such as in illicit drug use) that can arrive as a supraphysical nervous exhilaration in relation to the initial aperture of the inner consciousness, the downrushes of the Ananda are at least equally as possible, especially in the manner that they describe it, one consistent with their frequently admitted lack of Self-Realization or Conscious-Identity as God. For the experience of Ananda in the Self-Realized is – unless in the state of classical samadhi – a permanent one, enduringly associated with Conscious-Identity, and occurring throughout all states of the ordinary human activity – waking, dream sleep and deep-sleep. The Satchitananda of the Self-Realized is a state accessed at Conscious-Will, and is therefore permanent, whereas the sufi mystics only speak of an *intermittent* experience of the ecstasy in between "sobriety", a frequency consistent with mystics of the Intermediate Zone who do not have the elevation or *humility* of consciousness – nor the solidity of the adhar – required to experience Ananda permanently. It is an intermediate nature which is yet so powerful to the mystic with an unrefined ego, that – even as they admit the lack of permanence to their ecstasy – in turn leads sufis like Hujwari to controversially believe themselves the

highest rank of men, which according to their doctrine – and Islam – should *only* consist of the prophets:

Therefore, the saints, while they are sober, are as ordinary men, but while they are intoxicated their rank is the same as that of the prophets, and the whole universe becomes like gold unto them. (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 227)

While this declaration of Hujwiri's is certainly evidence of an ecstasy-induced heresy deluding him into exalting the status of saints over that of the prophets, it also highlights the intermediate and intermittent (note the distinction between “sober” and “intoxicated” periods) quality of their ‘intoxication’, in which the downrush of Ananda gets *mixed* with the deficiencies of the ego – in this case the vanity of becoming known as the highest rank of mankind. It is this amalgamation that often gives one the impression that the sufis experience a mere vital intoxication rather than the Supreme Ananda; but the fact that the inpouring occurs while their vital egos are *unrefined*, is the most likely explanation for the narcissism present, as the ego will latch upon the torrents of Ananda (experiences that they instantly know to mark them as unique from the ordinary populace), further aggrandizing their egoistic sense of self. The sufis, after all, cannot be described as entirely Asuric, even though they certainly are significantly influenced by the Asuric ideology of Islam and the occasional inner vital world interactions (that they confuse for God) with hostile entities – thus for them to experience intermittent influxes of Ananda is much more likely than comprehensively infrarational mystics like Mohammed and Hitler. However, as that very Asuric influence leads the sufis to reject the possibility of an ascension of consciousness towards Self-Realization, their inner experiences inevitably lack the required Central organization, as seen in some of the descriptions of their mystic states:

Sufism has two sides: ecstasy and visions. **Visions belong to novices, and the expression of such visions is delirium. Ecstasy belongs to adepts, and the expression of ecstasy, while the ecstasy continues, is impossible.** (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 167)

This association of delirium with sufi experiences, relegated in the above Hujwiri example to the *expression* of visions, is nevertheless fitting when we consider some of the other pronouncements of the sufis. These descriptions, as presented in multiple previous citations, include the association of their ecstasy with a *lack* of consciousness, one that naturally led them to experience it in a state they at times labelled, as in the following Rumi stanza, drunkenness – with its corresponding lack of control and awareness of one's actions:

O Emperor, they are intoxicated with Thy election (of them): **pardon him that is intoxicated** with Thee, O Pardoner!
The delight of being elected (singled out) by Thee at the moment of Thy addressing them has an effect that is not produced by a hundred jars of wine.

Since Thou hast intoxicated me, do not inflict a penalty: the Law does not see fit to inflict a penalty on the intoxicated.

Inflict it (only) at the time when I become sober; for indeed I shall never become sober (again).

Whoso has drunk of Thy cup, O Gracious One, is for ever delivered from self consciousness and from the infliction of penalties.

Their intoxication consists **in a state of unconsciousness of self (*fana*)**, (in which they are) abiding for ever: he that passes away from self in love for Thee will not arise.

This narrative, while certainly presenting a consciousness separate from the ordinary human self, does not elevate the consciousness towards that of the Divine Self – indeed the separation between mankind and God is maintained, evidenced by the addressing of Allah as Emperor and separate from the mystic. While the couplets mention the claim of never becoming “sober” again, it is best considered as a wish, for not only is the Ananda *only* accessible on a permanent basis when Self-Realization occurs, Rumi also understood the typical sufi experience of ecstasy as presented in his following stanza, in which the sufis – in this case Bayazid - go in and out of ecstasy. It is a state where they are once again to be permitted clemency from adherence to Sharia law, to – as in the previous stanza – be granted a special pardon undocumented in the Asuric scripture for the heinous crimes (against Islam) they are committing: Indeed in the following example, Bayazid ecstatically demands that his followers “worship” him, a breach of Islam that Rumi contends the sufi should be excused from due to the state of “bewilderment” that emerges from the sufic intoxication in the marifat stage:

**That venerable dervish, Bayazid, came to his disciples,
saying, “Lo, I am God.”**

That master of the (mystic) sciences **said plainly in drunken
fashion, “Hark, there is no god but I, so worship me.”**

**When that ecstasy had passed, they said to him at dawn,
“Thou saidest such and such, and this is impiety.”**

He said, “This time, if I make a scandal, come on at
once and dash knives into me.

**God transcends the body, and I am with the body: ye must kill
me when I say a thing like this.”**

When that (spiritual) freeman gave the injunction, each
disciple made ready a knife.

**Again he (Bayazid) became intoxicated by that potent flagon:
those injunctions vanished from his mind.**

The Dessert came: his reason became distraught. The Dawn
came: his candle became helpless...

When the *huma* of selflessness took wing (and soared),
Bayazid began (to repeat) those words.

The flood of bewilderment swept away his reason: he spoke
more strongly than he had spoken at first,

(Saying), “Within my mantle there is naught but God:
how long wilt thou seek on the earth and in heaven?”

All the disciples became frenzied and dashed their knives at
his holy body.

Like the heretics of Girdakuh, every one was ruthlessly
stabbing his spiritual Director.

Every one who plunged a dagger into the Shaykh was
reversely making a gash in his own body.

There was no mark (of a wound) on the body of that
possessor of the (mystic) sciences, while those disciples were
wounded and drowned in blood...

Day broke, and the disciples were thinned: wails of
lamentation arose from their house.

Thousands of men and women came to him (Bayazid),
saying, “O thou in whose single shirt the two worlds are

contained,

If this body of thine were a human body, it would have been destroyed, like a human body, by the daggers.”

A self-existent one encountered a selfless one in combat: the self-existent one drove a thorn into his own eye (hurt himself).

O you who stab the selfless ones with the sword, you are stabbing your own body with it. Beware!

For the selfless one has passed away (in God) and is safe: he is dwelling in safety for ever.

His form has passed away and he has become a mirror: naught is there but the form (image) of the face of another.

If you spit (at it), you spit at your own face; and if you strike at the mirror, you strike at yourself;

And if you see an ugly face (in that mirror), tis you; and if you see Jesus and Mary, tis you.

He is neither this nor that: he is simple (pure and free from attributes of self): he has placed your image before you.

When the discourse reached this point, it closed its lips; when the pen reached this point, it broke to pieces.

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book IV, 2102-44)

Multiple inadequacies – from the Yogic experience – and heresies – to the Islamic perspective – are present in this extensive recollection, the factual validity of which is irrelevant to the analysis, since Rumi and subsequent sufis accept its general plausibility. In the former, we find the astonishing claim – without critique from Rumi – of the immortality of Bayazid's body, one that withstood the deadly blows from multiple daggers, at once killing those disciples who had merely followed his orders. Not only are the Yogin without the immortality of the body (their Immortality, we recall, is from the ascension into the Imperishable Self-Consciousness transcending the transitory body), neither would they degrade themselves in “testing” their disciples fidelity by way of Bayazid's method, for the purpose of the Guru-Sadhak arrangement is not to obtain a clannish or military-style loyalty, but for the Guru to assist the Sadhak - who has a naturally-arising, inherent faith in the Guru - towards the aspiration of Self-Realization. The Guru is also eternally secure in the Self-Knowledge of his Conscious-Identity as God, and would certainly not worry about any declarations of his Status, because the Guru's pronouncements, unlike the sufis, are not made from the psychology of the *vital ego*, but rather a Transcendent Consciousness free of the ego.

As sufi mystics deny the Yogin experience of Self-Realization, their *hulul*-like declarations while in the state of “intoxication” can only emerge from an associated aggrandizement of the vital ego narcissism that admixes, during their marifat ecstasy, with the torrent of Ananda that they have been able to inwardly and periodically open themselves up toward. It is this vital admixture that similarly leads them, as Bayazid did in Rumi's account, to speak of their ecstasy in terms of “bewilderment” and similar descriptions. For they experience the downrush of Ananda without an appropriate purification and elevation of the consciousness that helps to maintain organization to the experience – a Suprarationality rather than the sufic irrationality (as in “swept away his reason”) which accompanies their intermittent Ananda -, a psychological structure that also helps provide the appropriate perspective to the nature of the inner experience, along with strengthening the adhar whereby even *higher* levels (remember that Ananda is lower in the linear model than Sat and Chit, which makes it most likely to be first of the three experienced, especially as Ananda can occur without the mandated liberation from ego that must accompany the Self-Identification as God occurring with Sat and Chit) can be attained. But as

the sufi assumes the torrents of Ananda to be included in his erroneous idea of the highest possible state of existence, of a final 'unity' with God, his adhar will never be fully secure enough for either the initial experience of Conscious Ascension into Brahma, or the full Supramental Descent, because the sufi *does not believe* in either of those possibilities, and this lack of belief – in combination with a shariat-induced lack of refinement to the vital ego - automatically prevents the sufi from making the necessary effort towards the psychological states required for those Transcendental experiences, because he is satisfied with an intermediate consciousness.

Indeed the lack of belief in Self-Realization can similarly cause the sufi to mentally stop or will himself from proceeding on a path that he suspects might lead to a type of mysticism associated with the Hindukuffar, whom the majority of sufis – even in their own apostasy – consider themselves superior than. Neither their intermittent ecstasy nor their vanity, however, will protect them from the wrath of Allah, for theirs is an unceasing blasphemy that is quite evident in Rumi's account of Bayazid, one in which the latter's intermediate experience – the downrush of Ananda combined with the aggrandized ego declaring himself God (a statement later rejected when “sober”) - is to be excused, even though it utterly violates the central Islamic tenet of *shirk*. The irreconcilable natures of Sufism and Islam, which in many sufi writings is futilely attempted to be overcome, is succinctly presented by Rumi in one of the more honest pieces of sufi writing, in which he characterises intoxication as the culmination of both the marifat and the rest of the sufi stages, a pinnacle from which *independence* is reached from the Quran itself, the book that *is* Islam!

To combine the (outward) form with such a deep (inner) meaning is not possible, except on the part of a mighty (spiritual) king.

In such (mystical) intoxication (as his) the observance of due respect (to the letter of the Qur'an) will not be there at all; or if it be, tis a wonder.

To observe humility in (the state of spiritual) independence is to combine two opposites, like “round” and “long.”

Truly the staff is loved by the blind; **the (inwardly) blind man himself is a coffer (full) of the Qur'an.**

He (a certain one) said, “In sooth the blind are coffers full of the words of the Qur'an and commemoration (of God) and warning.”

Again, a coffer full of the Qur'an is better than he that is (like) an empty coffer in the hand.

Yet again, the coffer that is empty of (any) load is better than the coffer that is full of mice and snakes.

The sum (of the matter is this): **when a man has attained to union, the go between becomes worthless to him.**

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book III, 1393-1400)

This particular stanza of Rumi's is perhaps the best summation of the entire alliance of Sufism to Islam, characterized by a progressively loosening relationship through the four stages, whereby the apostasy of the sufis is initiated in their external behaviour through the tariqat acquisition of a pir, the same stage in which their internal blasphemy emerges through the exaltation of their pir to a heretical status. It is a subjective apostasy that finds a final testimony in the marifat stage, with the diluted summit of an intermediate ecstasy providing the justification to consciously sever the bond with Islam. For if the entry into a mystic order and their associated pirs is enough to, in the eyes of the pious, turn the

“Muslim” into a kafir, the sufi will nevertheless strongly self-identify as Muslim due to the importance of the shariat stressed in the initial years of the mystic order they have entered. It is only *after* - as the stanza clearly shows – the sufi has experienced the intermittent ecstasy that he will subjectively divorce himself from Islam, whether or not he maligns the Quran as Rumi did. While this severance is irremediable due to the terms of the Quran, the sufi, of course, is likely to distort the appropriate understanding that should be based upon the *literal* interpretation of the scripture. For like the rest of the heretical sects that emerged as blasphemous offshoots, the sufis similarly contend themselves to be true Muslims, even if their so-called adherence to Islam involves demoting the Quran to the status of a “worthless” “go between”, a middling tool that if strictly followed will still result in the “inwardly blind man” that is only superior to the man full of “mice and snakes”.

But unlike the hierarchy detailed by the sufikuffar, actual Islam demands that the Quran receive the utmost prestige; the Quran is the final ‘Word’, the guide to both external and inward “sight” - nothing else is to supplant it. That Sufism shamelessly downgrades the Quran to a status lower than their own doctrine, whose precepts in turn directly violate the content of the Quran, is perhaps the most flagrant verification of their apostasy, because the actual Muslim is to be the living embodiment in thought and action of the Quran first and foremost, with the authentic hadith supplementing that Asuric mindset. And as this heretical sufic doctrine continues through to modern times thanks to the orders established or heavily influenced by the medieval sufis, an enemy of the ‘one true religion’ remains within territories ostensibly Muslim, attempting to deceive believers away from real Islam into an apostate doctrine of earthly spiritual pirs and ‘unity’ with Allah and inspirations and ecstasy. While Sufism's component of ecstasy is not considered, unlike the rest of the elements comprising their stages, explicitly heretical (unless it is classified according to the illegal “inspirations”), it is nevertheless certainly antithetical to Islamic doctrine, which speaks of a different type of joy, one of a strictly vital – and ordinary – quality contained within the earthly life, a joy that in the afterlife continues in a similar – though intensified – vital character. The sufikuffar, as with all hypocrites, seek to use this Islamic scripture to promote their blasphemy of obtaining a Divine bliss during the life, misusing Quran 20:130 as evidence that their *zikr* practices can lead to marifat ecstasy, when the verse in question is much simpler in scope:

Bear then patiently what they say, and glorify your Lord by the praising of Him before the rising of the sun and before its setting, and during hours of the night do also glorify (Him) and during parts of the day, that you may be **well pleased**. (Quran 20:130)

The final portion of the verse is sometimes described in terms of a higher joy, but the more fitting translation is an ordinary type of pleasure or egoistic satisfaction, with the above “well pleased” much more appropriate than the mystic joy – as the Quran is describing a feeling that emerges within the earthly life. After all, the rest of the scriptural references to joy and pleasure are best understood in light of the restrictions assigned by Islam to the ordinary life, which is only to be lived once, which is strictly a place for improving one's chances at *escaping* the dreaded afterlife hellfire. Indeed the joy mentioned is often explicitly in relation to that relief, with one verse saying, “On the day when they shall see the angels, **there shall be no joy on that day for the guilty**, and they shall say: ‘It is a forbidden thing totally prohibited.’ ” (Quran 25:22) The afterlife joy (of a reprieve from the hellfire) is left for the actual believers whom Allah chooses – but only of those he considers to have correctly followed the Islamic principles, or those whom he forgives for whatever reason he adopts. It is a ‘joy’ that is only obtained when the believer meets his Lord on that Day, as seen in a hadith that can be mischievously used by the sufis in support of their heretical plots against genuine Islam:

Abu Huraira (Allah be pleased with him) reported Allah's Messenger as saying:

Every (good) deed of the son of Adam would be multiplied, a good deed receiving a tenfold to seven hundredfold reward. Allah, the Exalted and Majestic, has said: With the exception of

fasting, for it is done for Me and I will give a reward for it, for one abandons his passion and food for My sake. There are two occasions of joy for one who fasts, joy when he breaks it, and joy when he meets his Lord, and the breath (of an observer of fast) is sweeter to Allah than the fragrance of musk. (Sahih Muslim Book 6, Hadith 2567)

While the sufis might certainly interpret this joy as the result of an *earthly*, occult ‘unity’ with Allah, the hadith is merely describing the afterlife meeting that results from the Muslim adhering to correct Islamic principles including fasting. That the meeting is on the Day of Judgement is further demonstrated when we recall that the greatest of all men, Mohammed, did not have any authentic occult interaction with Allah other than the Night Journey that included brief auditions, and the witnessing of a “veil of light”. The Prophet did not mention an experience of ‘Divine’ ecstasy during his occult encounters; nor too is there any mention of this by any of the other prophets in the Quran. What was constantly stressed, however, was a boon in the afterlife, a vital pleasure that is hidden from the believer while upon earth, the time in which they have to prove themselves to Allah through belief and “good works” or deeds:

No soul knoweth what is kept hid for them of joy, as a reward for what they used to do. Is he then who is a believer like him who is a transgressor? They are not equal. **But as for those who believe and do good works, for them are the Gardens of Retreat - a welcome (in reward) for what they used to do.** (Quran 32:17-19)

In the twisted Asura of Falsehood's creation of Islam, the “good works” of Islam primarily involve the violent expansion of the religion, one in which the unbelievers are imposed upon until they are killed, converted, or subjugated into a slow death through taxation. And if the spoils of war are certainly a reward for these earthly actions, passages similar to the previous one offer a heavenly bounty after a lifetime of strenuous warmongering, with the “Gardens of Retreat” not a reference to either a temporal joy or the sufi myth of unity with Allah. Indeed, the Quran is quite clear that the “parable of the Garden” is an afterlife enjoyment, a striking contrast from the eternal hellfire that awaits the unbeliever: It is only – as the following passage describes – in the hereafter that the believers will experience a “bliss”, presented as an eternal form of vital enjoyment, one that vastly supersedes the transient pleasures of the world:

Allah amplifies and straitens the means of subsistence for whom He pleases; and they rejoice in this world's life, **and this world's life is nothing compared with the hereafter but a temporary enjoyment.** And those who disbelieve say: “Why is not a sign sent down upon him by his Lord?” Say: “Surely Allah makes him who will go astray, and guides to Himself those who turn (to Him). Those who believe and whose hearts are set at rest by the remembrance of Allah; now surely by Allah's remembrance are the hearts set at rest. **Those who believe and do right: Joy is for them, and bliss (their) journey's end.**” And thus We have sent you among a nation before which other nations have passed away, that you might recite to them what We have revealed to you and (still) they deny the Beneficent Allah. Say: “He is my Lord, there is no god but He; on Him do I rely and to Him is my return.” And even if there were a Quran with which the mountains were made to pass away, or the earth were travelled over with it, or the dead were made to speak thereby, Nay! the commandment is wholly Allah's. Have not yet those who believe known that if Allah pleases He would certainly guide all the people? As for those who disbelieve, disaster ceaseth not to strike them because of what they do, or it dwelleth near their home until the threat of Allah come to pass. Surely Allah will not fail in (His) promise. **And messengers before you were certainly mocked at, but I gave respite to those who disbelieved, then I destroyed them. How then was my punishment!** Is He then Who watches every soul as to what it earns? And yet they give associates to Allah! Say: “Give them a name; nay, do you mean to inform Him of what He does not know in the earth, or (do you affirm this)

by an outward saying?" Rather, their plans are made to appear fair-seeming to those who disbelieve, and they are kept back from the path; and whom Allah makes err, he shall have no guide. They shall have chastisement in this world's life, and the chastisement of the hereafter is certainly more grievous, and they shall have no protector against Allah. **The parable of the Garden which the righteous are promised! - beneath it flow rivers: perpetual is the enjoyment thereof and the shade therein: such is the end of the Righteous; and the end of Unbelievers in the Fire.** (Quran 13:26-35)

Though the sufis might attempt to use the part of the passage describing a "remembrance" leading to a "bliss" at the "journey's end" as support for their earthly *zikr* resulting in marifat ecstasy, the reminder of the Garden at the conclusion of the passage confirms "the end" to be none other than the vital Islamic Paradise. It is a type of afterlife experience that is quite differently described in the Sanatana Dharma, yet similarly involves a separation of consciousness between the individual and God. It is precisely because of this separation that the Sages and Yogin never advocate the Heaven or Swarga as the ultimate of realizations, for they permanently experience the Transcendental and Supreme Brahma beyond the varied paradises existing within the Cosmos. And that indeed is their location, within the inner worlds the majority of humanity cannot access during their lifetime, but *not* beyond the Cosmos bounded by the Golden Lid - and not even to the level of the Overmind from where the Gods and Goddesses silently work. For the Swargalokas maintain a separation of consciousness, whereas the Gods and Goddesses of the Overmind are United in Consciousness with Brahma yet assigned unique Aspects of function and work. Because of their Unity, they experience a Conscious and Eternal Ananda that is not available in the same perpetuity to the evolving individual consciousness that can obtain a temporary respite in the heavenly regions - or even the underworlds or netherworlds that the Puranas, as we recall, accurately reflect to be the location of Islam's Paradise for jihadi murderers:

Below the earth lie the seven regions of the underworld (Patala). Their names are Atala, Vitala, Nitala, Sutala, Talatala, Rasatala and Patala. The daityas, danavas and the snakes (sarpa) live there. **The underworld is a wonderful place, more beautiful than heaven itself.** The sage Narada once went on a trip to the underworld and was bowled over by its beauty. It is full of palaces and jewels. The sun rises there, but does not radiate too much of heat. The moon also rises, but its beams are not at all chilly. The forests are populated by beautiful trees and the ponds are thick with lotus flowers, the songs of cuckoo birds are heard everywhere. Below the underworld sleeps a great snake, known as Shesha or Ananta. It has a thousand hoods, all covered with jewels. In fact, this snake is really Vishnu in one of his various forms.

Also part of the world are hells (naraka), presided over by Yama, the god of death. Those are full of weapons, fire and poisons and sinners are sent there to be punished...Each sinner receives a punishment that is in **proportion** to the severity of his sin. Of course, if one performs penance (prayashchitta) for one's sins, one need not go to naraka. The best form of penance is praying to Krishna. (*Brahma Purana*, Preliminaries)

Of note in this particular Puranic account of the Patalas and of Naraka itself is the *proportional* or balanced nature to the wrong-doer's entry into hell, for in it we find no mention of "disbelievers" or "disbelief" leading one into the hellfire (the sins are related to evil actions taken during the lifetime, such as slaying someone simply because they believe in a different name of God), and penance performed even prior to the life prevents one from arriving in hell. Also, the narakas are not described as *eternal*, befitting the Sanatana Dharma's experience of the Law of Karma, of which the punitive portion (remember, Karma is much more than simple reward and punishment) *might* entail rebirths in order to exhaust previous wrong-doing, although punishment need not be forever, especially if the psychological lesson is achieved. And as the best penance is praying to Sri Krishna, the Grace of God extends to *all* wrongdoers, for we recall that Sri Krishna, unlike the Asura of Falsehood's formulation

of Allah, beckons to mortals according to infinite names, which means that *any* name of God chosen by the wrong-doer will help to obtain that Grace.

Returning to the similarities of Islam's Paradise with the Puranic account of the underworlds, we must detail another reason for the apparent superiority of the netherworlds to the Swargaloka. For as the definition of Swar or Svar is Mind, the corresponding paradises or Swargalokas, in the Hindu experience, are naturally located within the expansive Svar or Mental region - hidden, illumined and elevated in relation to the ordinary mentality, yet below the Golden Lid. Thus in addition to the previously addressed fact of the intoxicating pleasures of the Patalas distracting one away from the Supreme Consciousness, the sheer fact of their respective regions – Swargaloka in the Mind, Patalas in the Vital – leads to their differentiation, with the Swargalokas designed to increase the higher illumination that can eventually form a foundation for Self-Realization, the Patalas designed to exhaust the vital tendencies of mankind so that they might proceed towards greater Mental or Psychic realizations. And we certainly find in the Asura's scripture an abundance of *vital* characteristics to Islam's Paradise:

“Surely we fear from our Lord a stern, distressful day.” **Therefore Allah hath warded off from them the evil of that day, and hath made them find brightness and joy, And reward them, because they were patient, with garden and silk,** Reclining therein on **raised couches**, they shall find therein neither (the severe heat of) the sun nor intense cold. And close down upon them (shall be) its shadows, and its **fruits** shall be made near (to them), being easy to reach. And there shall be made to go round about them **vessels of silver and goblets which are of glass**, (Transparent as) glass, made of silver; they have measured them according to a measure. And they shall be made to drink therein a cup the admixture of which shall be ginger, (Of) a fountain therein which is named Salsabil. **And round about them shall go youths never altering in age**; when you see them you will think them to be scattered pearls. And when you see there, you shall see blessings and a great kingdom. Upon them shall be **garments of fine green silk and thick silk interwoven with gold, and they shall be adorned with bracelets of silver**, and their Lord shall make them drink a pure drink. (And it will be said unto them): “Lo! this is a reward for you. Your endeavour (upon earth) hath found acceptance.” (Quran 76:10-22)

The rays of Divine light of the Vedic Swargaloka are, even without the liberation of the consciousness into the Transcendental Brahma, superior in character to this Islamic Paradise, with the latter a reward for a lifetime of murder and subjugation of non-Muslims, a mere extension of the spoils of war from earth into ‘paradise’. The vital pleasures of the earth are heightened in the Asura's tale of heaven, with the believers remunerated with a “joy” of garden and silk, gold and silver, couches and goblets, and the accompaniment of undying youth. While the last peculiar feature of Islam's heaven has had, as we will soon see, a profound impact on the fate of remnant Pakistan, we also note in the clear association of joy to vital pleasures, a significant divergence from the marifat ecstasy of the sufis, who never portray their intermittent experience in terms of the vital pleasures craved by the pious Muslims. Indeed in this differentiation between the sufi occultists and the pious Muslim, we must give credit to the sufis for at least recognizing Islam's intensification of the lower vital pleasures as an unrefined type of ‘joy’, an understanding that motivates some of them to seek the type of earthly mystic experiences that only a small selection of mankind have reached, even if they consciously do not aspire to the Ultimate Realization.

While the sufis are able to ignore the Quran's message of fear with regards to their aspirations for inspiration and other intermediate mystic experiences, and similarly dismiss Islam's limited peak of earthly human joy as inadequate in relation to their intermittent marifat ecstasy, they nevertheless consciously allow for Islam to contribute significant mystic obstructions to their unique, and heretical, religion of Sufism. Indeed, even with the eventual sufi rejection of a Muslim identity – only vocalized

when they reach Sufism's summit of an intermittent ecstasy -, the years and years of their partial adherence to the shariat are enough to maintain at least one of the Asura of Falsehood's objectives with his concocted Islam. For at least the Asura has, through a constant stress on a strictly transcendental consciousness of Allah, prevented the sufis from seeking a true unity under terms of that consciousness. The sufis can only, as Ibn Arabi's works exemplify, conceive of a diluted unity, for at every moment that they incline to break the bonds defining that partial connection, their Asuric Islamic teaching transmits a fear of heresy – because in transgressing that particular line, they will become too obviously similar to the hated Hindu kuffar, of whose denigration the sufis unassumingly welcome.

In their unencumbered acceptance of Islam's assignment of permanent inferiority to the majority of Hindu Polytheists, the sufis automatically ensure a failure to reach the Supreme Unity, because their mental and vital regions cannot help but become infiltrated with the base egoistic contents of the Asuric scripture, even if the magnitude of the depravity is not as strong as the most pious of Muslims. For with that invasion of hatred and especially a permanent sense of division, arrives both a subtle burden on the concentration, and an attachment – to a hatred and supposed inferiority of the Hindus – that even as a *subconscious* formation can lead to significant problems in the mystic realms, suddenly arriving in conjunction with occult experiences hinting at *hulul* or Self-Realization, reminding the sufi that he should – per Allah – fear the association with the Polytheist *and Polytheist aspirations* like moksha, even if the same sufi occasionally excuses some of the Polytheist's outward *behaviour*. The sufi has at least enough of the Asuric imprint to fear the particular invective of Polytheism, even if they fail to follow other commandments of Islam, an inadequacy that marks them as psychological descendants of the rebellious – to Islam – clans of Mohammed's time:

Those unto whom We gave the Scripture rejoice in that which is revealed unto thee. **And of the clans there are who deny some of it.** Say: I am commanded only that I serve Allah and ascribe unto Him no partner. Unto Him I cry, and unto Him is my return. (Quran 13:36)

While the sufis intellectually reject Polytheism (even while actually practising it!) and in extension the vast majority of Hindus - to the point where the very word Polytheism is used to describe things the sufis find negative (even if the item has no relation to the actual definition of Polytheism) -, they deny the sanctity of different infrarational revelations in the Quran, a ‘crime’ evident by their persistent search for inspirations and revelations and visions and ecstasies, all of which the Quran either explicitly forbids them, or implies – by omission within the scripture – to be aspirations off limits to the Muslim. This is why Rumi and other sufis know that their final state of marifat places them in a straightforward confrontation with the Quran, and why Rumi in particular was candid in disavowing fidelity to the Quran once the ecstasy was reached, for his pre-marifat denial of certain verses had been finally confirmed in the experience of ecstasy, giving him the confidence to *indirectly* announce his apostasy. But this *unconscious* repudiation of *actual Islam* should not make the Hindu relax to the dangers of Sufism, for the true nature of this rejection must always be viewed with the understanding that the sufis, like all other sects of Islam, foolishly believe themselves to be the genuine adherents of Islam (even while the sufis, specifically, reject the Quran)! Therefore, even the heretics from the religion will always propagate the idea of themselves as the “true Muslims”, distinct from both lesser believers and of course the permanently inferior “unbelievers”.

Indeed the sufi's fanatical delusion of a superiority to other Muslims, combined with their doctrine of intermediate inner experiences, the mixed nature of which they similarly hold to be the ultimate state of existence (when it – *including* the downrushes of Ananda – is simply the beginning of the internal psychological and subtle work to be done in transforming the receptive adhar into a place that can hold the Immensity of the Self-Realization), is what makes them arguably even more treacherous to Hindus than the orthodox, because the latter often have difficulty in practising taqiyah for extended periods of time due to the volatile nature of the forces invoked by an Asuric faith. After all, the debased Islamic

qualities of paranoia, bigotry, hatred, an extreme sensitivity to perceived insults, monstrous lust, and of course, a desire to violently conquer the ‘other’, are difficult to suppress (from externally manifesting) for long within the minds of primitive men lacking the necessary mental control required to sustain a *taqiyah* of enough duration to secure the necessary conditions for a victory. But as Sufism has more facets to its doctrine than actual Islam, yet at the same time approves of Islam's goal of savage conquest, it is perilous to the Hindu, who might assume Sufism to be – simply because of a few superficial similarities – amicable to the Sanatana Dharma, when the reality is that Sufism, from the perspective of Hindu polity, is merely a different hue of the same Asuric darkness.

* * * *

That the Hindus are in some instances misled with regards to the true nature of Sufism is a result, primarily, of the aforementioned reflex to give the benefit of doubt to individuals partaking in any form of mystic discipline - even those, like the sufis, who inevitably glorify an Asuric religion. But there is another reason, one that emerged relatively recent to that historic penchant, for the tendency of some Hindus to assume Sufism as a religion seeking the same profundities illumined in the Veda, Upanishads and Bhagavad Gita. This peculiar susceptibility is the direct result of a subtle, and intellectual, distortion of a Rig Vedic verse, *Ekam sat vipra bahuda vadanti* (Rig Veda 1.164.46), that translates as, “Truth is One, the Seers call It by many names.” The subtle – and inappropriate – misrepresentation of this verse has been, in modern times, to broaden an already liberal verse into a proclamation of the uniform “truth” of *all* religions. In further support of this, proponents of the “all religions are equal” inaccuracy turn to the Bhagavad Gita, in which Sri Krishna says, “As men approach Me, so I accept them to My love (*bhajami*); men follow in every way my path, O son of Pritha.” (Bhagavad Gita 4:11)

But these two scriptural citations can only be known as true - in relation to the “all religions are equal” premise - from the vantage of those with the Highest Consciousness, of which Sri Krishna and the Vedic Seers naturally belong. From there, the Transcendental Brahma, *everything* becomes equal, and all paths – including the Atheistic – lead to Sri Krishna. The crucial caveat to this, the factor of absolute necessity in understanding how all paths can lead to Sri Krishna - the Bhagavad Gita quote is much more appropriately used for the “all religions are equal” argument, because the Veda verse simply mentions multiple names the *Self-Realized Seers* know Brahma by –, rests in the principles of time and reincarnation. For all paths certainly lead to Sri Krishna, but not all paths arrive at him within a solitary lifetime, as one might especially expect in the cases of individuals – like Hitler and Mohammed – whose Psychic withdraws entirely: Indeed unless those two offered a miraculous and sincere renunciation of their actions during their lives – completely unlikely with Hitler, whom the Asura of Falsehood impelled to suicide –, the journey of their consciousness will undoubtedly include a severe Karma of terrible worlds and reincarnations in which choices must be continuously made towards the Psychic option, if that centre of consciousness is to eventually reach anything close to Self-Realization.

That extreme trajectory can still be considered a path to Sri Krishna, with the clear distinction that the time involved will potentially span millennia upon millennia, through countless rebirths. But when the “all religions are equal” votaries seek to associate the likes of Islam and Sufism with the Sanatana Dharma, their implication is that the highest of realizations are equally as likely with the former two in comparison with the latter. That possibility, of course, is unequivocally rejected by *both* Islam and Sufism, with the rare exception of two barely followed and extremely heretic schools of Sufism, both of whom are discredited by even the moderate apostates of a sect that nevertheless suffers periodic executions – by the orthodox Muslims - of its own members. Even with the clear distinction made by the actual religions themselves, it is nevertheless worth analysing the example of Sufism, which

purports itself – unlike the primitive and rigid Islam – to be a conglomeration of mystic orders. In comparison, both the classical mystic paths and Hinduism advocate a Self-Realization that the sufis reject – but that is not the key point with regards to the “all religions are equal” proponents *and their use* of the Veda and Gita to support their thesis.

For if the clear divergence between the aim of the sufis – that of a diluted ‘unity’ - and the Hindus – that of Self-Realization – is enough to ascertain that these two paths do not reach the same conclusion, it is also important to specify that we are referring to a finale either within the lifetime, or at the very moment of death. This time frame, after all, is the purpose - at least for the Hindu sadhaks – of entering the mystic paths – the *acceleration* of a process that can take multiple lifetimes, even if the truth of all paths leading to Sri Krishna can eventually occur without sadhana, albeit over centuries or millennia. The sadhak aspires to advance this ascension of consciousness, which is why he or she enters the spiritual path of yoga, becomes the disciple of a Guru, and renounces certain features of the earthly life. This is why “all religions are equal” cannot be applied *in combination* with the Veda or Upanishads or Bhagavad Gita, as proponents of the theory are fond of doing, because the verses of these scriptures refer to a much different denouement than that of Islam or Sufism, as the latter two *consciously* reject the Vedic or Vedantic or Gita aspiration, meaning that adherents of the two religions automatically require at least one more lifetime to reach Sri Krishna, because they explicitly do not *believe* in that possibility either during the life or at the moment of death.

Indeed the example of Sri Krishna himself, even from the perspective of the sadhak that believes in Self-Realization, is quite illuminating on the matter, at least with regards to the *accelerated* path to God, which is precisely sadhana and yoga. For Sri Krishna is known among the Yogin and Indian – or foreign sadhaks instructed according to the Indian paths – mystics to be one of the most difficult deities to approach, even though he has forever told mankind that all paths lead to him. To obtain the help of, or the direct contact with (in his Overmind manifestation), Sri Krishna while undertaking sadhana, requires a lot of psychological preparation or refinement in the form of sincerity and humility and concentration, along with the eliminated personal ambition and vanity and lust, and of course the requisite prayer or call to Him specifically. If Sri Krishna, or other actual Gods or Goddesses (those who manifest in the Overmind although they are technically of the Supramental) with similarly strict criteria (as differentiated from deities like Shiva who are known to be more generous with their help or boons to the sadhak and devotee), deem the disciple to be psychologically unprepared, to still have too much ego, that individual will be ‘shown the door’, their calls taken by other beings such as the vital ‘gods’ that if occasionally of benefit to the spiritual quest, tend to function more in granting specific *material* boons.

Of course, even after understanding all of this, the “all religions are equal” exponents might propose the example of a “Muslim” entering into Hindu mystic orders, or that a “Muslim” can potentially obtain Self-Realization. This scenario, of people who self-identify as “Muslim” meeting the Hindu guidelines – which are all based on a refinement of the psychology that is universally achievable to mortals, including those who have never heard of Hinduism - for Self-Realization and then reaching that state, is absolutely possible, and is likely to have already happened. The problem, however, is that these same “Muslims” cannot possibly meet the *Islamic* criteria of a genuine Muslim, because in order for such “Muslims” to enter the Hindu (or mystic paths advocating *hulul* or Self-Realization) spiritual paths in the first place, they have to *believe* that multiple spiritual or religious disciplines are equal to the worthiness of Islam – after all, if they fail to believe in that parity, they will have already restrained themselves from receiving instruction from a Guru. And if they actually believe in the non-Islamic spiritual disciplines, which will always take different names for God besides Allah, they immediately expose themselves as apostates due to the crime of *shirk*.

But these self-identified “Muslims”, it is important to remember, are not consciously aware of their

actual status as Apostates or Hypocrites or Pretenders, and assume – perhaps because they were raised without an intensive education on the Islamic scripture, or because they were specifically taught the heresy that non-Islamic paths are equivalent to Islam, or possibly due an extraordinary self-delusion justified by scraps of the Quran – their participation in Kafir activities as a sign of actual Islamic behaviour! The truth, however, is that the real Muslim will never involve himself in a Polytheistic path, because the Muslim – as he should if he is faithful to the Asuric scripture – believes in an absolute separation from “unbelievers”, along with a ‘divine’ sanction to eternally humiliate them, as he believes their status worthy of subjugation or death or rape. This perverse mentality, of course, is an Asuric falsehood, because all mortals have the Purusha deep within, and should be approached, even in extreme circumstances such as war, from the psychology of samata, an inherent equality that the actual Muslims - the ones who are supposed to murder heretical “Muslims” who commit sins such as entering a Hindu spiritual order – reject because of their indoctrination. Similarly will the pious deny the possibility that “all religions are equal”, a stance that the heretical sufis – contrary to the perception non-Muslims have with regards to these alleged saints – *also* entertain. For the sufis, including the glorified Rumi, likewise do *not* believe in the inherent equality behind all existence:

(Many) different roads have become easy (to follow): every one's religion has become (to him) as (dear) as life.

If God's making (religion) easy were the (right) road, every Jew and Zoroastrian would have knowledge of Him.

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book I, 483-84)

If Rumi had had frequent acquaintance with the Hindus, he would have included them in this denigration of other faiths, a vilification that exposes his disbelief in the so-called equality of religions, contrary to the overriding reputation that Rumi represents the finest example of both Sufism's and Islam's “tolerance” for other faiths. It is an accolade based on misunderstandings of some of his poetry, including, for instance, when he writes, “Every prophet and every saint hath a way (of religious doctrine and practice), but it leads to God: all (the ways) are (really) one.” (*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book I, 3086) This, if loosely read, might be interpreted as his endorsement of the “all religions are equal” thesis; however when it is closely examined, it can only be a reference to the prophets and ‘saints’ admired *by Sufism*, and all of *their* ways leading to Allah – the paths of the non-Muslims, however, are still to be dismissed. That Rumi is committing a blasphemy in alleging multiple (sufic and Islamic) paths to Allah, when the Quran and authentic hadith demand a uniform interpretation of the scripture, is of no concern to sufis as they obstinately persist in a belief that their idea of Islam is the ‘true’ one. And as even the heretic “Muslims” are liable to do, Rumi on frequent occasions attacked the veracity of different faiths as acceptable paths, with the following stanza a subtle critique that initially appears to confirm the opposite:

In the salutations and benedictions addressed to the righteous (saints) praise of all the prophets is blended.

The praises are all commingled (and united): the jugs are poured into one basin.

Inasmuch as the object of praise Himself is not more than One, from this point of view (all) religions are but one religion.

Know that every praise goes (belongs) to the Light of God and is (only) lent to (created) forms and persons.

How should folk praise (any one) except Him who (alone) has the right (to be praised)? - **but they go astray on (the ground of) a vain fancy.**

The Light of God in relation to phenomena is as a light shining upon a wall—the wall is a link (focus) for these splendours:

Necessarily, when the reflexion moved towards its source, he who had gone astray lost the moon and ceased from praise; Or (again) a reflexion of the moon appeared from a well, and he (the misguided one) put his head into the well and was praising that same (reflexion):

In truth he is a praiser of the moon, although his ignorance has turned its face towards its (the moon's) reflexion.

His praise belongs to the moon, not to that reflexion, (but) that (praise) becomes infidelity when the matter is misapprehended;

For that bold man was led astray by (his) perdition: the moon was above, while he fancied it was below.

(The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book III, 2122-2132)

While Rumi presents his argument in the manner of one who understands how the error of disbelief in Allah's exclusivity can emerge, he nevertheless describes the divergent worship as “infidelity”, a conclusion that vitiates any possibility – seen in the initial part of the stanza – that he actually believed all “religions are but one religion”. Although Rumi was able to acknowledge that worship of the reflection is at heart the worship of God, he could not subsequently unify the two, so influenced was he by the Asuric content of Islam in which a mere discrepancy in name of God is enough to establish a person as an “unbeliever”. Indeed, Rumi's writings expose the standard Islamic bigotry with regards to Polytheistic belief, such as when he wrote, “For speaking is for the purpose of (producing) belief: **the spirit of polytheism is quit (devoid) of belief in God.**” (*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book IV, 3295*) He also went as far as to encourage the traditional Islamic ambition of eliminating Polytheism, along with invoking Allah's role in this hateful drive, writing, “There remains *except God*: all the rest is gone. **Hail, O mighty Love, destroyer of polytheism!**” (*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book V, 590*)

But the inspiration for Polytheistic worship, the Gods and Goddesses manifesting in the Overmind though their real source is the Supramental, simply cannot be destroyed, as they are eternal, immortal albeit typal, functioning in the cosmos as various emanations or Personalities of Brahma. They, unlike the Asuras, have not lost their *conscious* connection to the Transcendent Supreme, and a major part of their emanation was to function as a cosmic type of correction to the advent of the Asura's separated consciousness', existing as Aspects of the Supramental Brahma who – if the mortal *chooses* – offer multiple paths out of the falsehood and ignorance of the world. Though this multiplicity allows for a lot of fluidity in the search for the highest realizations, the very fact that the Gods and Goddesses of the Overmind manifestation have a specific mission – through infinite methods – to counter the Asuras, shows that at the very least, the “all religions are equal” thesis requires significant caveats, especially when the Asura of Falsehood, as in Islam, invades the domain of religion. For like everything else, formulations of mankind can be twisted according to the the Asura's inversion of wisdom, which in the case of Islam also appears in its Asuric distortion of the Dharmic truth of many paths leading to God, with Islam proposing the extreme opposite, to the extent of engendering perpetual battles between those claiming to be the ‘true’ Muslims. It is an internecine warfare that the sufis, including the great Rumi, do absolutely nothing to prevent – indeed they actually fan the flames!

So in fear of the miracles of the prophets have the sceptics

slunk away under the grass,

That they may live in hypocrisy with the reputation of being Moslems, and that you may not know who they are.

Like **counterfeiters**, they smear the base coin with silver and (inscribe on it) the name of the King.

The outward form of their words is profession of the Divine Unity and the religion (of Islam): the inward meaning thereof is like darnel seed in bread.

The philosopher has not the stomach (courage) to breathe a word: if he utter a word, the true Religion will confound him.

(The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book I, 2147-51)

While we already have discussed the benefits of scepticism and philosophy to mystic paths, assuming they are applied in a harmonious fashion to other aspects of a spiritual discipline, what is of note here is Rumi's outright contention that Muslims who are sceptical of their religion are indeed hypocrites, with only a public reputation of "being Moslems". This is the language of a takfiri, with the obvious exception that Rumi – like the vast majority of sufis – was *himself* a hypocrite and only outwardly Muslim, a fact most scandalously seen in his call to dismiss the Quran's importance once the intermittent ecstasy has been obtained. His official status as a pretender, of course, did not temper Rumi's fanatical zeal, for even with his blasphemous beliefs, he still held the dogma that Islam, and one version of Islam – his -, is the true religion. And though he and other sufis innovate their haqiqa and marifa into a religion that rejects both, they nevertheless use the Quran verses – as Rumi does in the following diatribe against rationalists – as evidence supporting their ironic denunciation of "Muslims" whom they judge to be hypocrites:

This is his (the hypocrite's) argument: he says at every moment, "If there were anything else, I should have seen it."

If a child does not see the various aspects of reason, will a rational person ever abandon reason?

And if a rational person does not see the various aspects of Love, (yet) the auspicious moon of Love does not wane...

This matter hath no limit in perfection, (yet) it seems like a fancy to every one that is deprived (of the reality).

Since to him the reality is the pudendum and the gullet, do not expound the mysteries of the Beloved to him.

To us the pudendum and the gullet are a (mere) fancy; consequently the (Beloved) Soul displays His beauty (to us) at every moment.

Any one whose custom and habit is (addiction to) the pudendum and the gullet, for him (the fit answer) is "Unto you (your) religion and unto me (my) religion."

Cut short thy talk with such (incarnate) scepticism: do not converse, O Ahmad, with the ancient infidel.

(The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book V, 3930-41)

Rumi in this stanza exposes the actual nature of the Quran verse, which in modern taqiyyah is used to 'prove' the lie that Islam accepts other religious faiths, when the reality of the verse is that of an expression of disgust towards the 'other' religion and its adherent, a statement telling the heinous hypocrite or Polytheist to remove his contaminated faith away from the pious Muslim. But the "hypocrite" of the pudendum and the gullet is not entirely wrong, it is just that he – like the sufi and

their diluted unity and intermittent ecstasy – sees a partial reality; accordingly, Rumi is guilty of the standard Islamic over-reaction, one based on the Asuric influence of the shariat, the doctrine of separation and bigoted labelling, precepts that should be antithetical to mystics who - if they follow the occult discipline to its utmost realization - should *experience* the world as a myriad of opinions and evolutionary types of partial truths contained within the greatest Truth. The sufis however, are intermediary mystics, with fragmentary openings of the inner consciousness which is yet dragged down by the gravity of the Asuric shariat. Otherwise we would not find these so-called saints, as Rumi does in the following, describing the “infidel thought” of Polytheists and hypocrites as the repository of trash:

Do not put musk on your body, rub it on your heart. What is musk? The holy name of the Glorious (God).

The hypocrite puts musk on his body and puts his spirit at the bottom of the ash-pit.

On his tongue the name of God, and in his soul stench (arising) from his infidel thought.

In relation to him praise of God is (like) the herbage of the ash-pit: it is roses and lilies (growing) upon a dunghill.

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book II, 267-70)

The language used expresses a primitive and unsaintly rage that further manages to show the sufis for what they are – non-Realized kuffar who fanatically believe their innovated idea of Islam to be the only true religion, to the extent that other “Muslims” within the community, including the genuinely pious, are deemed rubbish. It is a viciousness that at the very least demonstrates an inflexible posture of the Ignorance, part of their narcissistic opinion of themselves, one that assimilates the language of the Quran into a slightly different idea of an Infidel that nevertheless includes the Hindu along with the *munafiq*. This vanity, as we know, includes the ignorant idea that spiritual ardour is a significant accomplishment, with Rumi writing, “(Spiritual) ardour belongs to the saints and prophets; on the other hand, impudence is the refuge of every impostor.” (*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book III, 730) Additionally confirming their spiritual vanity, the sufic intoxication is likewise supposed to establish them as the unique race among men, for as Rumi wrote, “**All mankind are children except him that is intoxicated with God**; none is grownup except him that is freed from sensual desire.” (*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book I, 3430) Indeed, in another Rumi verse the idea of “superiority” is related to a spiritual “nobility”:

The superiority of that (person's) place is in respect of (his spiritual) nobility; the place (that is) far from the (spiritual) seat of honour is held in slight regard.

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book II, 1963)

But to hold these ideas is first and foremost to expose the frailty or incompleteness to one's own spirituality, because the purpose of the spiritual paths is precisely to remove from one's consciousness the egoistic fastenings of vanity and ambition, *especially* the spiritual type of ambition or vanity to be renowned as belonging to a class of spiritual elite. For the Self-Realized individual will never view himself in that manner, not just in relation to becoming free from the egoistic perceptions, but also because of that very status of Self-Realization, which is transcendental yet automatically involves a feeling of profound *equality* with all of existence, a state that intrinsically precludes the sense of superiority – after all, if *all* is One, then there is no ‘other’ to claim superiority above. The sufis, however, do not believe in Self-Realization, and let the religious vanity and ambition of the shariat invade and transform the mystic path into one where sufi occultists compete in miraculous performances, demand acknowledgement of their “superiority”, and even – as we have seen – chastise

as apostates those failing to adhere to *their* blasphemous precepts.

Not only is this sufi delusion the very dangerous (as far as consciously attaining to the Self or Purusha) spiritual narcissism, it is also completely heretical to Islam, a religion that fails to document the possibility of ‘saints’, and ‘divinely’ sanctions the fulfilment of the basest of desires such as the rape of children and kidnapped women, as long as it fits the ‘law’ set forth by the Asura. The sufis, however, manage to convince themselves that their mystic tradition is verified within the Quran, that their scandalous interpretation of the holy book is the correct one, and that *they* are worthiest “Muslims” vying for the throne of Islam (if we are to apply, to the topic of identifying the most pious of Muslims, the Asura's infrarationally revealed distortion of the cosmic function of the multiple Gods and Goddesses). Indeed the sufis, befitting both their Islamic heritage and the Asura of Falsehood's cardinal sign, specifically use the language of the Quran, and the book itself, to assert themselves as the ‘truest’ Muslims, when their doctrinal content in fact does not match the Islamic words put forth in their pronouncements:

Thou hast interpreted (and altered the meaning of) the
virgin (uncorrupted) Word: **interpret (alter) thyself, not the
(Divine) Book.**

**Thou interpretest the Qur'an according to thy desire: by thee
the sublime meaning is degraded and perverted.**

(The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book I, 1080-81)

What Rumi accuses the hypocrites of doing is in reality precisely what he and other sufis indulge in – the altered interpretation of the Quran verses, which the orthodox consider a degradation and forgery of Islam. Indeed the sufic interpretation is better considered a “sublime” translation that twists the primitive nature of the scripture, for it requires quite the imagination and creativity to, as the sufis do, discover Quranic justification for ‘unity of being’ and marifat ecstasy, or the permission of occult experiences for Muslims posthumous to Mohammed. Incredible is the above use of the Quran from the pen of Rumi, for in his same Mathnawi he also dismisses the Asuric text as secondary to the ecstasy, relegating it to a transitional tool eventually to be discarded. The Quran, of course, is the beginning and the end of the Islamic religion, and cannot be secondary to *anything* else upon the earth. But as all hypocrites are inclined, the sufis attempt to more intensely play the Islamic game by consciously or unconsciously amplifying their critiques of “infidels” and “hypocrites”, adopting the language of the pious in a retaliatory and *defensive* measure, one which similarly involves the magnification of the Quran idol and counter-allegations that the “hypocrites” are not following the Quran appropriately, that *they* are disobeying covenants while pretending to adhere to the Quran:

**Every Hypocrite, by way of fraud, brought a Qur'an under his
arm to the Prophet,**

In order to take oaths - for oaths are a shield; (this they did)
because (taking) oaths is a custom followed by the wicked.

Since the wicked man does not keep faith in (matters of)
religion, he will break (his) oath at any time.

The righteous have no need of (taking) oath, because they
have two clear (discerning) eyes.

Breach of compacts and covenants is (the result) of
stupidity; keeping of oaths and faithfulness (to one's word) is
the practice of him that fears God.

(The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book II, 2871-75)

The sufis, however, are unrepentant in their abandonment of Islamic oaths, and the poetic lines secretly read as a confession, or at least a chastisement that Rumi should have directed towards himself and

fellow sufi 'saints'. For once Sufism's pir-murid relationship moves beyond simple instruction on the Quran and authentic hadith, the sect enters into egregious innovations (oath-breaking) and apostasy, albeit with the confused narrative that they are the proponents of actual Islam. It is a role – that of guardians of Islam – that they take seriously, although in general they fail to participate in the ordained jihad, a fact that automatically assigns them to hell. While the sufi heretics have their own peculiar innovations, including 'saints' governing the universe, that they postulate as crucial to their incorrect idea of Islam, along with those particular bidats arrive the traditional Islamic custom of separating and chastising the "hypocrites" of the religion, who fail to follow the deviant "Islam" the sufis allege themselves upholders of. The language the sufis use in identifying pretenders is quite easily applied to the orthodox, with Rumi writing, "**That hypocrite is (assiduous) in fasting and praying**, in order that it may be supposed that he is drunken with devotion (to God)." (*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book I, 2631) While the Hadith and Quran certainly acknowledge that some Muslims who engage in fasting and praying are secretly apostates, as Rumi and other sufis are similarly classed as kuffar, their proclamations will only serve to additionally infuriate the most pious, even if the sufis on other occasions were in agreement with the orthodox, such as in their defence of the murderer Khizr:

As for the boy whose throat was cut by Khadir, the vulgar do
not comprehend the mystery thereof.
He that receives from God inspiration and answer (to his
prayer), whatsoever he may command is the essence of right.
If one who bestows (spiritual) life should slay, it is allowable:
he is the (Divine) vicegerent, and his hand is the hand of God.
(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book I, 224-226)

Of course, if the sufis and orthodox are in agreement with Rumi's contention that "vulgar" hypocrites cannot appreciate why Khizr killed an innocent boy, the very next lines, which fail to demarcate who can receive "inspiration" from God, reconfirm Rumi's heresy. The stanza also substantiates a significant Asuric influence to a mystic who occasionally had moments of higher thinking and intuition, because the slaying of a boy due to the simple reason of his "disbelief" should never receive support from a mystic, who should understand that a *general* lack of belief is a temporary phenomena designed to lead to a greater and more comprehensive form of faith in the future. But Rumi fully supported the implementation of Islamic edicts – relating to critiques and punishments - for those failing to accept *Sufism's* bizarre idea of Islam, on one occasion writing, "**Whoever disobeys (God) becomes a devil**, for he becomes envious of the fortune of the righteous. When you have acted loyally in (keeping) your covenant with God, God will graciously keep His covenant with you." (*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book V, 1180-81) Once again we find the curious case of a mystic writing in terms of a militaristic order, with loyalty and disobedience – to God – of paramount importance, when the mystic should know that in reality there can be no substantial disloyalty or disobedience – at least to the extent of calling such people "devils" - when all of existence is secretly United in Consciousness.

While one would normally expect the propagation of more enlightened principles from a so-called mystic, especially one widely celebrated for his presumed broad-mindedness, from the perspective of those accurately following the twisted Islamic religion, the application of Rumi's poetry is easily assigned to the sufis themselves, and the sufis in their insubordination to Islam become the devils they so despise. Indeed in another stanza of Rumi's, in which all of the lines are ironically infused with either Sufism's blasphemies or denunciations more appropriately assigned to the 'saints', we find the curious state of affairs wherein a sufi lauds "conformist" ritual prayer while chastising the argumentative – at least in thought - hypocrite who only pretends to submit during congregation. For as

we know, Sufism is either frankly dismissive of the group prayer, or innovates into it bidats that should never accompany it. We also find in the selection the continued use of the Asura of Falsehood's provocative and separative language, with the "hypocrite" destined for the eternal hellfire, the "believers" victorious after all:

The infidels in contending (for equality with the prophets and saints) have the nature of an ape: the (evil) nature is a canker within the breast.

Whatever a man does, the ape at every moment does the same thing that he sees done by the man.

He thinks, "I have acted like him": how should that quarrelsome-looking one know the difference?

This one (the holy man) acts by the command (of God), and he (the apish imitator) for the sake of quarrelling (rivalry).

Pour dust on the heads of those who have quarrelsome faces!

That (religious) hypocrite joins in ritual prayer with the (sincere) conformist (only) for quarrellings sake, not for supplication.

In prayer and fasting and pilgrimage and alms-giving the true believers are (engaged) with the hypocrite in (what brings) victory and defeat.

Victory in the end is to the true believers; upon the hypocrite (falls) defeat in the state hereafter.

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book I, 281-87)

Rumi, like the majority of sufis, confirms his agreement with the Islamic custom – infrarationally inspired by the Asura of Falsehood – of competing for the mythical title of best Muslim, along with the concurrent punishment – or "defeat" - of the pretend "Muslims" in the *infinite* hellfire, a cruel fate that one would not expect to be advocated by a so-called saint. It is a principle of takfir that ironically will lead to the death of Sufism or those "Muslims" who dare to respect and appreciate them, a reversal that we will shortly find salient to the ongoing convulsions in "Muslim" majority regions of the Indian subcontinent. That the sufis, including their famed poets, so readily champion takfir, albeit according to their fraudulent idea of Islam, makes a mockery of the utilization, by some, of Sufism in promoting the thesis of the equality of all religions. For if the sufis cannot even agree that all *Muslims* are equal, and quickly resort to the Islamic tradition of excommunication – in the sense of the ability of those "Muslims" to reach heaven -, they become exemplars of the opposite, with Rumi on multiple occasions, such as the following, unequivocally destroying any possibility that he genuinely believed in a fraternity with other religions, let alone different versions of Islam:

The fire (of Hell) is made the torment of the infidels because fire is the (proper) test for stones.

How oft, how oft, have we spoken gently to our stony hearts, and they would not accept the counsel!

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book I, 3601-02)

As the Hindus are included in the broad category of infidels, we find the great sufi poet in agreement with Islam's vicious 'justice' of an eternal afterlife torture for mere disagreements, a fact of which is additional evidence that Sufism is not some sort of implicit compatriot to adherents of the Sanatana Dharma. Indeed the likes of Rumi would abhor the notion of a relationship with a heinous Polytheistic faith, for as he wrote, "**The infidel's outward part is not defiled by this (outward filth); that filthiness is in (his) disposition and religion.**" (*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A.

Nicholson, Book III, 2095) This bigotry and association – clearly inspired by the Quran verses similarly characterizing unbelievers – of dirt to the Infidel, is also seen in yet another of his mistaken declarations on the Soul, when he penned, “And if you write a third time on the top of it, then you make **it black as the infidel's soul.**” (*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book II, 3385) Even the heart of the infidel does not escape censure from the poet, who maintained that “The infidel is of timorous heart, for, (judging) from opinion, he lives in doubt as to the state of that (the other) world.” (*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book III, 4027)

There is nothing here that hints at any harmony with the faiths of those like the Hindus, and if Rumi did not expound upon his hatred to the extent of some of the other sufi ‘saints’, it is only because of the lack of contact – with Hindus - he had in comparison to the subcontinental sufis, who more extensively and acrimoniously display their Asuric mentality toward the Hindu, as seen in Rizvi's documentation of the subcontinental Shaikh Muzaffar, a disciple of a *Wahdat al-Wujud* sufi who nevertheless demanded that the Islamic ruler of Bengal, in accordance with the Quran, refrain from friendship and assignment of governmental responsibilities to the Hindus:

The Shaikh's biographers estimated that the number of his disciples exceeded 100,000, of which **forty were respected as having achieved union with God.** Of those who achieved the supreme state, Shaikh Muzaffar, Malikzada Fazalu'd-Din and Maulana Nizamud-Din were regarded as the most outstanding, with Shaikh Muzaffar the most prominent of this elite group. ...Shaikh Muzaffar, his brother, Shaikh Mu'izz, and the latter's talented son, Shaikh Husain, decided to go to Mecca on a pilgrimage, via Chittagong. By 798/1395-96, when they reached Bengal, the Ilyas-Shahi Sultan, Ghiyasud-Din A'zam Shah (1389-1409), was ruling...the relations of the Ilyas-Shahi rulers of Bengal with the Hindus were cordial and they occupied high posts in the government. ...The Sultan...welcomed the party of Shaikh Muzaffar and treated them as state guests. The Shaikh, however, was annoyed because of the delay by the administration in arranging their travel. To his great disappointment, many high posts were held by the Hindus. ...In another letter the Shaikh advised the Sultan that high government posts should not be given to Hindus and wrote:

“The Exalted God has said ‘ye who believe! Take not into your intimacy those outside the ranks.’ The long and short of the matter is that in commentaries and lexicons they have said that the faithful should not make the unbelievers and strangers their confidants and ministers. ...He says ‘La yalunakum Khabalan’ (they will not fail to corrupt you), i.e. ‘La yaqseruna Ifsad-i-Amrekum’ (they will not hesitate or spare themselves in creating troubles for you). Therefore, it is incumbent on us that we should listen to the divine command and cast aside our weak judgement. God says ‘Wadduna Ma Anittum’ (may only desire be your ruin). i.e. When you make them intimate with yourself they will love to involve you in evil deeds. An infidel may be entrusted with some work but he should not be made Wali (chief supervisor or Governor) so that he may have control and impose his authority on Muslims. **God says ‘let not the believers take for friends or helpers unbelievers and neglect God: if any do that, in nothing will there be help from God except by way of precaution, that ye may guard yourselves from them.’ There are severe warnings in the Quran, the ‘Hadis’ and historical works against those who have given authority to the unbelievers over the believers.** (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, pp. 237-39)

While this particular ‘saint’ was certainly violating the tenets of the Quran through his insistence on ‘unity’ and his unsanctioned tariqat devotion to a pir, it is also impossible that this sufi, with his recorded divisive and spiteful beliefs, could have attained to a substantial and *Conscious* Union with a God transcending the ignorance of separation (in consciousness) he displayed in his opinion of Hindus. But of crucial importance is the highly accurate (as we have already shown through multiple Quran

verses) understanding of the appropriate connection between those who consider themselves Muslim, and the unbeliever – either no relationship at all, or one in which the Hindu is subjugated. That sufis are in actuality kuffar themselves is practically irrelevant to the ordinary Hindu, because the sufis *believe* themselves legitimate Muslims, and this is all that needs to be understood by the Hindu in adopting an approach to Sufism and their ‘saints’. For as Sufism's doctrine assumes the vulgarity of the Quran in excluding the Psychological interaction of friendship, the Hindu must be aware that any relationship with sufis - similar to those with individuals more piously adhering to the Quran – is one where taqiyyah might surface at any moment the heretical Muslim believes that he has an opportunity to prove his Islamic credentials, especially in regions where the percentage of Muslims is high enough to give them confidence in at least low-level jihadi actions such as rioting.

The views of the subcontinental sufis toward the Hindus, after all, are guided both by the Quran and the influence of foreign sufis – many of whom played key roles in establishing the subcontinental sufic orders – who could not help but subconsciously absorb a core bigotry toward the unbelievers, with Ibn Arabi, the crucial figure behind the fundamental elements of subcontinental Sufism, someone who even wrote sympathetically toward non-Muslims, nevertheless afflicted with the Asuric disease, as evidenced by his condemnation of rebellion to Islam, a crime that he believed worthy of the hellfire: “Whoever obeys his command and casts himself into this fire will be happy and receive his reward. He will find this fire to be ‘coolness and peace’. **Whoever disobeys him deserves the punishment and will enter the Fire and descend into it** because of his deed of opposition so that that justice from Allah might be set up among His slaves.” (Ibn Arabi, *Fusus Al-Hikam*, The Seal of the Wisdom of the Decree in the Word of Uzayr) This Islamic punishment, we recall, is not for any aberrant psychology or actions of the unbeliever – it is simply the result of worshipping a different name or form of God. Of course Arabi, apostate that he was, had a decidedly curious idea of the hellfire, describing it in terms extraordinary removed from the content of the Asurically revealed chastisement:

We said this, however, in respect of the one who thinks that Allah's wrath will continue against the people of the Fire forever, as he claims. So they do not have the principle of pleasure from Allah. What is meant is true. **It is as we have said, so the hopes of the people of the Fire lies in the removal of pains. Even if they still dwell in the Fire, that is pleasure, so wrath is removed when the pains are removed since the source of pain is the source of wrath** if you understand! (Ibn Arabi, *Fusus Al-Hikam*, The Seal of the Wisdom of the Unseen in the Word of Ayyub)

This apparent escape for the non-Muslim, however, has no foundation in the Quran, which ordains the punishment as both painful and everlasting - a fact of the religion previously mentioned, though necessitating a further review, with the following passage warning the unbelievers that their penance “shall not be abated from them”:

Surely the guilty shall abide in the chastisement of hell. It shall not be abated from them and they shall therein be despairing. And We are not unjust to them, but they themselves were unjust. And they shall call out: “O Malik! Let your Lord make an end of us.” He shall say: “Surely you shall tarry.” Certainly We have brought you the truth, but most of you are averse to the truth. Or have they settled an affair? Then surely We are the settlers. Or do they think that We do not hear what they conceal and their secret discourses? Aye! And Our messengers with them write down. Say: “If the Beneficent Allah has a son, I am the foremost of those who serve.” Glory to the Lord of the heavens and the earth, the Lord of power, from what they ascribe unto him. **So leave them plunging into false discourses and sporting until they meet their day which they are threatened with.** And He it is Who is Allah in the heavens and Allah in the earth; and He is the Wise, the Knowing. And blessed is He Whose is the kingdom of the heavens and the earth and what is between them, and with Him is the knowledge of the hour,

and to Him shall you be brought back. And those whom they call upon besides Him have no authority for intercession, but he who bears witness of the truth and they know (him). And if you should ask them who created them, they would certainly say: "Allah." Whence are they then turned back? **Consider his cry: "O my Lord! surely they are a people who do not believe." So turn away from them and say, "Peace", for they shall soon come to know.** (Quran 43:74-89)

As the passage clearly demonstrates, the "guilty" for whom the fire will be unceasing are the people who do not "believe", whether that be the likes of the Hindu, or the "Muslims" like Ibn Arabi and other sufis who entertain "false discourses". For all of these kuffar will be a hell that they reside in "for ever", as a different selection reveals: "Surely (as for) those who disbelieve and hinder (men) from Allah's way, they indeed have strayed far away. **Surely (as for) those who disbelieve and act unjustly Allah will not forgive them nor guide them to a path, Except the path of hell, to abide in it for ever**, and this is easy to Allah." (Quran 4:167-69) Similarly does another passage in the Quran identify those who defy *both* Allah and His messenger, along with the tenet of only believing in one Allah, as denizens of the "fire of hell", where they will assuredly live "for ever":

And when the slave of Allah stood up in prayer to Him, they crowded on him, almost stifling. Say (unto them, O Muhammad): "I pray unto Allah only, and ascribe unto Him no partner." Say: "Lo! I control not hurt nor benefit for you." Say: "Lo! none can protect me from Allah, nor can I find any refuge beside Him. (Mine is) but conveyance (of the Truth) from Allah, and His messages; and **whoso disobeyeth Allah and His messenger, lo! his is fire of hell, wherein such dwell for ever.**" (Quran 72:19-23)

Yet even after the copious amount of testimony within the holiest book of Islam, the Quran, we nonetheless find Arabi on multiple occasions persisting in his blasphemous deviations from the infrarationally revealed content, both in his postulation that the hellfire *punishment* is temporary, and in his outrageous notion that the disbeliever will eventually find bliss within hell:

As for the people of the Fire, they will return to bliss, but it will be in the Fire since after the end of the duration of punishment, it must become cold and peace according to the mercy which preceded it. This is their bliss. The bliss of the people of the Fire, after claims are settled, is the bliss of the friend of Allah, Abraham, when he was thrown into the Fire. He was punished by the sight of it since his knowledge told him that it is a form which causes pain to any living being which is near it. He did not know what Allah intended by it and from it in respect to him. (Ibn Arabi, *Fusus Al-Hikam*, The Seal of the Wisdom of the Breath (Nafas) in the Word of Jonah)

There is, of course, no scriptural justification for this flight of blasphemous fancy, as the verses are unambiguous in portraying the hellfire as a place of suffering and misery, with one verse describing it as a "prison" - hardly a place associated with bliss - for those failing to utilize second chances while living: "It may be that your Lord will have mercy on you, and if you again return (to disobedience) We too will return (to punishment), and We have made hell a prison for the unbelievers." (Quran 17:008) If that, or the countless other verses previously cited, is not enough, we can also turn to the following, which notes the "burning fire" of hell as a "severe chastisement", which Islam does not associate with some sort of perverse bliss experienced by the recipient:

And when it is said to them, "Follow what Allah has revealed", they say: "Nay, we follow that on which we found our fathers." **What! Though the Satan calls them to the chastisement of the burning fire!** And whoever submits himself wholly to Allah and he is the doer of good (to others), he indeed has taken hold of the firmest thing upon which one can lay hold. And Allah's is the end of affairs. And whoever disbelieves, let not his disbelief grieve you; to Us is their

return, then will We inform them of what they did surely Allah is the Knower of what is in the breasts. We give them to enjoy a little, then will **We drive them to a severe chastisement.** (Quran 31:21-24)

In another selection confirming the obvious connection of Islamic hellfire with suffering and torture, the “painful doom” of the afterlife fire is meted out to those, in this case the Christians along with the Polytheists, daring to partner others with Allah:

They surely disbelieve who say: “Lo! Allah is the Messiah, son of Mary.” The Messiah (himself) said: “O Children of Israel, worship Allah, my Lord and your Lord.” **Lo! Whoso ascribeth partners unto Allah, for him Allah hath forbidden paradise. His abode is the Fire.** For evil-doers there will be no helpers. **They surely disbelieve who say, “Lo! Allah is the third of three,” when there is no Allah save the One Allah. If they desist not from so saying a painful doom will fall on those of them who disbelieve.** (Quran 5:72-73)

While Ibn Arabi, like other sufis, was able to recognize the initial part of the excerpt as an unequivocal rejection of hulul or Self-Realization, by failing to acknowledge the transparent nature of the Quran's pronouncements on the Asuric pain the religion eternally ordains for disbelievers, Arabi, the precursor for much of subcontinental Sufism, once again adds to the abounding evidence of his blasphemy. This specific transgression is exacerbated by his deceitful interpretation of the fire Abraham was thrown into, for that particular engulfment was of a completely different circumstance to the *afterlife* hellfire Arabi claims to eventually transform into bliss, as seen in the previously cited verses describing Abraham's fire as the aftermath of an earthly confrontation he had with Polytheists:

He (Abraham) said: “What! Do you then serve besides Allah what brings you not any benefit at all, nor does it harm you? Fie on you and on what you serve besides Allah. What! Do you not then understand?” They said: “Burn him and help your gods, if you are going to do (anything).” **We said: “O fire! Be a comfort and peace to Abraham.”** And they desired a war on him, but We made them the greatest losers. (Quran 21:66–70)

To use this indisputably corporeal fire – with Abraham's escape the result of his *belief*, whereas the unbelievers in hell are infinitely tortured due to their *disbelief* - as proof of a transformation of the afterlife flames into peace and bliss, registers as a desperate attempt to minimize the Asuric depravity of the Islamic scripture through the dreaded use of bidats. For Ibn Arabi, as we have previously shown, believed that certain infidels did not meet the Islamic criteria for idolatry because of their higher psychological understanding of the purpose of “idols”, a deeper view that if commendable, fails to negate the danger of sufis like himself. For even though these relatively enlightened sufis might make exceptions, they still believe in an Asuric punishment centralized within the afterlife hellfire for those, as Arabi himself agreed, merely ‘disobedient’ to Allah and the Prophet. Thus if Arabi might have genuinely felt the charge of infidelity to only be appropriate for the “lower” type of Kafir, it is irrelevant, because the criteria in which he based the assignment of afterlife punishment remained heavily influenced by the Asuric construct of Islam, rather than a true psychological necessity for Karmic punishment which, ironically, is appropriately served to those engaging in Asuric activities like jihad and sexual slavery of kuffar women.

And as he carried significant Asuric elements of actual Islam into his philosophical doctrine of *Wahdat al-Wujud*, the basis of much of subcontinental Sufism, it naturally requires that the Hindus take these *relatively* broad-minded (it is quite easy to appear enlightened in comparison to the depraved Quran and authentic hadith) sufis with caution, because not only do they permit Asuric doctrine, they are also utterly unable to transform Islam. After all, Arabi, because of his rejection of *hulul* or Self-Realization – which consequently only led him to an incomplete or partial opening of the consciousness from which he could only theorize on ‘unity’ - *and* his transgression from multiple core tenets of Islam, was

in reality a blasphemous *philosopher*, a member of a group of mortals whom Rumi – likewise a sufikuffar yet also believing his doctored Islam to make him the most superior of Muslims – repeatedly castigated. Indeed his following stanza almost precisely captures Arabi's most recently presented crime, with the exception that the architect of *Wahdat al-Wujud* denied the existence of an *eternal* and *painful* hellfire for disbelievers, whereas Rumi's lines refer to the philosopher that simply denies Satan:

**The philosopher comes to deny the existence of the Devil,
and at the same time he is possessed by a devil.**

If thou hast not seen the Devil, behold thyself: without
diabolic possession there is no blueness in the forehead.

Whosoever hath doubt and perplexity in his heart, he in
this world is a secret philosopher.

He is professing firm belief, but some time or other that
philosophical vein will blacken his face (bring him to shame).

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book I 3283-86)

Arabi then, per the terms of Rumi, was arguably possessed by the devil when he denied the perpetual and horrific nature of the Islamic hellfire, because the former denied a mandated tenet of Islam. This obscurantism of the latter mystic is additionally documented in a different stanza dripping with vitriol, in which Rumi relates the depraved punishment of a “philosopher” who merely offered an explanation for the procurement of water:

A teacher of Qur'an-recitation was reading from the page of
the Book, “(if) your water (shall have) sunk into the ground:

(that is, if) I stop the water from (reaching) the spring,

And hide the water in the depths, and make the springs dry
and a place of drought,

Who shall bring the water to the spring again except

Me who have no like, the Gracious, the Glorious?”

**A contemptible philosopher and logician was passing beside
the school at that moment.**

When he heard the verse (of the Qur'an), he said in

disapproval, “We bring the water (back) with a mattock;

With strokes of the spade and (with) the sharpness of the axe
we bring the water up from below.”

**At night he fell asleep and saw (in dream) a lion-hearted man
(who) gave (him) a blow on the face and blinded both his
eyes,**

**And said, “O wretch, if you are speaking the truth,
bring up some light with an axe from these two springs of
vision.”**

**At (dawn of) day he jumped up and found (he had) two blind
eyes:** from both his eyes the overflowing light had vanished.

If he had moaned and asked pardon (of God), the departed

light would have appeared (again) through (God's) kindness;

But (the power of) asking pardon, also, is not in (our) hands:

the savour of repentance is not the dessert of every inebriate.

**The wickedness of (his) actions and the disastrousness of
(his) denial (of the Truth) had barred the way of repentance to
his heart.**

His heart became in hardness as the face of a rock: how
should repentance cleave it for sowing?

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book II, 1633-45)

The only contemptible figure in this tale is the narrator, Jalalu'd-Din Rumi, who lauded the Asuric nature of the punishment, one emerging out of a mere difference in *opinion*, with the consequences not even the result of an ordinary fight that occasionally happens after disagreements. Instead, we have the “philosopher” *disproportionately* blinded when all he did was offer – and the mystic of the highest experiences will instantly experience this profundity – an *aspect* of the truth. For the reality is that both the “logician” and the religious man were verbalizing the same truth; the former was unconsciously outlining the mechanism by which God works, the latter was unconsciously relating that all actions are performed (or implicitly consented to be undertaken) by God. But if a mystic is heavily influenced by the works of the Asura of Falsehood, he cannot help but succumb to such infrarational thinking – indeed this is precisely why the Hindus must always be wary of Sufism, because the writings and doctrine of the sufis are conspicuous by their failure to eliminate infrarationality *with regards to the* Hindus and other “unbelievers” like logicians, even if the sufis have ‘illegally’ broken free of the Quran in different domains. It is this distinction that also helps to explain why Rumi, though with some openings to genuine intuition, held significant hatred in his heart towards the disbelievers, a group whom he believed to be toxic:

**The true believers are a store of honey, like the bee; the
infidels, in sooth, are a store of poison, like the snake,**
Because the true believer ate choice herbs, so that, like a bee,
his spittle became (a means of giving) life;
(While), again, **the infidel drank sherbet of filthy water:
accordingly from his nourishment poison appeared in him.**

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book III, 3292-94)

While this language does not directly incite violence towards the infidel, it certainly disparages them to a status whereby the sufis, heretics who rarely risk their lives through the mandatory jihad, will nevertheless remain, at minimum, callously indifferent to the sufferings of Hindus at the hands of the actual Muslims. For the poetry reduces the Hindus and other infidels to untermensch, with Rumi persistent in degrading the unbelievers, in another instance writing, “**Inasmuch as the infidels were congeners of Sijjn (Hell)**, they were well-disposed to the prison (*sijn*) of this world.” (*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book I, 640) Not only did Rumi believe the subhuman infidels to be the equivalent of hell, he also deemed the property of lust as fraternal to non-Muslims, and he called for the believers to eliminate kuffar machinations, writing, “What is the remedy for the fire of lust? The light of the Religion: your (the Moslems') light is the (means of) extinguishing the fire of the infidels.” (*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book I, 3700) If Rumi may have envisioned this light to be some sort of occult power the sufis frequently boast possession of, not only can the verse – according to the Asura's perversion of light - be deemed a call to kill the infidels, we have already seen multiple instances of the sufis encouraging jihad, even if only a handful of them participated. Rumi's disposition towards violence, however, was predominantly that of a hateful man preferring to leave the work to Allah in the afterlife, while he resorted to earthly warnings as if he was a prophet:

**Those disbelievers have made a laughing-stock of the
parables** and clear exposition of them that glorify (God).
Make (them) a laughing-stock, if thou wishest (O
disbeliever): **how long wilt thou live, O carcase, how long?**
Rejoice, O lovers (of God), in supplication at this same door,

for it is opened today.

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book IV, 1080-82)

The implied threat, of course, is that of the hellfire the unbelievers are congeners of; it is a warning uttered by an individual that must content himself with imitating the dire exhortations of the Asuric vibhuti Mohammed, someone without the physical strength or amassed power to personally bring about the 'lawful' death of these infidels. The actual punishment – just as with the Prophet when his military was weak - is to be left to Allah and his “mighty shape”:

It (the wrath of God) is mighty, mighty; but when you begin
to tremble, that mighty (wrath) becomes assuaged and
equable,

Because the mighty shape is for (terrifying) the unbeliever;
when you have become helpless, it is mercy and kindness.

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book IV, 3753-54)

Besides his approval of Allah's wrath for the “unbeliever” - when the mystic should know that God, as the Supreme One, fully understands the purpose of ‘disbelief’ in the long play of evolution towards Himself -, Rumi also condones the Islamic ignorance that fear of Allah is a luminous facet of religion or spirituality, when what God wants from his adhar is the utmost courage, the sadhak liberated from fears such as becoming *accused of apostasy* if reaching a certain type of mystic realization. But the sufis are programmed to have some amount of fear, as the Quran is an Asuric text full of intimidation and threats of grave consequence, and even the innovated sect of Sufism cannot fully extricate itself from fear when the shariat has already entered its path at the very beginning. Therefore with the exception of specific blasphemies, the shariat controls much of what the sufis believe and practice, even though its lack of complete authority instantly makes Sufism an abode of the kuffar who confuse themselves for Muslims. This unique feature is why Rumi was comfortable endorsing multiple violent verses of the Quran, even if he partially diverted their force, as the following exemplifies:

Go, *be hard on the infidels*, sprinkle dust on (renounce)
fondness for the strangers.

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book II, 124)

The original intent of the verse, as we know, is simply to incite warfare against the unbelievers; if Rumi through his partial redirection reduces the intensity of the verse, it nevertheless highlights his support of standard Islamic practices towards the Hindu, even if on other occasions he opined that warfare was of lesser importance to superior paths such as the mystic one. For all Rumi and other sufis have done is establish their illegal intermediate mysticism as something greater than the Quran; they have not, however, proposed that different religions such as the Sanatana Dharma can be held equal to Islam. Their primary contention, after all, is that they are the finest of Muslims, with the lesser Muslims still of a higher grade than the Hindu. As such, although Rumi and other sufis might look down upon jihad and even the Quran *in comparison* to their haqiqat and marifat, they still view the former features of Islam as more enlightened than the practices of Infidels like the Hindus. Accordingly, we find Rumi lauding the actions of Mohammed in breaking the “idols” of the Polytheists:

**How many idols did Ahmad (Mohammed) break in the world,
that the (religious) communities might cry “O Lord”!**

Had it not been for the efforts of Ahmad, you also, like your
ancestors, would be worshipping idols.

**This head of yours has been delivered from bowing to idols,
in order that you may acknowledge his rightful claim upon
the (gratitude of the religious) communities.**

If you speak, speak thanks for this deliverance, that he may also deliver you from the idol within.

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book II, 366-69)

Thus we find the greatest of sufi poets mired in the domain of infrarationality, applauding the violence of “idol” breaking, which he certainly knew to include a similar aggression towards the people “worshipping” those “idols” - depravities undertaken all because of a varied opinion as to what should constitute religious activity and what the name of God should be. Violence, however, should be initiated according to a different set of circumstances - especially if needed to uphold and expand Dharma against Asuric forces that seek to impose Falsehood. The fact that Rumi offered the internal idol as the ultimate attachment to be liberated from does not abrogate his blessing for the destruction of Hindu artwork, acts that historically involved the genocide of countless numbers of Hindus due to Islam's false idea of religion. But the sufis – to the potential jeopardy of the Hindus who assume them to believe in harmony with the Sanatana Dharma – consistently condone the Asuric behaviour of Mohammed, with the martyred Hallaj also – ominously - exalting the Prophet's destruction of “idols”:

He lifted the cloud, and pointed to the Sacred House. He is the limitation, and he is a heroic warrior. **It is he who received the order to break the idols, and it is he who was sent to mankind for the extermination of them.** (Mansur Hallaj, *Kitab al-Tawasin*, The Ta-Sin of the Prophetic Lamp, 10)

The martyrdom of Hallaj can consequently be understood as irrelevant to the Sanatana Dharma or its adherents, because as we know, Hallaj explicitly denied the possibility of Self-Realization, hence confirming that he practised an intermediate mysticism with different aspirations than the Hindu spiritual paths. His execution does not make him an ally of the Hindus, because his death was simply the result of the perpetual internecine murders among those vying for the elusive title of most pious Muslim. That the sufis frequently embrace martyrdom at the hands of the more pious Muslims does not then translate to them having some sort of rapport with Hindus, because the sufis, if they ever obtain power or control of the Muslim mass, will likewise seek to target the Hindus in an ignoble fashion, though they might have slightly less – because of the diversion through their occult practices – of the fanatical intensity of the orthodox. Their overall world-view and intent towards perceived unbelievers however, is the same as the most pious, as unequivocally seen in the writings of Arabi, who casually assumed that the unbeliever should be in a state of subjugation:

Jesus showed humility to the extent that he prescribed that his community “pay the jizya tax with their their hands in a state of willing submission,” and that if one of them were slapped on the cheek, he should offer the other cheek to the one who slapped him, and not rise up against him nor seek revenge. (Ibn Arabi, *Fusus Al-Hikam*, The Seal of the Wisdom of Prophethood in the Word of Jesus)

The arrogance of the seemingly enlightened Arabi is breathtaking, as he presumes the non-Muslim to have an obligation to *voluntarily* offer themselves up for subjugation to the Muslim, in the process contorting both the Quran verse on jizya and the biblical turn the other cheek as ‘evidence’ of Jesus' call to submit before the superior Muslims. Arabi's factual accuracy however, is not important – it is the conceit that is crucial for the Hindu to observe, as the Islamic contempt for non-Muslims is not eliminated within Sufism and its mystics, who will see the humiliation of Hindus as the natural order of things, even as they illegally speculate and innovate to Islam. The Hindus then must in turn only presume taqiyah – or the infinitesimal possibility of an astonishing ignorance on the part of the sufi – to any conciliatory proclamations on the part of sufi leaders, for even as moderate heretics, they retain the same bigotry and ingrained arrogance toward the Hindus. The sufis, after all, have historically (as we have extensively documented) engaged in both jihad and ordinary proselytizing to obtain Hindu converts, with Rizvi in one passage mentioning Shaikh Ala'u'd-Dawla Simnani in relation to such

missionary activity:

In Bukhara, the works of Ibn al-Arabi were burned (Lata'if-i Ashrafi, f. 216b)...What really distinguished his disciples from other sufis was their missionary zeal. In India Simnani's missionaries exhorted sufis to convert the Brahmans and become active proselytisers of Islam. The most enthusiastic convert to...Simnani's ideology in India was Saiyid Muhammad bin Yusuf al-Husaini, popularly known as Khwaja Banda Nawaz (His Servants' Helper) or Gisu Daraz (Of the Long Locks). (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, pp. 250-51)

Also of relevance in the citation is the destruction of Ibn Arabi's – of whom Simnani was, as we have seen, strongly opposed – works in the Islamic city of Bukhara, a portend for what we are currently witnessing in majority Muslim areas of the subcontinent. That Sufism inevitably finds itself in peril could hardly have been imagined by the likes of early sufis like Simnani, who felt themselves the champions of the Islamic faith. Nevertheless, his example is also pivotal to the Hindu, for if on the one hand we find him actively seeking to convert Hindus, we also find him damning the work of other sufis like Arabi, the moderate heretics who nevertheless believe the Hindu and other unbelievers to be appropriately subjugated. What this means, is that the possibility of intrasufi disagreements - or superficial similarities in doctrine to Hinduism - indicating some sort of harmony with the Sanatana Dharma, is in reality a fallacy, as the example of Hamadani, initiated into Sufism by one of Simnani's disciples, displays:

The more advanced treatises of Saiyid Ali (Hamadani) depart seriously from the philosophy expressed by Shaikh Ala'u'd-Dawla Simnani in so far as they spiritedly support the *Wahdat al-Wujud* theory of Ibn al-Arabi. ...In a short treatise entitled the *Wujudiyya* he emphasized that god revealed His Essence to Himself in the world and that this revelation emanated from His *Ahadiyya* (Oneness) and no other source...he believed the epitome of the manifestation of the Names and Attributes of Being was in the *Insan-i Kamil* (Perfect Man). (*Risala-i Wujudiyya*) (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 293)

Hamadani, we recall, aggressively targeted Hindus with forced conversions and humiliation, all the while straying from the orthodox Sufism of Simnani into the moderately blasphemous *Wahdat al-Wujud* favoured by most of the subcontinental sufis. Thus any apparent similarities with the Sanatana Dharma are not enough to prevent Hindus, at the insistence of *sufis*, from being killed precisely because of their non-Islamic faith. Though the sufis are certainly blasphemous themselves, and while they can only philosophize on “Oneness” and “Essence”, they are perfectly fine with the murderous elimination of Hindus, many of whom, out of ignorance, bestow the sufis a reverence they do not deserve. For not only have the majority of famous sufis, whose mausoleums are the scene of both “Muslim” and Hindu devotees, advocated the subjugation – in one form or another – of the Hindus, all of these ‘saints’ rejected the possibility of Self-Realization, and thus prayers specifically *invoking* them are at best the conjuring of a vital ‘god’, entities potentially helpful but without the transcendent nature of either the Overmind Gods or the Self-Realized Guru, both of whom are eternally connected to the Transcendent Brahma.

Indeed, as the Self-Realized have forever shed their limited ego-consciousness, subsequently even after the ‘death’ of the perishable form they assumed in the particular lifetime, all invocations of them can be acted upon with Omnipotence, because they have become another Personality of Brahma, another Godhead of the Supreme Mother. The sufi mystics, on the other hand, are individuals who openly confess their incapacity to proceed beyond a relatively small opening of the inner consciousness - thus if they are invoked while *under the premise* that they are the Guru, the effectiveness of the supplication is diminished, especially with regards to the aspirations of the *mystic paths* (ordinary prayers, on the other hand, might be taken up by the Highest Power even if directed to a non-Realized entity). This

result is the same whether or not the sufi ‘saint’ has left the physical sheath or if he has yet to proceed on from his current form. Nonetheless, if the sufis are absolutely useless to the Hindu in the ordinary life, since Brahma can answer standard prayers asked of him according to *any* name (thus prayer to a sufi ‘saint’ provides no particular advantage), there is still a solitary way in which the sufis can be of specific help to certain Hindus – the sadhaks aspiring to the Divine. But even this use of the sufi shaykhs is somewhat precarious, and must be ventured into with full awareness and a robust Psychic or suprarational intuition and discrimination.

This serviceability of the sufi shaykhs to non-Muslims entering the mystic paths is because of their genuine openings to the inner consciousness – thus the non-Muslim sadhak might find their guidance to be of significant help, at least for the intermediate steps of a journey to Self-Realization. That Sufism is inimical to Hindu polity is a matter for the regular Hindus that are not searching – to advance the *specific* aspiration of earthly moksha - for a Guru or spiritual guide, the overall Hindu community for whom the sufi ‘saints’ function as wolves in the clothing of sheep, woollen ones who preach “unity” but harbour enmity towards “unbelievers” and desire their subjugation. Of course, as the sufis take pride in their incomplete mystic experiences, they are far from a necessity to the non-Muslim sadhak, because their helpfulness will always be of a limited quality, and eventually the sadhak will either have to rely on their own Psychic, help from luminous occult emanations, or move on to a different spiritual guide - preferably a Guru. Nevertheless, as these sufis currently still have active spiritual orders, the non-Muslim sadhak might consider it worthwhile to seek their assistance in obtaining that *initial* opening of the consciousness, even if the sufi saints are dispensable for these sadhaks, because the latter can receive the same help by mystics less likely to be under the sway of the Asura.

For that, as we have shown, is the primary danger of the sufis, both in the ordinary life and in the spiritual discipline – the permission of Asuric Falsehood into their practices and mentality. In the mystic orders, this invasion need not bring with it any of the extreme violence found in the standard customs of Islam, because the first strategic goal of the Asura, we recall, is to prevent the Conscious Union with the Supreme. Therefore as long as the sufis, by way of instruction in the Quran and Hadith, are taught that Self-Realization or *hulul* or *ittihad* is a sin or evil, a construct of the dreaded Polytheism, the Asura will have already achieved a victory by introducing fear of the sublime Unity - consequently maintaining the basic *avidya* of the separate consciousness. This fear will prevent the sufi mystic or his disciple from appropriately exploring the subliminal realms to their Transcendent conclusion that a marifat stage should bring. The Asuric shariat will also, through both its introduction of cowardice and a general coarsening of the sadhak's ego, help to *obstruct* the “accidental” and extremely rare instances when a sadhak, upon initial spiritual discipline, near immediately attains to the highest Self-Realization, for either the novice becomes *frightened* by the “infidel” experience, or he does not have the disengagement from ego to even attain the liberation in the first place, as the shariat only helps to strengthen the egoistic attachments.

Because of this, if the sadhak is to seek the guidance of a sufi mystic – an understandable risk to potentially take, since the opening of the inner consciousness is alone a difficult task -, it should be done under circumstances in which the shariat stage can be skipped, where the sadhak avoids the Asuric indoctrination of the Islamic portion of Sufism, jumping ahead to their heretical stages. This of course, may be impractical, as most sufic orders are fairly stringent in their requirements; nevertheless, it represents the only manner in which the sufi ‘saints’ can be of benefit to non-Muslim sadhaks, as by removing the shariat instruction, the infrarational influence on mystic quests returns to a normal level of possibility, dependent more on the standard factors of the individual ego instead of the addition of decidedly Asuric texts. For if there are certainly charlatans who claim to be Self-Realized Gurus, that, along with each individual sadhak – even if he is under the tutelage of an actual Guru - having some level of susceptibility to the Asura, are inevitable hazards of the mystic path, and represent the

unconscious purpose of the Asura, as the sadhak must develop the psychology necessary to remain unmoved by the Asuric influence - whether that arrives through a charlatan or by thoughts and emotion. The ability to resist the Asura of Falsehood's call, however, is much more difficult if the sadhak has already been subjected to years of repetitive shariat indoctrination, as such mystics become afflicted with the Asuric sickness which inverts all elements of the psychology including, in one example, the effect of the mantra.

For the utterance of the mantra in mystic paths is not just for the sake of its lyrical quality or aesthete, not solely for the production of an intense concentration, but also to actually invoke the truth or power or God the verses are conveying. As one can subsequently conclude, to use the verses of the Quran - the majority of them expressing the Asuric perversion of Truth – while meditating, is to then *invoke* the Asura of Falsehood and other hostile forces, to intensify a degraded psychology that has already been constructed through the years of rote inculcation of the Islamic scripture. Faced with this possibility, the non-Muslim sadhak deciding that the guidance of a sufi pir might be of benefit, must abstain from the initial sufi stage of shariat, thus minimizing the chance that the Quran invocations used will carry the Asuric force, even if the sheer content of most of the verses makes their impact almost inescapable. Nevertheless, as many of the sufic orders – demonstrated in the following Rizvi selection - incorporate non-Islamic elements into their practices, there does exist the minor chance that the non-Muslim sadhak can avoid the infrarational character of many of the sufi mantras:

The founders of the silsilas in the twelfth century linked themselves with Muhammad through either Ali or Abu Bakr, but generally through the former. In spite of some serious differences over the question of orthodoxy, the main emphasis of the silsilas was on **continual meditation of the verses of the Quran and on different names of Allah. Gradually many sufi sayings were intermingled with the traditions of Muhammad.**

Influences, such as Neo-Platonism, the monastic tradition of Buddhism and Christianity, and Vedantist and Yogic philosophy were all Islamized by members of silsilas in such a way as to make them virtually unidentifiable. (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 83)

While the sufic acculturation of Hinduism and other religions into their sect has been done in a fashion minimizing the sources, we at least find with it the small possibility of diluting the Asuric power of Islam's verses, because the simple introduction of foreign content might lessen the subconscious connection to the Asuric Quran. Unfortunately, this extrication remains a difficult assignment when we consider some of the specific verses the sufis use as mantras, with Rizvi informing us on the Chishtiyya tradition:

Penance, austerity, self-mortification, meditation and contemplation were an integral part of Chishti life; contacts with yogis added a new dimension to *zikr* and **involved the strenuous co-ordination of limb movements and postures associated with alternate exhalation and inhalation. During *zikr*, there was a concentration on the utterance of the first part of *al-kalimat at-tayyiba* (the blessed phrase) or the phrase of *shahada* (testimony), *la Ilaha Illa'llah*.** (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 217)

The shahada, we recall, is that “There is No God but Allah”, which if invoked as a mantra after years of shariat instruction, carries with it the psychological elements of division and hatred that constitute the original intent behind Gabriel's infrarational revelations to Mohammed. It is a line that, when used alone in meditation, cannot help but become an *infrarational* mantra, with the invocation jeopardizing the non-Muslim sadhak's aspirations through its summoning of forces hostile to a Self-Realization. Indeed for the sufis to use an infrarational mantra, one that they know promotes a permanent division, as a pathway to a state of ‘unity’ or haqiqa (‘Reality’), is utterly inexplicable, an absurd state of affairs

wherein the sufis have contact with Hindus and incorporate Hindu practices such as hathayoga, yet call upon a mantra that promotes disunity and hatred, that refutes other gods or forms of devotion. Meditation on such infrarational verses cannot lead one to moksha, which is fine for the sufi mystic who does not believe in Self-Realization, but proves another impediment for the sadhak who aspires to that Consciousness.

And as the sufis continuously invoke the Asura of Falsehood's revelations, Sufism inevitably becomes a domain for infrarationalism to flourish, for dangerous openings into the Vital – rather than the Psychic or Intuitive Mind -, even if its mystics are not necessarily captured by the Asura of Falsehood in the same way that Mohammed was. While they are unlikely – it is the rare individual whom the Asura completely possesses – to be taken as his vessel, the sufis nevertheless indulge in an extreme exaltation of one of the Asura's instruments, a pattern hinted at in the Chistiyya practice (even if they do not always invoke the second part of it) of using *al-kalimat at-tayyiba* as an infrarational mantra, for it includes the entire attestation of Islamic faith - “There is no God but Allah, and Mohammed is his only Prophet.” This idolatry of Mohammed and his tradition, with the majority of sufis proceeding to an extreme (deification by way of *Nur*) in part through their constant repetition – while meditating - of verses that glorify him, is nevertheless also present among the ordinary Muslims and orthodox sufis, with Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindi providing an insight into the standard unconscious Islamic idolatry of the Prophet:

And he who disbelieves and dislikes this Din and who is reluctant to obey it will have believed in and obeyed none of the previous Dins. **By the same token, a person who disbelieves Hadrat Muhammad (sall Allahu alaihi wa sallam) and who speaks ill of that great Prophet, who is the highest of all people and the elect of the good, will have disbelieved the perfectness and the superiority of Allahu ta'ala's Names and Attributes. To believe Rasulullah 'alaihi-s-salatu wa-s-salam', to realize his superiority will mean to realize and to believe in all the superior traits. This means to say that a person who disbelieves this exalted Prophet and who dislike the Din, which he brought, is the worst, the basest of ummats and people.** (*The Collected Letters of Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindi*, Volume I, Letter 79)

While Sirhindi does not appear to have engaged in the type of *sama* or meditative rituals partaken by the sufis of worse blasphemy, he was certainly afflicted with the most barbarous type of idolatry, a severe attachment to a psychological understanding – based on the Islamic scripture – of the “highest of all people”, which ironically led him to adopt one of the lowest of all psychological traits – the slandering of others, all because of a non-confrontational disbelief in that ‘exemplar’ of mortals. Of course, there are additional vulgarities that arise from an obdurate attachment to Asuric vessels like Mohammed or Hitler, with Rumi, in one example, furnishing a quite extraordinary rationalization of the Prophet's actions:

If any one should raise a difficulty about my words in regard to the prophets and saints,
(And should say), “Had not the prophets a killed (mortified) fleshly soul? Why, then, had they enemies and enviers?”—
Give ear, O seeker of truth, and hear the answer to this difficulty (born) of doubt.

Those unbelievers were (really) enemies to themselves: they were striking at themselves such blows (as they struck).

(*The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi*. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book II, 786-89)

Rumi, although in poetic form, is simply blaming the victims, the ones who refused to change their non-confrontational *beliefs* in accordance with Mohammed's Asuric demands. As one can observe, the attachment Sufism permits to Mohammed is so endangering that it leads to the corruption of some of

its finest minds, who become apologists for infrarational murder and genocide if they are not, like Khusraw, already glorifying it in biographical accounts. One can also observe in Rumi's depiction a *subconscious* understanding of the falsehood of Mohammed's way, for otherwise he would not have penned the equivalent of "the unbelievers deserved it", and would have instead unabashedly basked in the glory of Mohammed's mass slaughter. Nevertheless, his justification of Asuric genocide is a prime example of how Sufism, by allowing the infrarationalism of Mohammed and Islam a lofty position, debases the consciousness of its mystics from the ultimate aspiration. But this is simply one of the many external manifestations of the Asura's hold; the process itself involves both the ordinary instruction on the Islamic scripture, and the ritualistic invocation of infrarational mantras done in the *sama* ceremonies, with Rizvi noting the poetry to involve additional praise for the companions of Mohammed and contemporary Islamic rulers, along with Mohammed and Allah:

The motive of these sufi poets who wrote Hindi *masnawis* was to arouse indescribable ecstasy both in themselves and in others thus obliterating the distinction between 'Thou' and 'I.' Their writings were not designed to fulfil a missionary aim, as some admirers have suggested. The works based on the model of Persian *masnawis* **always began with verses of gratitude to Allah, followed by praise for Muhammad and his companions, the reigning monarch and lastly tributes to the particular pir.** (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 364)

As these mathnawis are designed to help the sufi reach ecstasy, and as the *sama* rituals utilized to arrive at marifat involve the rhythmic recitation of poetry from both the mathnawis and the Islamic scripture, the chanting might well include verses similar to the previous stanza of Rumi's. Of course, as Rizvi's passage indicates, such specific verses are less likely to be invoked; yet even the general praise of Mohammed and Allah are dangerous for the Hindu or other non-Muslim mystic, as the Prophet and his 'God' are inexorably connected to Asuric Falsehood. Indeed the glorification of Mohammed is a means to foolishly extol an Asuric vibhuti, with the hymns – along with those invoking Allah – only serving to invite the attention and influence of the Asura of Falsehood, when the highest mystic path should be a complete rejection of the Falsehood and Ignorance that he affirms. Some of the sufis, to the contrary, magnify their praise of Mohammed to a degree forbidden by the cult they claim to follow, to a state considered by some of them to be greater than the power of a mantra:

Muhammad was a deep mystery, believed Shaikh Abdul-Quddus and could not be approached by the mere crying of his name. **In fact Ahmad (Muhammad) and Ahad (One or God) were the same** and everyone in the world was misguided because of a failure to understand the true significance of the intervening *mim* (M) in the words. (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, pp. 338-39)

The Yogin invocation through the mantra (which can certainly include the use of a solitary name), to the contrary, is done in full knowledge that just as the word AUM *is* Brahma, so can particular mantras be both the highest Truth – *only* if one has ascended to the Consciousness – and the means, in meditation, to rise from the phenomenal consciousness into that Supreme Reality. Nevertheless, though Abdul-Quddus did not believe the Prophet capable of being reached by one of Sufism's infrarational mantras, he still blasphemed in equating Mohammed with God, a blunder arising out of the same exaggeration of the Prophet's importance, for although he declared the infrarational mantras unqualified to conjure the desired subliminal response, he nevertheless entrenched the fallacy of Mohammed's status within Sufism. Indeed Abdul-Quddus is perhaps the perfect example of the danger of Sufism to the Hindus, for while he quickly betrays his apostasy through the *shirk* of equating Mohammed to Allah as "One" (when the Quran incessantly says that there are no partners with Allah and that Mohammed was a mortal), by his assertion of the Prophet's unity with God, Abdul-Quddus might prompt those guided by a sufi in agreement with this hypothesis, to then believe that Mohammed is a

valid psychological ideal for God! The opposite is of course the truth, and when sufis exalt the Asura of Falsehood's vibhuti, they run the risk of summoning the Asura's power or influence within the spiritual discipline, a most alarming course. While one might argue that it is simply the “name” of Mohammed being chanted, what that name *psychologically represents* is of absolute importance – after all, we do not hear of Yogin invoking Ravana (also an infrarational mystic, though a Rakshasa rather than an Asura) or Hitler, or other Asuras or Rakshasas. There is a precise reason for that, for while there are certainly multiple paths to Self-Realization, not everything is an *accelerated* (within the lifetime) or direct path, and it is therefore very important for the mystic to make sure that what he is invoking in his spiritual disciple is of a psychology – because the mystic starts with psychology and then proceeds to the Psychic or Suprarational experiences or truths – representing the Supreme Mother.

Indeed, practising the type of mysticism favoured by the majority of sufi ‘saints’ in order to attain to the greatest of enlightenment, the flowering of the Self or Soul from behind the veil, is similar to attempting sadhana while believing in the veracity of Mein Kampf, *and* specifically using its prose during meditation and accompanying mystic practices! At most one will only receive intermittent experiences of a higher or profound quality, events that occur *in spite of* the Asuric mantras; at worst the Asura or other dark forces might occultly command the mystic to his eventual ruin. For the ordinary mind must be purified from degraded influences like the shariat before it can be ready for a permanent ascent of the consciousness, even if technically all of existence – including the Asuras – are contained within Brahma. It is just that as sadhana is intended to be a direct pathway to Self-Realization, the spiritual disciple must detach from all engagement with Falsehood – whether that be subtle suggestions or the precarious subliminal entrapment, as the tacit permission of the Asura's functioning by God is first and foremost to allow for a secret examination of the potential adhar's psychological stability, with that foundation undermined by Asuric attachments including the Islamic scripture. This very imbalance is seen in sufic accounts of their *sama* rituals, including an aforementioned description of an Auliya gathering:

In other words, during the state induced by listening to music, celestial lights descend from the angelic sphere upon the spirits. What subsequently appear in the heart are called mystical states, because it is from the potential realm that they descend on the hearts. **Next, crying, movement, and agitation appear, and they are called physical effects because they alight from the present world on the bodily limbs...** (*Fawa'id ul-Fa'id, The conversations of Hazrat Khwaja Nizamuddin Auliya as recorded by Khwaja Amir Hasan 'Ala Sijz, Assembly 33*)

These are not signs of a Divine Realization, because agitation is the opposite of what awaits one in the Unity of Brahma, as the experience of Brahma-nirvanam, the stupendous Peace, indicates. But the sufis would not entirely disagree, as they neither advocate nor *believe* in Satchitananda – choosing to actually reject It. Indeed their dismissal of the Truth represents another of the reasons why their mystic practices degenerate into the disorderly nature featured above, capable at times – due to sheer repetitious effort and the byproduct of intense mystic concentration – of intermediate and intermittent higher experiences, but remaining distant from the highest region of Consciousness. Sufism then, is a creed unworthy of comparison to Vedanta, for it – as a faith elevating the Asuric shahada to a mantra, as a sect rejecting the inherent plurality endorsed by the Upanishads and the Veda – corrupts the spiritual practice with falsehoods, in actuality summoning the Asura through the chanting of infrarational mantras, with the use of Quran verses in meditation similar to inverting the Pavamana mantra and asking God to lead one from Light to darkness, or from Truth to untruth. Sufism is a religion only capable of adding a few layers onto an intractable Islamic substratum, a sect whose mystics remain enclosed well beneath the Golden Lid because of a fear of *transcending* that boundary of consciousness. This remnant psychology – precisely what the Asura of Falsehood seeks at baseline – shows the ultimate failure of Sufism, and why its mystics inescapably return to the fundamentals of

shariat, as seen in the example of Shaikh Baha'u'd-Din:

Shaikh Baha'u'd-Din strongly discouraged sufis from seeking guidance from a number of different pirs, urging them to lay their heads on one rather than a number of thresholds. (FF pp 32-33) He laid great stress on performing namaz and admitted that all of his achievements were the result of it. (FF p 8) **According to him, omission of namaz amounted to death.** (FF p 237) (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 193)

The namaz or prayer, as we know, is best performed in the mandatory congregation, under an Imam rather than the pir that this sufi – though more orthodox than others – blasphemed by condoning. These congregational prayers – and the sufi's habitual deviance from them – are important to acknowledge in relation to the sufic use of infrarational mantras, for if the latter invocations may – unintentionally in comparison to their desire for a vague ‘unity’ - conjure up the Asura himself, the Lord of Falsehood does not have a particular need for this, because he has already finalized a very effective mechanism – the ordinary mental-vital belief in the Quran and Hadith – to create chaos and perpetuate a reign of Falsehood. This is why Gabriel included the caveat that those after Mohammed claiming access to the “Unseen” are by Islamic law Infidels to be murdered, because the Asura knows that Islam, if properly applied and allowed to exert itself through “kuffar” negligence, is enough to obstruct the ascension towards the Multiplicity in One. And as the Asura knows the psychology of the assembly or congregation, how the brainwashed leader can control the simpleton flock through primitive emotions fomented by paranoia entrenched by years of unbridled indoctrination, and most importantly, how destructive a mass of barbarians driven by the same Falsehood can be, he established the congregational method as the only acceptable route for the prayer of a real Muslim, because he knows it produces excellent conditions for stirring up jihad.

The congregation route to jihad is a much better means for the Asura of Falsehood to externally manifest his ideology of hatred and division throughout the world, at least compared to an occult capture of sufi mystics subsequent to Mohammed, as the former method allows him to seize many more men through the elementary imbibing of the “holy book”, because the psychology of the congregation is closer to the rudimentary nature of man, and allows the Asura to work *quicker*, whereas it takes time for the sufi mystic to be ready to receive the Lord of Falsehood. Consequently, there is only an infrequent need for him to ‘take’ a sufi mystic for his machinations; nevertheless, he maintains this *potential* command of the ‘saints’ by the simple redirection of their mystic aspirations to an amorphous ‘unity’ well below Satchitananda, allowing him ample opportunity to gain control *if needed*. That he might use these sufis in their mystic endeavours while at the same time permitting Islam to kill them because of the blasphemy of that very mysticism, is an irony irrelevant to the Asura of Falsehood, who does not care at all for any mortal, and will nonchalantly see them suffer and killed even after they serve him well. But that is a fate the sufis and their followers fancy themselves immune from, as they, including Rumi, hold a delusion of themselves as protectors of Islam:

Transcendent is God and exalted above the sayings of the blasphemers, and the belief of those who attribute partners (to Him), and the imputation of defect (to Him) by those deficient (in knowledge), and the comparison (of Him) by the comparers, and the evil conceptions of the thinkers, and the descriptions (of Him) by those who vainly imagine. And to Him be the praise and the glory for the composition of the Divine, Lordly Book of the *Mathnawi*, since He is the Helper to success and the Giver of bounty, and to Him belongs the (power of) conferring abundant benefits and favours, especially upon His servants, the gnostics, in despite of a party who desire to extinguish the Lights of God with their mouths - but God will bring His Light to completion, even if the unbelievers are loth. *Verily, We have sent down the Warning (the Qur'an) and verily We will guard it. And whoever shall alter it after he hath heard it, surely the guilt thereof is upon those who alter it: verily, God is Hearing and Knowing. And*

praise be to God, the Lord of all created beings! (The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book III, Introduction)

While this prose introduction of one of his books shows Rumi to believe himself both anti-Polytheist and liberated from *shirk*, he in the same breath dares to call his Mathnawi a “divine” book, when Islam teaches that the last of the “divine” books is the Quran – indeed even the hadith are not to be sanctified to the level of the Quran. These are the instances of sufi blasphemy that can confuse certain Hindus into assuming their aspirations and intentions to be peaceful, their religion complementary to the Sanatana Dharma. It is a misunderstanding additionally inflated when we consider the extreme sufi heretics like the Hallaj school, who are one of the two sub-sects that are genuinely consonant to Hinduism. Indeed, if all of Sufism practised the doctrine of the Hallaj school, Hindus could certainly be less vigilant about Sufism, knowing the sect to be fraternal in its core beliefs. But the Hallaj school has historically had very few adherents, and Mansur Hallaj was himself both opposed to the type of beliefs espoused by the former, and executed for his own lesser blasphemy, a fact that illuminates the Hallaj school's primary problem for Hindus – that they are not even sufis, let alone Muslims!

As an adherent to the Hallaj school or any other renegade sufi advocating a similar doctrine, are an extreme minority within both Sufism and Islam, they become irrelevant to Hindu polity, because as the Asura of Falsehood is the creator of Islam, it inevitably follows that strength and power are eventually imposed over all other considerations. And as the Hallaj school types will practice a multifaceted faith and are, most importantly, exceptionally *outnumbered*, they will always have to practice in secret due to the fear of being murdered for ‘blasphemy’, and thus will never hold sway over the Muslim mass, because that influence is inevitably obtained by brute force - whether involving gargantuan bloodshed or just enough to instil fear and control. Indeed their insignificance and impracticality to Hindu polity is finalized when we recall, once again, that the killing of these apostates is considered ‘religious’ in Islam – thus any forlorn hope that these heretics might enact some sort of Islamic “Reformation” is resolved as a fallacy when examining the Quran and Hadith that not only demand their execution, but also unquestionably forbid the process of “Reformation”.

Similarly is it futile for the Hindu to expect the traditional sufis to transform Islam from within, even if such ‘saints’ experience intermittent Ananda, for if the sufi decides to return to the regular life, he does so in propagation of his doctrine of Shariat-Tariqat-Haqiqat-Marifat, which means that any action undertaken is done with the falsehood of the Quran and Hadith as the foundation! While this certainly makes them exceptionally dangerous to Hindu polity, because the sufis foolishly uphold Islam's Asuric law as a pathway to an elevated spirituality, they are also of limited use to Prakriti's ultimate aim, for though the sufis might occasionally receive downrushes of Ananda, they categorically reject Satchitananda, which means that there is absolutely no chance of them *maintaining* a permanent state of Ananda, because that only occurs after Consciously Uniting with Brahma. Subsequently, because they do not actually *live* from the Supreme Consciousness, because their samadhi experiences are both not of the highest state and not transferred into the waking consciousness, there is no possibility of them becoming capable of engaging in the Supramental descent and unlocking the lower grades of Nature's material – the physical, vital and mental sheaths – which currently characterizes the pinnacle of Prakriti's incomplete evolution. Instead, we find the sufis offering baseless presumptions on matters of God and Soul:

When the soul has been united with God, to speak of
that (God) is (to speak of) this (soul), and to speak of this
(soul) is (to speak of) that (God).

(The Mathnawi of Jalalu'd-Din Rumi. tr. by R.A. Nicholson, Book VI, 4040)

That Rumi, its greatest poet, could be so limited in knowledge is testament to Sufism's marginal experiences, because the Soul is always united with God, as the Purusha *is* God. But we should not be

surprised that Rumi endorsed such ignorance, for though one might be a fine poet, it does not exclude one from either the type of *avidya* outlined above, or the influence of the Asura transmitting into the stanzas. For poetry, like other forms of human expression, is the outward manifestation of what is within, and in Rumi's case – as expected due to his self-identification as a “Muslim” who ironically advocated the eventual abandonment of the Quran - we find a distinct Asuric component mixed with splendid intuitions. It is a materialization that can similarly occur with music, a vital domain that contains many types, from the lower vital onward to the Psychic; and as the disturbances noted in the *sama* rituals indicate, the music used in Sufism is not necessarily of the Psychic. These are the distinctions that must be appreciated by the Hindu polity, for it is not enough to *assume* that because Sufism produces the occasional poet, encourages meditation and incorporates Hindu-style music and practices, that it is simply advocating a familiar type of sadhana with the highest of aspirations.

It is a premise – assuming things is an inherently unsound approach – exacerbated if superficially looking at the writings of the likes of Abdul-Quddus and other sufis who believe in Brahma and other Hindu names for God. The problem with them is that not only do they fail – as they admit in their own writings – to attain to Satchitananda, they also dismiss incarnation as a possibility and simultaneously castigate the Hindus as people worthy of subjugation. Thus their blasphemous incorporation of Brahma and Onkar and the like into their practices is irrelevant to Hindu polity, as it is the equivalent of the Quran changing its verses to identify Allah by a different – solitary - name, for that superficial alteration would fail to transform the Asuric *psychology* of the Quran, rendering it a meaningless change. Indeed the likes of Abdul-Quddus are perfect examples of the double games played by the sufis, who want to have things both ways, illegally incorporating Hindu practices while denigrating the Hindus as kuffar; advocating multiple blasphemies including *shirk* yet desiring to take spoils of war (recall the example of Chishti's second wife) from the Hindus; seeking a diluted unity with God yet refusing to view the world according to its inherent equality or *samata*.

This latter aspiration for unity, of course, is impossible to attain when affirming the standard Islamic separation and delineation of an ‘other’ who is worthy of a perpetual punishment. As Sufism concurs with Islam on this matter, it represents the primary reason why the vast majority of sufi mystics, at minimum, will continue to remain in the Ignorance of the world, because the Asuric shadow over their sect is clear, even if the ‘saints’ have the occasional ecstatic inner experience. Worse yet, that very shadow might turn them into modern infrarational mystics – or at least followers of such mystics – who ironically claim to follow a religion that abruptly terminated all mystic experience after Mohammed. However, even if the two extremes – Satchitananda or becoming an Asuric instrument – are both – especially the former - rare events for the sufi, from a practical standpoint, Sufism only worsens the Asuric nature of Islam by functioning as an obfuscation of the elementary and obvious Falsehood of the religion, which means that even if the sufi mystics are only *influenced* by the Asura, because he is not *entirely* rejected, his dominion remains unchecked and inevitably causes terrible consequences.

Indeed one of the grave repercussions, *to the sufis*, in refusing to comprehensively reject the Asura of Falsehood's doctrine, is the mortal threat to their own lives. For if the sufi heretics are not always punished for their crimes, as the orthodox view their activities as potentially helpful in converting unbelievers (after all, if a fellow kafir like a Hindu decided to try and convert *Hindus* to Islam, while maintaining his own religion, the orthodox would certainly refrain from killing him as long as the fool continued to obtain converts), the very fact that they clearly deviate from the religion of Islam they *choose* to follow, exposes them to the possibility of Asuric punishment for their apostasy. But before this fitting culmination is reached, a vicious cycle – one based on a recognition that they must frequently ‘prove’ themselves ‘good’ Muslims in order to distract attention from their doctrine – plays out whereby the sufis more aggressively seek converts than the orthodox, or more excessively praise Mohammed, in order that they might be spared death for apostasy and continue to be allowed to

practice their strange hybrid religion.

But this pattern is only tolerated by the orthodox to a certain extent, because they are fully cognizant of the blasphemy of Sufism, and will legally murder the sufikuffar in varying quantities depending upon the circumstances, which if in medieval India meant the slaughter of certain ‘saints’ who were far too vocal in their heresy, in modern times is a decidedly more virulent proposition. For there are now considerably more “Muslims” running about the subcontinent, with two segments of it deemed to be nations *specifically* designed for those identifying as “Muslim”. And as we know, when an entire land begins to fancy itself as “Muslim”, the next stage of Asuric Islam begins in earnest, with the less pious of the Muslims slaughtered for their blasphemies, especially when there are no more overt unbelievers like the Hindus left to kill. And in the remnant of “Pakistan”, we find the sufis – and their followers – now on the other side of the sword, with their previous efforts for the sake of Islam to no avail, because just like the Ahmadis and Shias, their targeting of the Hindus and India in the name of Islam fails to excuse them from the wrath of the actual Muslims.

* * * *

The ambition of Jinnah and the other Western educated “Muslims” who profited from the British divide and rule strategy was not just, as some have argued, to have their own positions strengthened. If that was certainly one factor motivating them, their overall ambition also included an authentic desire to construct a political state where the interests of “Muslims” were upheld, where the community's general well-being was improved. It was a desire that they felt could only be affirmed when surrounded by others of the same faith, for though Jinnah and his peers were certainly exposed to non-Islamic customs and education, they nonetheless held dear the Islamic disdain – although perhaps not individually expressed in the brutish manner of an Imam during Friday prayers – for Hindus, or at least for Hindu influence. It was, for them (in comparison to the Imams), a mentality based less on the particulars of Islamic scripture than on the ordinary pride of the group and a rudimentary need to out-compete the ‘other’, with this *partially* Islamic attitude of the state's founders acknowledged in the “Pakistan” textbooks of today:

The Hindus started a campaign of replacing Urdu with Hindi in 1867. Syed felt a lot of pain at this. **The Hindus wished to ruin Muslim civilization and culture by destroying Urdu.** This enmity of the Hindus convinced Sir Syed that in order to live an honourable life, the Muslims should claim that they are a separate nation. **He thought that it was necessary for the Muslims to receive western education to compete with the Hindus.** (AH Nayyar and Ahmed Salim, *The Subtle Subversion: The State of Curricula and Textbooks in Pakistan*, 2005, p. 82)

Indeed the use of the term “Muslim” in connection to western education and a language other than Arabic is instructive, for as we have noted, the “Muslim” elite that goaded the division of India in reality desired a “Muslim” culture, rather than that of real Islam. After all, the proper Muslim is not going to search for western education when he already believes the Quran and authentic hadith to be the pinnacle of ‘truth’, and non-Islamic education the likely source of bidats to the Islamic religion. Sir Syed – whose full name was Syed Ahmad Khan – is in fact a fantastic example of the paradox of the “Muslim” founders of “Pakistan”, for he, although creating Aligarh Muslim University, though considered by most to be the first proponent of the Two Nation Theory dividing Hindus and Muslims (albeit with a minority arguing that he was not the originator of the theory), and while specifically identified by the textbooks – including the above – as at the very least an advocate of separation between the Hindus and Muslims, was nevertheless hardly a firm adherent of *Islam*. Indeed as Usha

Sanyal notes, he dismissed much of the Hadith, and believed Gabriel to be a *metaphorical* figure rather than an actual angel communicating with Mohammed!

Sayyid Ahmad Khan was a rationalist. His reformist ideas were in the tradition of Shah Wali Ullah, and were also similar to those of Muhammad Ismail, the author of the *Taqwiyat al-Iman*, particularly in his disapproval of what he saw as accretions to Islamic belief and practice and different forms of associationism (*shirk*). ...In keeping with his modernist, rationalist thinking Sayyid Ahmad Khan denied the possibility of miracles, **interpreting the miracles surrounding the Prophet as later fabrications. He also interpreted belief in angels metaphorically rather than literally, as a quality possessed by prophets. Thus, the angel Gabriel “stands for the ... inherent possession of prophethood in the Prophet himself and thus stands for the cause of revelation”** (Troll, 1978: 181). **He was also critical of much of the hadith literature, dismissing it as being inauthentic.** (Usha Sanyal, *Ahmad Riza Khan Barelwi: In the Path of the Prophet*, 2005, pp. 42-43)

Failing to understand – or worse, consciously rejecting – the comprehensive nature of Islam, and attached more to the group identity of “Muslim” rather than the actual *content* of Islam, the founders of “Pakistan” inevitably proposed this artificial construct as a homeland for “Muslims” instead of the *Islamic religion*, with the obviously classified unbelievers potentially welcome as long as they acknowledged the superiority of the so-called Muslims. This latter group was to include the sect of Sufism – in fact it still does, and the rebellious orders persist in contaminating the ‘purity’ of a land that *continues* to misunderstand what Islam's perversion of purity is, that insists on accommodating multiple parties of pretend “Muslims”. While this vitiation also applies to the Shi’ite and “Secularist” - at least as secular as possible for a Pakistani – individuals of remnant Pakistan, it is most germane to Sufism, which if not existing as an official, public denomination for the vast majority, is nevertheless hugely influential by way of its significant presence within, ironically, the self-identified major *Sunni* schools of “Pakistan”.

It is a bizarre mixture of doctrine that accounts for much of the derision directed at subcontinental “Muslims” by Arab Muslims, especially when we consider the sheer numbers of the two largest Sunni-sufi hybrids in rump Pakistan, the Barelvis and Deobandis. Indeed the Barelvis – decidedly the more blasphemous of the two, even if the Deobandis are, as we shall see, far from immune to the same bidats (although they practice them less provocatively) – are generally assumed to be the most populous of all Islamic subgroups within “Pakistan”, constituting anywhere from an estimated fifty to sixty (R. Upadhyay, *Barelvis and Deobandis: “Birds of the Same Feather”*, South Asia Analysis Group, 28 January 2011) percent of the total population, with the caveat that Islamic sects are not officially counted by the state of Pakistan. Notwithstanding the finer point of their actual quantity, the predominance of the Barelvis is clear, both in numerical terms and in historical importance, even if the former parameter is being steadily eroded by the more orthodox of Muslims present in “Pakistan”. And rightly – at least per Islam's corruption of right and wrong – so, for we find in the Barelvis a strong emphasis on standard subcontinental Sufism:

What distinguishes the Barelwis from the other reformist groups (Deobandis, the Ahl-e Hadith, and others) is their attitude to the relationship of the transcendent to this world. While the other groups reject sufism or Islamic mysticism either wholly **or in part**, and deny the importance of saintly mediators, miracles, and other manifestations of the holy in the here and now, the Barelwis embrace everything associated with sufism as an intrinsic part of their identity. But they share with the other reformists a strong focus on the Prophet Muhammad as a model of correct behaviour and an example of the virtues that every Muslim should strive to cultivate and that he or she should live by. (Usha Sanyal, *Ahmad Riza Khan Barelwi: In the Path of the Prophet*, 2005, XI)

Sanyal, in this citation, is comparing the emergence of the Barelvīs to the other schools of Islamic thought established in the 19th century Indian subcontinent, groups whose characteristics often depended on the personality and vision of the leading individual in the movement, with that influence, as one might expect, increasing in scope the further the school deviated from austere Islam. And in Ahmad Riza Khan the Barelvī movement – indeed subcontinental Sufism in general – had an imposing figure, whose force of personality helped somewhat account for the lack of successful opposition seen to the movement in his lifetime, when one would normally expect a strong Islamic counter to his type of conception, for “the kind of model Muslim person he visualized was one who **embraced rather than shunned ritual intermediaries and a ritualistic style of worshipping God**. One might say that he wanted his followers to use reformist religious methods so as to be better, and more individually driven, traditionalists.” (Usha Sanyal, *Ahmed Riza Khan Bareilwi: In the Path of the Prophet*, 2005, XII) His – and his followers - abject heresy, briefly outlined above, was afforded protection by way of a peculiar projection of his personal force – that of an incessant and ingenious use of *fatwas* (scholarly legal opinions):

Ignoring politics, he sought to make religion vital in personal life; and the religion he espoused was largely that of custom, of the shrines, and of mediation, **now sanctioned by erudite volumes of *fatawa* and Law**. (Barbara Daly Metcalf, *Islamic Revival in British India: Deoband, 1860-1900*, 1982, p. 313)

But before we review some of the particulars of Ahmad Riza's *fatwas*, we must examine his lifelong assertion of Sufism, a matter that his followers contend began from a early age, during which Barelvī lore insists that his prowess in *both* the rote shariat memorization and the sufi esoteric knowledge developed:

Ahmad Riza's biographer, Zafar ud-Din Bihari, records a number of stories about Ahmad Riza's spiritual and intellectual accomplishments as a child...when learning the Arabic alphabet from his grandfather, Ahmad Riza is said to have instinctively understood the deeper significance of the letter “la” – a composite letter with which the attestation of faith (the *kalima* or *shahada*, lit. “witness”) begins. **He grasped not only its outward meaning, that related to the Oneness of God, but also its inner, gnostic meaning, communicated to him by his grandfather**. This story is significant in light of the fact that Ahmad Riza went on to become both an ‘alim or scholar of Islamic law, and a sufi or mystic seeker of God.

Other stories claim that at four, Ahmad Riza had memorized the entire Qur’an by heart, and at six he addressed a gathering of worshipers at the mosque from the pulpit on the occasion of the Prophet's birthday (an annual celebration at which he addressed large crowds from the mosque in later years). (Usha Sanyal, *Ahmad Riza Khan Bareilwi: In the Path of the Prophet*, 2005, pp. 57-58)

Although considered a prodigy, it was only later in his youth, while visiting Mecca, the geographical centre of Islamic idolatry, that he was formally recognized as a scholar in the traditional Sunni categories of learning. Curiously enough, it was during the same visit, according to Barelvī accounts, that his status as a great sufi was affirmed:

While Ahmad Riza was in Mecca he received recognition from ‘ulama in high positions of authority. Sayyid Ahmad Dahlan, the mufti of the Shafi‘i law school, gave him a certificate (*sanad*) in several fields of knowledge – hadith (the traditions of the Prophet), exegesis of the Qur’an (*tafsir*), jurisprudence (*fiqh*), and principles of jurisprudence (*usul-e fiqh*). The other scholar to do so was the mufti of the Hanafi school of law. Although Ahmad Riza had not studied under these scholars formally they authorized him to teach in the fields they had specified and to cite their names when doing so. Equally important, though in a different way,

was his encounter with Husain bin Saleh, the Shafi'i imam. The latter noticed him one day during the evening prayer and took him aside. **We are told that he held "his forehead for a long time, saying at length that he saw Allah's light in it.** He then gave him a new name, Zia ud-Din Ahmad, **and a certificate in the six collections of hadith, as well as one in the Qadiri order,** signing it with his own hand" (Rahman Ali, 1961: 99). This encounter emphasized the spiritual (sufi) rather than the scholarly sources of Ahmad Riza's authority. So too did another – Medinan – experience, a dream in which Ahmad Riza was assured that he was absolved of all his sins. As most Muslims believe that this assurance is granted to very few, this vision can be read as a claim to leadership of the Ahl-e Sunnat movement in coming years. (Usha Sanyal, *Ahmad Riza Khan Bareilwi: In the Path of the Prophet*, 2005, pp. 63-64)

While the modern world correctly understands Arabia to be the financial epicentre of global funding for an Islamic "extremism" that despises Sufism, as one can see in this selection, Mecca has, ironically enough, not always been the stronghold of austere Islam. Nevertheless, although the Mecca of Ahmad Riza's time had been corrupted with blasphemous Imams, because the city will always retain – thanks to the Quran and Hadith – an idolatrous importance to Islam, this particular aspect of Ahmad Riza's life provided his heretical Sunni-sufi hybrid with an undeserved authenticity, helping to explain why his modern followers continue to view Bareilvi as a beacon of real Islam, for he had these experiences in *Mecca*, with the approval of *Meccan* Imams. But what he failed to obtain however, was conformity with the Quran and authentic hadith, the scripture assuredly immune to bidats, unlike the mortals of the city of Mecca, where the pervasiveness of heresy and religious innovations explained the rise of Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab in the 18th century. While his Wahhabi movement, now labelled a "radical" form of Islam, was unable to effect a significant change in Meccan – along with global Islamic – practices until after both his and Ahmad Riza's respective eras, as one observes in the following Sanyal excerpt, Wahhabism was certainly an appropriate Islamic response to the corruption wrought by Sufism:

The founder of the Wahhabi movement was Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab (1703–87). His message was an insistence on the unity of God (*tawhid*), which meant that all forms of superstition (the veneration of saints' tombs, holy objects, and the like) were contrary to the worship of the one God. He believed that the first generation of Muslims, namely, the Prophet and his companions, were the models of true Islamic practice. He therefore rejected later developments in the history of Islam, particularly sufism and what he viewed as its excesses. Albert Hourani (1983: 37) describes his ideas as follows:

The true Islam, stated Ibn Abd al-Wahhab, was that of the first generation, the pious forerunners, and in their name **he protested against all those later innovations which had in fact brought other gods into Islam: against the later development of mystical thought, with its monist doctrines, its ascetic renunciation of the goods of the world, its organization into brotherhoods, its rituals other than those prescribed by the Quran; against the excessive cult of Muhammad as perfect man and intercessor with God** (although great reverence was paid to him as Prophet); **against the worship of saints and reverence for their shrines; and against the return into Islam of the customs and practices of the [pre-Islamic age].** (Usha Sanyal, *Ahmad Riza Khan Bareilwi: In the Path of the Prophet*, 2005, pp. 21-22)

Wahhab, of course, had robust support in his contentions, beginning with the Asuric revelation of Mohammed as the "exemplar" for mankind, to the multiple verses, previously cited, rejecting the possibility of mystic experiences subsequent to the Prophet's. He also correctly struck at the heart of one of Sufism's curious heresies – that of their diluted unity with Allah, who Wahhab accurately identified as *strictly* transcendent to the consciousness of man, with no possibility of *any* sort of 'unity' obtained during meditation, even if the sufis reject the greatest Unity of Self-Realization. Of pertinence to the Bareilvis especially, are his denunciations of the worship of saints and their shrines, along with

the ancient mystical paths and orders. Contravening the Arab reformer, Ahmad Riza Khan, the pivotal figure of the Barelvi movement, inflated the status of the pirs, glorifying them as crucial to a hierarchy of spiritual and religious knowledge:

Also noteworthy in this regard is the hierarchy of levels of knowledge laid out in the above fatwa: **after God, Muhammad's knowledge was greatest, then followed the knowledge of various prophets, that of the ulama and sufi shaikhs and pirs (Shaikh Abd al-Qadir Jilani foremost among these), and finally, that of ordinary believers.** (Usha Sanyal, *Ahmad Riza Khan Barelwi: In the Path of the Prophet*, 2005, p. 77)

But this, as we know, is an intrusion on the appropriate established order of Islamic learning, with only the Imams and scholars allowed any sort of knowledge above the ordinary believers. The sufi 'saints' are impostors upon this hierarchy, for their teachings – even if some of them are personally acknowledged as Islamic scholars or as Imams – include esoteric knowledge clearly derived from non-Islamic traditions, including that of the Polytheist. The sufis however, want to be revered in both domains, and instead of judiciously rejecting the non-Islamic tenets, they instead rebrand it. This blasphemous desire – to be known as upholders of Islamic knowledge while simultaneously incorporating heretical innovations – was observable at Ahmad Riza's entry into public life:

By the 1880s, Ahmad Riza had begun to establish an identity of his own as a mufti who wrote erudite works, including daily responsa (fatawa) in response to questions from Bareilly Muslims and others in distant places, **and as a sufi surrounded by a close group of disciples.** His perspective was markedly hierarchical. In the spiritual sphere, what mattered most was "closeness" to God, just as in the scholarly one it had been the amount of knowledge the person had. **By both measures, the Prophet came first, followed by the founder of the Qadiri order, and finally the sufi master to whom the individual believer was linked through discipleship.** (Usha Sanyal, *Ahmad Riza Khan Barelwi: In the Path of the Prophet*, 2005, p. 87)

Once again we find a bidat involving a hierarchy - this example referring to the esoteric orders rather than religious knowledge. We also find Ahmad Riza, like any other sufi, initiated into one of the sect's orders, embracing a heretical accretion to Islam – which on its own violates the Asuric revelation to avoid division into sects - to the extent that he believed his relationship with his pir to be unbreakable even with death:

Ahmad Riza became Shah Al-e Rasul's disciple (*murid*, lit. seeker) in 1877. He seems to have thought of the relationship between master and disciple as unbreakable by the disciple even **after the master's death**, even though it had not necessarily been close in his lifetime. That at least is how he treated the relationship with his own master, Shah Al-e Rasul, who had died a mere two years after it had been formed. As mentioned already, Shah Al-e Rasul's grandson, Nuri Miyan, took over as Ahmad Riza's spiritual director (though technically they were sufi "brothers" or *pir bhai*, being disciples of the same pir), and **Ahmad Riza continued to pay his respects to his deceased master by commemorating his death every year at his home in Bareilly.** (Usha Sanyal, *Ahmad Riza Khan Barelwi: In the Path of the Prophet*, 2005, p. 89)

While Ahmad Riza's insistence on honouring the death of his pir was certainly one of many religious innovations that he lent his weight toward, before we discuss the extent of the heretical sufi customs the Barelvis continue to perpetuate, we must examine how the innovation of celebrating anniversaries related to saints becomes further aggravated, how it adds insult to apostasy. In that, we refer to the Barelvi belief – as one would naturally expect from sufikuffar – in the rare spiritual powers of the 'saints', including their unique ability to intercede with God via a hierarchy of mediation, a gift which according to Ahmad Riza established the taking of a pir as an absolute necessity for a "Muslim":

...as Ahmad Riza put it elsewhere, "To try [to go through life without a pir] is to embark on a

dark road and be misled along the way by Satan” (Ahmad Riza Khan, 1901: 9-11).

However, such acts of day-to-day guidance were but a small part of the pir's role in the disciple's life. **The most important reason why a person should bind himself to a pir, Ahmad Riza explained, was that pirs are intermediaries between the believer and God in a chain of mediation that reaches from each pir to the one preceding him, all the way to the Prophet and thence to God.** Hadith (prophetic traditions) proved, he said, that **there was a chain of intercession to God beginning with the Prophet interceding with God Himself. At the next level, the sufi masters (*masha'ikh*) would intercede with the Prophet on behalf of their followers in all situations and circumstances, including the grave (*qabr*).** It would be foolish in the extreme, therefore, not to bind oneself to a pir and thus ensure help in times of need (Ahmad Riza Khan, 1901: 12). (Usha Sanyal, *Ahmad Riza Khan Bareilly: In the Path of the Prophet*, 2005, p 90)

But as we already know, there is no support in the authentic hadith for these allegations, with the Hadith leaving unmentioned the existence of ‘saints’, let alone their ability to intercede with Allah - a capacity that the authentic hadith explicitly document as *only* granted to prophets from among the mortals. From the differing perspective of mysticism, we note Ahmad Riza's invocation of fear to justify one's binding to a pir – the emotion the Asura of Falsehood favours in impelling mortals to his chaos -, a warning stemming from his obsession over Satan's power and the eternal nature of the Islamic hellfire – all of this a sign of the irrationalism dominating his consciousness. Yet this should hardly come as a surprise, because like all sufis, he was well indoctrinated by the shariat, even if he upheld the curious – for someone supposed to have been a scriptural scholar – transgressions and persistence in promoting heresies related to intercession, with the following selection describing the imaginative process by which the sufi ‘saints’, including the Qadiri order's founder, are illegally included in an Islamic hierarchy that in its actual form was only meant for the external religious law instead of the esoteric:

Ahmad Riza was affiliated to the Qadiri order (*tariqa*), one of the three major sufi orders in nineteenth-century India (along with the Chishti and Naqshbandi). The Qadiri order was founded in the twelfth century by Shaikh Abd al-Qadir, a native of the town of Jilan in Iran, who later became a scholar and preacher in Baghdad. **His tomb in Baghdad is visited by pilgrims from all over the Muslim world, particularly from South Asia. To his followers, he is a saint, an intercessor with God,** and the occupant of a place of honor in the hierarchy of saints “between this world and the next, between the Creator and the created” (Padwick, 1996: 240). One of his most popular epithets is “Ghaus-e A‘zam,” the “Greatest Helper.” **Qadiris regard him as the Qutb,** axis or pole of the invisible hierarchy of saints who rule the spiritual universe. This spiritual “government” is as follows:

Every ghaus has two ministers. The ghaus is known as Abd Allah. The minister on the right is called Abd al-Rab, and the one on the left is called Abd al-Malik. In this [spiritual] world, the minister on the left is superior to the one on the right, unlike in the worldly sultanate. The reason is that this is the sultanate of the heart and the heart is on the left side. Every ghaus [has a special relationship with] the Prophet. (*Mal'uzat*, vol. 1, p.102)

The first ghaus, Ahmad Riza said, was the Prophet. He was followed by the first four caliphs (Abu Bakr, Umar, Uthman, and Ali), each of whom was first a minister of the left before he became ghaus upon the death of the previous incumbent. They were followed by Hasan and Husain (Ali's sons, the second and third imams, respectively, in Shi'ism). **The line continued down to Abd al-Qadir Jilani.** He was last “great” ghaus (*ghausiyat-e kubra*). All who followed after him were deputies (*na'ib*). In this chain of spiritual authority, the sources of spiritual knowledge are united with those of sharia knowledge – for the source of the latter is none other

than the Prophet, followed by the first four caliphs of Sunni Islam. **This is a fitting image for one who, like Ahmad Riza Khan, saw himself as embodying the path of both sharia and sufism (*tariqa*).** (Usha Sanyal, *Ahmad Riza Khan Bareilwi: In the Path of the Prophet*, 2005, pp. 94-95)

The amount of innovations on display is staggering, with the previously discussed concept of the Qutb augmented with the bidat of the *ghaus*, for which there is absolutely no scriptural mention, nor any association with Mohammed or ensuing Caliphs, let alone the inclusion of sufi 'saints' into this arrangement. For the Prophet and the Islamic rulers after him are not considered the rulers of a fantastical "spiritual world", of which there are no descriptions within the authentic hadith or Quran: they were corporeal rulers, upholders of the religious law, the Sharia, which rejects the establishment of sufic orders whose mystic practices are conducted in illegal monasteries. The shariat is the only path for the actual Muslim, with the daily indoctrination of the scripture enough to account for any esoteric quests, since that external content is designed to shape the internal thoughts and beliefs of the Muslim. There should only be shariat, not shariat *and* Sufism, especially as we know the latter to be the repository for heresies, including the status of Qadir as intercessor, for which his followers visit his tomb on pilgrimage, a blasphemous practice thoroughly embraced - as we shall soon see - by Ahmad Riza, who insidiously – at least from the orthodox perspective – supported his multifarious disbelief by way of his status as an Imam along with the aforementioned tactic of fatwas and other written forms of propaganda:

Belief in the intercession of saintly persons with Allah on behalf of the ordinary believer is controversial in Sunni Islam. Indeed, Muslim reformers have often spoken out against it on the grounds that it is a form of *shirk* or associationism and an accretion to "pure" Islam. Years before, Muhammad Ismail had written against this very belief (and the practices that arise from it) in his book *Taqwiyat al-Iman*, classifying it as the second of three types of *shirk* (see p. 32). **Ahmad Riza, for his part, wrote extensively in favor of such belief, declaring that Muhammad Ismail's position was contrary to the Qur'an, which gives the prophets the power to intercede with God's "permission" (*izn*), and that it detracted from the Prophet's power, which included the ability to perform miracles.**

For Ahmad Riza and the Ahl-e Sunnat movement, which saw sufism as a necessary complement to the law, the intercession of sufi masters and, ultimately, of the Prophet himself was crucial to the relationship between master and disciple, for the living hope that the dead pir (here the ordinary dead are less central than the holy, exalted dead) will intercede for them both in the here and now and when they face Judgement Day. (Usha Sanyal, *Ahmad Riza Khan Bareilwi: In the Path of the Prophet*, 2005, pp. 91-92)

In Ahmad Riza's above disputation we find one example of his argumentative techniques in justifying Bareilvi heresies, for while it is true that the Prophet was granted permission by Allah to intercede, the point is irrelevant to the actual issue, which is the supposed ability of *sufi saints* to intercede with Allah, whether or not through Mohammed. There is, of course, absolutely no evidence for the latter contentions, as only the prophets were granted intercessory powers on the Day of Judgement, and they certainly were not permitted – per the scripture of Islam – the right to act as intercessory intermediaries through others (such as the sufi shaikhs), whether on Judgement day or for issues within the life. But the specious arguments of Ahmad Riza were effective enough to withstand any sustained orthodox pressure, because the era was one in which the attempted resolution of intra-Muslim disagreements was done through the method of private and public debate, a domain he excelled in, with another of his techniques involving, as Barbara Metcalf documents, a very clever argument to justify using weak hadiths for the all sorts of flagrant heresies:

...he argued that it was laudable to act not merely on authentic *hadis* but on weak *hadis* as well,

so long as they were not contradicted by authentic *hadis*. ...**On the basis of weak *hadis*, for example, he considered laudable the practice of kissing the thumbs and placing them to the eyes upon hearing the name of the Prophet in the call to prayer, a practice conducive to visions of the Prophet.** ...he maintained that unless a customary practice were specifically opposed by a *hadis*, it was legitimate. (Barbara Daly Metcalf, *Islamic Revival in British India: Deoband, 1860-1900*, 1982, pp. 304-05)

Once more we find sophistry to his arguments, because even the unopposed weak hadiths can easily lead to clear bid'ats and *shirk*, and in the example of having visions of the Prophet – or any other local custom, for that matter - all hadith must answer to the infrarational Quran revelations rejecting the ability of mortals born after Mohammed to have mystic experiences like visions. But Ahmad Riza, instead of accurately applying his scholarship to proceed with eliminating heresies, chose to unconditionally *embrace* the blasphemies – at least those against real Islam – of Sufism, leading him to condone the illegal practice of trying to envision Mohammed. It also helps us understand how he was uninhibited in exalting the powers of the *pir*, who not only can intercede with Allah, but are also gifted with special gifts such as reading the minds of their disciples:

The reason the relationship with the *pir* was so important, according to Ahmad Riza, was that the *pir* had a unique insight into his disciple's mental frame of mind, and was always on hand to guide him:

Sayyid Ahmad Sijilmasi was going somewhere. Suddenly his eyes lifted from the ground, and he saw a beautiful woman. The glance had been inadvertent [and so no blame attached to him]. But then he looked up again. This time he saw his *pir* and teacher (*murshid*), Sayyid ...Abd al-Aziz Dabagh. (*Malfuzat*, vol. 2, p. 45)

On the second occasion the *pir* had intervened to prevent Sayyid Ahmad Sijilmasi from looking – intentionally, this time – at a woman outside the circle of relatives with whom social intimacy was permitted, and possibly being led astray. (Usha Sanyal, *Ahmad Riza Khan Bareilwi: In the Path of the Prophet*, 2005, p. 89)

While this sort of sexual discipline is again, *not* advocated by Islam – especially because the Asura of Falsehood has no overriding requirement for another infrarational Muslim mystic after Mohammed -, the belief in the ability of a sufi saint to read the thoughts – whether close or from a distance – of his disciple, one that we have already documented as promoted by multiple sufis throughout the history of the apostate sect, is alone enough to prove the charge of *shirk*. For the knowledge of the thoughts or beliefs or desires of others, is ordained by the Quran as belonging to Allah, who has said, “And keep your opinion secret or proclaim it, lo! He is Knower of all that is in the breasts (of men).” (Quran 67:13) Nowhere is this knowledge authentically attributed to mortals, including the Prophet Mohammed, considered by sufis to be the pinnacle of mysticism – in fact the Quran demonstrates the opposite, with Gabriel having relayed to Mohammed, “Say, (O Mohammed): Whether ye hide that which is in your breasts or reveal it, **Allah knoweth it**. He knoweth that which is in the heavens and that which is in the earth, and Allah is Able to do all things.” (Quran 3:29) Similarly is all thought – including any belief in the intercession of ‘saints’ – known to Allah alone, even if the apostate attempts to hide it:

Lo! now they fold up their breasts that they may hide (their thoughts) from Him. At the very moment when they cover themselves with their clothing, **Allah knoweth that which they keep hidden and that which they proclaim.** Lo! He is Aware of what is in the breasts (of men). (Quran 11:05)

The Bareilvis, however, make no attempt to disguise their inner embrace of Sufism, including the nascent *shirk* seen in the belief of the all-encompassing knowledge of the *pir*. For the Bareilvis follow in

the footsteps of their local heritage, traditions most loudly declared in the works of Ahmad Riza, who went further than assigning to the *pir* intercessory and mind-reading capabilities, elevating – as any sufi should – them to the level of a God that the follower could unite – according to the standard sufi dilution of unity – with or become absorbed in:

The *pir*, in turn, should conform to four exacting standards: he should be a Sunni Muslim of sound faith (*sahih aqida*), should be a scholar (*alim*) qualified to interpret the sharia, his chain of transmission (*silsila*) should reach back from him in an unbroken line to the Prophet, and finally, he should lead an exemplary personal life and not be guilty of transgressing the sharia (*Malfuzat*, vol. 2, p. 41).

If both master and disciple conformed to these high standards, the disciple would eventually attain a state of complete absorption in his *pir*, a condition known as *fana fil shaikh*. Nuri Miyan was cast as a perfect illustration of the model of *fana*:

[Nuri Miyan] loved and respected his [*pir*, Shah Al-e Rasul]; indeed, he loved everyone who was associated with him, and all the members of his family. **He followed his commands**, he presented himself before him at his court (*darbar*), he sought his company, he was completely absorbed in him. His face had the same radiance [as Shah Al-e Rasul], his personality had the same stamp (*hal*), he walked with the same gait, when he talked it was in the same tone. His clothes had the same appearance, he dealt with others in the same way. In his devotions and strivings, he followed the same path (*maslak*). The times set apart for rest in the afternoon and sleep at night were times when he went to him particularly, receiving from him guidance in every matter and warning of every danger. (Ghulam Shabbar Qadiri, 1968: 91) (Usha Sanyal, *Ahmad Riza Khan Bareilwi: In the Path of the Prophet*, 2005, pp. 90-91)

While this type of absorption is distant from the level of Self-Realization, the Union of Consciousness, it is conversely a blasphemy in Islam, because it assigns devotion to a mortal, when nobody – whether mortal or immortal – else but Allah is permitted the same level of reverence in the Islamic religion. Indeed in advancing *fana fil-shaikh* Ahmad Riza immediately transgresses his own four-fold standard defining a *pir*, as his faith is established as unsound, unworthy of a Sunni who should never devote himself – to the point of following commands deviant to authentic Islamic scripture – to any other mortal or ‘god’ in a fashion similar to worship of Allah. Only the commands of Allah should be followed, the ‘one true god’ is the only one to remain devoted toward; indeed the final Prophet Mohammed is also unworthy of such reverence, because Allah has deemed him only a human. But from the perspective of Ahmad Riza and his followers, the Prophet – and the saints – are in fact deserving of worship, as we observe in the following Metcalf selection outlining the diverse beliefs characterizing Bareilvi *shirk*:

...He also emphasized the importance of the saints. Ahmad Riza justified many of the ceremonies the reformers disapproved of by the importance he gave to their role as intermediaries. **On the issue of *sama*, of whether the saints after death could hear the believers' prayers, he held that they could not only hear, but that their powers of *tasarruf* and *karamat* continued after death as they had in life, and that the saints maintained not only a spiritual but a bodily life after death.** [Abdu'l-Hakim Khan, Akthar Shahjahanpuri, *A'la Hazrat Bareilwi ka Fiqhi Maqam* (Lahore, 1971), p 32] **In his book *Hayat-i Maut* he explained that the saints could see with the light of God (*nur-i khuda*). They could be solicited for their help not only at their graves but everywhere. Their powers of communication were especially strong on Friday nights, he explained, and then, indeed, even the ordinary dead could speak.** In another work, *al-Aman wa'l-Ala*, he elaborated his belief in the secret hierarchy of saints whose presence in every age sustains the universe. **Not only the dead but the living could be intermediaries.** He told, with approval, an anecdote of a

weeping child, known for his visions, who saw his mother being led to hell; **a *shaikh*, who had 70,000 *durud* (of praise to the Prophet) in reserve, transferred them to the mother, and the child, joyous, saw her in heaven.** (Barbara Daly Metcalf, *Islamic Revival in British India: Deoband, 1860-1900*, 1982, pp. 302-303)

While these beliefs certainly confirm the apostasy of Ahmad Riza and the Barelvi-style Sufism he has justifiably – given the volume of writing he produced – come to represent, it is once again important to review an important source of inspiration for these heretical precepts, these outrageous transgressions into *shirk* characterized by the belief that the ‘saints’ are capable – as if they were Allah - of answering the prayers of believers, that they can see with the light of God, that they can prevent the believer from residing in hell by exchanging the currency of “praise”! For the sufis, as we know, look to the Prophet Mohammed as the *founder* of the mystic orders they wish to continue, when in fact Islam ordains him the culmination, the *end* of all forms of mysticism. But as the sufis – Ahmad Riza was merely an attempted preserver of over a millennium of blasphemous traditions – either ignore or contort the clear Islamic scripture which forbids their customs, they take the infrarational mysticism of Mohammed as the standard-bearer for their *own* illegal practices, though of course they – including the Barelvis - attribute to Mohammed's mysticism a different scope than that outlined by the authentic scripture. Part of this, as we have already discussed, includes the heretical claims of Mohammed's unseen knowledge, with Ahmad Riza and his followers believing it to be comprehensive:

Ahmad Riza also believed that the Prophet had unique knowledge of the unknown, of *ilmul-ghaib*. The reformers, anxious to preserve God's uniqueness, had denied that the Prophet had this knowledge except in special instances, when it was granted by God. **The Barelwis, by contrast, felt that he had full knowledge of spiritual matters (*haqiqat-i ruh*); of the meaning of all metaphorical passages in the Quran; and of the past and future.** (Barbara Daly Metcalf, *Islamic Revival in British India: Deoband, 1860-1900*, 1982, pp. 300-302)

The Quran, as we have displayed, is clearly in agreement with the “reformers”, because the Asuric revelations frequently announce that the Unseen (or Unknown) knowledge belongs solely to Allah, even if it certainly – as would be expected since Mohammed was recipient of the final infrarational revelations – acknowledges that Mohammed was privy to some of it. However, there is certainly no mention of a sweeping Omniscience that Mohammed possessed, and absolutely no *authentic* indicators that he had a “metaphorical” understanding of the scripture. Nor did he have a “full” knowledge of the past and future, and the scripture does not even provide a brief comment on any supposed ability of his to read minds. The latter capacity, which we know the sufis like Ahmad Riza attribute to their ‘saints’, is likewise imputed to the Prophet, with the Barelvi hero alleging Mohammed to have had this sort of knowledge along with five things specifically mentioned in a Quran verse:

The Prophet also knew what was going on inside people's minds: “He knows the movement and glance of the eyelid, the fears and intentions of the heart, and whatever else exists” (*Al-Dawlat al-Makkiyya*, 90).

And, most controversially (for the Deobandis, among others, denied this), the Prophet had knowledge of the five things referred to in Qur'an 31:34:

Only God has the knowledge of the Hour.
He sends rain from the heavens,
and knows what is in the mothers' wombs.
No one knows what he will do on the morrow;
no one knows in what land he will die.
Surely God knows and is cognisant.
(31:34)

Ahmad Riza argued that apart from the resurrection, the other four things – knowledge of when it would rain, of the sex of a yet unborn child, of what one would earn on the morrow, and of the land where one would die – were not all that significant in themselves. In fact, they were rather minor in scale of importance compared to knowledge of the attributes of God, heaven and hell, and the like. **(In fact, Ahmad Riza argued, knowledge of these five things had been given not only to the Prophet, but also to Shaikh Abd al-Qadir Jilani, the *qutb* or “pivot” at the head of the invisible hierarchy of saints on whom the government of the world depends.** (Usha Sanyal, *Ahmad Riza Khan Bareilwi: In the Path of the Prophet*, 2005, pp. 75-76)

The blasphemy is brazen, as the Quran verse *specifically* says that *only* Allah has this knowledge – which means that either Mohammed is a god united with Allah (and the *qutb* al-Qadir Jilani), or Ahmad Riza has magically interpreted a different meaning to a very direct proclamation. That the sufikafir somehow managed to maintain his livelihood while daring to make such despicable – to the orthodox – comments is a testament to the effectiveness of his primary weapon – the fatwa. For even in the case of his erroneous contentions on Mohammed's unseen knowledge, Ahmad Riza was able to summon up a fatwa of “two hundred pages” length to justify a blasphemy easily proved as such by a handful of Quran verses, the worth of which far exceeds – in the view of Islam – thousands of pages of legal scholarship:

Having made this fundamental distinction between God's knowledge and the Prophet's, **Ahmad Riza then proceeded at great length (the fatwa is approximately two hundred pages long) to lay out the scope of the Prophet's knowledge of the unseen.** He began by saying that some knowledge of the unseen is possessed even by ordinary human beings: Muslims believe in the resurrection of the dead, heaven and hell, and other unseen things, as commanded by God. The knowledge possessed by prophets was of course much greater than that of ordinary people, and although it was but a drop in the ocean compared to what God knows, it was itself **“like an ocean beyond counting, for the prophets know, and can see, everything from the First Day until the Last Day, all that has been and all that will be.”** (*Al-Dawlat al-Makkiyya*, 57, 59) (Usha Sanyal, *Ahmad Riza Khan Bareilwi: In the Path of the Prophet*, 2005, p. 74)

Ahmad Riza's practice of intellectual bombardment through fatwas, along with his fortune of living during a time when the revival of pure Islam (as represented by the Wahhabis) was only in its infancy, an era whose circumstances also necessitated an orthodox concentration upon the British Christians and the Hindus rather than *munaḥfiqun* “Muslims”, were all enough to save him from the earth-bound Islamic justice, the legal execution for his apostasy. Otherwise his egregious pronouncements on the Prophet, from the irritating to the obscene, would have been severely dealt with. As fate would have it, he lived a life free to pass off blasphemies as austere Islam, with the milder ones – such as the following, clearly inspired by the doctrine of Ibn Arabi – a sign of even worse to come:

Of the relationship between God and the Prophet, Ahmad Riza said:

Only the Prophet can reach God without intermediaries. This is why, on the Day of Resurrection, all the prophets, saints (*auliya*), and ulama will gather in the Prophet's presence and beg him to intercede for them with God. ...The Prophet cannot have an intermediary because he is perfect (*kamil*). **Perfection depends on existence (*wujud*) and the existence of the world depends on the existence of the Prophet** [which in turn is dependent on the existence of God]. In short, faith in the preeminence of the Prophet leads one to believe that only God has existence, everything else is his shadow. (Ahmad Riza Khan, *Malfuzat*, vol. 2, p. 58)

To those who argued that belief in the perfection of the Prophet was contrary to belief in the Oneness of God (*tawhid*), Ahmad Riza replied that “everything comes from God,” that only God is intrinsic (*zat*) while everything else is extrinsic or dependent. This said, however, God chose Muhammad as “His means of bringing the extrinsic (*ghair*) world to Him. ...

Muhammad distributes what He gives. What is in the one is in the other.” (Usha Sanyal, *Ahmad Riza Khan Bareilwi: In the Path of the Prophet*, 2005, pp. 97-98)

While the perfection of the Prophet is certainly a religious innovation, one extrapolated from the idolatry engendered yet denied by orthodox Islam, the passage only glances – when describing Ahmad Riza's belief that the existence of the world depends on the Prophet - at the horrendous blasphemy the sufis have in relation to Mohammed, one that explicitly exalts him to the level of Allah. We refer, of course, to the aforementioned *Nur-i-Muhammad*, a doctrine that Ahmad Riza and the Bareilvis, like all other sufikuffar – whether or not they delude themselves into identifying as Sunni – hold dear to their hearts, with Ahmad Riza, as the following selection shows, expanding upon the doctrine of *wujud* to connect it to the sufi fabrication that Mohammed was the original light from which the sun and all light emerged:

And on Muhammad as God's light, he said:

God made Muhammad from His light before He made anything else. Everything begins with the Prophet, even existence (*wujud*). He was the first prophet, as God made him before He made anything else, and he was the last as well, being the final prophet. Being the first light, the sun and all light originates from the Prophet. All the atoms, stones, trees, and birds recognized Muhammad as prophet, as did Gabriel, and the other prophets. (Bihari, 1938: 96–98)

Being made of light, the Prophet Muhammad had no shadow. Ahmad Riza wrote in a fatwa, “Undoubtedly the Prophet did not have a shadow. This is clear from hadith, from the words of the ulama, of the [founders of the four Sunni law schools], and the learned” (Ahmad Riza Khan, 1405/1985:51–52). He cited numerous hadith to prove the luminous quality of the Prophet's face and body, to show that flies did not settle on his body, that after he had ridden on the back of an animal, the animal did not age any further, and so on. Such miracles associated with the Prophet also have a long history in popular literature throughout the Muslim world. (Usha Sanyal, *Ahmad Riza Khan Bareilwi: In the Path of the Prophet*, 2005, p. 98)

Of course, none of this is “clear” from the authentic hadith, and is especially absent from the Quran, which as we have reviewed, at most describes Mohammed as a vessel (lamp) for the “light” *belonging strictly to Allah*. Not only are the hadith mentioned in this Sanyal citation lacking in authenticity, they also fail to prove an “eternal” nature to Mohammed's light, because the luminous quality of one's face does not entail one becoming the source of all light. These magical miracles, manifested in weak or fabricated hadith accretions to ‘pure’ Islam, fail in receiving corroboration from the Quran and the authentic hadith. Indeed, in one of the many hadith – some of which we have already presented – proving Mohammed's *lack* of an eternal light, we find documentation of Mohammed *asking* for light that the sufis illegally assert he should have already possessed:

Narrated Ibn Abbas:

...In the meantime Bilal informed the Prophet of the approaching time for the (Fajr) prayer, and the Prophet offered the Fajr (Morning) prayer without performing new ablution. He used to say in his invocation, “Allahumma ijal fi qalbi nuran wa fi basari nuran, wa fi sami nuran, waan yamini nuran, waan yasari nuran, wa fawqi nuran, wa tahti nuran, wa amami nuran, wa khalfi nuran, wajal li nuran.” Kuraib (a sub narrator) said, “I have forgotten seven other words, (which the Prophet mentioned in this invocation). I met a man from the offspring of Al-Abbas and **he narrated those seven things to me, mentioning, ‘(Let there be light in) my nerves, my flesh, my blood, my hair and my body,’ and he also mentioned two other things.**” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 8, Book 75, Hadith 328)

We also find in the Hadith an unequivocal rejection of Ahmad Riza's corollary to Mohammed's eternal light – his subsequent lack of a shadow. For the Hadith in fact document the Prophet as having had a

shadow during prayer, with a Sunan Abi Dawud hadith, from Abdullah ibn Mas'ud and graded sahih, narrating, "The extent of the shadow when the Messenger of Allah prayed (the noon prayer) was three to five feet in summer and five to seven feet in winter." (Sunan Abi Dawud Book 2, Hadith 400) The authentic hadith also fail to record any subliminal viewings of Mohammed by other believers, let alone documenting him as devoid – as if he were a God of the Overmind – of a shadow. There is, however, an extraordinarily pertinent hadith, albeit graded as hasan (good), one level below sahih, that documents *Gabriel* as having had a shadow when praying *with* Mohammed, a subliminal feature that helps to further verify – in addition, of course, to the abhorrent psychology he promoted - the identity of Mohammed's "Gabriel" as the Asura of Falsehood:

Narrated Abdullah Ibn Abbas:

The Messenger of Allah said: "Gabriel led me in prayer at the House (i.e. the Ka'ba). He prayed the noon prayer with me when the sun had passed the meridian to the extent of the thong of a sandal; he prayed the afternoon prayer with me when the shadow of everything was as long as itself; he prayed the sunset prayer with me when one who is fasting breaks the fast; he prayed the night prayer with me when the twilight had ended; and he prayed the dawn prayer with me when food and drink become forbidden to one who is keeping the fast.

On the following day he prayed the noon prayer with me when his shadow was as long as himself; he prayed the afternoon prayer with me when his shadow was twice as long as himself; he prayed the sunset prayer at the time when one who is fasting breaks the fast; he prayed the night prayer with me when about the third of the night had passed; and he prayed the dawn prayer with me when there was a fair amount of light." (Sunan Abi Dawud Book 2, Hadith 393)

An actual Divine emanation, as we have discussed, would have *subliminally* appeared to Mohammed without a shadow, unblinking, and without his feet touching the ground. But as we already know from the mere analysis of Islam's psychology, the vital being who controlled Mohammed was precisely the opposite of Divine, which naturally led to an absence of documentation capturing the objective – in the occult domain – features expected of a higher emanation. That Ahmad Riza would nevertheless attribute such qualities to Mohammed was the inevitable result of the ample Polytheistic – Hindu and other pre-Islamic – influence upon Sufism, with its incorporation so detached from the actual roots that Ahmad Riza, like most apostates, was insistent that his heresy was the real Islam! Having forgotten the true origin of much of Sufism's precepts, he continuously asserted that Islam held Mohammed's light to be derived from Allah's light, a position undeniably assigning divinity to the Prophet, especially when Mohammed is, according to Barelvi blasphemy, both Omnipresent and the intermediary in "creation":

He particularly emphasized the preeminent position of the Prophet, writing some sixteen books on his life and composing praises of him in Urdu verse. ...**In his writings and sermons he often focused on the Sufi doctrine of the *nur-i muhammadi* which, he claimed, was denied by his opponents. The doctrine was that there existed a "light of Muhammad" that had derived from God's own light and had existed, like the Word in Christian theology, from the beginning of creation. It had acted as an intermediary in that creation, he explained, enlightening the world just as the full moon, reflecting the sun, lights the world. He denied the charge of the "Wahhabis" that this theory compromised the unity of God.** He insisted that one must recognize the place of the Prophet for whom the very world had been created: it was designed for his glory. **The Prophet was himself light, present and observant (*hazir o nazir*) in all places. As light, he had no shadow...**[Zuhur Ahmad Azhar, "Barelwi", *Da'irah-yi Ma'arif-i Islamiyyah*, Lahore, 1962, II, pp 485-87] (Barbara Daly Metcalf, *Islamic Revival in British India: Deoband, 1860-1900*, 1982, pp. 300-302)

This, however, is a narrative that negates the proper Islamic history of Mohammed functioning exclusively as the *human* and *final* prophet whose only supernatural *power* was an ability to intercede on the Day of Judgement. The “Wahhabis” - a term Ahmad Riza applied in denigration to all who disagreed with him – were correct in their counter-argument that the sufi heresy of Mohammed's *Nur* contravenes the *Islamic* concept of God's ‘unity’, which is that Allah only exists as the one true god, that there can be no other gods including the prophets (who are his slaves just like ordinary mortals), and that the consciousness or being of Allah is not accessible to any mortal, because Allah is exclusively transcendent. But Ahmad Riza was not to be convinced otherwise, and his blasphemy of *shirk* – in placing Mohammed with Allah - was further exacerbated by the scandalous means he went about worshipping the Prophet, as seen in Metcalf's comment that **“He would kiss the feet of any returning hajji who had been present in the mosque where the Prophet was buried.”** (Barbara Daly Metcalf, *Islamic Revival in British India: Deoband, 1860-1900*, 1982, pp. 302-303) Of course, this was only scratching the surface of his grave worship, a peculiar form of devotion that began during his second pilgrimage to Mecca, where he spent the majority of time at the *tomb* of the Prophet. During this same period, he was to make exceptionally heretical proclamations:

The Prophet was a personal presence in Ahmad Riza's life. When he went on his second pilgrimage in 1905–6, he spent a month in Medina, where the Prophet is buried. Ahmad Riza was in Medina during the Prophet's birthday celebrations.

According to his own statement, he spent almost the entire period at the Prophet's tomb; he even met the ulama of Medina there. He considered this the holiest place on earth, even surpassing the Ka’ba, as he wrote in the following verse:

**O Pilgrims! Come to the tomb of the king of kings
You have seen the Ka’ba, now see the Ka’ba of the Ka’ba**
(Ahmad Riza Khan, 1976: 96; *Malfuzat*, vol. 2, p. 47–48)

Ahmad Riza believed that the Prophet could help whoever he wished, in whatever way he saw fit, from his tomb. (He also had the capacity to travel in spirit to other places.) While most Sunni ulama believe that the Prophet will intercede with God on Judgment Day for ordinary Muslims, **Ahmad Riza believed that the Prophet's intercession is ongoing from the grave.** (The Prophet lives a life of sense and feeling while in his grave and spends his time in devotional prayer.) He mediates with God every day; his ability to do so is not limited to Judgment Day. Ahmad Riza had undertaken this second hajj particularly in the hope of being blessed with a vision of the Prophet. **And according to Bihari, this did indeed occur after he had presented the Prophet with a poem (*ghazal*) he had composed to him. In Bihari's words, “His fortune (*qismat*) awoke [on the second night of waiting]. His watchful, vigilant eyes were blessed with the presence of the Prophet”** (Bihari, 1938: 43–44). **He also reported having seen the Prophet in a dream** (*Malfuzat*, vol. 1, p. 82–83). (Usha Sanyal, *Ahmad Riza Khan Barelwi: In the Path of the Prophet*, 2005, pp. 99-100)

While his desire to obtain visions of the Prophet already exposed him to the possible charge of heresy, his contention that Mohammed could help anyone anywhere – like a God who eternally answers prayers – from his tomb, was the open declaration of Polytheism on the part of Ahmad Riza, with the additional component of the grave worship simply adding a morbid hue to the apostasy. Indeed the latter aspect is – as one would have expected a so-called scholar on Islam to have understood – a direct violation of multiple authentic hadith that we have already mentioned, with variations of them in particular (the recollections are repeated on numerous occasions by the hadith texts) expressing Mohammed's explicit fear that his grave would be worshipped:

Narrated Urwa bin Az-Zubair:

Aisha said, "The Prophet said during his fatal illness, 'Allah cursed the Jews for they took the graves of their prophets as places for worship.'" **Aisha added, "Had it not been for that (statement of the Prophet) his grave would have been made conspicuous. But he was afraid that it might be taken as a place for worship."** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 5, Book 59, Number 725)

When we observe the unambiguous language of the authentic Islamic scripture, it becomes astonishing that intelligent and learned Islamic scholars like Ahmad Riza would persist in their blasphemy, the particulars of which unintentionally promote the idea – among the pious believers - that the so-called "extremism" of certain Muslims is in actuality "reasonable", with this latter category of Muslims, as we have seen, often accusing the sufikuffar of "irrationality". But if the sufis might be irrational, it is nevertheless *not* rationality that is practised by the orthodox; instead, the latter are merely following the rules or dictates set by Islam, with any difference from the rules striking the pious as "irrational", when it is simply a disobedience accompanied by significant amount of fantasy. Accordingly, the actions taken forth by the orthodox Muslims with regards to the worship of Mohammed's grave are appropriate in terms of *following the commands* set by Islam, with Sanyal noting, **"It was also the Ahl-e Hadith who 'opposed pilgrimage (ziyarat) to the Prophet's tomb in Medina, as they opposed pilgrimage to all tombs,' sharing the orientation of the Wahhabis who 'had gone so far as to destroy the tomb of the Prophet' in the early nineteenth century** (Metcalf, 1996: 186–187)." (Usha Sanyal, *Ahmad Riza Khan Bareilwi: In the Path of the Prophet*, 2005, p. 69)

The Ahl-e Hadith - one of the primary competing subcontinental "reformers" (along with the Deobandis) during Ahmad Riza's era - and the Wahhabis were certainly justified in their actions, because the Prophet unquestionably did not want his grave to become the centre of worship. And as the behaviour of half-Muslims like the sufikuffar can be legally met with executions, the actions of the "radical" and "extremist" Muslims were in fact generous in comparison to what could easily be licensed against the sufis, who previously worshipped at the grave of the Prophet (before the revival of actual Islam) and continue to worship at the tombs of their 'saints'. But before we discuss the different types of punishment available, it is incumbent upon us to examine one of the particular facets of Bareilvi-style Sufism - the annual celebrations in honour of individuals deemed important to the heretical sect - that provokes such responses from the orthodox. This aspect, as one would expect from a sect aggrandizing the importance of Mohammed's infrarational mysticism, includes rituals designed to show reverence to the Prophet, as briefly outlined by Metcalf in the following:

Ahmad Riza himself showed his respects for the Prophet in a number of ways. He gave great importance to the celebration of *maulud*, the very holiday the reformers opposed, and made that occasion one of the three times in the course of each year when he regularly delivered a sermon. **...He would arrive to speak at the time of *qiyam* (the period of standing, when it was believed that the Prophet was present) and, that concluded, would begin a scholarly sermon.** Not only the ceremony – on a fixed day, with *qiyam*, with people wearing new clothes and distributing sweets – but the whole style of a select gathering was markedly different from the practice of the Deobandi ulama. (Barbara Daly Metcalf, *Islamic Revival in British India: Deoband, 1860-1900*, 1982, pp. 300-302)

The *qiyam* in particular, an act that the Pakistani Bareilvis, befitting their heritage, continue to believe in, is an unseemly practice for those whose "nation" was supposed to have been created in the name of 'pure' Islam, because as Sanyal corroborates, "Another controversial issue had to do with the ceremony known as *qiyam* or 'standing up' during the *milad*. This was a point at which the Prophet's birth was recalled during the sermon. **Ahmad Riza justified the act of standing up as a mark of respect for the Prophet, and also quoted a scholar from Arabia who said that the Prophet's spirit was present in the room at that time.**" (Usha Sanyal, *Ahmad Riza Khan Bareilwi: In the Path of the Prophet*, 2005,

p. 102) This, of course, has no authorization within the scripture, and would fundamentally negate the very premise of Islam – that of a singular name and strictly transcendent form of God - through its attribution of Omnipresence to Mohammed. Neither is there any permission in the scripture for the - in comparison - *relatively* minor innovation of celebrating the *urs* (death anniversaries) of the sufi saints:

Ahmad Riza faithfully observed the *urs* of a number of saints, including that of Shah Abdu'l-Qadir Bad'uni, whom he particularly revered...He revered many elders of the past, above all Abdul-Qadir Gilani. He not only celebrated the eleventh of each month in his honor, but particularly celebrated *toshah*, the offering of fixed amounts of food accompanied by specific readings in the hope of gaining some particular desire. He accepted with great reverence food that had been offered in *giyarhwin*, the celebration of the *urs* of Abdul-Qadir. (Barbara Daly Metcalf, *Islamic Revival in British India: Deoband, 1860-1900*, 1982, p. 303)

Although these rituals appear benign, they are precisely the major point of contention between the Barelvis and Deobandis, the two major “Sunni” groups of remnant Pakistan, with both having sizeable numbers of adherents within India itself. For not only are they the manifestation of the blasphemous beliefs held by the Barelvis – including the Omnipresence and divinity of Mohammed and certain sufi ‘saints’, along with the macabre feature of grave worship -, they are also practised in a very public fashion, besieging the awareness of the most pious in a manner that brings up a certain, dreaded, familiarity that impels the Muslims of greater piety to zealously reject the Barelvi customs. The unhindered and lavish displays of the Barelvis, only hinted at in the above Metcalf selections, are more finely detailed in Sanyal's account of the anniversary celebrations of both the Prophet and the sufi ‘saints’ (which includes illegal prayers directed towards al-Qadir's tomb in Baghdad rather than the mandated direction toward Mecca), events that continue in modern times:

In addition to daily acts of devotion to the sufi pir, Shaikh Abd al-Qadir Jilani, and the Prophet, special rituals marked their birth or deathdays. It was a time when the community came together, affirming not only their shared beliefs but also their group identity. Some of the rituals were particular to them, not being favored by the other groups.

The ritual celebration of a pir's deathday (*urs*) was frowned upon by ulama such as the Ahl-e Hadith whom Ahmad Riza called “Wahhabi.” **Others, such as the Deobandis, held that it was in order as long as the celebrations did not involve any forbidden activities such as singing, dancing, and the use of intoxicants.** Ahmad Riza would mark the occasion by recitation of the entire Qur'an (*khatma*), **poetry in praise of the Prophet (*nat*)**, and sermons by the ulama. He himself would deliver a sermon at the mosque, speaking not only about Shah Al-e Rasul but also about Shaikh Abd al-Qadir, the founder of the Qadiri order to which he belonged, and the Prophet. The event would be reported in Rampur's Urdu newspaper, the *Dabdaba-e Sikandari*.

It lasted anywhere between four and six days. In 1912, a year in which the *Dabdaba-e Sikandari* reported on an *urs* celebrating Nuri Miyan on his death anniversary, it lasted five days and was attended by four to five thousand people, some from distant parts of the country (this was a much smaller turnout than the usual twenty thousand, on account of confusion as to the dates of the event). **Apart from the Qur'an readings and recitation of poetry in praise of the Prophet, Nuri Miyan's *urs* featured the viewing of prized relics (*tabarrukat*) such as a hair of the Prophet or Ali's robe, which had come into the family's possession.** These objects were also viewed forty days after the pir's death, when his successor (*sajjada nishin*) was formally installed in a ceremony known as the *dastar-bandi* (“tying of the turban”). ...

Ahmad Riza's veneration for Shaikh Abd al-Qadir was ritually expressed through the eating of consecrated food and the drinking of consecrated water on the eleventh of every

month (gyarahwin) in memory of his birthdate. This was done to the accompaniment of certain prayers (durud ghausia) and the recitation of the Qur'an while facing Baghdad (Bihari, 1938: 202–203). As with the celebration of the *urs* in memory of one's pir, the observance of *gyarahwin* was frowned upon by some ulama, including those of Deoband.

The Prophet's birth anniversary was the occasion for a big joyous celebration every year (*majlis-e milad* or *milad al-nabi*). It was one of the few annual occasions when Ahmad Riza gave a sermon at the mosque in Bareilly, addressing a large gathering that overflowed the mosque's seating capacity (Bihari, 1938: 96–98). Like the other ritual occasions mentioned above – the *urs* for pirs or sufi masters and the *gyarahwin* for Shaikh Abd al-Qadir Jilani – some ulama objected to the *milad* celebrations on the grounds that it could lead to worship of the Prophet, and hence *shirk* or association of partners with Allah. (Usha Sanyal, *Ahmad Riza Khan Barelwi: In the Path of the Prophet*, 2005, pp. 100-102)

The familiarity that one finds in these descriptions of the blasphemous celebrations of the subcontinental sufi, activities that persist within the so-called land of the pure, is that of the pattern seen in the ceremonies of the Hindus, who commemorate important events in a fashion very much alike to that outlined, with the rituals involving food and water, singing and dancing, strikingly similar. What these sufi rituals are inconsonant with, however, is actual Islam, which rejects music, and certainly admonishes those who engage in rituals that can be considered religious innovations by virtue of their origin in non-Islamic religions (ironic of course, when we recall the circumambulation, a clearly Polytheistic tradition, that takes place around the Ka'ba). Indeed in the Barelvi Sufism articulated by Ahmad Riza, we find strong similarities to Hindu customs, noted by both Barelvi detractors and outside observers like Sanyal, who commented on some of the psychological and ritualistic details shared:

Ahmad Riza's interpretation of the sunna of the Prophet was informed by ideas of hierarchy and religiosity derived from sufi notions of “love” for the Prophet, and expressed itself in ritual worship centered on sufi shrines and calendrical anniversaries of sufi pirs, Shaikh Abd ul-Qadir Jilani, and, of course, the Prophet's birthday. **It was thus informed by personal devotion to a wide array of pious and holy ancestors.** This was its hallmark and its source of strength. A warm, loving (and simultaneously demanding) relationship between each believer and his or her pir lay at its heart. **Such a relationship is particularly resonant in the South Asian context, for it mirrors similar ties among other religious communities in the subcontinent, particularly Hindu followers of the *bhakti* tradition.** *Bhakti* or devotional worship of God emphasized the individual believer's relationship with a personal god (forms of Vishnu or Shiva). **“The devotee's ... adoration was often focused on the person of a human guru or spiritual preceptor who was revered as a living manifestation of the god”** (Bayly, 1989: 41). **In fact, south Indian sufi texts since the fifteenth century have frequently interwoven Hindu and Muslim sufi motifs, enabling the Muslim saint to “leap the boundaries between ‘Hindu’ and ‘non-Hindu’, ‘Islamic’ and ‘un-Islamic’”**(Bayly, 1989: 120). **Critics of the Ahl-e Sunnat also claim that ritual practices during the Prophet's birth celebrations (*milad*) resemble Hindu worship practices. Indeed, despite some major differences between the two traditions, such as the lack of images and of priests in the Islamic context, there are many similarities: for instance, food and water offered to and consecrated by the saint, then consumed by the worshiper, the sprinkling of rose petals in the sanctum, the recitation of religious texts and the telling of exemplary stories about the Prophet and the saints are similar to Hindu worship practices.** (Usha Sanyal, *Ahmad Riza Khan Barelwi: In the Path of the Prophet*, 2005, pp. 127-128)

Among the numerous critics of both Ahmad Riza and the Barelvi movement were, as evident in the previous citations, the Deobandi movement and the Imams associated with them. One such

contemporary *Imam* or Mufti was Kifatuyallah Dehlawi, who had completed his formal Islamic studies at Darul Uloom Deoband, which as the name suggests is a madrassa founded by the Deobandis. The Mufti, as Arun Shourie notes, was unambiguous in damning Barelvi customs, including their *sajda* or prostration done at graves, whether performed out of respect or in worship of the sufi saint (*pir-parasti*), for these practices, along with the devotional music and other ritualistic customs at the grave, are *shirk*, the prohibited infidelity:

The Barelvis...maintain that these personages continue to exist not just as entities of the spirit but in a bodily sense also after death, and that therefore they continue to have the power to render help of various kinds...The Barelvis therefore set great store in visiting the graves of the pirs, in seeking help from or through them, in observing days and anniversaries associated with them – in particular the *giyarvin* and *urs* of Shah Abdul Qadir and Shah Barkatullah, in making offerings for the fulfilment of some particular goal or wish... The others condemn these as vestiges of pagan, specifically Hindu practices. They condemn them as forms of that deadliest of sins – polytheism. They condemn them as *bid'at*, heretical innovations, as *shirk*, idolatry and polytheism, as *kufri*, infidelity. They declare these practices to be grounds for being expelled from the pale of Islam. ...Whereas the Barelvis allow local customs to be continued unless there is an express prohibition against them in the Quran etc., Mufti Kifayatullah insists that all customs and practices smacking of Hinduism must be jettisoned.

In a comprehensive fatwa that has many allusions to practices which the Barelvis encouraged or condoned, Mufti Kifayatullah declares that while it is permissible to visit the graves of elders, to make offerings at them is *najaiz* and *bidat*...One must not do *sajda* at graves, the Mufti rules. **And there is no distinction between doing *sajda* merely out of respect for the deceased person and doing it out of *ibadat*, worship. The former is indistinguishable from the latter.** Therefore, people should be taught not to do *sajda* to any one but Allah, so that they may refrain from this practice altogether...to honour an elder in the belief that he is an efficacious intercessor, to recount miracles of his which are not proven and are in fact far from reason and contrary to the Shariah, to ask the elder to fulfil one's wishes...**to make offerings at the graves, to attribute divine powers to him and seek to prove these – all these things are *haram*, they are *pir-parasti*, and are reckoned among the beliefs and deeds of polytheism, declares Mufti Kifayatullah.** ...**To make offerings at graves is *haram*, he declares.** And to eat that which has been offered at graves is *haram*...It is impermissible and *bidat* to insist on observing *som daham*, *chehlum* and to think that they are in accordance with the Shariah, he says. ...Is it *jaiz* to observe *urs* at graves, asks the querist, is it *jaiz* to hold readings of the Quran at graves, to commemorate the person by singing *qawwalis* at the grave? The practice of *urs* as it is current is *makruh*, detestable and *bidat*, a heretical innovation, declares the Mufti. (Arun Shourie, *The World of Fatwas or the Shariah in Action*, 1995, pp. 635-39)

The Imams officially considered part of the Deobandi leadership are similarly severe in their censure of Barelvi practices, including the lighting of lamps and prayers directed to the *pir*, with the rituals of *shirk* done at the grave frequently chastised:

The *Ulema* of Dar al-Ulum, Deoband are just as emphatic. **They declare lighting lamps at graves and putting covers on them to be prohibited and detestable.** They stress repeatedly that neither to gain a boon nor as thanks is it right to make offerings or offer *gilafs* and *chaddars* at the graves of pirs or others – indeed it is illegitimate, *haram*, and a cardinal sin to do so. **To pray to a *pir* for a boon, to give offerings at his grave as thanks to him, to perambulate around and prostrate at the grave, to light lamps and burn incense there, to put up flags etc. at the graves – all these are worship of *ghair Allah*, they declare, and as such are *haram*.** They are *shirkiya* and *kufriya*, the *Ulema* declare. ...Observing the *urs* of the *pir*,

holding majlis for Imam Husain, observing the *giyarvin* or any other date associated with a pir, celebrating the birthday of the Prophet himself, laments on the martyrdom day of Hasan and Husain – each of these comes in for censure. Like Mufti Kifayatullah, the Ulema of Deoband also declare that there is no difference between doing *sajda* at the graves of pirs to honour the pir and doing it to worship or pray to the pir. The two are indistinguishable, they declare, so the practice is to be shunned altogether. [*Fatawa Dar al-Ulum*, Deoband, Volume III, p. 106] (Arun Shourie, *The World of Fatwas or the Shariah in Action*, 1995, pp. 639-40)

In the particular bidat of the lighting of lamps, we are reminded of the orthodox criticism of the Bareilvi precept of the eternal light of the Prophet, with the similar doctrine of Mohammed's comprehensive knowledge of the Unseen also rebuked, as Metcalf notes, by the Deobandis - in the following by Rashid Ahmad Gangohi, one of the movement's founders: **“On the Prophet, they insisted that he did not share God's knowledge of the unknown (*ghaib*). Rashid Ahmad deemed this so important that he forbade his followers to accept as imam at prayer anyone who denied it. He argued that the Prophet was superior to all else in creation, but was still a servant of God like all other men.”** (Barbara Daly Metcalf, *Islamic Revival in British India: Deoband, 1860-1900*, 1982, pp. 150-51) Generally speaking, however, the Deobandis primary focus has always been on the Bareilvi practices observable in the *public* domain:

The fatawa in general reflected three underlying principles: to revive lapsed practices such as undertaking the Hajj...to avoid fixed holidays like the *maulud* of the Prophet, the *urs* of the saints... (Barbara Daly Metcalf, *Islamic Revival in British India: Deoband, 1860-1900*, 1982, p. 151)

While the Deobandi concentration on the *externals* of Bareilvi faith will emerge pivotal to our understanding of the differences between the two sects, before we address that topic, we must first review the response of Ahmad Riza to the fatwas meted to himself and the Bareilvi movement. As one might expect, he certainly did not adopt a passive stance, instead choosing to directly target his opponents with his favoured tactic, the use of his own fatwas, including one paradoxically highlighting his own hypocrisy, with Sanyal writing, **“For instance, an anti-Deobandi fatwa on the need to respect graves (entitled *Ihlak al-Wahhabiyyin ala Tauhin Qubur al-Muslimin, or Ruin to the Wahhabis for their Disrespect toward Muslim Graves*) was first published in 1904, and reprinted for the fourth time in 1928 with a print run of a thousand.”** (Usha Sanyal, *Ahmad Riza Khan Bareilwi: In the Path of the Prophet*, 2005, p. 114) But graves in general – let alone the chastisement of grave worship abundant in the hadith – are overall deemed inferior places in the authentic hadith, with Abu Marthad al-Ghanawi having **“reported Allah's Messenger as saying: Do not sit on the graves and do not pray facing towards them.”** (Sahih Muslim Book 4, Hadith 2121) Indeed the very location is deemed impermissible – according to the following Abi Dawud hadith graded sahih - for prayer, even if hypothetically that prayer was directed toward Mecca rather than the tomb:

Narrated Sa'id: and the narrator Musa said: As far as Amr thinks, the Prophet said: “The whole earth is a place of prayer except public baths and graveyards.” (Sunan Abi Dawud Book 2, Hadith 492)

But the inaccuracy and heresy of his contentions was never going to have deterred Ahmad Riza, who after an initial period of reluctance in declaring other Indian Muslim leaders unbelievers, eventually – after receiving support from Meccan scholars – ushered in the start of what was to eventually result in, as described by Metcalf, a “fatwa war”:

In 1896, he had written a fatwa in which he characterized a number of contemporary Muslim movements – from Sayyid Ahmad Khan's modernist Aligarh movement, to the Ahl-e Hadith, Deoband, and the Nadwa, not to mention the Shi'a – as having “wrong” or

“bad” beliefs (*bad-mazhab*) and being “lost” (*gumrah*). These people were misleading ordinary Muslims, he said. In 1900, he had sent this fatwa (most of which was against the Nadwa) to certain Meccan ulama, asking them to confirm his opinions (sixteen Meccan ulama had signed their assent to this fatwa).

But with the exception of the Aligarh modernists (whom he described as “*kafirs* and *murtadds*,” he had stopped far short of calling the other groups unbelievers, even though they had, in his view, denied the “essentials” of the faith (*zaruriyat-e din*).

Much had changed by 1906, apparently. In 1900 a number of his followers had declared him to be the Renewer (*mujaddid*) of the fourteenth Islamic century. Not surprisingly, the claim was not accepted by rival movements who elevated their own ulama to the title. **Perhaps this helps explain why it was that when Ahmad Riza went on pilgrimage in 1905–6, he was prepared to write a fatwa against a small group of Deobandi ulama, as well as Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, naming them all as unbelievers.**

For the Ahl-e Sunnat, this effort was crowned with success when twenty ulama from Mecca and thirteen from Medina certified *Husam al-Haramain*, giving it their support. They belonged to three different law schools, namely, the Hanafi, Shafi’i, and Maliki. One of them (whose title was Shaikh al-Ulama) appears to have been a scholar of great standing in Mecca. Khalil Ahmad Ambethwi, the Deobandi scholar who had preceded Ahmad Riza to Mecca and had been trying to get a fatwa declaring an Indian scholar to be an unbeliever because of his belief in the Prophet’s knowledge of the unseen, had to leave Mecca two weeks after his arrival because, Metcalf says, some people “objected to his visit.” **Back in India, the Deobandis got busy writing fatawa of their own responding to Ahmad Riza “point by point,” leading to what Metcalf calls a “fatwa war”** (Metcalf, 1982: 310). (Usha Sanyal, *Ahmed Riza Khan Bareilwi: In the Path of the Prophet*, 2005, pp. 108-109)

From the standpoint of *subconsciously* protecting the livelihoods of himself and his followers, Ahmad Riza’s fatwas were highly effective, partially related to the accuracy – from an *Islamic* perspective – of his criticism towards the different Muslim subgroups, a facet that we will review later. With regards to the security his arguments brought, we find a perfect example in Metcalf’s discussion of the “fatwa war”, for as she writes, “The Deobandis, of course, answered Ahmad Riza point by point. ...Rashid Ahmad had, in a *fatwa*, declared the opposite of their charge: that anyone who said God was a liar was a *kafir*.” (Barbara Daly Metcalf, *Islamic Revival in British India: Deoband, 1860-1900*, 1982, pp. 310-11) The particular fatwa Rashid Ahmad responded to is one we will shortly examine, but for now, it is important to note that Ahmad Riza’s choice targeting of Rashid Ahmad, one of the main Deobandi leaders, caused the latter to assume a *defensive* position, a quite useful state to help obscure the Bareilvi’s obvious blasphemy from the criticism of Imams with standing in the broader Muslim community.

While his fatwas may have been effective in providing cover to Bareilvi blasphemy, they nevertheless - as one observes in the most recent Sanyal selection – indicate that the predominance of Sufism to Ahmad Riza and Bareilvi customs hardly leads to a state of *samata*, because the mindset required to condemn swaths of mankind to the fate of an eternal hellfire can only be that of someone at least significantly influenced by the infrarationalism the Asura of Falsehood naturally magnifies. Indeed Ahmad Riza’s fatwas, though quite voluminous and certainly important in articulating the traditional Sufism of the subcontinent, were – befitting that same Sufism - not at all emerging from either the sattvic guna or the psychology of samata. Instead, they were of a quality that could not help but inflame the base vital passions of his followers and opponents, because as we discover in the following Shourie review of some of the fatwas contained in his extensive collection, *Fatawa-i-Rizvia*, Ahmad Riza Khan was pathologically consumed by a primitive hatred towards his opponents, frequently assigning to them

the vulgar – according to Islam - invectives of kafir and dogs and pigs and denizens of Hell:

The Fatawa-i-Rizvia declares the Deobandis, Ahl-i-Hadis etc. to be “barking falsehoods,” to be swearing false oaths, to be *Kafirs*, to be apostates, to be *bid'atis*, to be *jahannumi*, the dwellers of Hell, to be *jahannum ke kutte*, the dogs of Hell. To call them the equivalent of Karijis and Shias, it declares, is to be cruel to the latter. [Fatawa-i-Rizvia, Volume VI, pp 88-91]

The Fatawa-i-Rizvia declares the Ahl i-Hadis, the Wahhabis and of course the Shias to be guilty of *kufir* on several counts: they do not go by the four Imams on whom there is a consensus, they denounce *taqlid* as “shirk.” These beliefs are denial of the Quran, of the Hadis, of the *ijma*, consensus, of the *Ummah*, and all that is *kufir*, it says. The Ahl-i-Hadis are accordingly out of the circle of Islam, it declares. **He who refuses the consensus on these matters pains Allah and the Rasul, and such a one is accursed. Fire, Fire for him, the sinner, it curses.** The wayward – and it is correct to call the Ahl-i-Hadis “wayward” it declares – are the dogs of Hell, it says, and that too dogs of the worst kind; they are worse than dogs, worse than pigs, they are the dogs of ones who are worse than pigs [Fatawa-i-Rizvia, Volume VI, pp 35, 70]...**the Fatawa-i-Rizvia declares that knowing someone to be a Wahhabi and yet to not take him to be a Kafir is itself kufir. To say nothing of such a person being a Sunni, he is not even a Muslim, it declares. ...They call Muslims polytheists,** it says; according to them all – from the Companions to Shah Waliullah – are polytheists, it declares. As one who calls a Muslim a “Kafir” is a “Kafir”, they are *Kafirs*, declares the Fatawa-i-Rizvia, which itself calls several groups of Muslims *Kafirs*! [Fatawa-i-Rizvia, Volume XII, pp 110-12]

Similarly, the Deobandis are *Kafirs*, the Fatawa-i-Rizvia declares, and he who doubts that they are *Kafirs* is also a *Kafir*. [Fatawa-i-Rizvia, Volume VI, pp 81-81; Volume IX, Book II, pp 313-14] (Arun Shourie, *The World of Fatwas or the Shariah in Action*, 1995, pp. 645-46)

Ahmad Riza was particularly angry at being called a kafir himself, an insult that motivated him to lash out in rage against his enemies - especially the actual Wahhabis - by responding in kind, exacerbating a vicious cycle characterised by the repetitive flinging of apostasy accusations between different sects, a state of affairs that shows the farce that becomes of “Muslim” lands after obtaining the low-hanging fruit of ethnically cleansing minority Hindus. For it is quite easy, if one tries hard enough, to find evidence of heresy within another Muslim, especially in remnant Pakistan, where Sufism's *shirk* is rampant among so-called Sunnis: And when each Muslim group decides to embark on the very serious step of declaring others as unbelievers, it is inevitable that infrarational violence – the quick resort of the hateful - will materialize. But the prevention of this cataclysm is not to be found in the shariat that Ahmad Riza Khan transgressed when indulging his predilection for sufi blasphemies, a leniency of which he refused to grant the Hindus and their beliefs, as seen in his zealous opposition to the Deobandi coordination with them against the British imperialists:

Ahmad Riza, characteristically, opposed the Khilafat movement. Part of his objection related to his insistence that the sultan of Turkey could not claim the title of caliph as he was not of Quraysh descent (there were other *shar'i* conditions as well, though this was the most important). **The other had to do with his view that Muslims could not seek the cooperation of kafirs (unbelievers) in the pursuit of a religious (*shar'i*) goal – a clear indication that he was looking at the Khilafat movement in religious rather than political terms.** (Usha Sanyal, *Ahmed Riza Khan Bareilwi: In the Path of the Prophet*, 2005, p. 81)

The Khilafat movement had sought to politically unite the Hindus and Muslims against the British colonialists, with the Hindus returning the favour of Muslim cooperation by joining them in support of the Caliphate's revival. Ahmad Riza Khan however, could not stand the thought of associating with the Hindu kuffar, and turned to the multiple Quran verses already cited in which Allah demands that the

actual Muslim reject friendship with the Polytheist. Islam, however, also permits the use of taqiyah or dissimulation whereby the Muslim is allowed to adopt the pretence of friendship in order to advance the ambitions of Islam, and Ahmad Riza failed to realize that this was the Deobandi intent behind their alliance. Instead, he used the cooperation to promote hatred toward the Deobandi, slandering them as the worst of the Infidels because of their arrangement with the Hindu unbelievers – the Bareilvikafir neglecting to reflect upon his own blasphemy:

Denouncing them for their view that Muslims should work together with Hindus – even though they were urging this for attaining strictly Muslim objectives – Maulana Ahmad Riza Khan dubs Deobandis to be *badtar-az-badtar-se-badtar* – worse than the worst of the worse. If your hatred had been what Allah has prescribed hatred should be, and you had hated evil deeds one degree, you would have hated idolaters a lakh degrees, he declares, and if you had hated idolaters a lakh degrees, then you would have hated Deobandis a crore degrees, the Maulana declares. [Fatawa-i-Rizvia, Volume VI, pp 3-4] (Arun Shourie, *The World of Fatwas or the Shariah in Action*, 1995, p. 644)

As one can thus observe, the fact of Ahmad Riza's strong belief in Sufism did absolutely nothing to change his opinion of Hindus and the Sanatana Dharma, for as we have extensively discussed, the superficial similarities of Sufism to Hinduism fail to address their crucial differences, and Ahmad Riza in particular is a notable example of the sufi mysticism – courtesy of its acquiescence to the shariat – sinking into infrarationality and hatred of the 'other'. Indeed it was this very shariat that accounted for Ahmad Riza's rejection of the Khilafat movement – his use of the Quran's Asuric injunctions against friendship with the Polytheists accompanied by the book's specific elevation of the Christians above the Polytheists:

With regard to Muslims' relations with Hindus, Ahmad Riza's assessment was that the interests of Hindus and Muslims were intrinsically opposed. **He argued that the Muslim leaders of the Khilafat (and Noncooperation) movements had lost their sense of balance, as they wanted to cut off relations with one set of unbelievers, the British, while seeking close relations with another, the Hindus.** In religious terms, this was tantamount to “pronouncing that which was indifferent (mubah; neither good nor bad) to be forbidden (haram), and that which was forbidden to be an absolute duty (farz qati).” **The Christians were at least people of the book, whereas the Hindus were pagans.** (Usha Sanyal, *Ahmed Riza Khan Bareilwi: In the Path of the Prophet*, 2005, p. 109)

Ahmad Riza Khan's antagonism towards the Hindus was not something that developed as an instant response to the cooperation of Deobandis and others with them; as one would expect, it was – he had, after all, been indoctrinated with the virulent Islamic scripture – well established internally, with its manifestation triggered by the political alliance. For otherwise we would not have seen the sheer quantity of fatwas dedicated by him – over a “hundred” pages, of which Arun Shourie provides the following summary– to damning those who dare to associate with Hindu kuffar:

Maulana Ahmad Riza Khan's fulminations against doing anything which entails association with *Kafirs*, Hindus in this case, extend over more than a hundred quarto-sized pages of closely packed text. The denunciation and scorn he heaps on those who are advocating such a course are even greater than what he hurls at the course itself. Indeed, time and again he declares that those Muslims – “Muslims” is the wrong term actually for his school had issued the *fatwas* of *kufr* on the leading *Ulema* of Deoband etc. - who advocate such a course are greater enemies of Islam than the *Kafirs* themselves.

His *fatwas* against associating with the *Kafirs* in any way are, as we have noticed earlier, grouped under the generic heading, “*Nafrat ke Ahkam*”, “The Ordinances of Hatred.”

Wishing well of Islam, the Maulana declares, consists in living within the bounds of Islam. To unite with the polytheists, to have understanding with them and the conduct of conciliation with them, to make polytheistic leaders the guides of one's religion; to take a polytheistic lecturer as the preacher for Muslims; to take him to a mosque, to make him stand higher than Muslims and have him lecture them; to have *tilak* put on one's forehead by polytheists; to shout *jai* for polytheistic leaders in gatherings of polytheists; to carry the bier of a polytheist on one's shoulders and take it to the cremation grounds; to use the mosque to condole the death of a polytheist; to bare one's head in a mosque for condoling his death; to put out announcements for *namaz* and ask for *dua* for him (the last three allude to the sort of things which were done at the death of the Lokmanya); to keep the Quran and the Ramayana in one box and, venerating them equally, to carry them to *mandir* together; to do these things or even any one of these things is to cross the bounds of Islam, the Maulana declares. (Arun Shourie, *The World of Fatwas or the Shariah in Action*, 1995, pp. 245-46)

It is of course most appropriate that the fatwas were entitled “The Ordinances of Hatred”, because this is precisely what Ahmad Riza was propagating in his severe demand of complete separation from the Hindus and anything related to Hinduism, along with a general classification of them - and anyone supporting them or disobeying his fatwas – as occupants of the hellfire. However, in the above examples his fatwas were at least upholding actual Islam, which with the exception of taqiyyah *does* in fact call for a rigid isolation from Polytheists, to the extent of even rejecting friendship with them. But this message, this advocacy of infrarational Quran revelations, when arriving in the person of Ahmad Riza Khan, remains quite ironic to behold, as the following Shourie passage helps to highlight:

To respect a polytheist is the gravest sin, he rules, it is to denigrate the Quran. And he invokes the hadis: He who respects a bid'ati, an innovator, or a non-Muslim has helped to demolish Islam.

To join their procession is *haram* for other reasons also, proclaims Ahmad Riza Khan, and quotes the Prophet saying that he who joins the procession of a *quam* is one of them. He invokes a second *hadis*: He who increase the gathering of any *quam* is one of them. He quotes a third *hadis*: He who comes with a polytheist or stays with him is one and the same as him. (Arun Shourie, *The World of Fatwas or the Shariah in Action*, 1995, p. 258)

Ahmad Riza, while certainly correct – from the shariat perspective – in denouncing the Hindus, was in actuality also describing *himself*, a kafir who practised takfir, a sufi innovator who helped to demolish Islam yet declared himself its upholder, a Polytheist who respected himself as a “Muslim”. It is an irony – that of the takfirikafir - we also discover in his critiques of different sects habitually feeling the brunt of Sunni rage. One of these groups, as the selections have briefly touched upon, is the Shi'ite, whom Ahmad Riza, as Sanyal writes, had chastised from early on in his public life: “Despite Awadh's fairly rapid political decline in the latter part of the eighteenth century, Shi'ism continued to influence the political and cultural landscape of the eastern Gangetic plain throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. **Indeed, at the end of the nineteenth century Ahmad Riza Khan wrote frequently about the negative influence of Shi'ism in his home territory of Rohilkhand, west of Lucknow, urging his followers to refrain from participating in Shi'i rituals and practices.**” (Usha Sanyal, *Ahmad Riza Khan Bareilwi: In the Path of the Prophet*, 2005, p. 5) Metcalf also reports that “As a *shaikh* he seems to have concentrated on intercession, divination, and amulets rather than on instruction in spiritual development...Like the Deobandis and the Ahl-i Hadis he wrote extensively against the Shi'ah. **He cited as appropriate behavior the precedent of Maulana Nur of Farangi Mahall, who would not even greet a Shi'ah.**” (Barbara Daly Metcalf, *Islamic Revival in British India: Deoband, 1860-1900*, 1982, p. 307) Of course, it is a blessing in disguise that Ahmad Riza failed to instruct his disciples on their “spiritual” development, for as he was consumed by hatred, their

mystic progress might well have resulted in the embrace of a hostile vital emanation. Indeed, his all-encompassing vitriol was only one of his deficits with regards to potentially guiding others – he also had a profound lack of self-awareness, evidenced in the very topic of his Shi'ite hatred, because as Sanyal writes, he shared numerous heretical beliefs *with* them!

In keeping with the sufi dimensions of Ahl-e Sunnat belief and practice (discussed in the next chapter), **Ahmad Riza also held a number of related beliefs about the Prophet, some of which are found in Shi'ism: that he was God's beloved for whom God had created the world, that Muhammad had been created from Allah's light and therefore did not have a shadow, and, most importantly, that he mediated between God and the Muslim believer in the here and now** – one did not have to wait for the last day and the resurrection for such mediation to occur. (Usha Sanyal, *Ahmed Riza Khan Barelwi: In the Path of the Prophet*, 2005, p. 76)

This particular takfirikafir, one of many sufikuffar currently admired in the land of the impure, could not recognize the error of his ways, overconfident as he was in the 'truth' that he deemed himself possessor of, having fully internalized the accolades bestowed upon him by his followers, including their proclamation that he was the *Mujaddid* or Renewer, with his great *sufi* faith one of the rationales offered for that allegation:

It was during the week-long meetings that occurred at Patna that one of the ulama present referred to Ahmad Riza in his sermon as the “*mujaddid* of the present century.” According to Zafar ud-Din Bihari, all those present seconded the idea, and later thousands of others, including several ulama from the Haramain (Mecca and Medina) did so as well. As he writes, there was thus consensus among the ulama of the Ahl-e Sunnat on the question. Zafar ud-Din adds that Ahmad Riza fulfilled the requirements of a *mujaddid*, namely, that he (it could not be a woman) be a Sunni Muslim of sound belief, endowed with knowledge of all the Islamic “sciences and skills,” the “most famous among the celebrated of his age,” **defending the faith without fear of “innovators” who would criticize him, and also, according to Zafar ud-Din, a profound sufi.** (Usha Sanyal, *Ahmed Riza Khan Barelwi: In the Path of the Prophet*, 2005, p. 65)

While Ahmad Riza was actually an impostor who *brought* innovations into Islam when he was supposed to protect the religion from them, because he genuinely *believed* himself defender of the “faith”, he set about targeting those who were harming Islam, and outlined in his fatwas a descending hierarchy of enemies to the religion, of which the Hindus surprisingly find a group worse than their own:

...in *kufir* the Magians are worse than the Jews and Christians; and the Hindus are worse than the Magians; and the Wahhabis and apostates are worse than the Hindus. The commandments about them are progressively harsher in this very order.

The Maulana then hones in on the ones he deems to be the worst of all, that is the ones who are advocating the course which entails working together with *Kafirs*. He says that they are *Kafirs* by the command of the Quran itself as they contradict the Quran and deliberately alter the meaning of its words. Nor is this attempt of theirs to invert the meaning of the Quran new, he says. And he proceeds to lambast Maulana Azad in particular, charging him with perpetuating six heresies as early as 1913, the foremost among these being that the faithful should love *Kafirs*, and that to love Muslims and *Kafirs* is the essence of Islam. [Fatawa-i-Rizvia, Volume VI, pp 13-14] (Arun Shourie, *The World of Fatwas or the Shariah in Action*, 1995, p. 252)

If in this example Ahmad Riza targeted Maulana Azad for working with the Hindukuffar of the Indian National Congress, we know that the Deobandis – primarily because of their fatwas against him – were

the primary group of apostates that he attacked, with another fatwa specifically mentioning them as worse than the Hindus, because at least the latter are born that way: “They are apostates, he declares, far worse than the *asli Kafirs* – the ones who refuse Islam and are *Kafirs* from the very beginning, that is the atheists, Polytheists, fire-worshippers, Jews and Christians. And among the apostates, the Deobandis and Wahabiyas are the worst of all – because they dress up as Muslims and deceive Muslims. [Fatawa-i-Rizvia, Volume VI, p 55]” (Arun Shourie, *The World of Fatwas or the Shariah in Action*, 1995, p. 644) Yet if all of this certainly establishes Bareilvi as a hateful fanatic with the standard Islamic malevolence toward the ‘other’, it should not detract from his argumentative capacity, which if unfit - due to his gargantuan ego – to be transformed for the purpose of self-criticizing his own deviant customs, was nevertheless effective in outlining crimes of blasphemy committed by the different subcontinental Islamic leaders of the time, as seen in his infamous 1906 treatise *Husamul Haramain*, which details the transgressions of the other figures – especially the Deobandis, as Sanyal reviews in her book:

In the rest of the fatwa, Ahmad Riza proceeded to name four groups of Indian ulama and explain why he considered the leader of each group to be an unbeliever. The first, as noted above, was Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, whose followers Ahmad Riza calls the Ghulamiyya (rather than Ahmadiyya, as they called themselves), in a play on words – the literal meaning of the word *ghulam* is “slave,” though here it is probably better understood as “knave,” as Ahmad Riza accused him of making a number of misleading claims about himself... **Reversing Ghulam Ahmad's claim that he was “like the Messiah” (Jesus Christ), Ahmad Riza denigrated him as the Antichrist (*dajjal*), inspired by Satan. However, it was Ghulam Ahmad's statement that he was a “shadowy” prophet that incensed Ahmad Riza the most. His unbelief was said to be greater than that of any of the other scholars named in the fatwa.**

Ahmad Riza's second group consisted of “Wahhabis” who believed that this world was only one out of seven, and that there were prophets like Muhammad in the other six worlds as well, making seven in all. He referred to this group by the home-made term *Wahhabiyya Amthaliyya*, “likeness Wahhabis.” According to him, most of them held that the likenesses of Muhammad were the last prophets in their respective worlds, as Muhammad was in this one, but there were also some who denied it: in the other six worlds the “seal of the prophets” (Arabic, *khatim al-anbiya*) would be someone else. Ahmad Riza called these people, whom he found particularly offensive, “seal Wahhabis.”...**All three of the ulama Ahmad Riza described as leaders of the “likeness” or “seal” Wahhabis were from Deoband.** One alim was quoted as saying that the discerning among the ulama know that prophetic superiority is unrelated to being either first or last in time. Ahmad Riza declared that they were unbelievers because they had implicitly denied the finality of the Prophet Muhammad, which of course was a “fundamental” belief on which all Muslims agreed.

The third group (whom Ahmad Riza called the “Wahhabiyya Kadhdhabiyya,” “the lie Wahhabis”), also from Deoband, were said to believe that God can lie should He wish to. The leader of these ulama was said to be Maulana Rashid Ahmad Gangohi, the Deobandi alim...**By saying that God can lie, Ahmad Riza said that Rashid Ahmad was casting doubt on the very profession of faith, the *shahada* or *kalima*.** The first part of the profession says, “There is no God but God,” and belief in it is, once again, necessary if one is to be considered a Muslim. **Once again, Ahmad Riza's discussion ignored the hypothetical nature of Gangohi's statement, which was also about God's absolute power.**

He called the last group the “Wahhabiyya Shaytaniyya,” “the Satanic Wahhabis.” Allegedly led by Rashid Ahmad Gangohi, like the third group, they were said to believe that Satan's

knowledge exceeded that of the Prophet and that the Prophet's knowledge of the unseen was only partial. Rashid Ahmad was said to have cited a controversial hadith to the effect that the Prophet Muhammad did not even know what lay on the other side of a wall, claiming that highly respected authorities also accepted it, which Ahmad Riza doubted. In support of his own argument Ahmad Riza cited a Qur'an verse:

He is the knower of the Unknown, and He does not divulge His secret to any one Other than an apostle He has chosen. (72:26–27)

The suggestion that the Prophet Muhammad's superiority to preceding prophets since the beginning of time was even hypothetically denied, or that the finality of his prophethood was being denied, or that his knowledge of the unseen was not acknowledged led Ahmad Riza to declare that the ulama concerned were *kafirs* and apostates (*murtadd*) from Islam. (Usha Sanyal, *Ahmad Riza Khan Bareilwi: In the Path of the Prophet*, 2005, pp. 105-107)

In highlighting some of the innovations – like their belief in prophets residing in parallel worlds – the Deobandis held, Ahmad Riza certainly identified deviations from the correct faith of Islam, a matter exacerbated by Deobandi provocations such as Satan having more Unseen knowledge than Mohammed. But the limits of his arguments, often based on his attachment to Sufism, are evident, with his angry retort against the Deobandi hypothesis of Allah's ability to lie arguably countered by the Quran itself, which informs us, “As for them, they are but plotting a scheme, And I (too) will make a scheme. So grant the unbelievers a respite: let them alone for awhile.” (Quran 86:15-17) The Deobandis were intimating at Allah's ability – also permitted to his Muslim slaves - to use deceit against the unbelievers if it furthers Islam's conquest, rather than Allah lying about the *shahada*! Similarly is Ahmad Riza's argument in favour of Mohammed's comprehensive Unseen knowledge hindered by the very Quran passage he cites, because as we have already shown, the “secret” divulged was *not* the totality of ‘knowledge’, but simply the infrarational revelations necessary for mankind. Indeed one of the many verses already cited is enough to remind us of the distinction between the “Secret” and the “Unknown” mentioned in the communication used by Ahmad Riza:

Say: “I do not say to you that I have with me the treasures of Allah, **nor do I know the Unseen**, nor do I say to you that I am an Angel. **I do not follow aught save that which is revealed to me.**” (Quran 6:50)

The “secret” is simply the revealed verses, but the Totality of the Unknown or Unseen is off-limits to all of created existence, including the mortal Prophet Mohammed. Indeed another verse similarly presents the “unseen treasures” as only knowledgeable to Allah: “**And with Him are the keys of the unseen treasures - none knows them but He**; and He knows what is in the land and the sea, and there falls not a leaf but He knows it, nor a grain in the darkness of the earth, nor anything green nor dry but (it is all) in a clear book.” (Quran 6:59) But Ahmad Riza Khan, as seen in his studious avoidance of the previously discussed context behind the verses 72:26-27 – context that clearly shows the “Unknown” or “Unseen” of the verse to be referencing the *Day of Judgement*, context that additionally makes clear that the “secret” is simply the received word the apostles *were* tasked with conveying to mankind - , was recalcitrant, ignoring or explaining away the verses interfering with his blasphemous delusions. It is an unfortunate legacy that he has bequeathed to modern Bareilvis, who remain wilfully ignorant of all the verses contradicting their heretical stance on the “Unseen” knowledge, such as “Surely Allah knows the unseen things of the heavens and the earth; and Allah sees what you do.” (Quran 49:18) The foreboding contained in this particular verse is observable in another that similarly intimates that any deviance from the Quran's parameters on Unseen knowledge will be met with an unenviable response from Allah:

And Allah's is the unseen in the heavens and the earth, and to Him is returned the whole of

the affair; therefore serve Him and rely on Him, and your Lord is not heedless of what you do.
(Quran 11:123)

This fact of Islam, that a comprehensive Unseen knowledge belongs to Allah alone, if understood well by the enemy of Ahmad Riza Khan, the Deobandis, and while helping to establish their proximity to austere Islam in comparison to the Bareilvis, should not, however, be taken as evidence that they are the prototypical orthodox Muslim. For the incredible truth of the matter – at least when contrasting the Deobandi reality with their reputation as hard-line Muslims – is that the Deobandis are themselves guilty of apostasy, although the primary reason for this is of a different nature to the bidats asserted by Ahmad Riza. Nevertheless, the main evidence for the Deobandi apostasy ultimately rests in the same irresistible magnet of infidelity that afflicts the Bareilvis: Sufism. For though the general perception is that the Deobandis are staunchly opposed to Sufism, this is far from the truth, even if they certainly attempt to include it in a different fashion than their Bareilvi enemies, with Sanyal noting the Deobandi dislike of the “excesses” associated with Sufism:

In 1867, a new seminary (madrasa) called the Dar al-Ulum was founded in the small town of Deoband, about eighty miles north of Delhi. ...Two ulama who were central to the school's founding and early years were Maulanas Muhammad Qasim Nanautawi (1833–79) and Rashid Ahmad Gangohi (1829–1905). Muhammad Qasim's family had a long-standing relationship with the ulama of Delhi, as did Rashid Ahmad's. Both were of the reformist tradition; **they were critical of the rituals customarily performed at saints' tombs, lavish weddings and feasts, and the payment of interest on loans, for instance. They were also ambivalent about rituals associated with the death anniversaries (urs) of sufi saints**, discouraging but not completely condemning them. ...**The fact that the Deobandis were reformist does not mean that they were opposed to sufism** – on the contrary, both Qasim Nanautawi and Rashid Ahmad were disciples of the famous Haji Imdadullah – but it did mean that they **disapproved of what they considered sufi excesses**. (Usha Sanyal, *Ahmad Riza Khan Bareilwi: In the Path of the Prophet*, 2005, pp. 35-36)

As one would expect of those who had been initiated into a sufic order, the Deobandi founders sought, as Metcalf comments, to “integrate” Sufism into what they considered to be austere Islam – a Sunni-sufi hybrid that somehow, in contrast to the insufficient Bareilvi attempt, was to be reflective of actual Islam!

The collection of the *fatawa* of Rashid Ahmad Gangohi reveal the issues of religious concern that troubled the pious followers of these ulama...approximately one-third of the *fatawa* did in fact deal with issues related to sufism: its importance; the primacy of the *shariat*; the role of the *shaikh*; and the legitimacy of practices such as saying *zikr* aloud, *tasawwur-i shaikh* (conceiving of the image of the shaikh), pilgrimages to saints' graves, the celebration of *urs* (the death anniversary of the saints), and the recitation of the Fatihah. **The Deobandis, in contrast to the contemporary Arabian Wahhabis and the Bengali Fara'izis, never sought to eliminate sufism, but rather to integrate it into an obedient religious life.** ...The *fatawa* clearly place the Deobandis in the reformist tradition of the pre-Mutiny reformers. Like them, **they consistently sought to strip away local customs that unduly elevated the status of saints and prophets**. The theoretical justification for this orientation was again an emphasis on *tauhid*, the singularity of God. (Barbara Daly Metcalf, *Islamic Revival in British India: Deoband, 1860-1900*, 1982, pp. 148-49)

These local customs include, as we have seen, the practice of *urs* and the importance of the tombs and tomb worship, with the Deobandis, instead of trying to eliminate Sufism, instead offering their version of a Sunni-sufi hybrid as the correct one - to the extent that, as Metcalf notes, most of the early Deobandis were considered leading sufis!

The Deobandi ulama were devoted not only to Hanafi law but to Sufi doctrine and discipline, as well. ...Students at the school often became disciples of their teachers...The ulama of the madrasahs represented a Sufi leadership separate from the most characteristic institution of later sufism, the guardianship of the tombs of the medieval saints. **Indeed, Deobandi opposition to certain Sufi customs, notably that of *urs* and pilgrimage, directly challenged the centrality of the tombs and the networks of support for them. The Deobandis offered an alternative spiritual leadership, geared to individual instruction rather than to mediation, stripped of what they deemed to be deviant custom.** They were among the leading Sufis of the day. At the school the post of *sarparast* in particular was staffed by revered and influential Sufis: Muhammad Qasim, Rashid Ahmad, Mahmud Hasan, and Ashraf Ali Thanawi, the last of whom has been widely considered the preeminent Sufi of modern India. (Barbara Daly Metcalf, *Islamic Revival in British India: Deoband, 1860-1900*, 1982, p. 157)

While all of this provides the Deobandis the appearance of highly motivated and conscientious reformers, capable of disciplining Sufism into something obedient to Islam, the reality of their distinction from the Bareilvis is a highly superficial one, primarily based upon *public* displays - the Deobandis preoccupied, as the following Metcalf passage indicates, with changing the external customs instead of Sufism's fundamental blasphemies:

The Deobandis became known for opposition to certain customs and practices, but, as in the case of the pre-Mutiny reformers, there was scope for disagreement among them. They tended to oppose the celebration of the Prophet's birthday, *mauludun-nabi*, for example, on the grounds that it encouraged the belief that a dead person was actually present; that it elevated the importance of a fixed day; and that it resembled the practices of the Hindus. Under Rashid Ahmad's aegis, a group jointly signed a fatwa opposing the observance. They published descriptions of dreams of the Prophet himself denying the legitimacy of a practice that was presumably in his honor. The urgency of the Deobandis in questioning the celebration was the greater because its observance was spreading in the late nineteenth century, fostered by other groups of ulama. **Nonetheless, Muhammad Qasim sanctioned participation for the elite who could observe the occasion without succumbing to its objectionable features. Hajji Imdadullah actually joined in the elaborate celebration of the *maulud* in Mecca**, although he approved of Rashid Ahmad's refusal to participate either at home or in the Hijaz. **However, all felt they shared an understanding of the correct attitude to the practice, and tended to conform publicly to opposition to the custom.** (Barbara Daly Metcalf, *Islamic Revival in British India: Deoband, 1860-1900*, 1982, pp. 150-51)

The Deobandi founders, as we observe, failed to emphasize that the occasion itself – and not just the features of it - was objectionable; otherwise they would not have granted the “elite” permission to partake in the festivities, as if proper decorum is enough to negate the bidat of the celebration. Indeed the Deobandi position is precisely the definition of hypocrisy, because they affect a certain display of piety – by their restraint in participating in deviant customs – that fails to match, as the following Metcalf selection documents, their internal fondness for Sufism's heresies:

The Deobandis emphasized these teachings rather than the customary observances of sufism. Indeed, the disciple was expected to forsake such observances as that of *urs*, the death anniversary of saints. ...The Deobandis were not notably influential in eliminating these observances, for even in Gangoh, Rashid Ahmad, to his great anguish, was unable to stop the celebration of the *urs* of Shaikh Abdul-Quddus. **Indeed, the appeal of these festivals can be judged by Muhammad Ya'qub's own attraction to them. He wrote that although he no longer participated in them as he had in his youth, his outward propriety belied his inner attitude.** [Muhammad Ya'qub, *Bayaz*, pp 83-84, 87] **He felt similarly ambiguous about**

sama...Some of the Deobandis also questioned the legitimacy of making pilgrimages to the graves of saints.

In limiting the practices associated with what is often called “popular sufism,” the Deobandis tried to minimize, as they had in the case of the living saint, the role of the dead saint as intercessor. Rashid Ahmad explained in a *fatwa* that praying to a saint to grant one's wish was wholly illegitimate, nothing less than *shirk* or polytheism. He admitted a certain ambiguity on the question of whether one could ask that saint to intercede with God on one's behalf. He himself implied that this was also wrong. ...**Muhammad Ya'qub, in contrast, believed that the dead could hear prayers and hence intercede, but only if the believer were present at their graves.** [Muhammad Ya'qub, *Bayaz*, pp. 106-109] **Muhammad Qasim also believed that the dead could hear**, but urged his followers just to come to a grave, read a section of the Quran, and offer its reading as *isal-i sawab*. He turned to metaphor to explain the subtle balance between recognition of the saint's power and preservation of belief in the unity of God and the necessity of obedience to Him. ...The Deobandis uniformly prohibited tombs and monuments for themselves and their followers, and forbade the placing of food on graves. (Barbara Daly Metcalf, *Islamic Revival in British India: Deoband, 1860-1900*, 1982, pp. 181-82)

While it might seem admirable that they attempt to eliminate the practice of *urs* and tomb worship and the placing of food on graves and the doctrine of *pir* intercession, the religion of Islam demands a comprehensive obedience, external *and* internal: thus the Deobandis, although moderately successful in their public propriety, are already seen to have failed in their internal fidelity to Islam. It is a type of apostasy that brings to mind the multiple verses, such as “And thy Lord knoweth what their breasts conceal, and what they publish”, (Quran 28:69) that capture the peculiar position of heretics like the Deobandis, whose blasphemy is especially exposed when we further examine the core tenets of Sufism they integrate into their fraudulent Sunni-sufi hybrid, with Metcalf detailing the Deobandi belief that the *sufi* *shaikhs* – of whom the movement's founders are included – have the ability to exert a spiritual “force” upon others:

The *shaikhs*, however, did not only exert influence by the evidence of their spiritual intensity and humility; they were held to be able, as well, **to exercise an effective physical force over other people and over the outside world. This force was considered a manifestation of their spiritual perfections and was understood, no doubt, as an extension of the power they clearly exerted over their own instincts and personalities.** The pious held this power to take various forms although, in actual cases, the distinctions were not always clear. **One of the most important forms was called *tasarruf*, literally, “application” or “expenditure”, because the *shaikh* was held to concentrate his attention on a person and expend his power upon him. The power was irresistible, and could be used even on those unaware of it or at a distance. It was brought into action above all to influence people to conform to the *sunnat*.** The *shaikhs* used it to complement the instruction of their disciples. Thus Rashid Ahmad, his biographer explained, through *tasarruf* had brought thirty-five disciples to the stage where they themselves could undertake guidance of others. **Maulana Asraf Ali Thanawi, one of those disciples, specifically attributed his changed position on the legitimacy of customary practices such as the celebration of the *maulud* to the *tasarruf* of Rashid Ahmad.**

The *shaikh* could use his power to win his followers away from worldly concerns, away from distractions that hindered their fidelity to religious obligations. (Barbara Daly Metcalf, *Islamic Revival in British India: Deoband, 1860-1900*, 1982, pp. 172-73)

In this precept we find the same heresy of the Barelvikuffar, with the exception of the Deobandi emphasis that *tasarruf* is specifically used to shepherd the ordinary believer into conformity with proper Islamic practice. While this might sound like a harmonious assimilation of *sufi* principles with

Islam, it brings to mind the aphorism of the road to – Islamic - hell being lined with good intentions. Indeed in the Deobandi example, the saying is prophetic, for though they think they are furthering the cause of pure Islam, the very fact that *tasarruf* is a religious innovation, a bidat that directly violates the Quran injunctions *against* post-Mohammed mystic experiences and powers, means that the Deobandis are corrupting the minds of potentially ‘pure’ Muslims, because they are openly equating non-Islamic principles with Islam. The Deobandis, besides this illegal neglect of Gabriel's commandments against mysticism, are also, in their intent to remodel the ways of their followers from non-religious concerns, arguably violating another Islamic principle illustrated in the following Quran passage:

If thy Lord had so willed, He could have made mankind one people: but they will not cease to dispute. Except those on whom your Lord has mercy. And for this did He create them. And the word of your Lord is fulfilled: Certainly I will fill hell with the jinn and the men, all together. (Quran 11:118-119)

These infrarational revelations, voiced to the Prophet in particular, were as already discussed necessitated by the scope of Mohammed's military power – when he was weaker, Gabriel comforted him by informing the Prophet that although the kuffar were not listening to his message, it was only because of the will of Allah, who was certain to have the unbelievers encompass hell. Similarly did the Asura of Falsehood specifically instruct a then militarily-weak Mohammed to “leave them alone” and refrain from attempting to alter their disbelief:

But what is the matter with those who disbelieve that they hasten on around you, On the right hand and on the left, in groups? Does every man of them desire that he should be made to enter the garden of bliss? By no means! Surely We have created them of what they know. But nay! I swear by the Lord of the Easts and the Wests that We are certainly able To bring instead (others) better than them, and We shall not be overcome. **Therefore leave them alone to go on with the false discourses and to sport until they come face to face with that day of theirs with which they have been promised,** The day on which they shall come forth from their graves in haste, as if they were hastening on to a goal, Their eyes cast down. Disgrace shall overtake them; that is the Day which they were promised! (Quran 70:36-44)

As there is no evidence that Mohammed – who *was* granted a small amount of occult capacity by Allah – used anything analogous to *tasarruf* upon the copious amount of unbelievers during his time, his example offers further proof that the Deobandis are, irrespective of their rationale, committing a grave religious innovation by using an illegal ‘mystic force’ to obtain fidelity to shariat. In fact the Quran - with the particular verses only communicated by the Asura of Falsehood after Mohammed's military strengthened - commands a different method of obtaining fidelity: that of physical force. Thus the Muslims are given the options – depending upon their corporeal power at the time – of leaving the disbelievers – and this includes apostates - to hell or violently demanding either their subjugation or conversion, with the kuffar facing genocide if they refuse. There are no other directives available, *especially* not the particular heresy of the shaikh's – there are, we recall, no such people mentioned in Islam – ‘spiritual power’ being applied to eliminate apostasy, with the moderate Deobandi heresy of using *tasarruf* to improve religious duty accompanied, as expected, by more egregious accounts of illegal ‘mystic prowess’:

Another form of the saint's power was *tawajjuh*, the concentration of the *shaikh's* attention on a follower. **Generally *tawajjuh* did not produce the kind of dramatic conversions that *tasarruf* entailed, but rather created an immediate spiritual experience on the person involved. It could produce a vision.**

A disciple of Muhammad Qasim, Diwan Muhammad Yasin, was very famous for his voiced *zikr*. Once he was repeating it in a corner of the Chattah Masjid; Muhammad Qasim sat in another corner, facing

him, and exerting his attention on him. **Such a state spread over Muhammad Yasin that he saw the roof of the mosque disappear and a throne in the heavens, approaching him, surrounded by a strong light. On the throne was seated the Prophet surrounded by the four caliphs.** The Prophet asked Muhammad Qasim for the accounts of the school, then had him read them aloud. His happiness and pleasure at this reading was boundless. He dismissed Qasim; and the throne reascended to heaven. (Zuhuru'l-Hasan, *Arwah-i Salasah*, p. 413)

...Most commonly, however, *tawajjuh* produced mystical experiences of light or of sensations like “a river flowing through one's heart.” (Barbara Daly Metcalf, *Islamic Revival in British India: Deoband, 1860-1900*, 1982, pp. 174-75)

This is an undoubtedly worse blasphemy against the Asura of Falsehood's infrarational word, because the Quran has specific commands against the reception of mystic visions for those after Mohammed, with the selection confirming the Deobandis as - once we remove their public piety to expose their subjective practices and beliefs – apostates along with their hated Barelvi opponents. It is a particular hypocrisy – the outward restraint failing to mask the deviant beliefs – that the Deobandis remain unaware of, having like most sufikuffar deceived themselves into a delusion that they are the righteous upholders of Islam. In the case of the Deobandis it leads to the astonishing irony in which we find their leaders lamenting the *damage* to Islam caused by Sufism, yet in the same breath perpetuating the very heresies that Sufism has introduced to the Asuric religion!

Whatever the necessary role of the saint might be, the Deobandis, in contrast to the common practice of the pirs of the shrines, emphasized as far more effective the central responsibility of the disciple to adhere to the Law. Rashid Ahmad once lamented the failure of Sufis to recognize this responsibility:

The harm the Sufis have caused to Islam...is greater than that of any other sect. Originally the Companions did not need disciplines. Over time they became necessary, but then deteriorated into deviant practice. Those who tried to effect reform were Shaikh Abdu'l-Qadir Gilani, Shaikh Shiahabu'd-Din Suhrawardi, Shaikh Ahmad Sarhindi...**God revealed to them the way of the *sunnat* and, praise be to Him, He also revealed it to me.** If a person does the things ordered by the Prophet, like *namaz*, on one considers him a saint or a great man. But if he does things not so enjoined...everyone does. [Zuhuru'l Hasan, *Arwah-i Salasah*, p. 279] (Barbara Daly Metcalf, *Islamic Revival in British India: Deoband, 1860-1900*, 1982, pp. 182-83)

As one observes, the Deobandi founder alleged himself privy to revelations on “the way of the *sunnat*”, with the use of the very word “revealed” exposing a heresy that can be conclusively attributed to the very Sufism Rashid Ahmad believed injurious to Islam. For in Islam, there are to be no further revelations after Mohammed, especially with regards to understanding the Quran; after all, Allah has already ordained the *final* and complete set of infrarational revelations for mankind. And if there is any attempt to dissimulate Rashid Ahmad's statements as a non-mystical revelation, we present the commentary of Metcalf, who notes the Deobandis as commonly holding a belief that Allah is communicating to them through dreams:

Another mark of the grace shown the ulama was their dreams of the Prophet or other great men. **Dreams of this were understood to be divine communications, not products of one's own experiences and wishes.** The pious prepared themselves for such dreams by the repetition of certain prayers and phrases before sleeping, and learned to remember their dreams. ...Of similar reassurance was a dream of Rashid Ahmad's: “Once Rashid Ahmad saw himself acting as *mufti* before the enthroned Prophet, who posed to him one hundred questions that he answered successfully. ‘Since that day,’ he said, ‘I have been happy and felt that were the whole world against me I would still know that the right was on my side.’ ” (Zuhuru'l Hasan, *Arwah-i Salasah*, pp 287-88) (Barbara Daly Metcalf, *Islamic Revival in British India: Deoband, 1860-*

1900, 1982, pp. 177-78)

If this blasphemous advocacy for “divine communications” is bad enough, the Deobandis – supposed orthodox or hardline reformers, allegedly far removed from the stain of Hinduism – inevitably descend into an outright *shirk* in which their shaikhs are illegally visualized during the practice of meditation:

The Deobandis...also instructed their disciples in methods of meditation and devotions that prepared their hearts for **intuitive knowledge of these same truths**. The centrality of the relation between the *shaikh* and the disciple was evident in their teaching of the practice known as *tasawwur-i shaikh*, **conceiving of the image of one's shaikh as an aid to focusing one's thoughts on spiritual matters**. Some earlier reformers, such as Maulana Ismail, had condemned the practice; and some of the Deobandis suggested that its practice should be spontaneous, not taught. They held it wrong to consider the practice a necessity or to consider the *shaikh* actually present. **They did not want the shaikh to be understood as an intercessor or conduit of divine power to a passive believer**. At the same time, they held that the spiritual power of the *shaikh* had a compulsion beyond that of the guidance of the *alim* in effecting the common goal of a more perfect commitment to the Law. (Barbara Daly Metcalf, *Islamic Revival in British India: Deoband, 1860-1900*, 1982, p. 183)

Not only is intuitive knowledge banned in Islam, which is a religion of strict submissiveness to rules of thought and action – with its adharmic laws rejecting intuition and similar capacities – under the threat of hellfire for insubordination, the Asuric scripture unequivocally rejects the other practices outlined above. For though the Deobandi intent is to avoid having the shaikh perceived as a “conduit” to “divine power”, their methods make the conclusion inescapable! After all, the sufis are here meditating – a form of worship associated with heretical beliefs such as Self-Realization - on the *image* of the shaikh, with the very use of an image (even if imagined) a form of “idolatry” according to Islam: And of course, the practice of using the shaikh's image for *spiritual* matters is certainly an example of *shirk* – thus the intense opposition to the custom by different reformers. But the Deobandis, as we know, are only opposed to the *publicly* provocative sufi traditions, and have not strenuously attempted to eliminate the types of customs detailed above: In fact, in the accounts of the early Deobandi leaders, we find their practices leading to a more comprehensive *shirk*:

Mohammed Ya'qub urged one of his followers to engage in *tasawwur* at the time of the spiritual exercise of *zikr* “as the lover continuously thinks of the beloved, or the student holds in mind the image of his teacher while doing his work.” [Muhammad Ya'qub, *Bayaz*, pp 71-74]

The desired result of contemplation of the shaikh was extinction of the thought of all else but him, *fana fi'sh-shaikh*. This was a recognized step toward extinction of all else but the Prophet, *fana fi'r-rasul*; and ultimately, of all else but God, *fana fi'llah* or *ihsan*. In a state of excitement, Rashid Ahmad once confided his own experience of this progression: “**For three years the face of Imdadu'llah was in my heart and I did nothing without asking him first. ...Then, for three years the face of the Prophet was in my heart.** ...Then there existed the rank of spiritual realization (*ihsan ka martabah*).” [Zuhuru'l Hasan, *Arwah-i Salasah*, pp 290-91] Rashid Ahmad's disciple, Husain Ahmad Madani, described his own experience of identification with his *shaikh*, in turn:

In Medina...I had many dreams of virtuous people. I would go every night to the mosque which as the tomb of the Prophet; and I would repeat my *zikr* until my body began to move out of control, then, if other people were present, I would go outside. A powerful feeling would come over me that my body had become Rashid Ahmad's body. This was the state called *fana fi'sh-shaikh*, annihilation in the *shaikh*. [Husain Ahmad Madani, *Naqsh-i Hayat*, pp 87-88] (Barbara Daly Metcalf, *Islamic Revival in British India: Deoband, 1860-1900*, 1982, p. 184)

The Deobandi tenet of a supposed annihilation in the trinity of the shaikh, the Prophet and Allah is disturbingly close to the ultimate aspiration of the Sanatana Dharma - that the devotee can Unite in Consciousness with the Divine. While in the above example neither the shaikh or the devotee are held to be consciously united with Allah – although the Deobandis certainly grant both parties illegal spiritual power -, the similarities are nonetheless too striking for it to be considered anything other than *shirk*, especially when it introduces distinct bidats, because this type of annihilation – including the image of the Prophet's face – is absent from the authentic Islamic scripture. As one can subsequently imagine, the pir – and Mohammed, since *fana fi'r-rasul* establishes him as a deity according to the Deobandi tradition - holds an inordinate amount of importance to the Deobandis, who can look to their founder's examples for the levels of worship appropriate. And in Rashid Ahmad Gangohi we find an unseemly amount of devotion to entities other than Allah:

Rashid Ahmad himself loved his *shaikh* Imdadu'llah above all others, and when the latter died he wept over him at night for months...**Rashid Ahmad trusted utterly Hajji Imdadu'llah, despite his apparent commitment to practices disapproved of by the Deobandis.** This was, it is argued, a providential test for Rashid Ahmad who, having mastered it, learned *hifz-i maratib*, the preservation of degrees, embedded in the relation of follower to *shaikh*. **One ought not, wrote Rashid Ahmad in a *fatwa*, leave a suitable *pir* even if one's own parents urge it.** (Rashid Ahmad, *Fatawa-yi Rashidiyyah*, I, 53) (Barbara Daly Metcalf, *Islamic Revival in British India: Deoband, 1860-1900*, 1982, pp. 161-62)

In another Metcalf passage, we find the early Deobandi leader Ya'qub professing his belief that the shaikh can be a medium for Divine Grace, a power that certainly justifies the illegal worship the Deobandis afford their pirs:

Muhammad Ya'qub...suggested sitting alone, quietly, thinking of “the Divine Grace that would reach one through the medium of the heart of the *shaikh*.” [Muhammad Ya'qub, *Bayaz*, pp 120-23]...He also set as part of *ashgal* the reading of certain litanies: of praise to the Prophet, of supplication for forgiveness, and of desire for aid and protection. Some of these litanies, such as the *hizbu'l-bahr*, had been condemned by various reformers who preferred only formulae present in the Quran. Rashid Ahmad, for example, did find certain *durud*, litanies in praise of the Prophet, to be illegitimate. (Barbara Daly Metcalf, *Islamic Revival in British India: Deoband, 1860-1900*, 1982, pp. 189-90)

This selection once again emphasizes the anaemic Deobandi “reform” of Sufism, with certain public poems to Mohammed forbidden while their seminaries assert belief in the pir as a Divine entity directly connected to the Grace of Allah: in other words, Polytheism. Yet ironically, the Deobandis consider themselves the natural heirs to a legacy of subcontinental reformers, a peculiar position described in the following Metcalf passage, in which she highlights the name of Ahmad Sirhindi as one of their supposed forerunners, with the list curiously including the likes of Abdul-Quddus and Bayazid Bastami along with the famed orthodox sufi:

The Deobandis were clearly influenced by Naqshbandi practice, particularly in considering the technique of silent *zikr* as more valuable than spoken. Rashid Ahmad's relation to his disciples was described, moreover, as being in the style of Naqshbandi saints, emphasizing the attachment between *shaikh* and individual disciple (*tawajjuh*)...**Rashid Ahmad was himself descended in twelve generations from the Chishti *shaikh* Abdul-Quddus Gangohi (d.1537), and actually revived his *khanaqah*, which had lain deserted for three hundred years. He taught his disciples to love and emulate him**, and often told exemplary stories of his poverty and simplicity, his voiced *zikr* that lasted the entire day, and his disregard for the officials of the king. The Deobandis especially valued the reputation of the Chishtis for being aloof from the state and for basing their influence on individual spirituality alone.

Nevertheless, they cited others as their spiritual forebears, and visited tombs such as that of Shaikh Ahmad Sarhindi Naqshbandi when they traveled on hajj. Rashid Ahmad and his fellows constantly kept alive the memory of other great saints of the past: **Bayazid Bistami**, Shihabu'd-Din Suhrawardi, and Imam Ja'faru's-Sadiq. (Barbara Daly Metcalf, *Islamic Revival in British India: Deoband, 1860-1900*, 1982, pp. 159-60)

But to include him with grossly heretical individuals like Bayazid and Abdul-Quddus – the latter of whom, as we have documented, hated Hindus yet at the same time used Onkar and the names of Hindu deities in his sufi rituals – is to desecrate the name and work of Sirhindi, who strenuously criticized the bidats and outright *shirk* advocated by other sufis, and would have been appalled at the state of affairs whereby apostate Deobandis present themselves as champions of Islam. We can recall the cited example of Sirhindi's abhorrence of *kashfs* to highlight the fraudulence of Deobandis claiming him as their forefather, because as Metcalf notes with regards to Deobandi practice, “The follower was, on his side, expected to open himself wholly to the *shaikh*, to describe his feelings and his actions honestly and without reserve. **Often, through *kashf*, the *shaikh* in fact knew the disciple's thoughts without being told.**” (Barbara Daly Metcalf, *Islamic Revival in British India: Deoband, 1860-1900*, 1982, p. 194) This is precisely the opposite of Sirhindi's tenets, as he rejected the ability of anyone to be privy to *kashfs*, a fact that makes it impossible to consider the Deobandis worthy heirs to the rare category of orthodox sufis, let alone the coveted status of most pious Muslims.

Indeed a far different picture of the Deobandis is established through a review of their core principles, which in reality greatly accommodate Sufism, even if they assert themselves as proponents of austere Islam through their unsuccessful attempts at eliminating Sufism's garish and morbid public customs. But as we already know, adopting the appearance of a Muslim is not the same as actually existing as one, for the actual Muslim is fully – internally and externally - adherent to the scripture. The Deobandis, as their practices make abundantly evident, are not even close to that fidelity, and in fact meet the criteria for the hypocrite – whether or not consciously aware of his infidelity – that hides his disbelief from general viewing, with Allah having said, “He knoweth all that is in the heavens and the earth, and **He knoweth what ye conceal and what ye publish.** And Allah is Aware of what is in the breasts (of men).” (Quran 64:04) The Deobandis then, at least according to the Quran, will meet the same fate as their Barelvi enemy, for though the latter is quite open about his disbelief, the Deobandis are guilty according to the same Islamic criteria damning their rivals, because they perpetuate heresy, including the abomination of *shirk*, in their enclosed seminaries – secret settings that are not concealed from Allah:

And they have taken gods besides Allah that they may be helped. (But) they shall not be able to assist them, and they shall be a host brought up before them. Therefore let not their speech grieve you. **Surely We know what they do in secret and what they do openly.** (Quran 36:74-76)

If the secret – private is perhaps a better description for the Deobandis, because they do not, in their writings at least, attempt to hide their heresies – practices of the Deobandikuffar are certainly enough to substantiate their apostasy in taking their shaikhs and the Prophet for gods who might help them, to expose their enormous distance from the supposed orthodoxy they represent, it nevertheless should not lead us to conclude – after understanding the grip that Sufism has over their movement – that they have some sort of affinity to the truths of Hinduism. For just like other adherents to Sufism, the Deobandis similarly repudiate the paramount truth of the Sanatana Dharma – that man is in his greatest reality the eternal Purusha, a Supreme Consciousness. Instead, they stress an irremediable separation between God and his “derived” creation:

The disciples of these men were taught through writings, homilies, and example the fundamental truths of Islam. Above all, their teachers taught that the inner experience of sufism

was not a challenge to Islam but the deepest of its reaffirmations. They taught that the knowledge of sufism was certainty of Islam's most basic truth, the truth of *tauhid* that underlay the Law. **That truth revealed that God alone had an independence existence, and that all else derived from him.** (Barbara Daly Metcalf, *Islamic Revival in British India: Deoband, 1860-1900*, 1982, p 179)

As expected from this original error central to sufi mysticism, one continuously attested by the inclusion of the shariat to their mystic path, the sufi principle of separation devolves into the nebulous domains of intermediate and infrarational mysticism. Indeed Deobandi writings provide documentation of the same features previously mentioned as characterizing Sufism's inevitable descent, beginning with their exaltation of Mohammed, for whom **“The Deobandis affirmed that the most advanced mystic was he who most successfully imitated the exemplary life of Mohammed”** (Barbara Daly Metcalf, *Islamic Revival in British India: Deoband, 1860-1900*, 1982, p. 183) The Prophet however, can only be considered an “advanced” mystic if we presume the pinnacle of mysticism to be possession by the Asura of Falsehood! That the Deobandis ignore his proclamations on bidats, or the message of Allah relayed through the Prophet that forbids mysticism after him, fails to alleviate the profound danger in imitating his mystic path – Mohammed, we recall, is the *vibhuti* of Falsehood. Nevertheless, the Deobandis, like all other sufis, seek to invoke the Prophet and the Quran *during* their mystical practices, with the infrarational – and heretical - nature of their methods on display in the following Metcalf passage:

The core of the meditational practices of the Deobandis, as of Sufis everywhere, was *zikr*, the “recollection” of the name of God. There were two categories of *zikr*. **One was *zikr* of the name of God alone...The second was the first phrase of the profession of faith, *la ilaha illa'llah*...The phrase was known as the *nafi o isbat* because it contained both negation, *nafi*, of all divinity other than God, and affirmation, *isbat*, of His singular divinity. By regular repetition and by meditation on various aspects of the meaning of the *zikr*, the disciple sought complete forgetfulness of self and consciousness of God. ...Its success rested...not on the cultivation of extraordinary states. Indeed, believers were warned to avoid such experiences in favor of *jazb* “not in the sense of unconsciousness or madness but rather attentiveness to God's kindness, and the sense of being drawn to him. **One perceives light and the revelation of secrets.**” [Muhammad Ya'qub, *Bayaz*, pp 60-61] (Barbara Daly Metcalf, *Islamic Revival in British India: Deoband, 1860-1900*, 1982, p. 185)**

We find in these practices the use of the infrarational mantras of the Quran explained as such, for to these sufis the negation of other deities is here presented as an appropriate aspect of meditation! To the contrary, by using this *nafi o isbat*, the Deobandis only obstruct their attempts at reaching even a diluted unity, because by negating the other possible *names* of God during a meditation, they only invoke a *separative* consciousness. That it is here described as a “consciousness of God” is misleading, because if they had really ascended to the Supreme Consciousness, they would have *instantly* known multiple names or Personalities to be One God, and would have at minimum described It as extraordinary, because the Illimitable Consciousness is beyond extraordinary. The Deobandi account of consciousness is, as extensively described, the popular diluted unity that no genuine sufi will ever associate with *hulul* or Self-Realization, for that – rather than the actual limits defined by the Quran – is considered outside of what the sufis aspire toward in their spiritual practice. The lights and secrets mentioned, although potentially signs of spiritual progress (well before a Self-Realization), can also, as discussed, be distortions from the Asura of Falsehood, who in the Vital realm can project a certain light or glow that can easily be confused by intermediate mystics like the sufis. Nevertheless, as with other sufis, it is quite possible that the Deobandis experience visions of light belonging to higher mental regions, even if the described results of their meditations have a strong element of instability which

contravenes that possibility:

If *zikr* were successful, one would feel warmth, enthusiasm, **agitation, and such physical symptoms as hairs standing on end, spontaneous speaking, laughing and weeping, and visions of lights**. If such signs occurred, one was to be thankful; if not, simply patient.

Moreover, such experiences could be a distraction, an end in themselves, and the role of the *shaikh* was, in part, to guide his followers beyond such potential distractions. (Barbara Daly Metcalf, *Islamic Revival in British India: Deoband, 1860-1900*, 1982, p. 187)

Of all of this, only the light is *possibly* non-Vital in origin, as everything else is distinctly Vital, with - as in previously cited descriptions by sufis - agitation and other nervous vital reactions prominent, when a sadhana should lead one beyond the intensification of the physical-vital and into the Psychic and Intuitive Mind regions – entries characterized by peace and silence. Indeed the opinion of the *shaikhs* that their experiences were *distractions* attests to the difference in their mysticism from the Sanatana Dharma, especially with regards to the light, because the sadhak will be instructed by his Guru to understand *certain* visions of light as a sign of an excellent, though intermediate, progress on the spiritual journey to his real Self. But the traditional Deobandis are in-between all sides – both powerless to refrain from including Polytheistic principles to their practice and simultaneously assuming a fraudulent position as orthodox Muslims, with the root of their problem the very incorporation of Sufism into their illegal version of Islam. It is a mistake that the third major school of Islamic reform established in the 19th century subcontinent, the Ahl-e Hadith, insulated themselves from by rejecting Sufism in its *entirety*:

The content of practice and belief defined by the focus on *hadis* clearly distinguished the Ahl-i Hadis from those who followed customary forms of the religion as well as from other reformers. Like the Deobandis, the Ahl-i Hadis opposed the sufism of the shrines and the customs of the Shi'ah. Badru'l-Hasan Sahswani mocked the *taqlid* of the unreformed as conformity not to the rulings of the law schools but as conformity to custom in ceremonies, to the practice of *pirs* in *urs* and *qawwali*, and to the habits of Timur in keeping *ta'ziyachs*. Muhsinu'l-Mulk, in similar style, wrote, “people favor the word of Zaid and Amr...over the word of God and the Prophet. They take greater interest in the sayings and miracles of the saints than in the word of God and the Prophet.” ...

The Ahl-i Hadis, like the Deobandis, opposed the ceremonies that were the foundation of the communities that surrounded the shrines. They prohibited *urs* and *qawwali*, particularly opposing the *giyarhwin* of Shaikh Abdu'l-Qadir Gilani. They opposed keeping the flags of saints like Salar Mas'ud Ghazi of Bahraich. They prohibited all pilgrimage, even that to the grave of the Prophet of Medina. They insisted nonetheless that they respected the great saints. Such writers as Sana'u'llah frequently cited Shaikh Abdu'l-Qadir's perfections, and some cited him as Ahl-i Hadis himself. The practices of the followers of the saints they deplored. Sana'u'llah himself traveled to the shrine of Piran-i Kalyar in Roorkee and described in shock his observations of the use of candles, the practice of seven-fold circumambulation, and prostration toward the tomb. [Sana'u'llah, *Ahl-i Hadis ka Mazhab*, p. 50]

Unlike either the Deobandis or Barelwis, the Ahl-i Hadis discouraged the institutional reforms of sufism. In their emphasis on sweeping reform, they understood sufism itself, not just its excesses, to be a danger to true religion. They felt that sufism encouraged the attempt to seek knowledge of the nature of God, a quest they held inappropriate to the believer. (Barbara Daly Metcalf, *Islamic Revival in British India: Deoband, 1860-1900*, 1982, pp. 273-74)

In the Ahl-e Hadith we finally encounter – among the major subcontinental Islamic groups – the first of

the modern era to strenuously try and conform to Islam by eradicating Sufism in both public and private practice, external tradition and internal quest. The position of the Ahl-e Hadith is what Rashid Ahmad Gangohi should have adopted when realizing the “harm” that Sufism caused to Islam; but as he failed to do so, the Deobandis – at least the ones conforming to their tradition - stand as fellow half-Muslims with the Barelvis, compatriot kuffar with the Hindus. Indeed the Barelvi versus Deobandi fissure is more the case of a moderately heretic Sufism fighting a slightly less heretic Sufism, with both daring to claim themselves Sunni. The Ahl-e Hadith, on the other hand, are much closer to actual Islam, though even they cannot entirely eliminate the residue of Sufism, as seen above in some of the praise granted to sufi shaikhs whose writings plainly demonstrate apostasy. They have also been accused of overemphasising the hadith, a charge that subsequently led to the emergence of another subcontinental group, the Ahl-e Quran, that concentrates entirely on the infrarational message of Gabriel.

But these two latter groups, and even the genuine – entirely free of Sufism - Wahhabis present on the soil of fragmented Pakistan, are yet significant minorities in comparison to the Deobandis and especially the Barelvis, with the latter remaining heavily afflicted with the contamination of Sufism. Of course, this is hardly surprising, because Ahmad Riza Khan's ultimate legacy was the consolidation of traditional subcontinental customs of Sufism, including the historic process of sufi leadership, as Sanyal confirms: “Out of this select group the pir would choose one as his successor (*sajjada nishin*). Ahmad Riza chose his eldest son, Hamid Riza Khan – authorizing him, in November 1915, to continue the chain of sufi discipleship (*silsila*) named the silsila Rizwiyya.” (Usha Sanyal, *Ahmad Riza Khan Barelwi: In the Path of the Prophet*, 2005, p. 93) The legacy of the Barelvi founder also continues in different, more pernicious ways, including the recital of his blasphemous poetry during Pakistani celebrations of Mohammed's birthday:

Ahmad Riza wrote a number of eloquent verses about the Prophet. One, entitled *Karoron Durud* (Millions of Blessings), is well known in Pakistan today, and is recited on the Prophet's birthday:

I am tired, you are my sanctuary
 I am bound, you are my refuge
 My future is in your hands.
 Upon you be millions of blessings.
 My sins are limitless,
 but you are forgiving and merciful
 Forgive me my faults and offenses,
 Upon you be millions of blessings.

**I will call you “Lord,” for you are the beloved of the Lord
 There is no “yours” and “mine” between the beloved and the
 lover.** (Usha Sanyal, *Ahmad Riza Khan Barelwi: In the Path of the Prophet*, 2005, pp. 98-99)

That this profanity against the Prophet and Allah is allowed to persist in fragmented Pakistan makes a mockery of its claim to be a pure Islamic state, especially when Ahmad Riza represents – at least at this time – the majority. For the actual Muslim should not even hint, as Ahmad Riza does, that Mohammed can be anything close to the “Lord” - the believer should know that Mohammed was a slave of Allah's just like the rest of humanity. Granted, one can understand the idolatry of the Barelvikafir, because if their excessive praise of the Prophet is evidently that of the *munafiqun*, the Barelvis are only guilty of an error in manifestation, for Islam provides certain rules through which the Muslim can unconsciously idolize Mohammed, albeit with none of the ordinances allowing for copious praise or outright worship. The proper Islamic idolatry proceeds by imitation rather than the sufi worship, even if the mimicry of the Asuric *vibhuti* goes against one's svadharma. Traditional methods of devotion toward Mohammed, after all, represent the crime of *shirk*, because no one else should be deemed “Lord” other than Allah – especially not sufi pirs like Ahmad Riza, for whom persists, in the supposedly pristine “Pakistan”, the

most illicit of crimes:

Just as he held that saints continued their work after death, his followers have held him still to be their leader. The author of a recent work on his jurisprudential thought, for example, has interspersed frequent poetic verses addressed to him as if he were continuously present. His followers speak of him never by name but by the title of A'la Hazrat, "the exalted or most high presence." (Barbara Daly Metcalf, *Islamic Revival in British India: Deoband, 1860-1900*, 1982, pp. 305-06)

It is little wonder that conflict might emerge when the Barelvikuffar continue with their flagrant *shirk*, their Polytheistic devotion to entities other than Allah only serving to exacerbate the offensiveness of their public traditions, which includes the continued celebration of Ahmad Riza's *urs*, something that might have been overlooked if not for their simultaneously deviant devotion towards him. Such are their provocative displays that, as Sanyal notes, they have naturally failed to receive the Arab largesse bestowed upon groups closer in doctrine to actual Islam:

Since his death in 1921, Ahmad Riza's *urs* has been celebrated by his followers every year in Bareilly. ...In Pakistan, I found that Ahmad Riza's death anniversary was also commemorated with conferences at five-star hotels at which speeches were made and *nat* poetry recited. There are a number of Pakistani organizations which sponsor events honoring Ahmad Riza's life and work throughout the year as well as publishing his books. ... I should add, however, that the Ahl-e Sunnat in Pakistan appear to be less prominent nationally than the Deobandis. **Their perspective on sufism being at odds with that of the Saudi regime, they have not benefited from Saudi munificence as have other reformist groups** (Zaman, 2002). (Usha Sanyal, *Ahmed Riza Khan Barelwi: In the Path of the Prophet*, 2005, pp. 129-131)

Having witnessed, in her visit, a *relatively* muted atmosphere with respect to Ahmad Riza in particular, Sanyal sought to explain this by way of minimizing the extent of the Barelvi movement itself:

Most scholars believe that the Deobandis were influential in the urban areas, while the "Barelwis," as the Ahl-e Sunnat are widely known, were popular in the countryside. If this were true, it would make the Ahl-e Sunnat vastly more influential than the Deobandis, and probably the erudite Ahl-e Hadith as well, not to mention the followers of Sayyid Ahmad Khan, as the South Asian population was and continues to be overwhelmingly rural. However, this judgment arises from the general identification of the "Barelwis" with sufism, and with unreformed Islamic practice among the population at large. But since we have no way of knowing whether Muslims who prayed at the sufi shrines that are ubiquitous throughout South Asia thought of themselves as "Barelwi," we cannot make this assumption. (Usha Sanyal, *Ahmad Riza Khan Barelwi: In the Path of the Prophet*, 2005, pp. 122-23)

While Sanyal's arguments are reasonable, the connection between the traditional, rural, subcontinental Sufism with the Barelvi movement is one made not out of a strict or formal identification, but of a loose affiliation in which, crucially, Ahmad Riza Khan emerges as the *figurehead* of that heritage. For most of the sufis of the subcontinent still maintain a historic flexibility – one that fails to extend to the Hindus – between sufic orders and Islam, between the authentic scripture and illegal religious innovations, that Ahmad Riza merely served to articulate into copious books of fatwas and expositions - his life-long attempt at securing this particular "Islam" as the actual truth of the religion, with Metcalf commenting that the Barelvis **"wanted to preserve Islam unchanged: not Islam as it was idealized in texts or the historical past, but Islam as it had evolved to the present."** (Barbara Daly Metcalf, *Islamic Revival in British India: Deoband, 1860-1900*, 1982, pp. 296-97) Islam, however, is not a religion that evolves, and the Barelvi aspiration only adds further fuel to a conflagration that will inevitably engulf them: For their current dominance is greatly at risk, as numerous competitors

increasingly weaken their historic grip, with Sanyal hinting at the reason when noting, “because the Deobandis emphasized schools more than the Ahl-e Sunnat, in the long term they had greater influence in the urban areas than the Ahl-e Sunnat.” (Usha Sanyal, *Ahmad Riza Khan Barelwi: In the Path of the Prophet*, 2005, p. 125)

But Islamic madrassas need not be restricted to urban settings, and in the time period shortly after Sanyal's book was published, a concerted drive to usurp the rural Barelvi power commenced. The specifics of this push are described in a leaked American Intelligence cable from 2008, which documents the following: “During recent trips to southern Punjab, Principal Officer was repeatedly told that a sophisticated jihadi recruitment network had been developed in the Multan, Bahawalpur, and Dera Ghazi Khan Divisions. The network reportedly exploited worsening poverty in these areas of the province to recruit children into the divisions' growing Deobandi and Ahl-e Hadith madrassa network from which they were indoctrinated into jihadi philosophy, deployed to regional training/indoctrination centers, and ultimately sent to terrorist training camps in the Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA). Locals believed that charitable activities being carried out by Deobandi and Ahl-e Hadith organizations, including Jamaat-ud-Dawa, the Al-Khidmat Foundation, and Jaish-e-Mohammad were further strengthening reliance on extremist groups and **minimizing the importance of traditionally moderate Sufi religious leaders in these communities.**” (Wikileaks, *Extremist Recruitment on the Rise in Southern Punjab*, 13 November 2008) The cable further elaborates on these conversions of rural Pakistani “Muslims” to a truer Islam – a process that naturally includes an ideological assault on Sufism:

The local Deobandi or Ahl-e-Hadith maulana will generally be introduced to the family through these organizations. **He will work to convince the parents that their poverty is a direct result of their family's deviation from “the true path of Islam” through “idolatrous” worship at local Sufi shrines and/or with local Sufi Peers. The maulana suggests that the quickest way to return to “favor” would be to devote the lives of one or two of their sons to Islam.** The maulana will offer to educate these children at his madrassa and to find them employment in the service of Islam. The concept of “martyrdom” is often discussed and the family is promised that if their sons are “martyred” both the sons and the family will attain “salvation” and the family will obtain God's favor in this life, as well. **An immediate cash payment is finally made to the parents to compensate the family for its “sacrifice” to Islam.** (Wikileaks, *Extremist Recruitment on the Rise in Southern Punjab*, 13 November 2008)

Further commentary in the cable mentions a deficient response by the Pakistani government to the threat against Sufism, as well as noting the disparity in funds between the Barelvis and the so-called extremists:

Interlocutors repeatedly chastised the government for its failure to act decisively against indoctrination centers, extremist madrassas, or known prominent leaders such as Jaish-e-Mohammad's Masood Azhar. One leading Sufi scholar and a Member of the Provincial Assembly informed Principal Officer that he had personally provided large amounts of information on the location of these centers, madrassas, and personalities to provincial and national leaders, as well as the local police. He was repeatedly told that “plans” to deal with the threat were being “evolved” but that direct confrontation was considered “too dangerous.” ... The brother of the Federal Minister for Religious Affairs, and a noted Brailvi/Sufi scholar in his own right, Allama Qasmi blamed government intransigence on a culture that rewarded political deals with religious extremists. ... The moderate Brailvi/Sufi community is internally divided into followers of competing spiritual leaders and lacks the financial resources to act as an effective counterweight to well-funded and well-organized extremists. (Wikileaks, *Extremist Recruitment on the Rise in Southern Punjab*, 13 November 2008)

The Deobandis and the Ahl-e-Hadith however, are hardly able to generate, on their own, the type of funds required to sustain a massive assault on the apostate majority of “Pakistan” - for that they require support from wealthy Arabs, who were, as the leaked document informs, by that point annually contributing ten crore American dollars to the cause:

Government and non-governmental sources claimed that financial support estimated at nearly 100 million USD annually was making its way to Deobandi and Ahl-e-Hadith clerics in the region from “missionary” and “Islamic charitable” organizations in Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates ostensibly with the direct support of those governments. (Wikileaks, *Extremist Recruitment on the Rise in Southern Punjab*, 13 November 2008)

While Arab financing of the Ahl-e-Hadith is – even with the latter's perceived exaggeration of the hadith – easily justified, their backing of the Deobandis represents a curious alliance when we recall both the definitive blasphemy of the movement's founders and its modern sufi beliefs, with Metcalf noting, in one example of the latter, that **“One cure for illness was held to be the very dust of Muhammad Ya’qub's grave [Zuhuru'l-Hasan, *Arwah-i Salasah*, p 322].”** (Barbara Daly Metcalf, *Islamic Revival in British India: Deoband, 1860-1900*, 1982, p. 193) But there are many reasons for this strange arrangement, starting with the very source of the financing, which does not arrive from the Wahhabi clerics of Saudi Arabia, who though heavily influencing their patrons, do not have entire control, as witnessed by the sheer presence of *Polytheist* workers on Arab soil, when we know that the authentic hadith recorded *the Prophet* as demanding their eternal expulsion from the Arabian peninsula:

Then the Prophet ordered them to do three things saying, **‘Turn out all the pagans from the Arabian Peninsula, show respect to all foreign delegates by giving them gifts as I used to do.’**” The sub-narrator added, “The third order was something beneficial which either Ibn Abbas did not mention or he mentioned but I forgot.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 53, Number 393)

But the Arab rulers, for reasons pragmatic, have invited Polytheists - whether those Polytheists are Hindus or subcontinental sufis who call themselves Muslims – into the sacred land of Islam, because the Arab states have a need for a wide variety of foreign workers, from labourers to engineers. In attempting to mitigate a deviance from the tradition of Mohammed, the Arab states legally discriminate against official Polytheists like the Hindus, who for example are only entitled to one-sixteenth of the blood money granted to a Sunni male in similar legal circumstances⁴. Of more significance to their funding of Deobandis however, are the modern laws of the Arab states regarding Hindu worship – it is allowed, but only *indoors*, with the public space left to Islam. In this we find, after the possibility that the Arab rulers are simply unaware of private Deobandi heresies, the most likely reason why the Arab financial elite – of whom the Imams are *not* included – is so ready to fund the Deobandis, because these particular Arabs are satisfied with the Deobandi denunciations against the *public* affronts to Islam that arrive with Barelvi Sufism, for the Arab rulers practice the same hypocrisy. The concern over the Deobandi internal fidelity to Islam – of a suspect nature due to their continued promotion of the private sufi practices and their failure to disavow their founders – is thus relegated to the Wahhabi clerics, who nevertheless might grudgingly accept the funding for their own pragmatic reasons, because they know the Deobandi movement to be a step in the right direction from the conspicuous apostasy of the Barelvis.

Both sets of Arabs will also identify the Deobandis as having a good organizational structure – crucial to the task of Asurically purifying rump Pakistan – that is more extensive than other “extremist” schools within that particular global region, and has previously been shown to yield good results in jihad. Indeed the Arabs have for evidence recent historical successes resulting from their funding of Deobandis, including the infamous Taliban of Afghanistan, whose founder Mullah Omar was educated at Jamia Binoria, a Deobandi institute in Karachi. Thus even if the Deobandis are not entirely adherent

to austere Islam, the sufi accretions are not enough to obstruct most of the goals of jihad – whether against atheist Russians or Hindus or more deviant half-Muslims. There is also the matter of distinguishing the seminaries from their manifestation, because as with Mullah Omar, the graduate of a Deobandi seminary need not entirely conform himself to the traditional Deobandi precepts – indeed many Deobandi associated alumni have chastised both the internal and external practices of Sufism. With respect to the latter castigation, we find the prevalence, in Mullah Omar's Afghanistan, of violence towards sufis - the BBC mentioning that the Taliban “invaded Sufi gatherings, humiliated and beat up many of them and their musical instruments were smashed.” (BBC, *Sufism returns to Afghanistan after years of repression*, 23 February 2011) The same article also provides an interesting commentary on the trajectory of the Taliban movement, which initially included sufis only to later silence them after the Wahhabi “ideology became more prominent”.

Understandably, the Arabs – even when knowing the sufi element to the Deoband movement – will nevertheless expect this same pattern to play out in their support of the Deobandis, because the latter's sufi affliction is not as severe as the Barelvi's, and at any rate eventually violence can be used against the Deobandis if they fail to extinguish the private flame of Sufism permitted by their founders. But before then, the Deobandis and other “hardline extremists” of rump Pakistan can be used to target the flagrant apostates ranging from Hindus and Christians to Ahmadiyyas and Shi'ites, and finally the *bete noire* of the Deobandis, the Barelvis. It is a conflict that has, on recent occasions, resulted in violent attacks by the Deobandis on provocative Barelvi processions, the use of the fatwa-war fast becoming a vestige, with AFP reporting, in one example, that on the night of 28 February, 2010, “Sectarian violence erupted on Saturday in the town of Paharpur in Dera Ismail Khan district, **as hundreds of Muslims rallied to celebrate Eid Milad-un-Nabi, which marks Prophet Mohammed's birthday**. Gunmen opened fire on a parade by the Barelvi sect of Sunni Muslims, killing one person on the spot and prompting the angry crowd to retaliate by attacking a seminary of the local Deobandi Sunni sect.”

If this might potentially be a glimpse into a daily future, in present time, because of the fact that Barelvi processions are not - by virtue of the sheer number of days in the year - a frequent occurrence, the “extremists” of “Pakistan” – in this case not necessarily Deobandi even if they are educated at one of their associated schools – have adopted a different primary tactic, one psychologically devastating to the populace of a “nation” of narcissists that assumes their Islam to be the pure example of the religion. For the “extremists” have chosen to direct their hatred towards the very centre of Sufism in the kafir state they live in - the sufi dargah, of which there are “**hundreds of thousands of shrines across the country that attract devotees who believe a prayer at the grave of a saint will bring them health and happiness.**” (The Guardian UK, *The Saints go marching out as the face of Islam hardens in Pakistan*, 15 January 2014) This astonishing abundance of dargahs itself exposes the real nature of “Pakistan” as an infidel state, with its majority only able to cleanse itself of Hindus but unable to do the needful to their own heretical constructs.

But the leaders and elite of the Pakistani state can hardly be expected to have a negative view of the sufi shrines, because although they are taught to hate the Hindus, their education imparts a far different perspective on the subcontinent's other prominent exponent of *shirk*, the sufi. For in the same textbooks, the sufi saints are exalted to an unacceptable level, with one Urdu curriculum, in addition to requiring textbooks that contain poetry praising Allah and Mohammed, also demanding the students write essays on the sufi shaikhs:

Urdu Curriculum (first and second language) for classes VI-VIII, National Bureau of Curriculum and Textbooks, Ministry of Education, Government of Pakistan, 1986...p16
Recommendations for Textbooks 7. The book should begin with Hamd (a poem in praise of Allah) and Na'at (a poem in praise of Prophet Mohammed), and end in prayer...p18 6.
Essays...b. Personalities of Islam...3) Sufi's: Shah Abdul Latif Bhitai, Sultan Bahoo, Data

Ganj Bakhsh, Rahman Baba (AH Nayyar and Ahmed Salim, *The Subtle Subversion: The State of Curricula and Textbooks in Pakistan*, 2005, pp. 44-45)

The apostate nature of the Pakistani state education is once again exposed, because not only is it inappropriate to allege the practice of excessively praising the Prophet as Islamic, the vast majority of sufi saints are appropriately relegated to the status of unbelievers worthy of scorn. Indeed among the sufis of the previous citation, we find in the writings of Shah Abdul Latif the indelible mark of a heretic, for as Rizvi documents, he believed his own poetry to be “divine” in origin when Islam teaches that the last verses of ‘divine’ nature are housed in the Quran:

Shah Abdul Latif's poetic works, called *Risalo*, set the Panjabi and Sindhi folktales in a very sensitive framework of sufism. He himself warns his admirers:

‘Think not, O man, that these are mere couplets:

they are divine verses

That bear thee to the sacred precincts of the Beloved.’ (*The cultural heritage of Pakistan*, Karachi, 1955, p. 157) (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume II, p. 451)

Sultan Bahoo, as we have previously shown, was also transparently heretic, with Rizvi – in the following example – contorting himself to claim that Bahoo was adherent to Sharia when the sufi openly rejected Quran fundamentals such as pilgrimage to Mecca and mandatory prayers!

Sultan Bahu very firmly adhered to the rules of Sharia. Nevertheless he rejected formal prayers and worship, writing:

Kneeling, praying, fasting, doling

All are womanly pursuits

To Mecca tread only travellers

Empty hearted and sans-roots

Longest, loudest in professions

While their hearts care not two hoots

Useless are mere proclamations

Bahoo! Heart's contentment suits (The Aybat, p 164)

Rites of fasting, praying, abstaining

Cries in wilderness are, ho!

Rituals do not lead to Allah

read thyself and thyself know

Never, never, meets Beloved

Through the rituals, no, oh no!

Burn yourself with Love, O Bahoo:

And be one with One and glow!

(S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume II, p. 444)

In the eyes of the actual followers of Islam, who are for now a minority in a land that is supposed to belong to them, the demands of the state to force schoolchildren to imbibe heretical poetry to Mohammed and to write essays on sufi shaikhs are abhorrent crimes against Islam, because we know that the Hadith document that all humans are born Muslims, with most steered against the religion due to their subsequent upbringing, which might include an apostate education at a Pakistani state school! Indeed the state textbooks are full of even worse affronts to Islam, with K.K. Aziz documenting that Mu'ashrati Uloom of District Lahore offered lessons equating the saints to the prophets!

The last lesson is Sardar Abdur Rab Nishtar, who thus finds himself in the company of Adam, Abraham, Moses; Christ and Prophet Mohammed (p.56)...Thus, while the students of Lahore are liable to reckon up Hujveri in the list of prophets, those of Peshawar are faced with a more formidable task – that of accepting Sardar Abdur Rab Nishtar as wearing the nimbus of a

prophet. (K.K. Aziz, *The Murder of History*, 1998, pp. 13-14)

While K.K. Aziz criticized this as an example of too much religiosity, from the opposite end of Pakistan's limited spectrum of thought, the most pious view this as further illustration of the *shirk* taught by the blasphemous state textbooks. In doing so, the curriculum ironically fails to maintain the criterion of Islam defined by itself, as explained by Nayyar and Salim: "For Class IV and V Students, the Urdu curriculum requires that...Pakistan came into being to safeguard Islamic and culture...must know that the real basis for the strength of Pakistan is Islam...**Knows that the national culture is not the local culture or local customs, but that it means the culture the principles of which are laid down by Islam.**" (AH Nayyar and Ahmed Salim, *The Subtle Subversion: The State of Curricula and Textbooks in Pakistan*, 2005, p. 11) But by hoisting the shaikhs to a status beyond what they deserve, the Pakistani syllabus conversely entrenches the local customs of which saint worship belongs, marking their failure to teach the real Islam to its youth by making it appear to students that religious innovations are integral to Islam.

Indeed these frequent commendations of sufi saints provide another reason for the actual Muslims of "Pakistan" to hate the state curricula and its diluted secularism. For when they realize that the schoolchildren are being indoctrinated to revere the likes of Hujwari, they can only feel infuriated, because they know quite well of his – and other sufis - considerable heresy, including Hujwari's habit of attributing weak or fraudulent statements to the Prophet, such as when he wrote, "The Apostle said: 'Thy worst enemy is thy lower soul, which is between thy two sides.'" (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 206) While this might seem innocent enough, any accretion to the Prophet's tradition runs the risk of dissipating the Asuric force of Islam, and we also know Pakistan's favourite sufi to be guilty of much worse, including his brazen promotion of unverified declarations by Allah, including the claim of "a Tradition, which the Apostle received from Gabriel, that God said: 'My friends (saints) are under My cloak: save Me, none knoweth them except My friends.'" (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 63) This, contrary to Hujwari's implication, is without scriptural basis; the Quran, in actuality, is inimical to the whole tradition of monasteries and its devotees. Similarly does the holy book offer no support to the fantasies held by Hujwari and most sufis of timelines related to spirits and souls:

Amr b. Uthman Makkf says in the Kitab-i Mahabbat that God created the souls seven thousand years before the bodies and kept them in the station of proximity and that he created the spirits seven thousand years before the souls and kept them in the degree of intimacy and that he created the hearts seven thousand years before the spirits. (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 309)

This is of course a religious innovation, because the Asura did not ordain any specific timeline or hierarchy within his scripture. But Hujwari, heretic that he was, did not care at all for authenticity, preferring the tales of sufi saints to the infrarationally revealed word of the Quran or the carefully documented sahih hadith. As such, he frequently alleged fraudulent traditions, accounts often based on fabricated revelations from the Prophet or Allah, such as the following: "A certain Shaykh relates that one night he dreamed of the Prophet and said to him: 'O Apostle of God, a tradition has come down to me from thee that God hath upon the earth saints of diverse rank (awtad u awliya u abrar)'; The Apostle said that the relater of the tradition had transmitted it correctly, and in answer to the Shaykh's request that he might see one of these holy men, he said: 'Muhammad b. Idris is one of them.'" (Ali bin Usman al-Jullabi al-Hujwiri, *The Kashf al-Mahjub*, tr. By R.A. Nicholson, 1936, p. 116) If the dreams of the Prophet speaking to them are alone enough to violate the sanctity of the Quran's pronouncements against visions or inspiration, to additionally attribute to Mohammed knowledge of the Unseen – in this case, saints of a diverse rank! – beyond what was Asurically revealed to him, is disgraceful blasphemy.

Yet Hujwari freely persisted in this heresy, attempting to illegally assert it as “Islam”; the apostate Pakistanis likewise bequeath Hujwari a reverence thoroughly undeserved, with K.K. Aziz noting a 5th reprint of District Lahore's Mu'ashrati Ulum also granting him the status of Prophet:

The last lesson on the “Important Personality of Our District” is in praise of Shaikh Ali Hujwari alias Data Ganj Bakhsh. **Tomb worship is thus made a part of instruction at a very early age.** (pp. 75-76) Out of 21 lessons, one is the history of the district of Lahore, 15 on geography, economics and administration, and 5 on Adam, Abraham, Jesus Christ, the Prophet of Islam, and Data Ganj Bakhsh. **Hujwari, popularly known as Data Ganj Bakhsh, is thus firmly and unmistakably placed among the prophets. Probably a majority of Muslim students will believe that Hujwari was a prophet,** and this farcical addition to their knowledge of Islam will become apart of their belief. (K.K. Aziz, *The Murder of History*, 1998, p. 13)

Farcical – or inflammatory to the pious - indeed, for Hujwari was certainly not a prophet, and his exaltation puts to rest the notion of the textbooks seeking to eliminate local customs – the city of Lahore, after all, is the location of Hujwari's famous dargah! This mausoleum, like any sufi shrine, has long been the scene of tomb worship of the pir, a kufr practice which as we know, was encouraged by Hujwari himself. It is thus only appropriate that his apostate sufi “Muslim” followers have sought to emulate his behaviour by attending his grave in devotion, with Rizvi noting that Chishti was one of the early sufi mystics to venerate the tomb:

Later Muslims posthumously conferred on Shaikh Hujwari the title, Data Ganj Bakhsh, ‘Distributor of (Unlimited) Treasure’. **His tomb has always been greatly venerated by sufis and Muslims alike.** Among early mystics who undertook hard ascetic exercises in Lahore at the Shaikh's tomb was Khwaja Mu'inu'd-Din Chishti, the founder of the leading Indian order, the Chishtiyya. (S.A.A. Rizvi, *The History of Sufism in India*, Volume I, p. 112)

But tombs, even when not being used for blasphemous sufi worship, are considered by Islam to be inherently unclean, unworthy of austere Islamic prayer in which the Muslim faces Mecca, with a Tirmidhi hadith graded sahih, narrated by Abu Sa'eed Al-Khudri, reporting that “Allah's Messenger said: ‘All of the earth is a Masjid except for the graveyard and the washroom.’” (Jami al-Tirmidhi Vol. 1, Book 2, Hadith 317) More importantly, as the authentic hadith make indisputable, is the condemnation by the Prophet of the specific practice of grave worship, a censure reported countless times by the collectors, including Bukhari's record of Aisha's and Ibn Abbas' testimony: “On his death-bed Allah's Apostle put a sheet over his-face and when he felt hot, he would remove it from his face. When in that state (of putting and removing the sheet) he said, ‘**May Allah's Curse be on the Jews and the Christians for they build places of worship at the graves of their prophets.**’ (By that) **he intended to warn (the Muslim) from what they (i.e. Jews and Christians) had done.**” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 56, Number 660) Indeed is this practice of tomb worship - designed to help the “Muslim” obtain earthly and afterlife intercession from a ‘saint’ who continues to supernaturally bestow boons upon his followers after his death - also rejected by the Quran, although its repudiation is slightly circuitous in comparison to the hadith's categorical reproach. For in the Quran we find the infrarational revelation that “Neither are the living and the dead alike. **Surely Allah makes whom He pleases hear, and you cannot make those hear who are in the graves.**” (Quran 35:22) While this certainly applies to the deceased sufi ‘saints’, the particulars must be clarified by an authentic hadith:

Narrated Hisham's father:

It was mentioned before Aisha that Ibn Umar attributed the following statement to the Prophet “The dead person is punished in the grave because of the crying and lamentation of his family.” On that, Aisha said, “But Allah's Apostle said, ‘The dead person is punished for his crimes and sins while his family cry over him then.’” **She added, “And this is similar to the statement of**

Allah's Apostle when he stood by the (edge of the) well which contained the corpses of the pagans killed at Badr, 'They hear what I say.' ” She added, “But he said now they know very well what I used to tell them was the truth.” Aisha then recited: ‘You cannot make the dead hear.’ (30.52) and ‘You cannot make those who are in their Graves, hear you.’ (35.22) **that is, when they had taken their places in the (Hell) Fire.** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 5, Book 59, Number 316)

The mention of the butchered Pagans by the Asura's instrument is crucial to understanding the complete aberration of the sufi doctrine of pir intercession from the grave, for just like the Arab Pagans, from the perspective of actual Islam the sufis are unbelievers who will naturally assume a position in the Islamic hellfire, after which they will be *incapable* of hearing prayers, let alone answering them. And prior to this sanctioned denouement, the only possible afterlife activity on the part of the sufi saints will be an impotent audition in the grave mixed with *receiving* punishment, a wretched form of purgatory far removed from the glories attributed to the sufi shaikhs by apostates who consider themselves Muslim. They are instead half-Muslim kuffar who believe their bidats the accurate form of Islam, who think that the cleverness and volume of their disputations unquestionably substantiates their self-identification as Muslim, when in fact the simple matter of grave worship is more than enough to establish them as the modern descendants of similar apostates mentioned in the following Quran verse:

And in like manner We disclosed them (to the people of the city) that they might know that the promise of Allah is true, and that, as for the Hour, there is no doubt concerning it. **When (the people of the city) disputed of their case among themselves, they said: “Build over them a building; their Lord knoweth best concerning them.” Those who won their point said: “We verily shall build a place of worship over them.”** (Quran 18:21)

Such is the speciousness of the sufi arguments that they actually dare to use this verse as justification for their *shirk* of grave worship, when the infrarational revelation first and foremost does *not* permit the practice, and in actuality serves to simply highlight another in the litany of transgressions practised by the unbelievers, with the characterization of dispute crucial to observe. While this particular verse has understandably been interpreted as referring to the alleged pattern of the ancient Arabs killing “prophets” and subsequently erecting mausoleums for worship of those same prophets, irrespective of that consideration, the very language used in the verse easily compliments the many hadith castigating the practice of grave worship of holy men, with the following hadith almost capable of being superimposed over the above Asuric revelation:

Narrated Aisha:

Um Habiba and Um Salama mentioned a church they had seen in Ethiopia and in the church there were pictures. When they told the Prophet of this, he said, **“Those people are such that if a pious man amongst them died, they build a place of worship over his grave and paint these pictures in it. Those people will be Allah's worst creatures on the Day of Resurrection.”** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 5, Book 58, Number 213)

If apostates like the sufis pirs – and their many modern followers - are certainly the worst of creation on the Islamic Day of Judgement, they are similarly among the hated within the life as well, and to the Muslims who are closer (although, as with the Deobandis, not entirely unblemished) to Asuric purity than the likes of the Barelvikuffar, the garish shrines and tomb worship of the sufi saints is the most heinous of insults to Islam, a ‘crime’ of Polytheism punishable by death. And with the growing movement for ‘purity’ in remnant Pakistan - one that by the 21st century could not, if it were to be honest to its ambition, strictly expend its venom on the minuscule Hindu population -, at long last Islamic ‘justice’ reached the blasphemous spaces of sufi grave worship, including a most audacious assault on the heart of subcontinental apostasy from Islam, the Data Durbar Complex of Lahore, home

to the shrine of Ali Hujweri. In this July 2010 mission, unlike a number of attacks on Pakistani sufi locations that destroy the shrines without killing apostates, two suicide bombers murdered around fifty heretics committing *shirk* inside the complex.

This attack was perhaps the most morbidly spectacular of the wave of violence towards sufi shrines in the years surrounding 2010, a wave which encompassed deadly actions towards the dargahs of other renowned – including, as shown, within Pakistani state curricula – sufis like Rahman Baba, whose Peshawar shrine was subject to a bomb blast in March 2009 that belongs to the casualty-free category: However, the tomb of the complex was blown apart, a clear sign of the theological inspiration behind the bombing. While that particular blast – targeting the tomb rather than the apostate sufi worshipper – was in truth a rare example of mercy shown by the more pious Muslims of rump Pakistan, other attacks specifically targeting a place of sufi worship were unforgiving, including the April 2011 Dera Ghazi Khan suicide bombing at the shrine of the 13th century sufi Ahmed Sultan. This particular ‘cleansing’ of more than 50 apostates was notable for the day of its execution – that of the shaikh's *urs*, although the pious mujahideen made sure to detonate at the tomb itself. Another significant bombing among many in this multi-year wave was the October 2010 targeting of Baba Farid's south Lahore shrine, killing six – Baba Farid, we recall, was the pir to the hugely influential Nizamuddin Auliya.

None of this, of course, should come as a surprise – because after the removal of the Hindus, plenty of work remains for the cognizant Muslim, the one who actually knows what his scripture ordains and who is free of the prevalent Polytheism of “Muslim Pakistan”. Indeed the genuine Muslim of the Asuric land knows that the Barelvikuffar are certainly of those worthy of the “double punishment” mentioned in the Quran, for they have obeyed, instead of Allah, their heretical “leaders” and “great men” like Ahmad Riza Khan:

Surely Allah has cursed the unbelievers and has prepared for them a burning fire, To abide therein for a long time. They shall not find a protector or a helper. On the day when their faces shall be turned back into the fire, they shall say: “O would that we had obeyed Allah and obeyed the Messenger!” And they shall say: **“O our Lord! Surely we obeyed our leaders and our great men, so they led us astray from the path.” “O our Lord! Give them a double punishment** and curse them with a great curse.” (Quran 33:64-68)

While the double punishment mentioned is more likely an additional burden in the afterlife, the verses certainly help to reinforce the status of Barelvīs, so-called Muslims, as kuffar whose *shirk*, as the believer knows, has failed to transform after over a century of fatwas against their depraved practices. The genuine Muslim is also aware that his religion, the ‘true religion’ of Islam, offers a much simpler solution to this historic problem: Violence. The Barelvikuffar, after all, are apostates, and the authentic scripture is clear that the apostates are to be executed – whether one by one or through mass deaths by bombings and gunfire. And as the most pious Muslims are always more comprehensively indoctrinated with Asuric Islam, violence becomes a near-instantaneous preference, especially when the hypocrites have failed to heed countless verbal and other relatively minor warnings by predecessors. Understanding – as they are half-Muslim themselves – this pious propensity towards unceasing violence, the kafir Pakistani state responded to the initial wave of anti-sufi terrorism by increasing security at sufi shrines:

Prodded by protests that demanded more security, the government of Punjab, which oversees more than 500 shrines, is spending \$400,000 on increased security at 15 of its major shrines this year, including the installation of cameras, security gates and metal detectors. At some shrines, officials said donors had paid for new security installations. (New York Times, *The Islam that Hardliners Hate*, 6 January 2011)

Though this is certainly a reasonable response to the major incidents of terrorism suffered by a state

that, foolishly, invoked the strategy of Islamic terrorism – “death by a thousand cuts” - against India while crucially failing to realize that actual Islam labels *them* as apostates, the ironic nature of the situation is additionally highlighted by the money spent by the artificial state in protecting itself from the very religion it sought independence in the name of! Remnant Pakistan, whose initial boundaries were created to allow an unencumbered (by Hindus) space for Islam to breathe, now finds its hybrid – and thus apostate - idea of Islam under attack by forces that they confuse for misguided “extremists”, when the sordid reality is that the latter ultra-Asuras are trying to bring the ‘light’ of Islam to the rest of the populace. Presently, the inevitable culmination of Pakistan's destiny of falsehood, the utter annihilation of its rump existence, appears to have withdrawn, with the sufi shrines experiencing a relative security in the last few years. But this is the proverbial calm before the storm, even if the irresistible revival of violence against the sufis might – but only if the Arab financed efforts enact comprehensive rural change to the ongoing Bareilvi dominance – be of less intensity than what would currently be required.

Indeed this latter aspect – the continued quantity of Bareilvikuffar – is as previously discussed one of the main reasons for the reduction in attacks on sufis in recent years, for the literalist, more pious – though if they adhere to Deobandi doctrine on private application of Sufism, they cannot be considered *most* pious – Muslims cannot be more than one-fifth of the population. Thus everywhere the ‘pure’ Pakistani looks, he invariably finds kuffar, with the infidel abominations like shrines to sufi shaikhs hurting his fragile sentiments. Among those who share that heinous infidelity, we recall, include the Shi’ites, who although heretics like the Bareilvis, represent a far more achievable task to the pious heroes attempting to decontaminate “Pakistan”. The Shia percentage, we recall, is a more manageable – to the takfiri mujahideen – total of around twenty percent, and attacks against the Shia are crucially not met – in large part because the majority Bareilvis adhere to the condemnations of Shi’ites expressed by Ahmad Riza – with anywhere close to the same consternation seen in the aftermath of the murders at sufi shrines, divergent reactions that likely played a role in the recalibration of takfiri objectives away from spectacular attacks on the sufikuffar.

As the Bareilvis remain the largest contingent of “Muslims”, the heroic – the Asura of Falsehood's usurpation of heroism - takfiris have realized that it is simply more efficient to currently target and concentrate their resources on the problem of Shi’ism within the country – indeed the jihadi attacks in recent years have a clear orientation towards the Shia in comparison to the targeting of Bareilvi shrines or even Ahmadis and Hindus! The former are still too numerous; the latter two are insignificant. Indeed the Shia are just of the right demographic percentage to pose – especially with potential Shi’ite Iranian backing – a threat to the more pious Sunnis (including, of course, the Sunni Arab financial backers of Pakistani mujahideen, for whom the latter must make sure to present evidence of progress by way of killing the Shia whom the Sunni Arabs despise), and as the foolish Bareilvikuffar likewise consider Shia as unbelievers (and are thus indifferent to their murder), the more pious can continue in a piecemeal and Asurically efficient manner without much street-level opposition - the Bareilvis, in Niemollerian fashion, will be addressed later.

The comparison to Niemoller however, is only superficially fitting with the Bareilvis, because the German eventually discarded his Asuric views, whereas the Bareilvis maintain their hatred toward Hindus and other non-Muslims. It is a doctrine that is often forgotten by talk of the supposed Bareilvi tolerance, was yet again on display after the assassination of politician Salman Taseer in January 2011 by Mumtaz Qadri, a member of his police protection. Qadri's motivation for the murder was Taseer's support for a Christian woman who had been sentenced to death under Pakistan's farcical blasphemy laws that somehow fail to apply to its rampant Sufism, a sect whose mere presence is an insult to Islam. Qadri was – he has since been hanged to death -, as one might suspect, a Bareilvikafir himself; and to the Bareilvis, he is a hero, because he killed someone that worked for the officially classified non-

Muslims – in this case a Christian, although that category of course includes the Hindus. It is a stark reminder that the Bareilvis, like almost all other sufis bar a handful of hululis, offer absolutely nothing for Hindu polity, because while they fail to recognize their own apostasy – as seen in the catalogue of charges against Bareilvism, such as its saints who have divine-like powers including intercession, its excessive praise of the Prophet beyond the point of idolatry, its *shirk* through grave worship of its shaikhs, its worship of Mohammed and belief that he is eternal and made of *nur*, and other externals like celebrating anniversaries of pirs and other Islamic figures -, they nevertheless adhere to the standard Islamic hatred and doctrine of murdering unbelievers.

The Bareilvi virulence was especially observed in their reaction to both Qadri's 'heroism' and the subsequent response of the state to charge and execute him. For just days after the murder of Taseer, "The largest body of the Bareilvi group, the Jamaate Ahle Sunnat Pakistan (JASP), whose directions are considered binding on every other organisation that follows the same school of thought, issued a statement saying that 'No Muslim should attend the funeral or even try to pray for Salman Taseer or even express any kind of regret or sympathy over the incident.' " (Express Tribune Pakistan, *Hardline Stance: Religious bloc condones murder*, 5 January 2011) Similarly, days after the state punished Qadri with death, hundreds of thousands took to the streets to mourn and protest the death of this "martyr". As expected, this excessive lamentation, this apparent display of their Islamic purity, was yet accompanied by an unmitigated reminder of their unregenerate apostasy, for though the Bareilvi actions highlighted their hatred towards *brethren* kuffar like the secularists and Hindus and Christians, their idolization of Qadri has arrived with innovations related to the grave!

But almost 400 km away...**is the evolving shrine of Mumtaz Qadri in the Bara Kahu neighbourhood in the suburbs of the capital city, Islamabad.** The grave, which was dug in the middle of an empty ground and is likely to turn into a blooming shrine, **attracts hundreds of people every day who come to pray for his forgiveness** and salute his bravery for and commitment to standing up for his religion and dying for it. **There are flowers strewn on his grave every day and free food served to whoever visits**, which is bound to attract more people. Over 2,50,000 people attended the funeral of a man who is a criminal in the eyes of Pakistan's Supreme Court. ...

What is certainly new is the strange caution among those visiting the Qadri shrine. The voices criticising the government's perceived unfairness get muffled in the sound of the *azaan*. The manner in which the mob was stopped from joining Qadri's family for the burial is a definite signal to his father and other family members that they ought not to cross certain limits. **It is all right for the traders of Lahore to weigh Qadri's father in gold or to contribute to the building of the shrine**, but it must not be a space for political rebellion. (The Hindu, *Making of a shrine in Pakistan*, 14 March 2016)

The heresy of both the majority Bareilvis and government of fragmented Pakistan continues to be conspicuous, with the former adopting the shrine as a place for prayers (although not, *as of yet*, directed toward Mumtaz Qadri himself), the latter refusing to abolish the shrine when as supposed guardians of an *Islamic* state, they should be eliminating such potential places of *shirk*. The same article also recognizes a crucial element to the ironic Bareilvi agitation towards blasphemers and those, like Taseer, cooperating with blasphemers, with the author noting that "In the last decade or so, they seem to be gathering support and using the issue of blasphemy in order to push back their ideological opponents - the Deobandis and the Ahl-Hadith - represented by the Jaish-e-Mohammad (JeM) and the Lashkar-e-Taiba/Jamaat-ud-Dawa (LeT/JuD) respectively. Although blasphemy is a dicey issue to tackle, Bareilvi extremism has not won support from the government as in the case of the Deobandi and Ahl-e-Hadith militancy, which, over the years, tweaked their ideology to accommodate the Pakistan state's military-strategic objectives." (The Hindu, *Making of a shrine in Pakistan*, 14 March 2016) This is similar to

Ahmad Riza's strategy – born out of weakness – of incessant fatwas to subconsciously redirect attention from one's own failings, including deficient militancy. For though modern Barelvis – especially of the “Pakistan” Punjab – largely comprise the genocidal Pakistani army, their last exploits involved the extermination of Bengal Hindus and *munaḥiqun* long ago in 1971. The Pakistani army has since turned to outsourcing jihad to officially non-state actors *also* patronized by the army's same Gulf benefactors; hence the rise of the Deobandi and Ahl-e Hadith, who will also not hesitate to attack half-Muslims like the Barelvis – *or* the Pakistani army - if circumstances are favourable.

Indeed as the Barelvikuffar only have – because of their inability to wage jihad against their preferred Hindu target - minor obfuscations left to keep their own apostasy inconspicuous, and as they cannot ideologically progress in either direction – whether towards the light of accepting multiple paths of worship besides Sufism and Islam, or in the direction of actual Islam that rejects Sufism -, their destiny – assuming “Pakistan” remains viable - is in receiving an earthly Islamic ‘justice’. After all, their internal enemies increase in power and hatred thanks to the proliferation of “hardline”, Arab-funded madrassas that grow directly at the expense of Barelvi numbers. For the “extremist” madrassas, from which genuine Islam – barring the Deobandi acquiescence to certain sufi principles – is almost entirely promoted from birth, understand that the primary problem facing rump Pakistan is Sufism, either in its entirety (the view of Ahl-e Hadith and others) or its grotesque public features (Deobandis agree on this point). Indeed the heresies of the state leadership can be traced to an education glorifying sufis, and a number of remnant Pakistan's politicians are known to visit sufi shrines, the practice of which brings to mind the patronage of sufi dargahs by medieval Islamic rulers who were severely violent toward the Hindus. But the circumstances of those times were far different, because the Muslim percentage of the population was then marginal, and the sufi blasphemy could be overlooked to a certain degree, as happens in a modern India sharing similar demographics, where justified *ideological* attacks continue to take place on sufi practices prevalent to Indian “Muslims”. These particular ‘purification’ drives are not, as observed in the following report of controversial 2016 attempts by Tamil Nadu Islamic organizations to eradicate Sufism, combined with the same violence seen in fragmented Pakistan:

The Tamil Nadu Thowheed Jamath's (TNTJ) decision to go ahead with ‘Shirk Ozhippu Maanadu’, a campaign against what it terms as superstitions and un-Islamic beliefs, on January 31 in Tiruchi has come in for criticism from certain sections of the community.

TNTJ has said it would strive to raise awareness about how praying in dargahs, belief in astrology, black magic and other occult practices are un-Islamic. This has angered many Islamic groups, including Sunnath Jamath Federation of Coimbatore District (a federation of 70 Jamaths in the district) which filed a petition against TNTJ claiming that it had “hurt the sentiments” by speaking against certain mosques and other religious practices of a section of the community.

While TNTJ's state president Fakir Mohammed Al-Thafi maintained that the outfit is only spreading the ‘right Islam’, other Muslim outfits claimed that such a conference would only create more divisions within the community and between other religious communities in Tamil Nadu. “We are against dargah worship, astrology and other superstitious beliefs because they are not Islamic. Those who are opposing it are doing so to safeguard their financial interests and people are being exploited. We are confident that the courts and the law enforcement agencies will give us police protection and let us conduct the conference,” said Fakir Mohammed Al-Thafi.

Stating that the opposing Muslim groups are right in saying that “we are trying to promote one form of Islam”, he said that the outfit is doing it because it believed that this is the right way of practising the faith. “Just because there is a tradition, we don't have to continue to follow it. **What's there in the Holy Koran is the right form of Islam,” he added.**

Indian National League leader J. Abdul Rahim said that any talk of ‘eradicating *shirk*’ is not possible without discussing anti-idol worship message of Islam.

Thameemun Ansari, general secretary, Manithaneya Makkal Katchi, made it clear that the party would not get involved or take sides in controversial religious debates taking place within the community. (The Hindu, *TNTJ's meet creates rift among Muslim outfits*, 28 January 2016)

Although the TNTJ, like their pious brethren to the Northwest, have met with significant opposition by “Muslims” who allege to Islam numerous bidats, the organization is not without significant support, or at least interest, as seen in the six-figure turnout to their event:

TIRUCHY: ‘Allah-hu-Akhbar’ was the unanimous call of over **one lakh believers** of Islam, who had converged here on Sunday, for ‘Shirk Ozhippu Maanadu’ organised by Tamil Nadu Thowheed Jamaath.

The conference was organised to stress the ‘one-almighty’ ideology and also to clear the superstitions persisting across the country. It began with various cultural events in the morning followed by debates on topics related to the situations existing in Islam.

The focus of the debate was on the concept of Dargah worship; it being against Islam ideology as Quran does not encourage such worships, claimed debaters. Nineteen resolutions were passed on various religious and political aspects, with stress on certain decisions like worship only Allah, do not believe in black-magic, **do not believe anyone as the one equal to almighty.** (The New Indian Express, ‘*Anti-Shirk*’ Meet Stirs Dargah Worship Debate, 1 February 2016)

That the TNTJ has not yet implemented a full-scale *violent* assault on the degenerate ‘Islamic’ practices prevalent, is not because of any significant ideological difference with their pious Pakistani counterparts, but rather a case of both pragmatics and the historic pattern of Islamic violence under similar circumstances. Indeed the real difference between the genuine Muslims of Tamil Nadu and their brethren Muslims of “Pakistan” is simply their respective locations on the destructive Asuric cycle of Islam. For Tamil Nadu is majority Hindu, and the pious Muslims of the state understand that their initial objective is to weaken the self-identified non-Muslims of the region; thus they will – as was done by subcontinental Islamic organizations before the “Muslims” obtained their own political state – only engage the sufi supporters in debate, refraining from any violence or bombings, as that would be detrimental for reasons of attracting the wrong sort of attention from the unbelievers, and the fact that many of the half-Muslims are nevertheless useful in weakening or targeting the Hindus, whether through violence or other nefarious tactics like “love jihad”.

In a completely “Muslim” arrangement like rump Pakistan however, any divergence from the expected utopia leads to *sustained* scrutiny against the practices of some of the “Muslims” who might be deemed the causes of ‘impurity’ – an investigation that initially labels the heretics for what they are. And if non-violent efforts against these apostates do not yield the appropriate conversion, the pious are relatively quick to cull the “hypocrites” and other pretend Muslims, because the latter have become *the new Hindus*, the fresh category of “disbelievers” to be sacrificed at the altar of an Asuric faith that is inevitably concerned with murder and destruction and chaos. That the sufis of “Pakistan” are not first in line for extermination is only due to pragmatics, and the half-Sunni, half-sufi, utterly apostate Barelvi Sufism, ironically because of the very Asuric shariat it idolizes, must find itself destroyed if ‘purity’ is to arrive in “Pakistan”. For the contents of the Quran and Hadith are inimical to Sufism, and although the sufis *exhort* the shariat, this paradoxically serves to arouse the attention of the orthodoxy and motivates them to cleanse Sufism from the land.

It is a rhythm seen in the various nations – from the Levant to Persia and Transoxiana – where Sufism

previously flourished, and where the deviant practice petered out (to the extent that no great works followed the early sufi mystics). Similarly must Sufism and its followers die in “Pakistan”, at least if the real Muslims living there want to make the land Asurically pure. And if it may appear at this point that the worst has already happened, that the initial paroxysm has passed the sufis by, eventually the inverse of purity, the Asura of Falsehood's Islam, will assert itself. For not only will the Barelvis be next in line after the Shias are reduced to the levels of the Ahmadis and Hindus and Christians, another of the reasons for the reduction in Pakistani violence, the redirection of mujahideen attention to Syria and other Islamic insurrections, will eventually make a virulent return to “Pakistan”, because either the militants will proceed home more violent than ever, or the “extremist” mindset will radiate from these Caliphate lands towards younger Pakistanis, setting the scene for more violence, especially when we consider the steady erosion of Barelvi dominance thanks to Gulf money.

At a point soon to arrive (since the Shia appear unable to resist their steady demise), the Barelvis, faced with an insurmountable financial obstacle and unable to redirect pious hatred toward Hindus or more heretical Islamic sub-sects like the Ahmadiyya, will have for final recourse the favoured pastime of the Asura: bloodshed. It is a tactic not at all unfamiliar to the Barelvis, if we recall their participation in the Asuric genocide committed by the 1971 Pakistani army: The difference is that they will now have to take up arms against their fellow “Muslim” neighbours. It will be a difficult task for the Barelvis, even with their majority, for while they adhere to an Asuric doctrine, they are not as organized or focused as the more pious, a perilous defect in an artificial construct which the Barelvis themselves helped create through an ideological insistence on separation from the Hindus. For as “Pakistan” is the work of the Asura of Falsehood, where his religion of Islam has been placed on a pedestal, it was only a matter of time before it fulfilled the traditional Asuric destiny, one guided by the axiom incessantly promoted by Hitler, that strength is above all else. Indeed in an Asuric stronghold, the strongest one prevails, and we currently find the Wahhabis and Wahhabi-lites ascendant, not only due to Gulf money but also because they are willing to resort to extreme and depraved violence which their more heretic opponents are unwilling to do. For it is a far different matter to face the suicide bombers and remorseless violence of the ‘purer’ Muslims than the simplicity of killing minority civilian Hindus, and the time when ceaseless fatwas – as in Ahmad Riza's *Fatawa-i-Rizvia* – were enough to subdue the pious, has long gone: What can only occur now, if the Barelvis are to survive, is an overall increase in their homicidal efficiency and psychopathy, because the Barelvis are incapable of solving the matter by the judicious use of violence, as they have already acquiesced to an Asuric path through their doctrine and past actions.

That the Barelvis are next does not subsequently mean that they will be the last to meet the perpetual Asuric purge. For while their Deobandi opponents have clearly demonstrated a commitment to eliminating – through violence – the degenerate *public* sufi practices of the land of the impure, they are themselves not without heresy. Thus irrespective of how much bloodshed and killing of apostates they perversely accomplish, the Deobandis will (assuming they adhere to the *private* sufi principles established by their founders) eventually be culled - though they will be saved for later, after the obvious Ahmadiyya, Hindus, Christians, Shi'ites and Barelvi unbelievers. For most Deobandis are secret – even to themselves – renegades from Islam, adopting a sufi doctrine at odds with the Asura's religion. And Allah certainly knows what they do, because as the Quran has informed, “He knoweth the traitor of the eyes, and that which the bosoms hide.” (Quran 40:19) The subtle Deobandi traitors to Islam are – just as the Barelvis and Ahmadiyyas and Shi'ites, who all contributed to Partition and its horrors – merely paving the way for their own destruction at the hands of a ‘purer’ and more Asuric beast that they are creating by way of their *own* Asuric actions. But they cannot help themselves, because they are – even with their private sufi accretions – attempting to follow the infrarational word of the Quran, the one that demands that religion be made “pure”:

Therefore (O believers) pray unto Allah, making religion pure for Him (only), however

much the disbelievers be averse. (Quran 40:14)

Unfortunately, the land created for the pure “Muslims” continues to fail in fulfilling its self-appointed task, and the Deobandis and others must take up the mantle and move beyond prayer into the sanctioned violence to bring about the illusive ‘purity’ that the unclean Barelvis and others are obstructing. But as the Deobandi doctrine is full of internal *shirk*, as it allows for meditation and private worship of the pir, they can only function as a transitional tool to arrive at an achievement of ‘purity’ in which Sufism is completely annihilated, with the shift inevitably consuming the ‘heroic’ Deobandis, who will be usurped by a fresh breed of evermore ‘virtuous’ Muslims taking infrarational inspiration from the Quran:

But what is the matter with them that they do not believe, And when the Quran is recited to them they do not make obeisance? Nay! Those who disbelieve deny the truth. **And Allah knows best what they hide, So announce to them a painful punishment**, Except those who believe and do good; for them is a reward that shall never be cut off. (Quran 84:20-25)

While this passage is technically describing the *hellfire* that awaits the likes of Deobandis who secretly adhere to sufi principles, we know that it can certainly be used in conjunction with complimentary infrarational revelations and hadith to justify their earthly slaughter. Indeed ultimately, both the Deobandis and Barelvis are kuffar and should – if “Pakistan” wishes to be Asurically pure – meet the same fate as the Hindus and Christians and Ahmadiyyas and Shi’ites. For the two sub-sects want to have things both ways, to have their blasphemous sufi mystic paths – whether performed privately or publicly – accommodated, yet to also be heralded as faithful scholars of Islam, when they should be rejecting Sufism in its *entirety*, because their infrarational mystic paths lead instead to heresies by way of innovations – subtle and overt – to Islam, additions that are antagonistic to the core of the Asura of Falsehood’s religion. It is instead only the shariat, the Quran and authentic hadith, that should suffice for the believers, for their worldly life and for esoteric considerations: This is the only way to be ‘pure’, the only choice available for the Muslims.

* * * *

The psychopathic murderers who stalk the land ironically alleged to be a bastion for the pure, the pious who have been trained, almost from birth, to kill and maim the apostates and unbelievers, are not at all concerned that their destruction is wrong, because they have been indoctrinated with the Quran and authentic hadith, and are firm in all of their beliefs – including the need to murder the impure apostates. For unlike the half-Muslims who surround them, the more pious of ‘the land of the pure’, the ones who risk their lives in jihad against those hypocrites, assume that their ‘purity’ cannot be questioned, because as “The Prophet said, ‘**Subhan Allah! A believer never becomes impure.**’” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 1, Book 5, Number 281) Indeed unless these killers have been initiated into a sufic order – somewhat possible for the Deobandi educated -, their confidence is justifiable, since as we recall, the very idea of purity is inverted by the Asura of Falsehood, whose religion twists it into an unthinking obedience that demands a blind following of the rules, however depraved. But these psychopaths are not adhering to the rules for the mere sake – as if they were actually robots - of following rules, because the Asura knows that he has to dangle some type of carrot to further motivate his slaves.

That reward, however, is far from the luminous transcendence of Self-Realization or even the intermediate mystic experiences of the sufis. The Asura of Falsehood, as we know, only calls to the crude objectives of mankind – his craving for power, his desire for money and material objects, his primitive version of nationalism and group-ego, even his unrefined lust. And it is according to this

same manuscript, the one that has always given the Asura of Falsehood *temporary* success historically, that this fount of evil flourishes in the land of the impure. He is ably assisted in his machinations by the confused, partially secular, partially sufi, partially Muslim elite of the artificial construct, who although capable of pontificating on issues foreign to them, whether that be India or distant nations, have done nothing to alleviate a pervasive feudal-based poverty, let alone the rampant hatred towards the ‘other’ that defines their ‘purity’. Into this void have stepped the most pious, who as previously noted, have used direct cash-inducements to obtain youthful recruits from impoverished families:

The local Deobandi or Ahl-e-Hadith maulana will generally be introduced to the family through these organizations. He will work to convince the parents that their poverty is a direct result of their family's deviation from “the true path of Islam” through “idolatrous” worship at local Sufi shrines and/or with local Sufi Peers. **The maulana suggests that the quickest way to return to “favor” would be to devote the lives of one or two of their sons to Islam.** The maulana will offer to educate these children at his madrassa and to find them employment in the service of Islam. The concept of “martyrdom” is often discussed and the family is promised that if their sons are “martyred” both the sons and the family will attain “salvation” and the family will obtain God's favor in this life, as well. **An immediate cash payment is finally made to the parents to compensate the family for its “sacrifice” to Islam.** (Wikileaks, *Extremist Recruitment on the Rise in Southern Punjab*, 13 November 2008)

As is plainly evident, the poverty-stricken children of “Pakistan” are knowingly exchanged by their parents for money, the parents well aware that their youth are being trained with the possibility that they might be martyred in the name of Islam. While this indoctrination will likely include military training to facilitate attacks on apostate “Muslims” and additional non-believers, the children will first be brainwashed with an education strictly limited to the Quran and authentic hadith, since the more pious of “Pakistan” know that different forms of tutelage are capable of assimilating dreaded bidats, corrupting the minds of these potentially ‘pure’ Muslims. As part of this indoctrination, as part of this laboratory of hatred that can only devour, the children will, in addition to the vile Islamic scripture against the Hindus and apostates like the sufis and Shia, absorb an economic angle to the failures of the Pakistani state to promote genuine Islam, because the feudal lords of the state – irrespective of their other heresies – financially reflect a certain type of disbeliever infrarationally *revealed* by Allah:

Coin for them a similitude: Two men, unto one of whom We had assigned two gardens of grapes, and We had surrounded both with date-palms and had put between them tillage. Each of the gardens gave its fruit and withheld naught thereof. And We caused a river to gush forth therein. **And he had fruit. And he said unto his comrade, when he spake with him: “I am more than thee in wealth, and stronger in respect of men.”** And he went into his garden, while he (thus) was unjust to himself. He said: “I think not that all this will ever perish. I think not that the Hour will ever come, and if indeed I am brought back unto my Lord I surely shall find better than this as a resort.” His comrade, when he (thus) spake with him, exclaimed: “Disbelievest thou in Him Who created thee of dust, then of a drop (of seed), and then fashioned thee a man? But He is Allah, my Lord, and I ascribe unto my Lord no partner. If only, when thou enteredst thy garden, thou hadst said: ‘That which Allah willeth (will come to pass)! There is no strength save in Allah!’ **Though thou seest me as less than thee in wealth and children, Yet it may be that my Lord will give me better than thy garden, and will send on it a bolt from heaven, and some morning it will be a smooth hillside, Or some morning the water thereof will be lost in the earth so that thou canst not make search for it.**” And his fruit was beset (with destruction). Then began he to wring his hands for all that he had spent upon it, when (now) it was all ruined on its trellises, and to say: “Would that I had ascribed no partner to my Lord!” And he had no troop of men to help him as against Allah, nor

could he save himself. In this case is protection only from Allah, the True, He is Best for reward, and best for consequence. (Quran 18:32-44)

This passage can certainly be used to legalize attacks against the wealthier half-Muslims of “Pakistan”, including the land-owners - the believers aware that the scripture deems it an authorized fate. Indeed a Taliban push into the Swat Valley (that was eventually repulsed) specifically targeted the landlord elite, with the New York Times reporting, “The Taliban have advanced deeper into Pakistan by engineering a class revolt that exploits profound fissures between a small group of wealthy landlords and their landless tenants, according to government officials and analysts here. ...**In Swat, accounts from those who have fled now make clear that the Taliban seized control by pushing out about four dozen landlords who held the most power.**” (New York Times, *Taliban Exploit Class Rifts in Pakistan*, 16 April 2009) But if successes like these are spectacular, at this moment in time they do not represent sustainable gains, for much work remains to be done in ‘purifying’ the state from its part-secular, part-Western, part-sufi, part-Islamic condition. Thus the passages in the Quran containing the economic angle are mostly used to remind the brainwashed children that if the apostate Pakistani elite might be greater in wealth than them, the latter are yet heretics and will not be privy to the “double reward” Allah bestows upon the real Muslims:

And We never sent a warner to a town, but those who led lives in ease in it said: “We are surely disbelievers in what you are sent with.” And they say: “We have more wealth and children, and we shall not be punished.” Say (O Mohammed): “Surely my Lord amplifies the means of subsistence for whom He pleases and straitens (for whom He pleases), but most men do not know.” **And not your wealth nor your children, are the things which bring you near Us in station, but whoever believes and does good, these it is for whom is a double reward for what they do, and they shall be secure in the highest places.** And (as for) those who strive in opposing Our communications, they shall be caused to be brought to the chastisement. Say: “Surely my Lord amplifies the means of subsistence for whom He pleases of His servants and straitens (them) for whom (He pleases), and whatever thing you spend, He exceeds it in reward, and He is the best of Sustainers.” (Quran 34:34-39)

The emphasis placed by Islam on this class division, a result of Mohammed's – and his companion's – lack of respective standing prior to acquiring power, is in typically Asuric fashion, without nuance. For though a preoccupation with wealth and children is a sign of the ordinary *avidya* or Ignorance, to use it as another means to separate mortals into divisions of belief and disbelief is the classic Asuric mechanism of exaggerating Ignorance into Falsehood. The Sanatana Dharma, on the other hand, approaches the reality of family and wealth from the principle of attachment, and offers the aspiration of elevating one's psychology to the sattvic guna whereupon egoistic attachment to money and family can be relinquished, *even if* one remains living with the family and working in the world – a different perspective from the medieval Indian lapse into severe asceticism as the remedy for attachment to family and wealth. What Hinduism certainly does not do is overstate the importance of financial differences to the point where, as in Islam, poverty becomes associated with the means to a greater afterlife. But if this is certainly an excess on the part of Islam, from a practical standpoint it has partially contributed to a far more virulent aspect of *takfir* - the all-prevalent suicide bomber.

For the suicide attackers used in “Pakistan” and other Islamic battlegrounds throughout the planet do not solely consist of those *fully* indoctrinated later in life, such as the 9/11 terrorists. In fragmented Pakistan especially, the use of child or teenage suicide bombers is frequent; one account, from the American Public Broadcasting Service documentary “Pakistan: Children of the Taliban”, contains an interview with Taliban member Qari Abdullah that quotes him, when asked about the use of children to carry out suicide attacks, as saying, “ ‘Children are tools to achieve God’s will. And whatever comes your way, you sacrifice it.’ He then reveals that he recruits children as young as 5, 6, and 7 years old.”

Of course, most of the actual bombers are marginally older – usually teenagers - than such precocious ages; it is just that the process of indoctrination begins at the earliest age possible. This is the age from which the most pious can take advantage of their financial leverage, because the parents know they cannot afford basic necessities otherwise; and from this, the pious have no resistance in capturing the minds of youth for whatever evil purpose they might desire of them, including suicide bombing. But this latter objective, as it opposes the instinctive will to live in all mortals, must arrive with it a corresponding call to something considered greater than life: In this case, it is the Islamic paradise for which the indoctrinated children will – after years of exclusive brainwashing – happily sacrifice their lives. The Quran, after all, has repeatedly told them of the great rewards that await them on the Day of Judgement:

And thus have We revealed to you an Arabic Quran, that you may warn the mother city and those around it, and that you may give warning of the Day of gathering together wherein is no doubt. **A party shall be in the garden and (another) party in the burning fire.** And if Allah had pleased He would surely have made them a single community, but He makes whom He pleases enter into His mercy, and the unjust it is that shall have no guardian or helper. Or have they taken guardians besides Him? But Allah is the Guardian, and He gives life to the dead, and He has power over all things. (Quran 42:07-09)

This garden, while pleasant enough on its own, will also be one where the believer will find for himself the fulfilment of all of his desires - in direct contrast, as the following Quran passage confirms, to the apostates and other unbelievers who take various gods or ‘saints’ besides Allah: “Say: ‘**Is this better or the abiding garden which those who guard (against evil) are promised? That shall be a reward and a resort for them. They shall have therein what they desire abiding (in it);** it is a promise which it is proper to be prayed for from your Lord.’ **And on the day when He shall gather them, and whatever they worshipped besides Allah, He shall say: ‘Was it you who led astray these My servants, or did they themselves go astray from the path?’** They shall say: ‘Glory be to Thee. It was not befitting for us that we should take any guardians besides Thee, but Thou didst make them and their fathers to enjoy until they forgot the reminder, and became lost folk.’ (Allah will say) ‘So they shall indeed give you the lie in what you say, then you shall not be able to ward off (the punishment) or help.’ And whoever among you is unjust, We will make him taste a great chastisement.” (Quran 25:15-19) Having had both the fear of the great punishment, along with the enticement of abundant desires within the Paradise of Murderers, all instilled through years of brainwashing, the teenage suicide bombers become eager to kill, as they ‘know’ the Quran to provide a reward quite appealing to their nascent life-urges, a certain desire unlikely to be fulfilled within a world where they only have a future of poverty:

So woe on that Day to those who reject (the truth), Those who sport entering into vain discourses. The day on which they shall be driven away to the fire of hell with violence. (It will be said to them): “This is the fire which you used to give the lie to. Is it magic then or do you not see? Enter into it, then bear (it) patiently, or do not bear (it) patiently, it is the same to you. You shall be requited only (for) what you did.” **Surely those who guard (against evil) shall be in gardens and bliss.** Rejoicing because of what their Lord gave them, and their Lord saved them from the punishment of the burning fire. (And it is said unto them): Eat and drink in health (as a reward) for what ye used to do, Reclining on ranged couches. **And we wed them unto fair ones with wide, lovely eyes.** (Quran 52:11-20)

However, before Allah can drive the kuffar to the ‘revealed’ fate, they must first be killed on earth - it is here that the pious indoctrinated youth of “Pakistan” complete their duty by dispatching the erring apostates to hell, with violence. The believers meanwhile – assuming that they have also perished along with the heretics - find themselves in heaven, having been saved – thanks to their steadfast refusal to

practice the Asura's inverted definition of evil – from the hellfire. It is a discrepancy, between saved and doomed, adherent and deviant, found in all of the passages – including the following - offering the boon of lovely wives to the believers in heaven; the latter device used by the Asura to fortify a fear and reward strategy intended to maintain the enslavement of the pious Muslim:

And when it is said to them: “Guard against what is before you and what is behind you, that mercy may be had on you.” And there comes not to them a communication of the communications of their Lord but they turn aside from it. And when it is said to them: “Spend out of what Allah has given you”, those who disbelieve say to those who believe: “Shall we feed him whom, if Allah please, He could feed? You are in naught but clear error.” And they say: “When will this threat come to pass, if you are truthful?” They wait not for aught but a single cry which will overtake them while they yet contend with one another. So they shall not be able to make a bequest, nor shall they return to their families. And the trumpet shall be blown, when lo! from their graves they shall hasten on to their Lord. They shall say: “O woe to us! Who has raised us up from our sleeping-place?” This is what the Beneficent Allah promised and the messengers told the truth. There would be naught but a single cry, when lo! they shall all be brought before Us. So this day no soul shall be dealt with unjustly in the least, and you shall not be rewarded aught but that which you did. **Surely the dwellers of the garden shall on that day be in an occupation quite happy. They and their wives shall be in shades, reclining on raised couches. They shall have fruits therein, and they shall have whatever they desire.** (Quran 36:45-57)

The feast or famine afterlife dichotomy – incessantly imparted upon the suicide bombers and other Islamic murderers from an early age – is on display again in the following passage, from the assumed holiest of books, the only ‘wisdom’ a Muslim requires. In it, we find the wives mentioned previously to be quite alluring in nature:

I swear by those who draw themselves out in ranks and those who drive away (evil) with reproof, and those who recite, being mindful, most surely your Allah is One! ...Surely We have adorned the nearest heaven with an adornment, the stars, And (there is) a safeguard against every rebellious Satan. They cannot listen to the exalted assembly and they are thrown at from every side, Being driven off, and for them is a perpetual chastisement, Except him who snatches off but once, then there follows him a brightly shining flame. Then ask them (O Mohammed) whether they are stronger in creation or those (others) whom We have created. Surely We created them of firm clay. Nay! You wonder while they mock, And when they are reminded, they heed not, And when they see a sign they incite one another to scoff, And they say: “This is nothing but clear magic. What! When we are dead and have become dust and bones, shall we then certainly be raised (again)? Or our fathers of yore?” Say (O Mohammed): “Ye, in truth, and ye shall be brought low.” So it shall only be a single cry, when lo, they shall see. And they shall say: “O woe to us! This is the day of requital.” (A voice will say) “This is the day of the judgment that you called a lie.” (As said to the Angels): “Gather together those who were unjust and their wives, **and what they used to worship Besides Allah, then lead them to the way to hell.** And stop them, for they shall be questioned: ‘What is the matter with you that you do not help each other?’” Nay! On that day they shall be submissive. And some of them shall advance towards others, questioning each other. They shall say: “Surely you used to come to us from the right side.” They shall reply: “Nay, you (yourselves) were not believers, And we had no authority over you, but you were an inordinate people, So the sentence of our Lord has come to pass against us: (now) we shall surely taste. So we led you astray, for we ourselves were erring.” So they shall on that day be sharers in the chastisement one with another. Surely thus do We deal with the guilty. **For they used to behave proudly when it was said to them:**

“There is no god but Allah.” And to say: “What! Shall we indeed give up our gods for the sake of a mad poet?” **Nay: He has come with the truth and verified the messengers. Most surely you will taste the painful punishment. And you shall not be rewarded except (for) what you did, Save the servants of Allah, the purified ones.** For them is a known sustenance, Fruits, and **they shall be highly honoured, In gardens of pleasure, On thrones, facing each other. A bowl shall be made to go round them from water running out of springs, White, delicious to those who drink.** There shall be no trouble in it, nor shall they be exhausted therewith. **And with them shall be those who restrain the eyes, having beautiful eyes, As if they were eggs carefully protected.** Then shall some of them advance to others, questioning each other. A speaker from among them shall say: “Surely I had a comrade of mine, Who said: ‘What! Are you indeed of those who accept (the truth)? When we are dead and have become dust and bones, shall we then be certainly brought to judgement?’ ” (A voice) shall say: “Will you look on?” Then he looked down and saw him in the midst of hell. He shall say: “By Allah! You had almost caused me to perish. And had it not been for the favour of my Lord, I would certainly have been among those brought here. Is it then that we are not going to die, Except our previous death? And we shall not be chastised?” Most surely this is the mighty achievement. For the like of this then let the workers work. **Is this better as an entertainment or the tree of Zaqqum? Surely We have made it to be a trial to the unjust. Surely it is a tree that-grows in the bottom of the hell-fire. Its produce is as it were the heads of devils. Then most surely they (the people of hell) shall eat of it and fill (their) bellies with it. Afterwards they will then be given a drink of a mixture prepared in boiling water.** Then most surely their return shall be to hell. Surely they found their fathers going astray, So in their footsteps they are hastening on. (Quran 37:01-70)

The contrast between the remuneration for “good” Islamic deeds – performed by the “purified ones” - and the punishment for “bad” disbelief is gargantuan; and if this is the limit of human understanding as to what awaits them, if this is all that has been learned in one's formative years – that the fear of the terrible hellfire will be relieved, through Islamic actions, into the gardens of pleasure -, then the suicide bomber and other jihadis will be apprehensive of *failing* to fulfil their murderous missions. It is this primitive fear, combined with a desire for pleasure, that drives the mujahideen – the same dichotomy, proposed above all other considerations in the cruellest fashion imaginable, offering another classic sign of the Asura of Falsehood. For the Asura appeals solely to the lowest in mankind, in a manner that warps their understanding, purporting the profane to be the sublime. Indeed in the promise of lovely wives we find an appeal to these base temptations, hinted at in passages like the above, but more openly suggested in different infrarational revelations like the following: “Surely for those who guard (against evil) is achievement, Gardens and vineyards, **And voluptuous women of equal age**, and a full cup.” (Quran 78:31-34) This provocative description of what awaits the believer in heaven is clearly sexual in nature, and this typically Asuric appeal to the substratum of the human vital, when faced with no competition from counteracting instructional forces, only intensifies the other portions of the indoctrination, helping to justify commands to kill. For the Asura of Falsehood, like with other primitive life-forces, has utterly corrupted the elementary function of sexual desire – procreation – by turning it into the pinnacle of religious attainment, with additional passages exacerbating this degradation by identifying the women of Paradise as virgins intended solely for the sexual gratification of the real Muslims:

When the great event comes to pass - There is no belying its coming to pass - Abasing (one party), exalting (the other), When the earth shall be shaken with a (severe) shaking, And the mountains shall be made to crumble with (an awful) crumbling, So that they shall be as scattered dust, And you shall be three sorts: Then (as to) the companions of the right hand - how happy are the companions of the right hand! And (as to) the companions of the left hand - how

wretched are the companions of the left hand! And the foremost are the foremost, These are they who are drawn nigh (to Allah), In the gardens of bliss. A numerous company from among the first, And a few from among the latter. On thrones decorated, Reclining on them, facing one another. **Round about them shall go youths never altering in age, With goblets and ewers and a cup of pure drink. They shall not be affected with headache thereby, nor shall they get exhausted,** And fruits such as they choose, And the flesh of fowl such as they desire. **And pure, beautiful ones, The like of the hidden pearls - A reward for what they used to do.** They shall not hear therein vain or sinful discourse, Except the word peace, peace. And the companions of the right hand - how happy are the companions of the right hand! Amid thornless lote-trees, And banana-trees (with fruits), one above another. And extended shade, And water flowing constantly, And abundant fruit, Neither intercepted nor forbidden, And exalted thrones. Surely We have made them to grow into a (new) growth, **Then We have made them virgins, Loving, equals in age, For the sake of the companions of the right hand.** A numerous company from among those of old, And a numerous company from among those of later times. And those of the left hand, how wretched are those of the left hand! In hot wind and boiling water, And the shade of black smoke, Neither cool nor honourable. Surely they were before that made to live in ease and plenty. And they persisted in the great violation. And they used to say: "What! When we die and have become dust and bones, shall we then indeed be raised up again? Or our fathers of yore?" Say (unto them, O Mohammed): "Lo! Those of old and those of later time Shall most surely be gathered together for the appointed hour of a known day. Then shall you, O you who err and call the Truth a lie! Most surely eat of a tree of Zaqqum, And fill (your) bellies with it, Then drink over it of boiling water, And drink as drinks the thirsty camel." This is their entertainment on the day of Judgement. (Quran 56:01-56)

Thus the true believers will have for afterlife spoils the hedonistic companionship of voluptuous young virgins, a grand temptation for those too poor and powerless to obtain the sanctioned non-Muslim sex slaves within the earthly life. For them, the best of the corporeal life pleasures can be found in Islam's Paradise for Murderers, as long as they perform the necessary deeds that invariably involve killing apostates and other enemies of Allah. The above passage, with its addition of the crucial element of virginity, is perhaps the best summation of the core Islamic weltanschauung - a mere aggrandizement of rudimentary vital polarities: good against bad, torture contrasting lust, pain opposing pleasure, cruelty versus relief, punishment distinct from reward, and even the few parcelled out of the many. The latter is significant when we recall the continued obstacles facing the path of the pious in "Pakistan", because they continue to battle a heretical majority: Yet in the Quran are they promised that even if jihad results in their death, at least they will find themselves embraced by lust and other pleasures. This exaltation of lust, seen elsewhere in Islam's sanction – and Mohammed's example - of raping sex-slaves and non-Muslims, was inevitable, because like all other primitive vital-forces, the Asura of Falsehood understands lust as easy to summon. In this aspect, the thought of multiple virgins awaiting the pious represents an easy enticement to procure the fidelity of mortals who cannot see beyond their unrefined desires, who confuse religion for an intensification of those principles, who think that since their scripture has – as in the following – reiterated that the women awaiting them will not have been "touched", that lust is truly the summit of faith!

And for him who fears to stand before his Lord are two gardens. Which then of the bounties of your Lord will you deny? Having in them various kinds. Which then of the bounties of your Lord will you deny? In both of them are two fountains flowing. Which then of the bounties of your Lord will you deny? In both of them are two pairs of every fruit. In both of them are two pairs of every fruit. Reclining on beds, the inner coverings of which are of silk brocade; and the fruits of the two gardens shall be within reach. Which then of the bounties of your Lord will you deny? **In them shall be those who restrained their eyes; before them neither man nor**

jinni shall have touched them. Which then of the bounties of your Lord will you deny? As though they were rubies and pearls. Which then of the bounties of your Lord will you deny? Is the reward of goodness aught but goodness? Which then of the bounties of your Lord will you deny? And besides these two are two (other) gardens - Which then of the bounties of your Lord will you deny? Dark green with foliage. Which then of the bounties of your Lord will you deny? In both of them are two springs gushing forth. Which then of the bounties of your Lord will you deny? In both are fruits and palms and pomegranates. Which then of the bounties of your Lord will you deny? In them are goodly things, beautiful ones. Which then of the bounties of your Lord will you deny? **Pure ones confined to the pavilions.** Which then of the bounties of your Lord will you deny? **Man has not touched them before them nor jinni.** Which then of the bounties of your Lord will you deny? Reclining on green cushions and beautiful carpets. Which then of the bounties of your Lord will you deny? Blessed be the name of your Lord, the Lord of Glory and Honour! (Quran 55:46-78)

How will the believer resist the ‘honourable’ call to kill non-Muslims, even at the expense of his own life, when this fantastic bounty of pleasure awaits him? When nothing on earth can compare to this garden of lust? It is a commitment confirmed by the Asura of Falsehood's safeguard – the indoctrination with *fear* - that a Muslim's refusal to participate in jihad will lead him to hell, a facet that causes the reward to be perceived as an ultimate outcome or even bliss, for it is the best of a severe paucity of choices presented. After all, when Islamic Paradise is contrasted with the terrible hellfire, it becomes the only thing worthy in existence, with the world – after one completes one's necessary warfare – analogous to the medieval misconception of *maya*. Indeed as in the Quran, the untouched virgins of Islamic heaven are affirmed as the most glorious of prizes by the Hadith, which mentions that the first and most triumphant of believers to enter heaven will have houris for wives:

Narrated Abu Huraira:

Allah's Messenger said, “The first group of people who will enter Paradise, will be glittering like the full moon and those who will follow them, will glitter like the most brilliant star in the sky. They will not urinate, relieve nature, spit, or have any nasal secretions. Their combs will be of gold, and their sweat will smell like musk. The aloes-wood will be used in their centres. **Their wives will be houris.** All of them will look alike and will resemble their father Adam (in stature), sixty cubits tall.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 55, Hadith 544)

The splendour of Paradise is further emphasized in another hadith, which describes it as something that nobody except the martyr would desire leave from, for it – and the virgins it houses - is better than all that the ordinary world can offer:

Narrated Anas bin Malik:

The Prophet said, “Nobody who dies and finds good from Allah (in the Hereafter) would wish to come back to this world even if he were given the whole world and whatever is in it, except the martyr who, on seeing the superiority of martyrdom, would like to come back to the world and get killed again (in Allah's Cause).”

Narrated Anas: The Prophet said, “A single endeavour (of fighting) in Allah's Cause in the afternoon or in the forenoon is better than all the world and whatever is in it. A place in Paradise as small as the bow or lash of one of you is better than all the world and whatever is in it. **And if a houri from Paradise appeared to the people of the earth, she would fill the space between Heaven and the Earth with light and pleasant scent and her head cover is better than the world and whatever is in it.**” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 52, Number 53)

That Mohammed felt so secure in his pronouncements is due to his witnessing – as previously reviewed

– of “heaven” and “hell”, Vital netherworld scenes narrated to him by the Asura during spells betwixt the ordinary waking consciousness and during the Vital portions of sleep, formations reinforced by Gabriel's incessant dangling of the reward along with the fear of the fire. Thus the paradise that he witnessed was enough to convince him that this was the greatest possible state of existence for mankind. Yet is the apprehensive fervour of Mohammed's belief not enough to erase the limitations of Islam's summit, because its Paradise is simply an amplification of the things desired by the unrefined males of the world, including the lust for beautiful women. It is far from the Indescribable Union with Brahma experienced by the Yogin, for Whom the heavens and earth and underworlds in their *veiled* existences only offer cursory *hints* of the Transcendent, and for Whom the cruel, vindictive state of the concocted Islamic hell – and its idea that “unbelievers” will enter it - forms no part of their permanent experience of *Truth*. Neither does the Yogin experience encompass a direct, lower type (based on attachment) of consciousness – they are instead the Silent Witness - of the transitional states of the underworlds and the actual hell, worlds for which many are temporarily destined, including those who kill themselves. In suicide, we find the mystic knowledge of netherworlds and hell sharing a rare common ground with Islam, which similarly sends such persons in that direction:

Narrated Thabit bin Ad-Dahhak:

The Prophet said, “Whoever intentionally swears falsely by a religion other than Islam, then he is what he has said, (e.g. if he says, ‘If such thing is not true then I am a Jew,’ he is really a Jew). And whoever commits suicide with piece of iron will be punished with the same piece of iron in the Hell Fire.” Narrated Jundab the Prophet said, “A man was inflicted with wounds and he committed suicide, and so Allah said: ‘**My slave has caused death on himself hurriedly, so I forbid Paradise for him.**’” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 2, Book 23, Number 445)

Understandably, this element of the authentic Islamic scripture has led many “moderate” Muslims to denounce the “extremist” suicide bombers as not belonging to the Islamic religion, as being *munaḥiqun* themselves. It is for once a legitimate argument, yet one that the most pious can nevertheless contradict due to reasons hinted at in another hadith censuring the act of suicide:

Narrated Thabit bin Ad-Dahhak:

...Allah's Apostle said, “Whoever swears by a religion other than Islam (i.e. if somebody swears by saying that he is a non-Muslim e.g., a Jew or a Christian, etc.) in case he is telling a lie, he is really so if his oath is false, and a person is not bound to fulfil a vow about a thing which he does not possess. **And if somebody commits suicide with anything in this world, he will be tortured with that very thing on the Day of Resurrection;** And if somebody curses a believer, then his sin will be as if he murdered him; **And whoever accuses a believer of Kufr (disbelief), then it is as if he killed him.**” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 8, Book 73, Number 73)

The very last portion of this hadith subtly reminds us why the suicide bombers will be excluded from the usual punishment for suicide, since their actions are not strictly suicide in the normal understanding, because the typical act of suicide is solely designed *against oneself*. The *fedayeen* suicide bombers, as the word indicates, are instead *sacrificing* themselves in the act of slaying multiple apostates and other non-believers, those truly guilty of the accusation of *kufr*: The overall intent, after all, is to murder as many kuffar as possible; and for this they have absolute scriptural approval, one that overrides any contrary notions that their actions are un-Islamic because it might involve their own death. The “moderate” Muslim argument is also negated by a much more basic factor – the overwhelming rage and hatred generated by the Asuric scripture. Hatred, after all, is an emotion that consumes rationality, that even clouds an adherence to commandments or rules; similarly is a lust for virgins, evoked after years of reading a scripture that promises such a bounty, also infrarational and capable of superseding any potential violations of Islamic laws on suicide. Such is the power of the

unrefined lower vital forces that it – especially after years of conditioning – usurps the tendency to rule-following or rational thinking, especially when the natural fear of death is supplanted by a greater fear of Allah's punishment for *failing* to wage war against apostates and non-Muslims. This is the toxic combination that has 'inspired' the most pious of "Pakistan" to attack perhaps their most formidable heretical opponent, the Pakistani military, a force which protects the lives of the multiple heretics of the state. Though the military is stronger in might than the pious, the latter can turn to their scripture, which not only informs them that their military worth is the equivalent of ten non-Muslims (or apostates), but that Allah is aware of their difficult struggle for Islam against such heretics, that Allah is aware that the real believer is not taking any adherents besides the 'one true god':

What! Do you think that you will be left alone while Allah has not yet known those of you who have struggled hard and have not taken any one as an adherent besides Allah and His Messenger and the believers. And Allah is aware of what you do. (Quran 09:16)

These verses provide succour to the takfiris, who can tell themselves that Allah knows well what is in their minds and what is conversely in the minds of the heretical Pakistani army that not only upholds the depraved *shirk* of Sufism within "Pakistan", but is also composed – as they recruit heavily from the Punjab province – of the very adherents to the sufi apostasy from Islam. Indeed the military is the only structure of the confused hybrid Pakistani state that is capable of holding the fragile artificial entity together, preventing it from a full descent into chaos that will be characterised by unrestrained and vicious competition between feudal, gangster and Islamic factions. By protecting the state, the army invariably upholds the heretical construct of an "Islam" consisting of multiple sects, because "Pakistan" has only been capable of declaring the Ahmadiyya as non-Muslim when the secularist "Muslims", the Shi'ites and sufis are worthy of the same label. But that can only be expected from the military, because the education of the soldiers, usually in state schools rather than madrassas, is divergent from the pious understanding that sects are not supposed to exist within Islam – the textbooks, to the contrary, demand respect for the "feelings" of the different sects!

National Curriculum CIVICS for classes XI-XII, Government of Pakistan, Ministry of Education, Curriculum Wing, Islamabad, March 2002...p25 Guidelines for the Textbook Developer...While writing the textbooks, material contrary to the Ideology of Pakistan **which may injure the feelings of different sects, or which may create hatred against any Muslim leading personality may be avoided.** (AH Nayyar and Ahmed Salim, *The Subtle Subversion: The State of Curricula and Textbooks in Pakistan*, 2005, pp. 51-52)

The military defends this heretical hybrid "Islam" of "Pakistan", a fact which places them at odds with the scriptural injunctions against half-measures regarding adherence to the 'Word' of Allah. The army fails to take action against these illegal sects who propagate some of the worst of crimes including *shirk*; in fact they brazenly wage war against the very champions of Islam in the name of a fraudulent idea of Islam that includes Shia and sufi *shirk*, Western education and democracy, and various non-Muslim habits and customs. And in perhaps the worst of all scenarios, the Pakistani military has allied with foreign non-Muslim governments against certain common enemies, the "bad" Taliban who justifiably attack the apostate Pakistani state. The problem for the *munafiq* Pakistani military, is that these same "bad" Taliban are closely allied with the "good" Taliban who concentrate their resources on Western powers currently ruling Afghanistan - the Taliban, we recall, previously created by the Pakistani ISI to serve the latter's interests according to the "strategic depth" hypothesis. What the Pakistanis fail to understand, is that Asuric entities have no loyalty or any other higher vital principle; and the Taliban has unsurprisingly turned on their previous masters, imitating them by playing a double-game, this time *against* the Pakistani state, with the anti-Western Taliban secretly aiding the anti-Pakistani Taliban. And rightly so, because the Taliban is well aware that the Pakistani military are the hypocrites of Islamic antiquity, for while the army may say the right things about Islam, the religion

– like the ancient enemies of Mohammed – is not actually in their hearts:

Those of the dwellers of the desert who were left behind will say to you: **“Our property and our families kept us busy, so ask forgiveness for us.” They say with their tongues what is not in their hearts.** Say: “Then who can control anything for you from Allah if He intends to do you harm or if He intends to do you good. Nay, Allah is Aware of what you do. Nay! You rather thought that the Messenger and the believers would not return to their families ever, and that was made fairseeming to your hearts and you thought an evil thought and you were a people doomed to perish.” And whoever does not believe in Allah and His Messenger, then surely We have prepared burning fire for the unbelievers. (Quran 48:11-13)

Like the dwellers of the desert, the Pakistani army has stayed behind, tending to their extensive economic (including property) interests⁵, failing to risk their lives in jihad, whether in Afghanistan or Kashmir or elsewhere. Indeed the military has failed to take responsibility for jihad against the obvious Polytheist enemy: Hindu India. Instead, these traitors to Islam provide intelligence and other deadly forms of cooperation – albeit half-heartedly – *against* the most pious of Muslims, in order to maintain favour with Western governments who have economic and military leverage over “Pakistan”. The military understands that it must be able to maintain a facade of “tolerance” to placate Western benefactors, an additional factor that sustains the blasphemous presence of Shi’ites and sufis and other illegal sects. It is a double-game that is certainly pragmatic and perhaps justifiable for the ultimate goal of Islamic conquest, but the problem is that the Pakistani army, while certainly Asuric itself, must answer to a force of ruder Asuric depravity, a stronger Islamic piety that justifiably has little confidence that the military is capable of furthering jihad and conquest, and seethes at the latter's duplicitous cooperation with the West, one that has not yielded any form of progress for Islam. The most pious thus rightly see the Pakistani military - which allows for sects (as evidenced by an inclusion of numerous Shi’ite soldiers), whose ranks are mostly procured from sufi areas, who fight *against* the real Muslims, who have failed to mass slaughter Hindus for decades - as the core of the Kafir Pakistani state, *against* whom war is mandated by the very infrarational word of the Quran:

Surely they who believe and do good deeds and keep up prayer and pay the poor-rate, they shall have their reward from their Lord, and they shall have no fear, nor shall they grieve. **O you who believe! Be careful of (your duty to) Allah** and relinquish what remains (due) from usury, if you are believers. **But if you do (it) not, then be apprised of war from Allah and His Messenger:** and if you repent, then you shall have your capital; neither shall you make (the debtor) suffer loss, nor shall you be made to suffer loss. And if (the debtor) is in straitness, then let there be postponement until (he is in) ease. And that you remit (it) as alms is better for you, if you knew. And guard yourselves against a day in which you shall be returned to Allah. Then every soul shall be paid back in full what it has earned, and they shall not be dealt with unjustly. (Quran 2:277-81)

While this passage is partially related to the practice of usury, not only does the Pakistani military fail in meeting that specific criterion (as seen in their acceptance of money from the International Monetary Fund and even the United States, both advocates of usury), they spectacularly fail in maintaining their *overall* religious duty to Allah. And for that insufficiency alone, they must face war from the actual Muslims, the pious who wish to bring ‘purity’ to the land of the impure. In waging this jihad the pious are scripturally certain to receive rewards from their Asuric Lord even in death – what awaits them are gardens of lust and virgins, *and* a release from the hellfire. Thus they, the ‘heroic’ few, *must* attack the Pakistani military, the last centre of organization within the heretical and artificial “Pakistan”, for the killing of infidel and apostate civilians (although the pious certainly do not consider *anyone* civilians, because that is not a concept that Islam acknowledges) alone cannot suffice as a strategy to annihilate the “Pakistan” heresy and bring victory for Islam. And this is precisely what the real Muslims of

“Pakistan” have done, with most of their morbidly sensational results arising from such attacks against the military and the ISI.

In one of many audacious examples of a civil war that simply cannot end for theological reasons we will soon readdress, the more pious of “Pakistan” attacked the army's general headquarters in October 2009, leading to a hostage situation and 12 deaths: While previous bombings against military targets had led to much higher death counts (in fact less than one month later 35 mostly retired military personnel were killed at a bank in Rawalpindi), this was notable for striking at the heart of the military. Another daring assault occurred in May 2011 at the headquarters of the Pakistani Naval Air Arm, leading to not only the deaths of 18 military personnel but also the destruction of two American built P-3C Orion surveillance aircraft. The same month saw an attack on paramilitary recruits, killing 80 of them, in specific retaliation for the American assassination of Osama Bin Laden within Pakistani land, a sign that the pious did not believe the military's remonstrations against the American raid into *Pakistani* territory, that they did not believe that the military was unaware of an assault that occurred within walking distance from the Pakistani Military Academy.

But these are just a few of the notable examples among many assaults on the heavily favoured Pakistani military, who according to some estimates have lost over six thousand personnel due to these attacks (*South Asia Terrorism Portal*). Yet if some of these attacks are certainly bold and courageous even according to non-Muslim ideals, we already know the more pious Muslims to be remorseless in killing civilians, because the Asura of Falsehood, in exalting war and power above all else, forces *all* of humanity to be considered party to the Islamic war. And in the most horrific manifestation of this pervasive Falsehood of “Pakistan” and its insurmountable civil war, we find the slaughter of schoolchildren, in one notorious case the December 2014 massacre at the Army Public School of Peshawar, where 132 schoolchildren of teenage years and younger were slaughtered. The killings at this school, one targeted because of the amount of children of military personnel that it taught, is perhaps the most brutal materialization of Pakistan's inevitable transition into *overt* Falsehood, in which schoolchildren are indoctrinated to kill apostates and non-Muslims, and where schoolchildren are killed *because* they are apostates and non-Muslims.

It is also a state of affairs that can never be corrected by the Pakistani government, whether political or military, for the very inception of “Pakistan” opened a door to *Islam* that can never be closed by them. As this artificial construct is founded on Islam, they will never be able to stop Taliban-like internecine warfare, because even a cursory reading of the authentic Islamic scripture acknowledges *takfir*, the identification of *munafiqun* and their genocide. It is not a finer point of the religion – it is the *core* of it and cannot be modified, because the religion, as we know, explicitly rejects any attempt at “Reformation”. This most crucial of dogma has not been understood by the handful of “liberals” of “Pakistan”, who look to the West for guidance and think that the same process that played out with Christianity – separation of church and state – can occur with Islam. What they fail to realize, is that although the religions are similar, like anything else in life they are not exactly the same, and the Quran's clear injunctions against different interpretations or modifications relegates the “liberal” quest to a fantasy, one that paradoxically worsens the situation, because instead of unequivocally rejecting Islam, they inadvertently *invoke* the core of Islam by continuing to suggest a “moderate” Islam as the panacea – intensifying orthodox anger by proposing a *religious innovation*. Indeed, the “liberal” postulations only serve to remind the latter that much work needs to be done, that more blood needs to be spilled, before a real land of the ‘pure’ emerges out of the death and ruin of the pretenders claiming to adhere to Islam.

* * * *

Like the United Kingdom, “Pakistan” is a geopolitical arrangement rather than a true nation. It has no *inherent* law or Dharmic truth of nationhood from which unity springs forth naturally. The Pakistanis instead depend upon the external force of Islam to try – though their attempt is full of contradictions and actions considered illegal by the religion – and fix a common ground, to try and forcefully obtain solidarity according to their illegal hybrid version of Islam. But the chosen method violates the primary requirement for nationhood, the inherent internal law that manifests in a fluid yet *similar* inner *psychology* for the nation, a likeness that must not be confused for the rigid conformity – however it emotionally or violently manifests - demanded by infrarationally revealed religions. In the latter, it is the external mind that is moulded to an unthinking submission – a superficial house of cards that inevitably crumbles, as the inner equality of the former is closer in truth to the Supreme Unity, the One Brahma that *is* the Existence above the *avidya* or Ignorance of the ordinary separative consciousness which the Asura inverts into Falsehood by calling it a higher “truth”.

If the current fragment of “Pakistan” is somewhat similar to the four nations forming the United Kingdom alliance, the latter is at least fully aware of its superficial status as a geopolitical accord, whereas the “Muslims” constituting “Pakistan” still believe that their nation is real, that Islam can be the foundation for nationhood. In that regards, “Pakistan” is in actuality more appropriately compared to Nazi Germany, even if the actual German nation under the Asura's shadow was technically whole in comparison to the four Pakistani sub-nations currently submerged by Asuric Islam. Indeed the very fact that the entire political state of “Pakistan” is afflicted by varying levels of wrath and narcissism and obscurantism, with all parties – including the liberal - asserting themselves as the ‘true’ believer, is another classic indicator of the Asura of Falsehood, who as in Nazi Germany has extended his powerful influence throughout remnant Pakistan. It is an aberration that is comparatively at the early stages to what Jung observed to be the German culmination – insanity:

The phenomenon we have witnessed in Germany was nothing less than the first outbreak of epidemic insanity, an irruption of the unconscious into what seemed to be a tolerably well-ordered world. **A whole nation, as well as countless millions belonging to other nations, were swept into the blood-drenched madness of a war of extermination.** No one knew what was happening to him, least of all the Germans, who allowed themselves to be driven to the slaughterhouse by their leading psychopaths like hypnotized sheep. ...Nevertheless, with the calamitous founding of the Reich in 1871, the devil stole a march on the Germans, dangling before them the tempting bait of **power, aggrandizement, national arrogance.** (Carl Jung, *After the Catastrophe*)

This appraisal is also fitting for the entire world-wide “Islamist” phenomenon of which “Pakistan” is but the most intricately – due to the presence of multiple sects – destructive. For the global resurgence of genuine Islam has brought with it an extraordinary aggrandizement of the importance of Allah and the Quran and authentic hadith, and an extreme arrogance that Islam is the only ‘truth’ for mankind, which in “Pakistan” manifests through multiple competing Asuric groups who kill in the name of their ‘better’ version of Islam. While this particular facet was not on display in Nazi Germany, like all things in history, it is the rhythm – rather than all of the details – that must be observed, and the glorification of war found in both the mainstream textbooks of the Pakistani state and the fanatical teaching of the scripture in madrassas, a reverence for war and power that only recently turned inward, is cardinal to the Lord of Falsehood. The indoctrination of children – and here we speak of the state textbooks, which even when failing to promote actual Islam, nevertheless inordinately exalts a heretical version of Muslim identity – is also quite similar to Nazi Germany, where the education was geared toward the idolization of a White racial identity.

Both “Pakistan” and Nazi Germany are also comparable for the preponderance of false narratives,

especially with regards to military losses. Hitler, we recall, blamed Germany's World War I loss according to the "stab in the back" hypothesis, whereas the Pakistanis barely acknowledge that they have lost all of their wars! Both distortions of military results are also influenced by similar persecutory projections upon the 'other' - Nazi Germany of course targeting the Jews, "Pakistan" primarily identifying the Hindus as unscrupulous facilitators of Pakistan's weakening (in recent times, with the widening of the conflict to include Western forces acting in Pakistani territory, Jews and Christians have emerged as part of the hidden 'other'). These projections continue in "Pakistan" unrestrained by any higher correction, leading to a situation similar to what Jung described of Nazi Germany, a state **"driven on by a seemingly impersonal but terrifying power which nobody and nothing can check. This ghastly power is mostly explained as a fear of the neighbouring nation, which is supposed to be possessed by a malevolent fiend. Since nobody is capable of recognizing just where and how much he himself is possessed and unconscious, he simply projects his own condition upon his neighbour, and thus it becomes a sacred duty to have the biggest guns and the most poisonous gas."** (Carl Jung, *Epilogue to Essays on Current Events*)

The Pakistanis – whether liberal, partially Muslim or growing in 'purity' – all share this habit, and almost entirely – here the handful of liberals are excused – wish to conquer and subjugate India, with the half-Muslim military and educated classes viewing it as their 'civilizational' inheritance from medieval Muslim rulers, the more pious correctly understanding it to be their utmost religious obligation. For both, the conquest will naturally involve massacres of the Hindu population of India, for while the former categories of Pakistanis are certainly apostates, we already have for example the 1971 genocide in East Bengal as evidence of their belief in both their "Muslim" identity and its corresponding call to slay Polytheists. Indeed the subsequent Pakistani response – or lack thereof – to the military's genocide in East Bengal is telling, as the state school educated class and the military, both heavily sufi, have displayed almost entirely no remorse over these historic actions. They do not document their crimes to their schoolchildren, *because they do not believe their actions were wrong*. Of course, this is to be expected, for even though the educated Pakistani class asserts to non-Muslims a cultured superiority, and even though they are actually half-Muslim themselves, their claim of broad-mindedness is merely a taqiyah that, when combined with a blindness to their own apostasy, deludes them into an absolute belief in their 'right' to subjugate and kill Hindus and others that they consider unbelievers. The remorselessness to genocide manifesting as the result of their curious position betwixt real Islam and real tolerance leads to what Jung described – after observing the same lack of guilt in the Germans subsequent to their extermination of millions – as a "psychopathic inferiority":

Anyone who wishes to get a vivid picture of the workings of psychopathic inferiority has only to study the way in which responsible Germans – i.e., the educated classes - react to the notorious *faits et gestes*. There is no doubt that a very large number of Germans are chiefly annoyed at having lost the war. A large proportion of them are shocked that the regime of the occupying forces is, in places, harsh, unjust, and even brutal - "after all, the war's over now." They refuse to listen to the accounts of Germany's unspeakable behaviour in Bohemia, Poland, Russia, Greece, Holland, Belgium, Norway, and France. "All kinds of regrettable things did happen, of course, but that was during the war." A slightly larger number admit the concentration camps and the "bad behaviour" in Poland and elsewhere, but in the same breath begin to enumerate the outrages committed by the English, from the Boer War on, without of course mentioning the war launched by their other psychopath, Wilhelm II. It never seems to occur to them that someone else's sin in no way excuses their own, and that their habit of accusing others merely shows up their own lack of insight. (Carl Jung, *Epilogue to Essays on Contemporary Events*)

The Germans, however, were after a couple of decades able to finally develop the necessary insight,

with their revamped education system and severe penalties for Nazi propagation a model for dealing with Asuric ideologies. But if such a program is to succeed, it requires the educated classes to be capable of insight, a quality we fail to find in the Pakistani state-educated deemed by some to be “moderate”. Indeed this upper stratum of Pakistanis are remarkable for their breathtaking duplicity, for a taqiyah so deeply implanted that their dissimulations are practically instinctive. For this elite of “Pakistan” has been trained from their youth to accept opposite realities as one acceptable ‘truth’ - the doublethink of George Orwell. On the one hand, they are indoctrinated with hatred toward the Hindus and other non-Muslims, taught to ignore the Falsehood of their genocide, to laud war with the Polytheists; paradoxically, we also find them instructed that Muslims have always acted with magnanimity against the Hindus, avoiding conquest and domination and initiation of violence!

In an attempt to present Muslims as always acting for noble purposes and not motivated by desires for conquest and domination, the Arab's conflict with the rulers of Sindh is presented as a response to the attack on a pilgrim ship. This selective portrayal hides the many previous attempts by the Arabs in the Makran-Baluchistan area which were repulsed by the local rulers. (AH Nayyar and Ahmed Salim, *The Subtle Subversion: The State of Curricula and Textbooks in Pakistan*, 2005, p. 90)

The Muslims – at least according to what the state-educated Pakistanis are taught - are thus only capable of acting graciously, a ‘fact’ further illustrated in textbook documentation on the medieval rulers, with a 2002 English Class VIII textbook from Lahore summarized as noting that “The Sultans of Delhi were tolerant in religious matters. **They never forced the non-Muslims to convert to Islam. The Hindus embraced Islam due to the kind treatment of the Muslims.**” (AH Nayyar and Ahmed Salim, *The Subtle Subversion: The State of Curricula and Textbooks in Pakistan*, 2005, pp. 59-60) The same textbook also ignores the murderous actions of Muslims during partition, focusing only on Hindu violence toward Muslims: “The Hindus in Pakistan were treated very nicely when they were migrating as opposed to the inhumane treatment meted out to the Muslim migrants from India.” (AH Nayyar and Ahmed Salim, *The Subtle Subversion: The State of Curricula and Textbooks in Pakistan*, 2005, p. 62) The lies are multiple, with bin Qasim's raid of Sindh unprovoked, designed to increase the territory of Islam; similarly were the Sultans of medieval India no strangers to enforcing violent conversions or those made under the duress of economic hardship; and although the Hindus were certainly violent toward Muslims in certain regions during Partition, the killings occurred in both directions - the textbooks notably omitting the facts of the time period.

While the lies and omissions presented in the textbooks undoubtedly establish a pattern of instinctive lying from an early age, the very fact that the *education* teaches the youth of “Pakistan” to obfuscate Islamic violence towards unbelievers, marks the educated elite and military protecting them as *munaḥiqun*. For when the textbooks appeal to “nobility” and other such qualities, they are in fact validating the superiority of non-Muslim principles in their *own* curriculum. Islam's version of ‘nobility’, after all, is simply the waging of war against unbelievers and slaughtering and raping and subjugating them for the sake of Islam; it does not care for the type of rationalization of war offered – such as a pilgrim ship being attacked – in the textbooks, because the Quran is the only endorsement required. Why then, the real Muslim of “Pakistan” will ask, does the state seem so desperate to explain the actions of righteous Muslim invaders according to *non-Muslim* principles? Why does it *hide* the glorious deeds of the Muslim rulers and claim that conversions were made without duress? The pious can only conclude that the educated elite are secretly embarrassed about the Islamic nature of the medieval rulers, a shame that exposes their confusion, their preoccupation with how they appear to non-Muslims, when the real Muslim would thoroughly *embrace* the history and laud the bloodshed and subjugation that Islamic jihad brought to a land full of kuffar.

But if the half-Muslim apostates of “Pakistan” remain inordinately sensitive to the perceptions of non-

Muslims, if their *taqiyah* is *unnecessarily* extensive, they nevertheless have enough Islam within them to make it impossible for their words to be trusted by non-Muslims. They are also certainly Islamic enough to fully believe their religion – however much they innovate to it Sufism and Western concepts – to be perfect, without need for transformation. This, combined with their indoctrinated *taqiyah* leads to an incessant need to accuse the ‘other’, jumping upon any event in external states (while previously almost exclusive to India, the expanded war on terror and American presence on Pakistani soil has also turned the habit westward) as signs of “genocide” and other grievous crimes familiar to Pakistani functioning. Along with this type of aggressive *taqiyah*, one designed to redirect criticism - a reaction that leads to a dangerous state of affairs in which the only detracting voices arrive from the most pious who are too murderous to be silenced – outward by minimizing Islamic hatred and violence, the Pakistanis are likewise prone to the minor forms of *taqiyah*, whether pretending to be Indians abroad to avoid the stigma of association with terrorists, or claiming that Islam is peaceful and tolerant, or that all religions are equal – pacifying phrases that they know the kafir, at least for now, likes to hear.

Words, however, cannot for long mask one's actions, a fact known to the more pious of heretical “Pakistan”, and one that should be evident to Indians. While the irremediable behaviour of “Pakistan” is progressively being understood in separation from its conjoint *taqiyah*, this propensity has not always been appreciated. It is a negligence that has resulted in appalling examples of inaction by the Indian political leadership, who have so far failed to take advantage of numerous victories achieved by the Indian military. Indeed as far back as 1947, Indian military victories should have led to increased territorial gains, with the worst example the aftermath of 1971, which resulted in the capture of 90,000 Pakistani prisoners of war. While the war itself had been exceptionally executed from *both* a political and military standpoint, the political response to the enormous leverage was lacking, with only the creation of Bangladesh resulting from it. What should have *at least* occurred, in addition, was the return of Pakistani occupied Kashmir to the Indian state. Instead, the remaining Asuric fragment of “Pakistan” was allowed to live, and though their current tactics have transitioned to proxy-jihad, they have also developed nuclear weapons, an obvious deterrent to traditional warfare whereby the necessary Indian vanquishing of “Pakistan” is obstructed.

Yet even with this impediment, the *reconquest* of “Pakistan” - an artificial creation that barely survives as a semi-functional organization even with significant foreign Islamic and Western funding - is imperative, the *only* possible outcome. For “Pakistan” is completely under the Asura of Falsehood's influence, befitting his usual pattern of capturing swaths of humanity along with certain individuals; the Asuric construct will thus always represent a problem to India – and to the world, though by proximity India will naturally have to remain the most vigilant – until it is reconquered. In fact the intermittent Pakistani provocations are unconscious and secret reminders of this fact, just as the gradual dissolution of remnant Pakistan's last semblance of order is the secret, ironic work of the Gods to elucidate its Asuric nature, for the world to learn lessons from its Asuric failure, including the truth of inherent nationhood's profounder reality than the false use of an externalized religion for unity. But “Pakistan” must not be allowed a reorganization from its increasing chaos, because unlike the Asura's influence in other regions of the world, where a greater truth can emerge out of the falsehood by non-violent means, rump Pakistan must be destroyed due to the severe danger it presents to the world, a threat that will remain unless it is forcefully taken over.

Indeed the parallels between the ongoing survival of “Pakistan” and the Germany between both world wars are remarkable, for though the latter faced harsh terms under the Versailles treaty, nothing was done to change the *psychology* of the German state, and the punishment meted to them by the Allied victors was mainly economical. In between wars, of course, the excessive pride of the state's population only worsened, leading to the absolute capture by the Asura of Falsehood; similarly has the loss of East Pakistan not led remnant Pakistan to alter its Asuric nature, and the Indian political elite's lack of will

and insight into the Pakistani ideology – similar to Hindenburg's political concessions to the Asuric medium Hitler – has allowed for the worsening of the Asuric insanity gripping “Pakistan”, one that can potentially spill over into India. The lessons of the past must be learned, just as the Allies knew that they had to force an unconditional surrender at the end of World War II, with all Germans placed under a foreign military ambit. And though the ultimate removal of Islam will be the necessary program to prevent that particular Asuric menace from destroying the world, the artificial construct of “Pakistan” certainly requires special attention.

And the most careful of considerations must be wrought, for this particular battle of Truth against Falsehood, of the Gods and Goddesses – the Personalities of Brahma – versus the Asuras, carries with it the nuclear overhang. This does not mean that the task must be avoided, but that the plans be meticulous for the ultimate objective – Indian military rule over “Pakistan”. For this is the only means to liberate the Lord of Falsehood's hold over the true nation submerged, and while it might seem impossible at the moment, falsehood is always eventually conquered, and events are already proceeding in that direction, with the curious example of Nazi Germany attacking their previous Russian ally, finding a rhythm in recent Pakistani events. For when we consider the Pakistani involvement, through financing and housing – by way of its Afghan colony – terrorists *associated* with the 9/11 attacks, we again find the Divine forces at work to dissipate, by redirection, the working of the Asura of Falsehood, for in both cases a singular concentration – Hitler to his west, “Pakistan” to India by way of a previous decade of fighting in Kashmir – became irreparably manifold. For though the Americans have not engaged in traditional warfare against the Pakistani state, their mere presence in Afghanistan (along with drone bombings in certain regions of “Pakistan”) has disrupted Pakistani intentions and helped to expose the core heresies of the majority of the populace, especially its military and educational elite, to the bloodthirsty orthodox.

India must take full advantage of this secret gift, first and foremost by using the internecine warfare to continue its own upward economic trajectory, a path that will subsequently allow it to strengthen its military to an unassailable – for both traditional warfare *and* in defending against terrorist or guerrilla warfare – level. In the meantime, the Indian state must begin to insidiously invade disarrayed Pakistan's society in all levels of functioning, finding or developing agents in its economic, religious and of course, military spheres. While this might seem an obvious course of action, we recall that the late 1990's Indian Prime Minister I.K. Gujral foolishly shut down all intelligence activities within “Pakistan”. While these capacities have only recently improved, the mere presence of such operatives will be assisted by the Islam-inspired Pakistani paranoia that all negative acts within the state are due to the machinations of the Indian Research and Analysis Wing or other foreign entities. This paranoia can easily be used to mask the real work of intelligence operatives, all of which should be undertaken with the ultimate objective – the reconquest – in mind.

While this paranoia can provide a cover, what must not be done, under any circumstances, is to ally with any of the Asuric groups of the artificial construct, from the military to the most pious Muslims. For though that might be appealing under the doctrine of “interests” that currently afflicts global governing, it is Truth that must be fought for, a Truth that is suppressed by the Asuric Falsehood of “Pakistan”. Thus there can be no alliance with the Asuric forces in their civil war, because not only is this the wrong thing to do, it is unnecessary, as all that needs to be done – until the military differential results in India having an overwhelming force to quickly complete the conquest – is to maintain military discipline and properly defend India from any type of Pakistani assaults while partaking a judicious degree of retaliatory measures beneath the nuclear overhang. This discipline will frustrate the pious of “Pakistan” (especially if a significant part of India's reprisals include killing the mujahideen that are seeking infiltration into India for jihad), who will only find for murderous release the ‘legal’ targeting of heretics within the state – whether military or civilian. The Asuric purification of the land

of the impure will thus continue to unfold, furthering the ability of India to increase its intelligence operations and the continued non-warfare weakening of “Pakistan” until the timing is right for the military reconquest.

For that is the inevitable result of any Asuric purification, since Asuric factions always eventually fight among each other, because groups influenced by the Asura of Falsehood always live by an extreme principle of separation that demands imposition upon the ‘other’. As the major forces of “Pakistan”, each perceiving themselves to be righteous “Muslims”, follow this principle, they in turn reject the inherent unity of existence and thus find themselves without balance, constantly striving for ‘zero-sum’ growth – *if they have the means* - above all others who do not adhere to their ‘truth’. All alliances with competing Asuric groups are subsequently guided by superficial tactics or politics, with each believing itself the true believer. Accordingly, these collaborations are doomed to rupture if their initial objectives – based upon the unsteady emotion of hatred – do not meet with success; afterwards, the recriminations are severe, each blaming the other for the failure, and the more pious accusing the others of religious infidelity. While this is absolutely to persist as Pakistan's fate, there is always the possibility – hence the need for reconquest – a temporary truce will break out whereby the Asura's join to attack India, a possibility that demands vigilance and constant – and severe - punishment for misadventures, helping to continue to redirect the Asuric energy inwards to Pakistan's convulsion.

While this ongoing cataclysm is inescapable for “Pakistan”, the same possibility must be appreciated for the second fragment of the land of the impure, as Bangladesh, while certainly of a lesser priority in danger than “Pakistan”, is absolutely vulnerable to the same Asuric corruption, the same call to jihad against “Hindu India”, the same descent into anarchy of Asuric Muslim groups attacking each other and non-Muslims. For the majority of Bangladesh remains nominally Muslim, and though Hindus are actually present there, they are slowly being converted or fleeing under a local-level oppression that occurs even while the government does a fairly admirable job of fighting “extremism”. After all, the Bangladeshi state faces a difficult enemy - the Quran and the authentic hadith that the genuine believer must follow, however much opposition he faces from the heretics (Bangladesh has a sizeable amount of sufis and other half-Muslims). That Bangladesh has not yet become another Asuric cesspool of jihad does not mean it will always remain that way, and eventual options with Bangladesh might well involve population exchange to protect the livelihoods of the Bangladeshi Hindus while returning the illegal Bangladeshi Muslims residing within India, as well as protecting the border from infiltration by further potential jihadis through the building of walls and other means.

For even if the Bangladeshi Muslims are heavily influenced by Sufism at this time, we already know Sufism – including examples of medieval sufis who partook in jihad in current Bangladeshi lands – to be inimical to Hinduism, and we know that at any time, the destructive Asuric cycle might commence within Bangladesh. This cycle, after all, is only recent to rump Pakistan, whose population long considered itself the bastion of real Islam, who butchered Bangladeshi *Muslims* they considered apostates – little did they know that the hunter would soon become the hunted. And the same process will occur with the current pious of “Pakistan”, the ones who are slaying the previous killers of all types of Bengalis – because at least with the Deobandis, the pollutant of Sufism remains, and they will eventually find themselves under attack by Asuras of a greater inverted purity. Yet even if all become Sunnis (instead of Sunni-sufi hybrids) within “Pakistan”, there will never be peace from internecine strife, because there will always be power struggles to obtain spoils or titles like “Imam” or perhaps even “Caliph”, with each side using any reason – even after Sufism and Shi’ism are eliminated - available to accuse the other of infidelity, a tactic justified by the authentic hadith:

Abu Dharr reported Allah's Messenger as saying:

Verily there would arise from my Ummah after me or soon after me a group (of people) who would recite the Qur’an, **but it would not go beyond their throats**, and they would pass clean

through their religion just as the arrow passes through the prey, and they would never come back to it. **They would be the worst among the creation and the creatures.** (Sahih Muslim Book 5, Hadith 2335)

Thus the words of other Sunni Muslim groups – and words are compulsory, because the Quran and Hadith must be invoked in the five mandatory prayers – will be used to proverbially hang them, to legalize waging war against them, as it can be alleged that their words do not “go beyond their throats”, that they are hypocrites. In fact another hadith describing similar “believers” - this one refers to youthful apostates – demands that the ‘real’ Muslim find and kill such devious creatures:

Narrated Ali:

I heard the Prophet saying, “In the last days (of the world) there will appear young people with foolish thoughts and ideas. **They will give good talks**, but they will go out of Islam as an arrow goes out of its game, **their faith will not exceed their throats. So, wherever you find them, kill them, for there will be a reward for their killers on the Day of Resurrection.**” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 6, Book 61, Number 577)

The Sunnis then, cannot escape an earthly retribution for imagined slights or jealousy or political manoeuvring hidden under accusations of apostasy, because these particular hadith make *takfir* a free-for-all between presumably ‘pure’ Sunni groups, even within lands freed of Sufism and Shi’ism and other non-Islamic contaminations, since these hadith establish a principle whereby the words of the supposed believer cannot be trusted. This is the fate awaiting the Muslims of greater piety once Pakistan is made pure according to their unhinged perception of purity - because the Asuric purity is never final, and “Pakistan” itself is simply one of the more rotten signs of the actual disorder: Asuric Islam. For it is the religion of Islam that is the heart of the problem, the manifested source behind most of the Asura of Falsehood's current global intrigues, whose sanctified scripture is eternally unchangeable – its every infrarational word to be obeyed by the Muslim slave. And without addressing this ideological spring, different groupings beyond the masses of “Pakistan” will be subsumed by the Asura's evil, and India may find itself with an even more complex problem to solve.

Footnotes

1. Al Jazeera, *Is this the world's most dangerous moustache?*, 16 August 2013
2. Hafeez Saeed and Maulana Abdul Aziz are good examples of Islamic facial grooming
3. Wali Khan, *Facts are Facts: The Untold Story of India's Partition*, pp 40-42.
4. Human Rights Watch, 2004, *Migrant Communities in Saudi Arabia*
5. According to Ayesha Siddiqi, author of *Military Inc: Inside Pakistan's Military Economy*, the Pakistani army's multiple enterprises are worth at least 20 billion USD.

IV

Centres of Control

To begin organizing a comprehensive strategy regarding Islam, this most dangerous instrument of the Asura of Falsehood, we must again return to the already discussed topic of Islamic leadership, in which, as we are now well aware, there is no place for sufi 'saints' or other mystics posthumous to Mohammed. But before we readdress the status and function of the Islamic Imams, it is important that we briefly review the importance of Mohammed to the believer, a man who the Muslim is to obey *along* with Allah: "And the believers, men and women, are protecting friends one of another; they enjoin the right and forbid the wrong, and they establish worship and they pay the poor-due, **and they obey Allah and His messenger**. As for these, Allah will have mercy on them. Lo! Allah is Mighty, Wise." (Quran 9:71) It is a rote obedience demanded of the faithful, one that if strayed from will lead to a dire fate, with the Quran also informing, "On that day will those who disbelieve and **disobey the Messenger** desire that the earth were levelled with them, and they shall not hide any word from Allah." (Quran 4:42) Indeed one passage in the Asura's scripture perfectly captures the desired or "successful" state of the real believer – that of a robotic slave who only listens and obeys:

The response of the believers, when they are invited to Allah and His Messenger that he may judge between them, is only to say: "We hear and we obey." And these it is that are the successful. And he who obeys Allah and His Messenger, and fears Allah, and is careful of (his duty to) Him, these it is that are the achievers. And they swear by Allah with the most energetic of their oaths that if you command them they would certainly go forth. Say: "Swear not; reasonable obedience (is desired); surely Allah is aware of what you do." Say: "Obey Allah and obey the Messenger; but if you turn back, then on him rests that which is imposed on him and on you rests that which is imposed on you; and if you obey him, you are on the right way; and nothing rests on the Messenger but clear delivering (of the message)." (Quran 24:51-54)

While these infrarational revelations, as we have already discussed, function to establish Mohammed as the primary idol of the Islamic religion (rather than the Polytheism that might be reasonably interpreted from the verses), the Asura of Falsehood certainly could not have *only* relied upon one particular human (for the Quran is clear that Mohammed was a *mortal* who died, without the extraordinary, divine-like qualities of the sufi 'saints' who allegedly uphold the universe) to propagate his religion. And though the Prophet does hold unique intercessory powers, that is only on the Day of Judgement which has yet to commence. Prior to that day, Mohammed's importance rests in his idolatrous "tradition" for mankind, including his role as the Head Commander or Ruler over the nascent Muslim army-nation of his time. But as Mohammed was the *last* prophet, and as Islam claims that it existed previously before his arrival, we find in the earlier prophets a similar status of Leader or Imam over their respective "Muslim" nations, including an already cited Quran passage telling us, "And certainly We gave the Book to Moses, so be not in doubt concerning the receiving of it, and We made it a guide for the children of Israel. **And We made of them Imams to guide by Our command when they were patient, and they were certain of Our communications.**" (Quran 32:23-24) Not only are the Imams to be guided through the infrarational communications, they are also, as we have noted, to have "power in the land":

Surely Pharaoh exalted himself in the land and made its people into parties, weakening one party from among them; he slaughtered their sons and let their women live; surely he was one of the mischiefmakers. And We desired to bestow a favour upon those who were deemed weak

in the land, and to make them the Imams, and to make them the heirs, **And to grant them power in the land, and to make Pharaoh and Haman and their hosts see from them what they feared.** (Quran 28:4-6)

Additional historic prophets were similarly revealed to have been Imams, with another Quran passage detailing, “And We gave him Ishaq and Yaqoub, a son's son, and We made (them) all good. **And We made them Imams who guided (people) by Our command,** and We revealed to them the doing of good and the keeping up of prayer and the giving of the alms, and Us (alone) did they serve.” (Quran 21:72-73) The prophet Abraham was likewise granted the title of Imam, with the Quran informing, “And when his Lord tried Abraham with certain words, he fulfilled them. He said: ‘**Surely I will make you an Imam of men.**’ ” (Quran 2:124) In this frequent association of the prophets to the status of Imam, we find further confirmation of Islam's actual organization as a religio-militaristic ideology, rather than the fluid set of instructions for individualized spiritual practice that we find in the Sanatana Dharma. Indeed in the following hadith Abu Bakr explicitly refers to the Imams as “heads and chiefs” rather than spiritual guides:

Narrated Qais bin Abi Hazim:

Abu Bakr went to a lady from the Ahmas tribe called Zainab bint Al-Muhajir and found that she refused to speak. He asked, “Why does she not speak?” The people said, “She has intended to perform Hajj without speaking.” He said to her, “Speak, for it is illegal not to speak, as it is an action of the pre-Islamic period of ignorance.” So she spoke and said, “Who are you?” He said, “A man from the Emigrants.” She asked, “Which Emigrants?” He replied, “From Quraish.” She asked, “From what branch of Quraish are you?” He said, “You ask too many questions; I am Abu Bakr.” She said, “How long shall we enjoy this good order (i.e. Islamic religion) which Allah has brought after the period of ignorance?” He said, “You will enjoy it as long as your Imams keep on abiding by its rules and regulations.” **She asked, “What are the Imams?” He said, “Were there not heads and chiefs of your nation who used to order the people and they used to obey them?” She said, “Yes.” He said, “So they (i.e. the Imams) are those whom I meant.”** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 5, Book 58, Hadith 175)

The ‘religious’ leaders of Islam, as we are once again reminded, bring order to the flock, the latter of whom are – as long as the Imam's commands conform to Islam – to obey like humble slaves. Yet unlike certain rulers of a despotic temperament who have graced the planet, the Imams of Islam are to strictly base their authority on a literal, rote, recollection of the Quran verses, an aspect previously shown by the hadith in which a prepubescent child was elevated to the status of Imam due to his memory of the verses. We also find another hadith confirming the automaton features of the Imam, with Abu Sa’id al-Sharif reporting “Allah's Messenger as saying: ‘When there are three persons, one of them should lead them. **The one among them most worthy to act as Imam is one who is best versed in the Quran.**’ ” (Sahih Muslim Book 4, Hadith 1417) The reason for this, as we have discussed, lies in the Asura of Falsehood's utilization of the ordinary Leader-Follower or Individual-Group relationship for his nefarious ends, whereby the literal repetition of the Quran by the Imam to his flock, in the mandatory assemblies, leads to an easily controllable mass of men who can – if needed – engage in Asuric violence at the behest of said Imam. The Islamic leader, we recall, knows that Islam is always at war with the disbelievers, and that all times of ‘peace’ are strategic truces characterised by the practice of taqiyah to minimize the chance of counter-actions by the Infidel.

The Imam is also fully aware that his jurisdiction is absolutely sanctioned within the Quran, which if associating early leadership with the prophets, also – befitting the Asura of Falsehood's global needs – provides the basic framework for a hierarchy of rulers, because different levels of Islamic leadership existed – as the following verse confirms – even during the time of Mohammed:

And when there comes to them news of security or fear they spread it abroad; **and if they had referred it to the Messenger and to those in authority among them**, those among them who can search out the knowledge of it would have known it, and were it not for the grace of Allah upon you and His mercy, you would have certainly followed the Satan save a few. (Quran 4:83)

As we can readily observe, even with the Asura's scriptural closure of occult experiences to ensuing Muslims, varied positions of *earthly* authority were available from the very beginning of Mohammedan Islam. Of course, this is hardly a surprise, because the Asura of Falsehood understood that the only way for him to maintain Islam as an effective weapon in his persistent efforts at preventing the earthly manifestation of Satchitananda, required leaders after the death of Mohammed. Thus the infrarational revelation of authority for figures other than Mohammed *during* his lifetime, even if Mohammed remained the unquestioned terrestrial commander, because the Asura understood that he had to begin transitioning the flock to submissively accept other Imams after the death of Mohammed, even if mystic practice was to remain forbidden. After all, the global wars of Islam had just begun, and further rulers were required to continue with the Asuric work initiated by Mohammed, a work for which the Prophet ordered Muslims to proceed forth if called to do so by the Islamic ruler:

On the day of the Conquest (of Mecca) the Prophet said, "There is no emigration after the Conquest but Jihad and intentions. When you are called (by the Muslim ruler) for fighting, go forth immediately." (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 52, Number 79)

Indeed a previously cited verse, also ominously close to Polytheism, was designed to sanction the obedience of Muslims to rulers not named Mohammed, with the infrarational revelation stating, "O you who believe! Obey Allah and obey the Messenger **and those in authority from among you**. Then if you quarrel about anything, refer it to Allah and the Messenger, if you believe in Allah and the last day: this is better and very good in the end." (Quran 4:59) As an authentic hadith confirms, this verse was presented "in connection" with obeying the military general when partaking in mandatory jihad:

Narrated Ibn Abbas:

The Verse: "Obey Allah and Obey the Apostle and those of you (Muslims) who are in authority." (4.59) was revealed in connection with Abdullah bin Hudhafa bin Qais bin Adi when the Prophet appointed him as the commander of a Sariyya (army detachment). (Sahih Bukhari Volume 6, Book 60, Number 108)

Thus the Imam has 'divine' sanction when ordering his unthinking flock to war – whether street battles or according to stereotypical formations of armies – against the kuffar, because the Quran has eternally established his authority to dictate that command. As it is a permission that is harmonious with the message of the Quran – the Asuric consecration of *adharmic* warfare -, there should be no reason for the ordinary Muslim to be suspicious if his 'divinely' ordained ruler tells him to attack non-Muslims. But there are different situations in which the message of the Imam might not be in accordance with the Asuric scripture, which is why Mohammed, as we have previously documented, verbalized a caveat to the basic Islamic demand of obedience to the Imam:

The Prophet said, "A Muslim has to listen to and obey (the order of his ruler) whether he likes it or not, as long as his orders involve not one in disobedience (to Allah), but if an act of disobedience (to Allah) is imposed one should not listen to it or obey it." (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 89, Number 258)

As one can subsequently conclude, the Islamic ruler who *fails* – for reasons other than taqiyyah – to incite his followers to attack the kuffar is guilty of disobedience to Allah, and for the believers to then follow that apostate is the equivalent of heeding a sufi mystic or different types of non-Muslims. As for the fate of the heretic Imam, Ma'qil narrates in a hadith that "Allah's Messenger said, 'If any ruler

having the authority to rule Muslim subjects dies while he is deceiving them, Allah will forbid Paradise for him.’ ” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 89, Hadith 265) Another hadith previously mentioned also commands the ordinary believer to fight the Imam if he were to display evidence of disbelief (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 88, Number 178). Killed upon earth due to their crime of leaving Islam, and barred from Paradise, these heretic Imams will, as previously documented, find themselves suffering the same sadistic punishment dispensed to other infidels:

“...nor will I say to a man who is my ruler that he is the best of all the people after I have heard something from Allah s Apostle.” They said, “What have you heard him saying?” He said, “I have heard him saying, **‘A man will be brought on the Day of Resurrection and thrown in the (Hell) Fire, so that his intestines will come out, and he will go around like a donkey goes around a millstone. The people of (Hell) Fire will gather around him and say: ‘O so-and-so! What is wrong with you? Didn't you use to order us to do good deeds and forbid us to do bad deeds?’ He will reply: ‘Yes, I used to order you to do good deeds, but I did not do them myself, and I used to forbid you to do bad deeds, yet I used to do them myself.’**” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 54, Number 489)

Not only can the blasphemous Imam be guilty of the hypocrisy described in this hadith, he can also be marked by a confusion as to what “good” means in Islam, with its Asuric inversion of knowledge and righteous acts from the egregious – such as the Islamic ‘truth’ of massacring disbelievers – to the more reasonable examples:

Narrated Ali:

The Prophet sent an army unit (for some campaign) and appointed a man from the Ansar as its commander and ordered them (the soldiers) to obey him. (During the campaign) he became angry with them and said, “Didn't the Prophet order you to obey me?” They said, “Yes.” He said, “I order you to collect wood and make a fire and then throw yourselves into it.” So they collected wood and made a fire, but when they were about to throw themselves into it, they started looking at each other, and some of them said, “We followed the Prophet to escape from the fire. How should we enter it now?” So while they were in that state, the fire extinguished and their commander's anger abated. The event was mentioned to the Prophet and he said, **“If they had entered it (the fire) they would never have come out of it, for obedience is required only in what is good.”** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 89, Number 259)

In this example the entry into the fire was clearly without support from the Islamic scripture, seeing as it did nothing to further the ultimate objective of subjugating the disbelievers and, of course, the escape from the hellfire. Consequently, there was no need for obedience, as the ruler's demand did not meet the *Islamic* criterion. While this might make it seem as if there is some flexibility within Islam with regards to obeying the ruler, it is actually the opposite, for these examples only serve to underline the importance of the Quran idol, of which the Imams are simply to be agents of. Accordingly, if the Imam is not conveying the Quran appropriately, he is to be disobeyed, because the ultimate ruler is the Quran idol, and the Imam is merely a *centralized* channel for the Asura of Falsehood's scripture - his mind primarily fixed to the rigid mentality created by Quran brainwashing, with the only allowable additions related to new techniques for taqiyah and warfare rather than anything that might *innovate* heresies into the core religious tenets. Thus when we read additional selections from the Islamic scripture ordering the Muslim to obey the ruler, we read them with the understanding that the ruler in question is simply a vessel for the Quran – to then disobey the authentic Imam is to reject the Quran, with severe repercussions:

Narrated Ibn Abbas:

The Prophet said, “Whoever disapproves of something done by his ruler then he should be

patient, for whoever disobeys the ruler even a little will die as those who died in the Pre-Islamic Period of Ignorance. (i.e. as rebellious Sinners)." (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 88, Number 176)

As one gathers in this hadith, disobedience to the austere Imam causes the Muslim to lapse into disbelief, a fact that, when presented with hadith like the following, assigns the believer the rank of slave with regard to his Imam (assuming the latter is adhering to the Quran):

Narrated Abu Huraira:

The Prophet said, **"The Imam is (appointed) to be followed. So do not differ from him, bow when he bows, and say, 'Rabbana-lakal hamd' if he says 'Sami'a-l-lahu Liman hamida'; and if he prostrates, prostrate (after him), and if he prays sitting, pray sitting all together, and straighten the rows for the prayer, as the straightening of the rows is amongst those things which make your prayer a correct and perfect one."** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 1, Book 11, Number 689)

Indeed does this hadith degrade the believer to a status arguably inferior to the slave, who might have slightly more agency than the astonishing imitation seen above. However, there is a different hadith that somewhat dilutes the necessity of such abject mimicry, as it narrates the Prophet's actions as varying from his verbal orders:

Narrated Anas bin Malik:

Once Allah's Apostle rode a horse and fell down and the right side (of his body) was injured. He offered one of the prayers while sitting and we also prayed behind him sitting. When he completed the prayer, he said, "The Imam is to be followed. Pray standing if he prays standing and bow when he bows; rise when he rises; and if he says, 'Sami allahu-liman hamida', say then, 'Rabbana wa Lakal-hamd' and pray standing if he prays standing and pray sitting (all of you) if he prays sitting."

Humaid said: The saying of the Prophet "Pray sitting, if he (Imam) prays sitting" was said in his former illness (during his early life) but the Prophet prayed sitting afterwards (in the last illness) and the people were praying standing behind him and the Prophet did not order them to sit. We should follow the latest actions of the Prophet. (Sahih Bukhari Volume 1, Book 11, Number 657)

Even if imitation of the Imam down to the minutiae is not commanded, the scripture is enough to establish an overarching authority of the Imam over his flock, with another authentic hadith informing, "It has been narrated on the authority of Abu Huraira that the Messenger of Allah said: 'It is obligatory for you to listen to the ruler and obey him in adversity and prosperity, in pleasure and displeasure, and even when another person is given (rather undue) preference over you.' " (Sahih Muslim Book 20, Hadith 4524) In a different hadith, the believers were ordered by Mohammed to similarly refrain from fighting the Imam:

Narrated Ubada bin As-Samit:

We gave the oath of allegiance to Allah's Apostle that we would listen to and obey him both at the time when we were active and at the time when we were tired and that we would not fight against the ruler or disobey him, and would stand firm for the truth or say the truth wherever we might be, and in the Way of Allah we would not be afraid of the blame of the blamers. (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 89, Number 307)

Of course, this is a highly difficult proposition, because as Islam is strictly of the lower Vital, the predilections of the believers invariably assume lower Vital qualities, of which gross ambition, rage,

impulsivity and fickleness predominate. Combining that with Islam's authentic acknowledgement of the possibility of heretic Imams and hypocrites who say – or preach, in the case of the Imams – one thing yet think or practice against Islam, it becomes easy for the ambitious believer to concoct a reason to attack the Imam, resulting in the leadership positions becoming filled by those with the greatest capacity for brute force. This degradation of leadership to a very simple criterion is precisely what the Asura wants, since it creates the chaos that he wishes to persist if nominal Muslims actually become the predominant group on the planet. Nevertheless, precisely because of these theological loopholes allowing the Muslim to attack the leader, the Asura of Falsehood did not block his occult instrument Mohammed from repeatedly insisting that the believer obey the Imam, including one instance where “Allah's Apostle said, ‘You should listen to and obey, your ruler even if he was an Ethiopian (black) slave whose head looks like a raisin.’” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 89, Number 256) In another example, Abu Dhar narrated, “My friend (the Holy Prophet) bade me to hear and obey (the ruler) even if he is a slave having his feet and arms cut off, and observe prayer at its prescribed time.” (Sahih Muslim Book 4, Hadith 1355)

Yet do the previous commands pale in comparison to one particular tradition of Mohammed, in which we find the Imams indisputably hoisted to the dizzying heights associated with entities – or Islamic idols – considered to be closer to God than ordinary humans. Indeed in the following hadith we find the Islamic version of idolatry distinctly assigned to the Imams, who assume an importance previously only permitted to the Prophet and the angels in comparison with Allah:

Narrated Abu Huraira:

Allah's Apostle said, “Whoever obeys me, obeys Allah, and whoever disobeys me, disobeys Allah, and whoever obeys the ruler I appoint, obeys me, and whoever disobeys him, disobeys me.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 89, Number 251)

While the rulers in question were those “in authority” during Mohammed's time, the narrative can be interpreted as pertaining to Imams – and of course the Caliph, the Imam of Imams – in ensuing generations, assuming they meet the necessary criteria to be declared an Islamic leader. Therefore at the very least, we find in modern Islam the living idolatry that accompanied the religion's inception, with the Imams the breathing embodiment of the Quran, to be obeyed as commanded by Mohammed, because disobedience to them is the same as rebellion against Mohammed *and* Allah. The submissiveness demanded, however, is not to elevate the Imam to a god as the sufis illegally do with their pirs – it is simply to provide an avenue for the Asuric content of Islam to become entrenched in the mind of the believer, through the brainwashing at the mandated congressional prayers led by the Imam. Disobedience to him, on the other hand, can only lead to a dire outcome when the Imam is so intrinsically connected to Allah, the ‘god’ who sadistically punishes those deviating from his demands. The fear of the punishment for this particular disobedience is why one of the Caliphs voiced his unwavering deference to all of the men identified as Ruler over the Muslims, and why he demanded the same acquiescence once he was himself named Caliph:

Narrated Ubaidullah bin Adi bin Al-Khiyar:

I recited Tashahhud and added, “Allah has sent Muhammad and has revealed the Holy Book (i.e. Qur’an) to him. You (O Uthman!) were amongst those who responded to the call of Allah and His Apostle and had faith in him. And you took part in the first two migrations...and you enjoyed the company of Allah's Messenger and learned his traditions and advice. Now the people are talking much about Al-Walid bin Uqba and so it is your duty to impose on him the legal punishment.”...Uthman then recited Tashahhud and said, “No doubt, Allah has sent Muhammad with the Truth and has revealed to him His Holy Book (i.e. Qur’an) and I was amongst those who responded to the call of Allah and His Apostle and I had faith in

Muhammad's Mission, and I had performed the first two migrations as you have said, and **I enjoyed the company of Allah's Messenger and gave the pledge of allegiance to him. By Allah, I never disobeyed him and never cheated him till Allah caused him to die. Then Allah made Abu Bakr Caliph, and by Allah, I was never disobedient to him, nor did I cheat him. Then Umar became Caliph, and by Allah, I was never disobedient to him, nor did I cheat him. Then I became Caliph. Have I not then the same rights over you as they had over me?**" I replied in the affirmative. Uthman further said, "Then what are these talks which are reaching me from you? As for what you have mentioned about Al-Walid bin Uqb; Allah willing, I shall give him the leg; punishment justly." Then Uthman ordered that Al-Walid be flogged forty lashes. He ordered Ali to flog him and he himself flogged him as well. (Sahih Bukhari Volume 5, Book 58, Hadith 212)

If Uthman maintained strict obedience to the Islamic ruler for the likely purposes of earthly battles and gains being sought by the rapacious Muslim army, there is yet another reason for the ordinary Muslim to be submissive before his appointed earthly leader, as hinted in the following hadith emphasizing the Imam's significance, one establishing the Islamic leader as infinitely superior to illegal sectarian considerations:

Narrated Hudhaifa bin Al-Yaman:

The people used to ask Allah's Messenger about the good but I used to ask him about the evil lest I should be overtaken by them. So I said, "O Allah's Messenger! We were living in ignorance and in an (extremely) worst atmosphere, then Allah brought to us this good (i.e., Islam); will there be any evil after this good?" He said, "Yes." I said, "Will there be any good after that evil?" He replied, "Yes, but it will be tainted (not pure.)" I asked, "What will be its taint?" He replied, "(There will be) some people who will guide others not according to my tradition? You will approve of some of their deeds and disapprove of some others." I asked, "Will there be any evil after that good?" He replied, "Yes, (there will be) some people calling at the gates of the (Hell) Fire, and whoever will respond to their call, will be thrown by them into the (Hell) Fire." I said, "O Allah's Apostle! Will you describe them to us?" He said, "They will be from our own people and will speak our language." **I said, "What do you order me to do if such a state should take place in my life?" He said, "Stick to the group of Muslims and their Imam (ruler)." I said, "If there is neither a group of Muslims nor an Imam (ruler)?" He said, "Then turn away from all those sects even if you were to bite (eat) the roots of a tree till death overtakes you while you are in that state."** (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 88, Hadith 206)

When this hadith is read along with the following, we can conclude that the Imam is the only – at least as far as the Asuric religious goals of Islam – possible earthly "guardian" of the believer:

Narrated Abdullah bin Umar:

Allah's Apostle said, "Surely! Everyone of you is a guardian and is responsible for his charges: **The Imam (ruler) of the people is a guardian and is responsible for his subjects;** a man is the guardian of his family (household) and is responsible for his subjects; a woman is the guardian of her husband's home and of his children and is responsible for them; and the slave of a man is a guardian of his master's property and is responsible for it. Surely, everyone of you is a guardian and responsible for his charges." (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 89, Number 252)

And as the following hadith informs, the Imam is not only the guardian of the believers during the life, but is also to be "responsible" for them afterwards, potentially to face a stern interrogation by Allah regarding his dominion over them:

Narrated Abu Huraira:

The Prophet said, “The Israelis used to be ruled and guided by prophets: Whenever a prophet died, another would take over his place. **There will be no prophet after me, but there will be Caliphs who will increase in number.**” The people asked, “O Allah's Apostle! What do you order us (to do)?” He said, “Obey the one who will be given the pledge of allegiance first. **Fulfil their (i.e. the Caliphs) rights, for Allah will ask them about (any shortcoming) in ruling those Allah has put under their guardianship.**” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 56, Number 661)

In a similar, yet more explicit hadith, we find that the Imam will be rewarded and punished depending upon his “righteousness”, a term that in the inverted world of Islam automatically includes guarding himself and his followers from ‘evils’ like *shirk* and desertion from jihad:

Narrated Abu Huraira:

That heard Allah's Apostle saying, “We are the last but will be the foremost to enter Paradise.” The Prophet added, “He who obeys me, obeys Allah, and he who disobeys me, disobeys Allah. **He who obeys the chief, obeys me, and he who disobeys the chief, disobeys me. The Imam is like a shelter for whose safety the Muslims should fight and where they should seek protection. If the Imam orders people with righteousness and rules justly, then he will be rewarded for that, and if he does the opposite, he will be responsible for that.**” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 52, Number 204)

As one can easily conclude, the Imam is to be judged in the afterlife in direct relation to the “righteousness” of the commands made to his followers, an additional factor to actions strictly belonging to himself. Indeed another hadith specifically mentions that the Caliph, the Imam of Imams, will be specifically interrogated over how he directed his subjects – whether towards austere jihad or apostasy:

It has been narrated on the authority of Ibn Umar that the Prophet (May be upon him) said: **Beware. Every one of you is a shepherd and every one is answerable with regard to his flock. The Caliph is a shepherd over the people and shall be questioned about his subjects (as to how he conducted their affairs).** (Sahih Muslim Book 20, Hadith 4496)

More importantly to the Imam's flock, however, is the scripture corresponding to the Imam's afterlife necessity to *themselves*, because the Islamic scripture – this time the infrarationally revealed Quran – reminds them that the Imam's presence in their life will extend to the very moment of Allah's judgement:

(Remember) the day when We will call every people with their Imam; then whoever is given his book in his right hand, these shall read their book; and they shall not be dealt with a whit unjustly. And whoever is blind in this, he shall (also) be blind in the hereafter; and more erring from the way. (Quran 17:71-72)

While the verse does not state outright that the Imam might provide Allah with his opinion on the quality of the particular Muslim's fidelity to Islam, the sheer presence of the Imam – for he must be there, otherwise it would not be communicated as such in the Quran – at the time of *Allah's* eternal judgement, is enough to remind the believer of the Imam's superior status to himself, and reminds the non-Muslim of the overriding militaristic nature of Islam. For in the Sanatana Dharma, religion is not the equivalent of a general and his soldiers, and even the Guru-Sadhak relationship is simply the Individual Embodied guiding another developing adhar toward Real Individuality – the Purusha that lies eternally within. Neither does the Guru function in the afterlife in a fashion implied of the Imam, whose presence at the time of Islam's Asuric day of judgement carries with it an implied threat, because

if the Imam is to be guardian of his flock, he is to have a certain recollection of their activities, and might very well be questioned by Allah on the deeds of a particular believer, becoming the determining factor between the ordinary Muslim residing in Heaven or Hell.

If this *potential* – for it is neither confirmed or denied, but exists as a possibility due to the ordinary (rather than prophetic Imams) Imam's presence with his sheep on Judgement day – afterlife function of the Islamic leaders, in which one could conceive Allah using the Imams to psychologically torture the believer with fear on the Day, is not overtly mentioned, there are yet different hadith that authorize ordinary Imams a pseudo-spiritual standing distinctly superior to the ordinary Muslim. For we find more detailed documentation in which the Imam is shown to be the conduit for the believer to obtain a higher – at least per Islam's inverted definitions - religious or spiritual state, with one authentic hadith recording Mohammed as saying that the believer who is only loyal to the Imam for materialistic purposes will fail to receive Allah's afterlife forgiveness:

Narrated Abu Huraira:

Allah's Apostle said, “There will be three types of people whom Allah will neither speak to them on the Day of Resurrection nor will purify them from sins, and they will have a painful punishment: They are, (1) a man possessed superfluous water (more than he needs) on a way and he withholds it from the travellers. **(2) a man who gives a pledge of allegiance to an Imam (ruler) and gives it only for worldly benefits; if the Imam gives him what he wants, he abides by his pledge, otherwise he does not fulfil his pledge;** (3) and a man who sells something to another man after the Asr prayer and swears by Allah (a false oath) that he has been offered so much for it whereupon the buyer believes him and buys it although in fact, the seller has not been offered such a price.” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 89, Number 319)

By linking the Muslim's motives when following the Imam to the former's afterlife fate, the Imam instantly assumes a superior ‘religious’ status, because the escape from hellfire is the ultimate ‘religious’ aspiration of the Muslim. But this, while certainly a compelling ‘spiritual’ association granted to the Imam, is not the only record of the Imam's unique disposition, for we have different hadith bestowing them various connections to non-worldly powers, including Abu Huraira's narration that “The Prophet said, ‘Isn't he who raises his head before the Imam afraid that Allah may transform his head into that of a donkey or his figure (face) into that of a donkey?’” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 1, Book 11, Hadith 660) While the donkey hadith represents one of the more outlandish claims related to the Imam's importance, of more significance to the ordinary Muslim is the assertion that the Imam's congregations are attended by ‘spiritual’ entities:

Narrated Abu Huraira:

Allah's Messenger said, “Any person who takes a bath on Friday like the bath of Janaba and then goes for the prayer (in the first hour i.e. early), it is as if he had sacrificed a camel (in Allah's cause); and whoever goes in the second hour it is as if he had sacrificed a cow; and whoever goes in the third hour, then it is as if he had sacrificed a horned ram; and if one goes in the fourth hour, then it is as if he had sacrificed a hen; and whoever goes in the fifth hour then it is as if he had offered an egg. **When the Imam comes out (i.e. starts delivering the Khutba), the angels present themselves to listen to the Khutba.**” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 2, Book 13, Hadith 6)

This angelic presence is ultimately confirmed by the Quran, with the Asura having revealed, “Establish worship at the going down of the sun until the dark of night, and (the recital of) the Qur'an at dawn. **Lo! (the recital of) the Qur'an at dawn is ever witnessed.**” (Quran 17:78) As the angels are witnessing the start of the Imam's sermon, the possibility of supernatural results – or reckoning for those who fail to attend – at the congregation arises, which means that this hadith and verse represents

another means for the Asura's religion to ingrain the fear of missing the assembly and its resultant groupthink indoctrination. And when we read the following hadith detailing the forgiving of sins when the Muslim properly listens to the Imam's sermon, we can surmise the angels to be more than simple observers of the Imam's congregation:

Narrated Salman-Al-Farsi:

The Prophet said, “Whoever takes a bath on Friday, purifies himself as much as he can, then uses his (hair) oil or perfumes himself with the scent of his house, then proceeds (for the Jumua prayer) and does not separate two persons sitting together (in the mosque), **then prays as much as (Allah has) written for him and then remains silent while the Imam is delivering the Khutba, his sins in-between the present and the last Friday would be forgiven.**” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 2, Book 13, Hadith 8)

While the Imam is certainly *not* the entity who forgives the sins, the fact that attending his congregational prayers is imperative to receiving absolution, means that the Imam has a ‘spiritual’ standing unequivocally superior to the ordinary member of the flock, however well-versed the latter is in the scripture and however ready he is to slaughter the kuffar and obtain a ‘good’ deed to enter the Paradise of Murderers. But this can only have been expected, because just as the Asura of Falsehood linked Mohammed, the final prophetic Imam, to ‘spiritual’ qualities including reception of the – infrarational – revelations and intercession, it was inevitable that he would infuse the Imam with a ‘spiritual’ quality, *especially* during the crucial congregational sermons. For what better way to funnel the simpleton believers into repetitive groupthink formations from which they can proceed to plan and commit atrocities? After all, if that particular rubric worked for Mohammed and the original followers, why not apply it – albeit without any permission for further occult practices – to subsequent generations?

Modern Imams are then, from a practical standpoint, equal to the Prophet; or at least we can describe them as *his* representatives within earth, partial idols that the believer can use for a reference – along with their own reading of the scripture - when attempting to imitate the ultimate human idol of Mohammed. That the Imams are void of Mohammed's infrarational revelatory power does not diminish their importance, because they are the central points from which Islam's infrarational depravities can continue to unleash themselves upon the world, a readily available means for the Asura of Falsehood to persist in obstructing the Divine Consciousness from its destined Sovereignty – as the Multiplicity - in the terrestrial manifestation. Through these centres of control, the Asura can easily corrupt the overall atmosphere, as the Imams incessantly promote the hatred and separation and violence of the Islamic scripture they are commanded to sermonize from, the scripture of which they have pledged allegiance toward, just as the leaders of Mohammed's time vowed loyalty to the Prophet by way of specific scriptural tenets:

Narrated Ubada bin As-Samat:

I was among those Naqibs (selected leaders) who gave the Pledge of allegiance to Allah's Apostle. We gave the oath of allegiance, that we would not join partners in worship besides Allah, would not steal, would not commit illegal sexual intercourse, **would not kill a life which Allah has forbidden**, would not commit robbery, would not disobey (Allah and His Apostle), and if we fulfilled this pledge we would have Paradise, but if we committed any one of these (sins), then our case will be decided by Allah. (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 83, Number 12)

While this hadith provides additional evidence of a hierarchy within the Islamic leadership, we also find in it a reminder that the Imams are to be automaton extensions of the Asuric scripture, including only murdering those whose deaths Allah considers ‘lawful’ – a broad category including, of course, the kuffar and *munafiqun*. The tenets of allegiance pledged by the Imams are certainly what led some

of the initial Imams and other historic Islamic figures to appropriately follow the Prophet's example by killing disbelievers, including the apostates murdered by Ali:

Narrated Ikrima:

Ali burnt some people and this news reached Ibn Abbas, who said, "Had I been in his place I would not have burnt them, as the Prophet said, 'Don't punish (anybody) with Allah's Punishment.' **No doubt, I would have killed them**, for the Prophet said, 'If somebody (a Muslim) discards his religion, kill him.' " (Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 52, Number 260)

The Imams are a mere continuation of the Asuric leadership practised by the Prophet and the early Caliphs, and although there is currently not a universally recognized Caliph in the modern Muslim world, there remain regional and local Imams who continue to keep the believers in line and persist with the ultimate Islamic ambition of subjugating the non-Muslim religions. As the scriptural account of the Imam is infused with fantasies of a 'spiritual' connection, and as the scripture also demands that they be obeyed according to a militaristic character, we again recall that there can never exist a genuine separation, in Islam, of the two crucial classes of religious and politico-military men. It is a lack of division distinct from the Vedic Varna, in which the religious class – determined by svadharma rather than the medieval decay into familial caste – concentrated on the higher spiritual aspiration, without seeking to entangle themselves in the *ordinary* (as opposed to extraordinary times when Asuric forces need to be fought) politico-military activities, for that would have been a transgression from their inherent law. Islam, to the contrary, mandates that the religious ruler *is* the political and military ruler, a fact that if not exactly exhibited in modern Muslim nations, only reminds us that the majority of these nations, even with their ingrained hostility to unbelievers, are only partially Islamic.

But if the actual Islamic hierarchy may not manifest this way in Muslim nations with standing armies, for the Muslim communities living as minorities in kuffar-majority lands, the Imam certainly functions in his lawful – according to Asuric Islam's law – capacity as General, even if the particular Imam does not *always* exhort his followers to war or even control tactics during actual battles (including street fighting and riots). If fighting does commence, his role is related to providing both the underlying *and* final impetus, by means of his sermons which indoctrinate the flock with Islam's hatred and separation and, at last, its call to violence. And even in the case of an organized Muslim army with a traditional structure, the Imam is still to be at the highest level, instructing the General on the latter's Islamic duties even if the former does not participate in the tactical details. For the overall strategic ambition – world conquest – remains under the control of the Imam, who in turn is controlled by what is in the Quran and authentic hadith. Thus even if some of the assembly is scripturally informed, they must nevertheless subordinate themselves to the Imam for the sake of organization – unless of course they ambitiously decide to seek the position themselves.

Indeed the matter of ascension to the Commander of the Islamic flock utterly cements the Asuric nature of the Imam and the religion he is to propagate, affirming the Asura of Falsehood's maxim of power above all other considerations. For though we have seen a previous hadith in which one of the early Caliph's was chosen by way of a reasonably measured decision, with the rival Ali even acquiescing, we nevertheless find a couple of authentic hadith that unquestionably establish murder as the means to solve a dispute between two potential rulers:

It has been narrated on the authority of Aba Sa'id al-Khudri that the Messenger of Allah said: **"When oath of allegiance has been taken for two caliphs, kill the one for whom the oath was taken later."** (Sahih Muslim Book 020, Number 4568)

Rather than democracy or an approach based upon rationality and higher qualities like intuition and Dharma, we find the cardinal sign of the Asura of Falsehood – the quick resort to violence as a solution to a problem – when determining the earthly leader of Muslims. In another authentic hadith, we

observe not only the same method of violently eliminating any contender to the Islamic throne, but also the demand of external and *internal* obedience before the Caliph, a reflection of which will naturally extend to the local and regional Imam – especially in modern times when there is no globally recognized Caliph by the mass of Muslims:

It has been narrated on the authority of Abd al-Rahman b. Abd Rabb al-Ka'ba who said:

I entered the mosque when Abdullah b. Amr b. al-As was sitting in the shade of the Ka'ba and the people had gathered around him. I betook myself to them and sat near him. (Now) Abdullah said: "I accompanied the Messenger of Allah on a journey...so we gathered around the Messenger of Allah. He said: 'It was the duty of every Prophet that has gone before me to guide his followers to what he knew was good for them and warn them against what he knew was bad for them; but this Umma of yours has its days of peace and (security) in the beginning of its career, and in the last phase of its existence it will be afflicted with trials and with things disagreeable to you. (In this phase of the Umma), there will be tremendous trials one after the other, each making the previous one dwindle into insignificance. When they would be afflicted with a trial, the believer would say: 'This is going to bring about my destruction.' When at (the trial) is over, they would be afflicted with another trial, and the believer would say: 'This surely is going to be my end.' Whoever wishes to be delivered from the fire and enter the garden should die with faith in Allah and the Last Day and should treat the people as he wishes to be treated by them. **He who swears allegiance to a Caliph should give him the pledge of his hand and the sincerity of his heart (i.e. submit to him both outwardly as well as inwardly). He should obey him to the best of his capacity. If another man comes forward (as a claimant to Caliphate), disputing his authority, they (the Muslims) should behead the latter.'**" (Sahih Muslim Book 20, Hadith 4546)

But this violence against competing Imams will utterly fail in reducing the natural tendency of Islam towards internecine strife and chaos – in fact it only reinforces that feature of the Asura of Falsehood's religion. For by establishing murder as a readily available solution to determining a dispute between declared Caliphs – and by extension regional Imams -, it automatically forces the second in line to *himself* use assassination to secure the position. After all, if the ambitious Muslim believes himself entitled to rule, yet fails to vocalize his desire at an early enough time, he knows that in order to subsequently ascend to the Islamic throne, he must first kill the Caliph or Imam before he finds himself facing their sanctioned wrath after they discover his intent. And since the Islamic scripture, as we know, provides authentic technicalities whereby *any* Muslim can be declared *munafiq*, the ambitious Muslim can 'legally' justify his murder through *takfir*, which means that the outcome of his attempted usurpation will simply be determined by whether or not his 'strength' is enough to kill the current Imam or Caliph.

And as the fish rots from its nervous centre, so will falsehood disseminate throughout the Muslim ranks when its points of control are determined by the Asura's perverse scripture and his vibhuti's authentic tradition. That the Imams will in many circumstances try to use the pulpit to strategically curtail the hatred from erupting into overt violence against the kuffar, is irrelevant, because their eventual desire is to subjugate the disbelievers, coercing them to either convert or pay the jizya in acknowledgement of their *dhimmi* status, or die if refusing. The Imams are the men who are tasked with keeping alive the Asuric fantasy of global conquest; the men for whom the Asuric depravities of sanctified rape, genocide, obscurantism, narrow-mindedness, and adharmas are inverted into perceived opposite qualities; the Asuric centres who control easily weaponized masses through an indoctrination with the crude emotions of hatred and group-idolatry and 'persecution'; the swath of humanity currently most proximate – by way of their indoctrination then propagation of Islam – in consciousness to the Asura of Falsehood himself.

* * * *

Although the Imams are subsumed by the Asuric scripture of Islam, which they delusionally believe to be the only truth for humanity, there are still many individuals from among the non-Muslims who think that these same Imams might be a vessel for change, for a magical “Reformation” or a Renaissance within the worldwide Islamic community that might lessen the hold of the Islamic scripture within the minds of Muslims. Certain non-Muslims might even, after interacting with a skilfully manipulative Imam or Islamic intellectual, believe this process to already be in motion - that the dawn of a harmonious coexistence with Islam beckons the planet. But what they fail to realize is that not only are the Imams *instructed* by their religion to practice dissimulation toward the non-believers, pacifying the latter's concerns and suspicions until the time is right for the Muslims to “strive hard” and murder the non-Muslims, they are also *commanded* by the Asura of Falsehood's religion to *never* alter, change, modify, reform, amend, revise, reinterpret, transform, add, ignore, or delete any portion or verse from their scripture.

While this fact of Islam has been mentioned time and again in these pages, it is worthy of another review, because the Islamic scripture is what the modern Imams are attempting to install as the tyrannical authority for all of mankind, and the question of its fluidity is actually more important than even its violent content. Violence and other aspects of humanity, after all, can all be transformed or compartmentalized or sublimated, if only the corrective and transformational qualities native to certain individuals are allowed to flourish. But this tendency was understood by the Asura of Falsehood when he set about using his slavish instrument to fashion his longest-serving earthly formulation, and was why he specifically – and repeatedly – included calls within the scripture rejecting the progressive – albeit, at times, secretly working - inclinations of mankind to a profounder truth than the superficial emotionality and mentality of Islam. Consequently, the Asura first and foremost sought to eliminate the mistake that occurred with Christianity, in which the words of the Bible were allowed to be modified and supplemented through multiple editions or versions throughout the centuries. Gabriel accused the Christians of “neglecting a portion” and of altering the words, and warned them of the punishment for their ‘crime’:

But on account of their breaking their covenant We cursed them and made their hearts hard. They altered the words from their places and they neglected a portion of what they were reminded of. And you shall always discover treachery in them excepting a few of them, so pardon them and turn away. Surely Allah loves those who do good (to others). And with those who say, “We are Christians,” We made a covenant, **but they neglected a portion of what they were reminded of**, therefore We excited among them enmity and hatred to the day of resurrection; and Allah will inform them of what they did. (Quran 5:13-14)

It was in reference to verses like these that Ibn Abbas is recorded as saying, “**You read it pure, undistorted and unchanged, and Allah has told you that the people of the scripture (Jews and Christians) changed their scripture and distorted it, and wrote the scripture with their own hands and said, ‘It is from Allah,’ to sell it for a little gain.**” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 92, Number 461) As an additional verse - “**There is no altering (the laws of) Allah's creation**” (Quran 30:30) – similarly confirms the forbidden nature of modifying the infrarational verses for any person daring to replicate the Christian error, it comes as no surprise to find a “middle course” – deemed by many to be the method for the fantasised Reformation or moderation of Islam – also rejected, as such a venture will naturally include ignoring or changing the hateful elements of the scripture (most of it!). As the Asura accordingly revealed, “And when a wave like mountains covers them they call upon

Allah, being sincere to Him in obedience, but when He brings them safe to the land, **some of them follow the middle course**; and none denies Our signs but every perfidious, ungrateful one.” (Quran 31:32) As one might expect from a religion that rejects a middle course, the Muslim is also provided no “option” or choice on topics infrarationally revealed by the ‘one true god’, because as the Quran informs, **“It is not fitting for a Believer, man or woman, when a matter has been decided by Allah and His Messenger to have any option about their decision:** if any one disobeys Allah and His Messenger, he is indeed on a clearly wrong Path.” (Quran 33:36) Whoever follows a middle course or decides to pursue a different alternative or choice – or messenger – from the commands of Islam, becomes of the hated disbelievers, because they take a “course between”, only partially adhering to the religion:

Surely those who disbelieve in Allah and His messengers and (those who) desire to make a distinction between Allah and His messengers and say, “We believe in some and disbelieve in others,” and desire to take a course between (this and) that. These it is that are truly unbelievers, and We have prepared for the unbelievers a disgraceful chastisement. (Quran 4:150-51)

Also outlawed is the internal discrepancy or hesitation of the *munafigun*, who only want to be seen as real Muslims but are internally divided in their fidelity to Islam. According to Islam, these individuals are deviants: “Lo! The hypocrites seek to beguile Allah, but it is He Who beguileth them. **When they stand up to worship they perform it languidly and to be seen of men, and are mindful of Allah but little. Swaying between this (and that), (belonging) neither to these nor to those.** He whom Allah causeth to go astray, thou (O Muhammad) wilt not find a way for him.” (Quran 4:142-43) To the hypocrites, the ones who pretend to believe, the liars who “alter the words” of the scripture, arrives a punishment in both the earth and the afterlife:

O Messenger! Let not those grieve you who strive together in hastening to unbelief, from among those who say with their mouths **“We believe,” but their hearts do not believe**, and from among those who are Jews. They are listeners for the sake of a lie, listeners for another people who have not come to you. **They alter the words from their places**, saying: “If you are given this, take it, and if you are not given this, be cautious.” And as for him whose temptation Allah desires, you cannot control anything for him with Allah. **Those are they for whom Allah does not desire that He should purify their hearts, they shall have disgrace in this world, and they shall have a grievous chastisement in the hereafter.** They are listeners of a lie, devourers of what is forbidden. Therefore if they come to you, judge between them or turn aside from them, and if you turn aside from them, they shall not harm you in any way; and if you judge, judge between them with equity. Surely Allah loves those who judge equitably. (Quran 5:41-42)

Similarly are those who make religious *additions* corrupting the core of Islam to find themselves among the hated, for as Aisha narrated, “Allah's Apostle said, **‘If somebody innovates something which is not in harmony with the principles of our religion, that thing is rejected.’**” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 3, Book 49, Number 86) These are the types of people identified in the Quran as fraudulently changing the Quran, claiming heretical additions to be “lawful” and authentic scripture to be “unlawful”:

And, for what your tongues describe, do not utter the lie, (saying) **“This is lawful and this is unlawful”**, in order to forge a lie against Allah; surely those who forge the lie against Allah shall not prosper. A little enjoyment and they shall have a painful punishment. (Quran 16:116-117)

The innovators of lies against Allah are per the hadith guilty of the “worst matters”, as narrated by

Abdullah: “The best talk (speech) is Allah's Book (Quran), and the best way is the way of Mohammed, and **the worst matters are the heresies (those new things which are introduced into the religion)**; and whatever you have been promised will surely come to pass, and you cannot escape (it).” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 92, Number 382) These are the apostates who will be “far removed” from the mercy of Allah which would have saved them from the intense burning of hell:

I heard the Prophet saying, “I am your predecessor at the Lake-Fount (Kauthar), and whoever will come to it, will drink from it, and whoever will drink from it, will never become thirsty after that. There will come to me some people whom I know and they know me, and then a barrier will be set up between me and them.” Abu Sa’id Al-Khudri added that the Prophet further said: “I will say those people are from me. It will be said, ‘You do not know what changes and new things they did after you.’ **Then I will say, ‘Far removed (from mercy), far removed (from mercy), those who changed (the religion) after me!’**” (Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 88, Number 174)

The Imams are certain – if they are worthy of the title – to know these crucial elements of the scripture, to understand that the rest of the authentic scripture is final and can never be altered or ignored in any way, to recognize that additions or subtractions which modify central tenets to the religion are illegal, to know that interpretation – as we have discussed – must be without variance. They similarly know fully well that straying from this fundamental tenet will lead them to perdition, for as the Quran reveals, “**those who break the covenant of Allah after its confirmation** and cut asunder that which Allah has ordered to be joined and make mischief in the land. **(As for) those, upon them shall be curse and they shall have the evil (issue) of the abode.**” (Quran 13:25) The Imams, having pledged an oath of allegiance to the sacred covenant of Islam, to reject *shirk* and to plot the subjugation of the disbelievers, are absolutely unlikely to “reform” or “modify” or “moderate” the religion - and at any rate the heretic “Imam” who honestly (rather than for taqiyyah) attempts that path will be assassinated when the austere Imams feel the circumstances are favourable for such actions, as the murder is sanctioned by the Asuric ‘god’ of Islam.

* * * *

As the Islamic religion simply cannot be changed, as any *sincere* attempt by either a genuinely liberal “Imam” or an ordinary “Muslim” to – but *only* after reading every verse of the Quran – try and dissipate, by using that same scripture, the incitement to hatred and violence against the disbeliever, is met by the Asura's stern reminder that doing so leads to disbelief and execution for apostasy, it becomes apparent that a variety of other means must be considered when addressing the Asuric threat of Islam. For clearly any internal efforts – the best method for reducing violence committed by a particular group outward – at transformation are *explicitly* rejected by Islam itself, in unequivocal and threatening language that leads to the excommunication and murder of the reformers. This most crucial of facts, when combined with the ongoing global menace wreaked by Islam, leads to the inevitable conclusion that unlike different Asuric constructs and influences currently active in the globe - whose negatives can be progressively transformed through the introduction of competing higher and Psychic forces of a psychological variety -, Islam must be comprehensively dismantled.

And as the Imams are the leaders of the religion, the *active* points of control, the shepherds of the flock, the heads of the demon, they are certainly worthy of significant attention. But before we discuss them further, it is important to remember that while they are the dynamic centres of control, there are additional centres by which the Asuric falsehood continues to disseminate. After all, the ultimate points

of bondage over the slaves of Islam are the Quran and authentic hadith, from which the Imams merely vivify through their crude propagation at the assembly. However, mandatory congregational prayers are not the only means for the scriptural falsehood to grab hold of minds – there is also, as Asuric “Pakistan” has shown us, the means of repetitive indoctrination from childhood. For that purpose, youth are only taught the ‘true’ scripture in madrassas, rotely ‘learning’ the Quran and authentic hadith without any competing psychological forces such as philosophy or global literature or music or art. This fanatical devotion to the ‘one true scripture’ prevents the promotion of samata in the Muslim child of the madrassa, that when combined with indoctrination on the Islamic calls to violence, means that the youthful murderers commonplace in “Pakistan” are hardly a surprising result.

Yet to prevent the kidnapping of young minds by the falsehood of Islam, it is not enough to simply modify the curriculum of the madrassas from where these Muslim children are indoctrinated, to try and merely incorporate diverse subjects for study along with the Islamic scripture. For even allowing the Asura of Falsehood's scripture the breathing room to inculcate itself, will lead to an inevitable return whereby the Quran and the Hadith assume sole prominence, because the study of the Quran and authentic hadith *ordains* a ‘knowledge’ that innovations or bidats are dangerous to Islam, which consequently promotes the opinion that other subjects should be forbidden from the curriculum due to their possible introduction of bidats into the mentality of youth, deviating them from actual Islam closer to the potential category of apostates. Because of this destined circling back – based on explicit infrarational revelations and accompanying tradition - to the ‘holy’ scripture alone, it is insufficient to try to transform the madrassas: They must be entirely eliminated, with new ones prevented from ever being built.

Of course, while the decision to safeguard impressionable minds from the depravities of Islam is certainly a justified course of action, it will naturally present itself controversially to a populace that still does not fully understand the Asuric nature of Islam, the falsehood that it promotes. Thus the liberation of the youth from the yoke of Islamic ‘education’ in the madrassas – centres of control by repetitive indoctrination - will be ably assisted by the education of the general populace on the Asuric wickedness of Islam. For that, an unceasing effort to uncover and disseminate the reality of Islam's falsehood, its degraded hatred and calls to rape and murder, its Asuric origin by way the “angel Gabriel”, and most importantly, its unchanging nature and plans to subjugate the world and all infidels, must proceed without hesitation. All avenues whereby the actual nature of Islam can be displayed must be utilized, especially as a counteraction to informational forces that are either ignorant of Islam or actively dissimulate (whether this be for reasons of economic incentives by wealthy Islamic benefactors, sheer dhimmitude on the part of certain disbelievers, or simply Muslims practising the dark art of taqiyah).

This particular education needs to be primary directed toward adults, for unlike Islam and its obsession with promoting a fear of the hellfire from an early age, a Dharmic education during those years should instead be directed towards the svadharma or inherent natural law of the child, which as discussed means that the very word dharma need not be even mentioned – or at least not overemphasized – during that time. Neither is it necessary that they be familiarized with the brutal nature of Islam unless under extreme circumstances; conversely, they should not they be taught anywhere close to an idea that Islam is a religion of equality or sharing the aspirations of Dharmic paths, for those contentions would be lies. Only at a later age, closer to adulthood, can all of these discussions and concepts be considered appropriate for them and even their Muslim counterparts, some of whom might have escaped – at least partially – the affliction of a complete madrassa indoctrination. Though in the latter the group-narcissism and – possibly – mandated group congregational prayers certainly result in an egoistic attachment to Islam, there are usually more internal openings to outside thoughts and beliefs – and criticism – than for the madrassa automatons.

Yet for both – along with many Hindus - will the truth of Islam's Asuric nature be necessary to unceasingly disseminate, because it is insufficient to leave the discussion to half-conclusions bemoaning Islam's "current state" or "difficulties", or especially the dangerous laziness or *tamas* of assigning Islamic terrorism to a "minority" of "extremist" Muslims. For these so-called extremists are in actuality the most pious of Muslims, and the fact that the allegedly "moderate" Muslims are not engaged in Asuric warfare over the mere name of God, does not either indicate a genuine moderation or mean that they will somehow triumph over the "extremists". Regarding the former, we find their lack of participation in warfare to only indicate an apostasy of which they are unconscious; and in fact, similar to what occurred in Mohammed's time, their lack of participation is often more related to fear or laziness rather than any *objection* to the activities of "extremists", and they desire the same spoils wanted by the "extremists" while leaving the violent work to them. Because of this shared desire for war booty, for Islam's victory over all the religions, the only reason for the "moderates" – other than a comprehensive apostasy beyond transgressing the core principle of jihad – to consciously attempt to override the "extremists" is because of strategic considerations.

As the "moderates" cannot be expected to transform Islam due to the highlighted reasons of – first and foremost – the scriptural rejection of such change, their own belief in the worthiness of Islam's superiority, their casual indifference, and a sheer inability to counteract "extremist" violence, they simply cannot be expected to work from within to elevate the psychology of Islam from its Asuric base. And as it is out of this "moderate" structure that the "extremists" – who are simply the ones ready to fully practice Islam by applying the tenet of jihad – emerge from, the Muslim community as a whole must also be focused upon, through what should be the foundation of the response to Asuric Islam: Ghar Wapsi. This *homecoming* or reversion from Asuric Islam back to the Sanatana Dharma should certainly be included as much as possible, even if ultimately the manner of addressing Asuric Islam will vary in different locales, with the local manifestation of the problem requiring local answers. Yet should Ghar Wapsi always be some part of a comprehensive plan, if for the simple reason that as Islam is an inherently anti-national and treasonous religion, the Muslim population is more susceptible to rebellion than others, at least to the point where they will try to use democracy to obtain another political division – the creation of another Asuric construct like "Pakistan".

But the ultimate rationale for Ghar Wapsi rests in the Asuric falsehood of Islam, its unrepentant refusal to allow for internal progression or transformation, and its *explicit* physical danger to the Hindu. For the reversion of the Muslim to the Sanatana Dharma will occur due to a different reason than the opposite conversion of a Hindu to Islam, as the latter process is initiated because of Islam's falsehood that a mere difference in opinion and belief is grounds for conversion. Ghar Wapsi, on the other hand, must be undertaken because the *religious* principle of Islam is that killing and subjugating others for alleged "disbelief" is warranted (even if strategic delays are necessary). Of course, the reversions will also help to improve the national dharma, transforming a minority susceptible – due to their birth in the Islamic community – to the most obvious Asuric imposition currently menacing the planet. While there is certainly a risk that some reversions might be made for the purpose of taqiyah, that is still a risk worth taking, especially as taqiyah itself is also problematic for the Islamic side as they can never be certain who is dissimulating for Islam, and who is pretending to dissimulate.

As the intent of Ghar Wapsi is to ultimately increase the growth of the Dharma out of the intransigent adharma and falsehood of Asuric Islam, it is in truth a different type of *Dharmayuddh*, part of the ongoing movement to uncover the inherent Dharma from that obstructing it and its ultimate progression to the state whereupon Dharma is abandoned and the Self-Consciousness of God is sought and Realized. Yet as the Ghar Wapsi is working against the Asura of Falsehood's religion, it cannot be implemented in a naive fashion, unaware of the crude Asuric machinations against such reversion drives and the ensuing apostates. For as Islam demands the deaths of apostates, the lives of those who

revert – and those who perform the Ghar Wapsi – can certainly become threatened, a fact that leads to multiple considerations including secret networks for those who revert – whether through homecoming drives that bring in masses (potentially by way of a heretic “Imam” or sufi leader who might be more susceptible to the reversion and then subsequently brings along his local community) or through reversions that might occur after the marriage of a Hindu to a Muslim -, including name changes and relocations to minimize the chance of repercussion from Asuric Islam's orthodox psychopaths.

This particular complication – the quick resort to violence advocated by Asuric Islam – is of course an important factor in conducting Ghar Wapsi, with the first adjustment involving the need for the work – like all work inspired by the Gods and Goddesses – to be done silently and steadfastly. But this does not mean that more robust options should be ignored, for strength is indeed an important facet to any movement against Asuric falsehood – it is just that the strength has to be of a different character to the type practised by Islam. The strength needs to be of a higher quality, more organized and disciplined, and also undertaken for higher values, rather than mimicking the lower vital nature of Islam. The strength should also be in place for other measures beyond the ongoing Ghar Wapsi, as the Indian Constitution itself needs to be modified to correct the mistake of appeasing Islam with remunerations such as allowing the Muslim male four wives and granting subsidies for Haj pilgrimages, with conflicting taxations of Hindu temples. This appeasement leads to the opposite result presumed, because it serves to provide the Muslim with belief that further gains against the Hindu are soon to come – and with the Haj also arrives the influence of Asuric Islam in its global epicentre.

In both the political changes to help the national dharma continue to grow out of the residue of a darker age, and in the non-political silent drive for homecomings, the strength that will supplement should certainly include an augmentation of the existing capabilities, a buttressing of an already present framework that includes the Indian police, counter-insurgency forces and the armed forces. These are the three whose capacities and effectiveness must be perfected, especially the former two who are currently impaired by a relative neglect. Finances and increased numbers, better training and innovations, are the call to the hour for all three, with the police and counter-insurgency forces the first in line to deal with the internal machinations of the Asuric cult, which by its very infratational word will always be technically treasonous, for it only recognizes the “Muslim” nation as worthy of the name. This underpinning of the already existing structure will be especially necessary if the most pious, as their religion instructs, regresses to type against Ghar Wapsi or the appropriate elimination of pro-Islamic laws. Indeed, it will also be necessary for another important aspect of the Goddesses' perpetual corrective campaign against Asuric falsehood – the circulation or verbalization of mere thought and opinion highlighting the Asuric nature of Islam and its horrific scripture.

For that is what Islam finds the most intolerable – the mere criticism of its depravities, as even a rational analysis which refuses to accept the occult reality of Gabriel, is more than enough to dispel the perverse and adharmic nature of the religion. It is why, as we have documented extensively, the Asura incessantly evoked the fear of hellfire and murder for leaving the Islamic cult, and why the madrassas inevitably turn to a strictly scriptural instruction. Literature and verbalization exposing the religion's ugly reality are certainly capable of yielding apostates – the full divorce necessitated due to the impossibility of comprehensively “moderating” or “reforming” Islam for any significant duration. But these apostates – who must be brought into the Hindu fold – will require the assurance of strength that must naturally also include the police and counter-insurgency forces, since we would expect the latter individuals to be of the best svadharma to negate the Asuric and adharmic forces that seek to intimidate and murder for the matter of a change in belief. And with the apostates from Islam observing the progressive increase in strength countering the murderous intentions of the most pious, the only fear that will have to be overcome is the root apprehension of the hellfire, a falsehood that should be addressed by the literature exposing Islam.

Progressive reversions of Muslims to the Sanatana Dharma will lead to a cascade effect, one that – if the counter-strengths are powerful enough – can lead to more and more public disavowals of the Asuric scripture, increasing confidence in the potential apostates and decreasing the assuredness by which the Imams assume their community to be ready to engage in activities – beyond the violence – to further the ambition of Asuric Islam to subjugate the Hindus. And if the literature and vocalization of the truth of Islam's evil nature is fundamental to countering the scriptural centres of control, literature – even when combined with strength – is usually not enough to convince the most pious of Islam's Asuric nature, because they have been brainwashed for far too long. Thus more comprehensive and subtle measures are additionally required, including the need for significant intelligence on the ideas and plans of the Imams, the nature of their assembly sermons, the stockpile of arms within their mosques – all the better to gain an idea on when low-level (riots and similar acts) or high-level jihadi actions are about to commence, an understanding that might certainly involve surveillance of both the Imam and the individuals attending his sermons and mosques, partially dependent upon the amount of hatred and violence being promoted.

Of course, these measures, while certainly to be considered (or perhaps already in motion), can be circumvented by the cleverest of Imams and the more pious of the followers, which means that innovative forms of punishment will likely need to be established, reflecting the unique nature of Islamic hierarchy. First and foremost, any murders committed by pious Muslims in response to literature and speech criticizing Islam, or in response to apostasy, should be punished with not only the execution of the jihadi, but also a significant penalty for the *Imam* who incited that particular jihadi to murder; the Imams, after all, rarely face censure for their hateful and disgusting speeches, and even if the Imam does not *literally* ask the jihadi to murder, the mere fact of his hateful speech (especially in response to literature or verbalizations that dare to criticize Islam, or to the sheer presence of apostates) is enough to warrant a punishment. This will finally bring some significant accountability to the Imam, and *perhaps* temper the message of separation and hatred constantly spewing from the mosques, loosening the emotional hold of the Imam over the flock, increasing the latter's responsiveness to the message of truth uncovering the falsehood of Asuric Islam propagated by the Imam. And if it is not an official Imam who held sway over that particular jihadi, then let the punishment also include the individual within that subsection who held the most psychological influence, who promoted in the jihadi the twisted hatred required to commit the Asuric violence, even if they were not involved in logistical planning of the jihadi act.

But if that person is most likely to be the Imam, the dynamic centre of control, the vantage point where the Asuric scripture is most likely to be vivified in all of its ugliness, we must nevertheless consider other centres of control whereby the falsehood is transmitted, and must seek to include them as part of the innovative counter-measures. To wit, the mosques and the madrassas must always be addressed, especially in relation to any act of Islamic jihad, but also for seemingly minor affronts such as the insidious “love jihad”, to arms smuggling or sexual slavery and pimping, and of course if they happen to be the starting point for any riots. To go along with punishing the instigating Imam, the mosque and associated madrassa themselves should be shut down, dissolving the specific centre of Asuric deviousness. This is a particular tactic – along with the attention on the Imam – that has been secretly verified by the history of Islam itself, as seen in its destruction of tens of thousands of Hindu temples, upon which Muslims often built mosques over the structural foundations – the barbarian's simulacrum of cultural superiority. As the evidence indicates, the Muslim despots erroneously thought that this would be the way to psychologically weaken the Hindus into conversion, to try and destroy their religion.

For the brainwashed pious, however, it is nearly impossible to understand the real centre of the Hindu religion, especially when Islam teaches that the Soul is capable of becoming lost or destroyed!

Contrastingly, in the Sanatana Dharma, the Purusha is the ultimate centre, the temple within oneself the greatest location of worship, and it is this fluidity that accounts for the inability of the Asuric Islamic savages to destroy Hinduism, for it is a religion that does not *require* any external centre, although of course such geographical locations might fluidly manifest as an expression of bhakta within the Hindu individual or group. As Islam is at best an adharmic religion, with the Asura codifying the adharmas into falsehood, the superficial idea that external centres are a mandatory part of religion was promoted, with the ulterior motive of using these centres as a means to prevent the believers from straying into Dharmic paths. But if the trampling upon Hindu temples was ineffective in yielding significant gains for the Asura of Falsehood's religion, there was indeed a method – of extortion - that met with a certain amount of success, as Sultan Firuz Shah Tughlaq succinctly explained in his autobiography:

Also due to my endeavours the *Zimmis* had the opportunity to embrace the true religion. **I proclaimed that whoever among the Infidels recited the Testament of Faith and followed Islam would, according to the principles of the faith of Muhammad (peace and blessings be upon him and his descendants) be exempt from the payment of *jiziyah*. When this proclamation reached the ears of the people, group after group of Hindus began to embrace Islam.** (Sultan Firuz Shah Tughlaq, *Futuh-i Firuz Shahi*, 2005, pp. 31-32)

The reason why *jizya* and the carrot of its abandonment was more favourable to such “rice conversions” rests in the paradox of the quick death – especially for those who believe in reincarnation – at times being more palatable than the slow strangulation through excessive *jizya* taxation, especially during a time when the Asuric falsehood of the Islamic scripture was not fully comprehended. And though Muslims are not in position to administer *jizya* upon modern Hindus, the importance of finance in countering Asuric Islam cannot be under-stressed. For not only is the financial health of India important in budgeting funds to strengthen the military and the geopolitical borders from the politically external Islamic threats of war and emigration (a type of demographic warfare), the increasing prosperity can also be used to improve indigenous military creations, yielding further money from decreased expenditure on foreign arms, with the additional wealth also directed to strengthening the police and counter-insurgency forces, and all intelligence operations both internal and external to the current geopolitical boundaries of India. And as the necessity of burgeoning these forces is often – but not always – related to the threat of jihad, one consideration is to source this money from the Islamic community out of which the mujahideen emerge.

After all, as the “moderate” Muslims are incapable of transforming Islam, as they certainly do nothing to permanently counter the hatred of the kuffar, then they – especially the leadership – can be held responsible for financing a significant amount of the security costs related to pious Islamic terror. While such government taxation would of course be controversial and would likely lead to panicked Imams whipping up the flock into a frenzy, there remain other financial considerations that are easier to implement, including targeting the Arab and other foreign funding of Islamic madrassas and different literalist movements within India, the ones more likely to advocate killing apostates and using violence against literature and speeches uncovering Islam's Asuric origin and depravity. And as this foreign money is certainly used for stockpiling of arms along with the standard Quran and Hadith indoctrination, it should be heavily taxed or otherwise diverted into the coffers of the Indian police and military and counter-insurgency forces, whether that money attempts to enter through ordinary means or by way of the *hawala* networks, which should certainly be monitored and infiltrated to at least disrupt the ease by which it can facilitate Islam's ambitions.

And if all this has the appearance of similarity with the techniques Islam uses in its warlust, we must remember that of most importance is the internal motivation, the consciousness – or Consciousness – that is attempting to manifest. When we acknowledge this critical factor, we find that it becomes *tamasic* to say – and the “secularists” of India, whether for financial or ideological reasons, often do

this – that anything that *appears* to parallel the behaviour and actions of the Muslims should be avoided. While it is certainly true that there should not be a mimicking of the ultra-vital nature of Islam, there will always be overlaps in a response to Asuric falsehood, because the Asura always uses earthly tactics including violence, and at any rate it is the nature of things to have certain similarities. And as the techniques used in the response are merely part of the external manifestation, we must remember the multifold internal foundation, including the *Dharmayuddh* needed to counter Asuric forces. We must also understand that any tactical or strategic similarities are not intended to represent the height of religion, because unlike Islam, the Sanatana Dharma does not codify fixed externals – like the mentality and actions of the medieval Arabs – into permanent religious principles.

It is also a *tamasic* – in this case a *tamasic* application of spiritual realities – to leave the problem of Islam to indifference or pacifism, resorting to supplications that all is “God's Will” or fate, or that if Brahma has allowed the Asuras to exist, then the Asuras – and any religion they might create – are ‘equal’ and do not require any correctives. But the truth of the Asura's equality, and the equality of religions, can only *substantially* exist for those who have Realized the Supreme Consciousness, who *experience* the Truth-Existence. For the vast majority, the ultimate Consciousness has not been experienced, because the majority belong to a partial consciousness yet to transcend the veil. And even for those of the Supreme Consciousness, like the Overmind Gods and Goddesses (different Personalities of Brahma), an additional feature of That profound equality is the truth of actively countering the Asuras and anything created by the latter. It is only in the highest elevation of Brahma, the Static or Silent *Sat* or Truth-Existence, where the Asuras are merely Witnessed as part of the profound equality – but for every other form of consciousness and Consciousness, the Asuras must be addressed *dynamically*, and a failure to do so in mortals is the confirmation of *tamas* rather than any sort of luminosity.

And as it is the Gods and Goddesses – and the Supramental Force-Consciousness – who are countering the Asura of Falsehood's obstructing force of Islam, the Hindus who work towards the decline of the Asura's religion will find themselves agents of the Supramental and Overmind Deities, who unlike the vital ‘gods’ will reward with a flowering of consciousness closer to Satchitananda, rather than the material rewards proffered by the latter. As the Gods are simply Personalities of Brahma, their Puissance is infinitely more powerful than the Asura of Falsehood, who though certainly dangerous by way of his effective use of the lower ego that mankind often desires to aggregate, is aware that Truth alone is the Victor, that defeat is his destiny. That it may take more time for the work of the Gods to manifest lies in the need to make sure elevated and Psychic values emerge out of the destined result of the activity against the Asuras and other hostile forces, along with the relative ease – in comparison - by which the Asura of Falsehood is able obtain responsiveness from mortals, some of whom are clouded by the partial – and deceptive - reality that worship of Allah is similar to any other worship, when in fact the invocations of the Islamic scripture are much more likely to summon hostile forces distinctly opposing the descent of the Supramental Consciousness.

Thus it remains dangerous to take solace in the idea that “all religions are one”, for it represents a *tamasic* application of the Supreme Unity, because to consider as equal, from the perspective of seeking Self-Realization, something that invokes the Asura of Falsehood – while crucially, at the same time seeking to subjugate or murder all ‘others’ – is a variation of degraded ‘knowledge’ that leads to ignorant inaction. What instead needs to be appreciated, is that the Asuras are part of a Supreme Whole that *also* includes a fundamental necessity that they be countered, because addressing the Asuric inversion of wisdom is similarly Integral to that Divine Consciousness. Subsequently, the Hindu can also perceive that anyone countering Islam is in reality resisting the Asura of Falsehood (working through his religion), and thereby strengthening the ongoing manifestation of the most recent occult entry into the terrestrial plane – the Supramental. While this Consciousness certainly attempts to

transform or syncretize Asuric machinations, such progressive integration is impossible with the Asura of Falsehood's most intransigent construct, which means that even a hint of accepting Islam should not be allowed, for that would automatically promote – at minimum – the ideology of separation, leading to a ceiling of *avidya* and inevitable degeneration into outright falsehood and chaotic violence.

Islam must perish, or be reduced to a level similar to the presence of modern Nazism – which is impotent –, as its potential takeover of the planet would lead to a self-devouring rather than the utopian peace envisioned by delusional Islamic intellectuals, cleaving the world sect by sect, violent ambition by violent ambition. And if the ultimate pressure will always rest with the Muslims, who are technically in a constant state of failure for their inability to have fulfilled the Islamic prophesy of world conquest (along with the ubiquitous presence of hypocrites within their midst), vigilance and a dynamic response must nevertheless be initiated, in the hopes of preventing the type of last resorts seen in the final response that precipitated Nazism's demise. Of course, however the work proceeds, one thing that should be avoided is the minutiae and rigidity that plagued medieval India in its societal spheres, even if the foundation should ideally be a Ghar Wapsi shielded from the crude Asuric tactics of intimidation and murder by Islamic fanatics. Fluidity and intuition are paramount to dealing – as India has done before – with the Asuric threat, as both are the avenues through which the Gods and Goddesses perfect the work.

And as that work is not merely to dismantle Islam, but also to effect the manifestation of the Supreme Consciousness, to progress the world closer to the ultimate Consciousness of Oneness in Multiplicity, the ending of Islam must not mean a cessation to the rise of the Sanatana Dharma or the assumption that the Asura of Falsehood has finished trying to deliberately obstruct the Truth from manifesting. For as we know, he has – unlike two of the other four major Asuras – resisted occult conversion, which means that manifold eruptions related to either his direct contact or influence can be expected even after Islam is rendered ineffective. Accordingly, India and other nations must make it a point to conduct their work for Truth rather than mere national interests – though certainly there will be an overlap between the two, as the Nation and its material development are realities that must be ensured, but not by *exaggerating* the importance of national interest over Truth. And part of that perspective is a vigilance towards ideologies that advocate falsehood or the entrenchment of ignorance, movements of which India is certainly no stranger towards, because well before the invasion of Islam, India had clear intrusions of ignorance and falsehood – indeed even during Vedic times, the original fissure occurred, as the ending of *Vedic* hymns to the Asura, and the emergence of Zoroastrian hymns to Ahura Mazda and against the Devas, makes clear.

While that, and even the notorious medieval intrusions of ignorance – by way of an overemphasis on *shastras* - that crystallised the decay of that particular era, did not result in a permanent obstruction of progress – precisely because those disturbances were not accompanied by the claim of God's 'last Word' -, they all required attention, and they were all worked through in one fashion or another. Similarly will the demise of Islam not immediately reduce the Asura of Falsehood's machinations, although of course his most dangerous current force of falsehood will at least be negated. India especially, since the culture accepts the aspiration of Self-Realization, must remain vigilant, because as we recall, the Lord of Falsehood's initial ambition is to always block that Supreme Awareness and maintain a separation of consciousness, and as India is a nation which respects the individual's aspiration to moksha, the Asura will certainly seek to harm India with the ultimate ambition of preventing the manifestation of Satchitananda *into* the terrestrial existence. And as we have seen historically, one way of obstructing the ancient task of India is by way of direct foreign invasions to go along with internal disruptions.

In part because of that most important historical fact, it becomes imperative that Hindus do not rest with a Ghar Wapsi of Islam and the vanquishing of the artificial Islamic geopolitical states temporarily

disfiguring the ancient nation of Bharat. Instead, these actions must represent the starting point of a much broader aspiration, one that will certainly involve further expansion and gains. For the ultimate goal is to spread the Sanatana Dharma worldwide, especially its final aspiration of a Unity of Consciousness with God which can then lead to the Supramental Descent. Indeed one might argue that the necessity of this increase was the secret intent behind the medieval attacks and invasions, to provide the impetus for the expansion of Dharma well beyond its historic geographical boundaries. It is an expansion that does not need to be – or at least, not entirely – the standard idea of physical conquest by way of armies and increasing territories held by a central state. The conquest that *must* occur, however, is a psychological one, in which the principles and aspiration of the Sanatana Dharma are established globally, helping not only to provide a defence for India against a return of the genocidal foreign rule seen previously through the Muslim and British invaders, but the more important necessity of the progression of global consciousness towards the Creator.

Indeed the location of the predatory rulers clues us in to the defensive – again, the minor reason for expansion of the Sanatana Dharma – value of spreading globally, when we consider the fact that no such atrocities were received from forces to the east of India, much of whom were either Hindu or Buddhist, with the latter religion having spread eastward from India through peaceful conversions. But it is not the spread of Buddhism that we want, because though it certainly has finer aspirations than the Abrahamic faiths, it unfortunately does not call for the descent of the Supreme Consciousness into the earthly adhar, and from a *practical* standpoint does not significantly endorse the Dynamic Self-Realization of God, although, as mentioned, many Buddhist cultures certainly believe in a Dynamic Creator. The ultimate aspiration must be the Descent of the Supramental or Vijnana Consciousness into the very physical material of the adhar, an aspiration that can occur *after* the initial phase of svadharma leading one into a sadhana. And as that Dharma – and of course the Illimitable Consciousness – is not restricted to India or officially classified Hindus, and is even practised by others throughout the planet (albeit not according to the name of Dharma), it is only right that the expansion of Vedic and Dharmic realities spread worldwide so that different nations can let that Eternal and Illimitable Consciousness manifest as part of the aspired Multiplicity.

As it is every human's inherent birthright to let the Psychic spark grow, to develop their inherent law, to let the Soul eventually reign as their Commander, it is a must that the Hindus look to expand the Sanatana Dharma in ways according to both their personal svadharma and the national dharma, as this will be of benefit to all of mankind and all nations, starting with the reality that the Supramental Descent is the pinnacle of Creation. From that starting point will the global growth of the Sanatana Dharma, the inherent law that prepares the stage for the greatest flowering of Consciousness, be unstoppable - an outcome that can only occur when the Hindus are mentally geared toward that expansion, which will of course include the Arab land of which the geographical idol of Islam is located. Once the mindset is channelled toward the greatest of all expansions, the Divine Mother will be ready to send forth the necessary 'hosts' or forces of inspiration and strength, propelling the Hindu forward, with seemingly fortuitous events increasingly favouring the expansion of the Sanatana Dharma even when facing the most obstinate of enemies – those who persist in preventing the greatest of all Realizations even if aware that they fight on the losing side. For it is only the Conscious Unity in Multiplicity that can emerge permanently victorious, because the Satchitananda is *the* Reality.