ALAHAZRAT NETWORK
www.alahazratnetwork.org

Fauz-e-Mubeen on Refutation of Earth's Motion

Compiled by :

Allama Hazrat Imam Ahmad Raza Khan

ALAHAZRAT NETWORK
www.alahazratnetwork.org

FAUZ-E-MUBEEN
DAR RADD-E-
HARKAT-E- ZAMEEN

A FAIR SUCCESS
REFUTING
MOTION OF EARTH

A'la Hazrat Imam Ahmad Reza Brailvi
(Mercy of Allah be upon him)

English Rendering
Abdul Hamid Maiskar
(M.A. Urdu-English)

Co-operated By
Muhammad Iqbal Noori
Masjid Habibia Silani, Bareily (India)

Published by
Idara-e-tahqiqat-e-Imam-Ahmad Reza
Reg. International, Karachi.
www.imamahmadraza.net
E-mail: mail@imamahmadraza.net

Name of the Book

A Fair Success Refuting
Motion of Earth

Author

A'la Hazrat Imam Ahmad Raza

English Rendering

Abdul Hamid Maiskar

Composing & Title

Rao Riaz Shahid Raza Qadri,
Digital Library Fikr-e-Alahazrat, Okara.

Published By

Idara-e-Tahqeeqat-e-Imam Ahmad Raza
International, Karachi. Pakistan.

Year of Publishing

2005

Price

Available At:

Idara-e-Tahqeeqat-e-Imam-Ahmad Reza

25-Japan Mansion, Regal Chowk Saddar

Karachi. www.imamahmadraza.net

E-mail: mail@imamahmadraza.net

FOREWARD

Allah, in the name of, the most affectionate and the merciful.

Physics is the most fundamental science concerned, with the basic principles Universe. It is one of the foundations on which the other physical sciences like Astronomy Chemistry and Geology (earth science) are based.

Regarding Physics, Mechanics is of vital importance from all disciplines. It is highly successful in describing the motion of material bodies, such as Planets, Rockets and based.

Famous firsts in Earth theory

Regarding earth theory, the famous firsts are:

1.Nicolas Copernicus (1473-1542) Poland
2.Galileo Galilee (1564-1642)
Italian Physicist & Astronomer
3. Johannes Kepler (1571-1630) German Astronomer
4. Isaac Newton (1642-1727)
English Physicist & Mathematician
5. Albert Einstein (1879-1955) German Physicist
6. Alahazrat Imam Ahmad Raza Khan Bareilvi
(1856-1921) Muslim Scientist the Asian Physicist, Astronomer, Mathematician, Philosopher, Psychologist, Elegant Jurist of the Muslim World, a poet and renowned Scholar of the Islamic Sciences.

Galileo formulated the laws that govern the motion of objects in free fall. He investigated the motion of an object on an inclined Plane and established the concept of relative motion.

According to Isaac Newton, the gravitation is the intrinsic property of matter that every particle of matter attracts every other particle with a force that is directly proportional to the product of their masses and is inversely proportional to the square of the distance between them.

According to Einstein theory, space time is curved especially locally near massive bodies. This theory doesn't tell us about the force of gravity acting on the bodies, instead we say bodies and light rays move along geodesics (equivalent to straight lines in plane geometry) in curved space time. Thus a body at rest or moving slowly near the great mass would follow a geodesic toward that body rather than force of gravity.

According to Imam Ahmad Raza, the Islamic theory (based on Quran and Hadith) explains that earth is static. In favour of his theory, Imam Ahmad Ran has written treatises like:

- ***Nuzool-i-Ayat-i-Furqan Besukoon-i-Zameen-o-Aasman, 1919.***
- ***Mueen-i-Mubin Bahar Daur-i- Shamas-o-Sukoon-i-Zameen, 1919 (Eng.trans: A fair guide on the revolving sun and the static earth)***
- ***Fauz-i-Mubin Dar Radd-i-Harkat-i-Zameen,1919.***

In his first treatise, Imam Ahmad Raza has discussed earth theory in the light of Qur'an and Hadith that earth and sky are static by coding several verses from the Holy Quran.

In his second treatise, lmam Ahmad Ran has elaborated that sun is in motion while earth is static based on astronomical observations and calculations. Most

probably, Dr. Abdul Qadeer Khan, the renowned Physicist and Atomic Scientist of the Muslim World has appreciated the arguments of Imam Ahmad Raza regarding motion of sun.(ref: Mujalla Imam Ahmad Raza.

In his treatise ***"Fauz-i-Mubin"*** Imam Ahmad Raza has not only proved that earth is static with 105 argumentations in the light of Modern Physics, but also criticized the ideas of renowned scientists like, Copernicus, Galileo, Kepler, Newton and Albert Einstein. In his book ***"Fauz-i-Mubin"*** lmam Ahmad Rant has discussed various scientific spheres of knowledge including Physics, Chemistry, Geology, Astronomy and Astrology, Mathematics, Logarithm covering the topics of Planetary motion in the orbits and the Physical mechanics like attractive and repulsive forces, Centripetal force, Centrifugal force, friction coefficient, projectile motion, relative velocity, circular speed, buoyant force, density & pressure, structure of earth, theory of tides and distance from the sun, along with dozens of geometric diagram representations with Algebric, logarithmic and mathematical calculations.

Conclusion:-

According to Modem Physics, the rest and motion are not absolute but are relative. Also, the rest and motion depend on the observer and its frame of reference. As we are on the earth, so earth is static with respect to us which favor argumentations of static theory of Imam Ahmad Raza.

It is interesting to note that Imam Ahmad Raza is the first Muslim scientist of the 20^{th} century who made rich creative scientific contributions regarding Modern Physics like static theory of earth.

In the end, I would like to suggest that to make the new generation conversant with the scientific work of Imam Ahmad Raza, it is necessary that various Seminars/Symposiums should be arranged at national/ international level where significant research scholars may vehemently discuss the informative scientific work of Imam Ahmad Raza that can bring about a guideline in the scientific era.

Dr: Muhammad Maalik
MBBS, PMDC
King Edward Medical College And Mayo Hospital Lahore.
Founder Al-Raza Islamic Centre
Head Raza Research Council.
Khurshid Clinic, Block No.16
Dera Ghazi Khan.

In the name of Allah,
the Beneficent and the Merciful and we praise Him,
And send our best wishes to the Noble Prophet.

Praise be to Allah, Who grasps and holds firmly the heavens and the earth that they may not deviate, and if they were to deviate there is not one that could grasp them after Him. Behold He his ever Clement, Forgiving. He made the ships to be of service to you that they may run upon the sea at his command, and He has made the rivers subservient and useful to you. He has subdued the sun and the moon constant in their courses, to be of service to you. He has subdued the sun and the moon to serve your cause. Each runs to an appointed term. Beware that Allah is the Most Powerful and Forgiving. O, our Master, the Nourisher of us, You have not created all these things in vain. You are the Most Praiseworthy. Please, do protect us from the fire of the Hell, you have commanded us and Your Command is Right and Perfect.

And it is Your Command that the sun is running towards a resting place for him. That is the measuring of the Mighty the Wise. And for the moon we have fixed the phases till it returns to the shape of an old shriveled palm-leaf. So, bestow upon the Prophet, the sun-like Messenger of your commandments, the Ladder to the place of ascent, the Zenith of your closeness and the Glory, where none has the power to reach. Verily, your Lord (i.e. Master; Nourisher) is your goal. And, also, O, Allah, bestow His (i.e. The Prophet's) family, his companions and his relatives and his clan with your blessings. The sun has risen and this day is between yesterday and tomorrow. May Allah listen to our prayers and fulfill them. (AMIN)

By the Praise of Allah, the symbol of the light that came from the Mountain of Tour and shined all over from the Mount Sayeer and derived abundance from the Faran of Makkah Muazzamah with glittering light and thus came to know by the whole world. He brought out the secrets of movements of the sun and the moon and the stillness of the earth. But today, they are teaching contrary to that. And the Muslims are unaware of it. It is drilled into the minds of simple and unknowing children. It is diluting their faith and their adherence to Islam. May Allah protect us from it. The ancient philosophy, too, was wholly against it. But it had discussed unsufficiently which was based on its own laws and it was contrary to their opponents. The Fakir (the saint), the seeker of shelter of the Prophet, the servant of him. Ahmed Raza Mohammadi, Sunni, Hanafi, Qadri, Barkati, Brailvi, (may Allah forgive him and fulfill his desires) got inspiration to start publishing a sufficiently creditable magazine and that it should be on the basis of the same modern astronomy so that with its own affirmations and conceptions their contents be eradicated and falsified and thus it may lead, spontaneously, to falsify their theory of the motion of the earth and that of the stillness of the sun. And Allah is the best supporter.

This magazine, a historical epoch, was titled" Fauz-e-Mubeen Dar Radd-e-Harkat-e-Zameen" (meaning The clear success in the falsification of the movement of the earth), containing a foreword, four sections (chapters) and one concluding article. The Foreword will include 1238 conceptions of the modern astronomy which will be used in this book. The First Chapter will contain the discussion on the Repulsion leading to the resistance of the falsehood and absurdity of the Motion of the earth. There will be 12 proofs on this subject. In the Second Chapter, there will be arguments over the conception of the attraction leading to 50 proofs of the falsehood of the

Motion of the earth. The Third Chapter is comprised of **43** proofs on the absurdity of the Motion of the earth, By the Praise of Allah, thus there are, in all, one hundred and five (**105**) proofs against the Motion of the earth of which fifteen have been discussed in the past in other books in which we have mode corrections and alterations as required and out of these there are ninety **(90)**, very clear & perfect. They are our own making, by the Grace of Allah. In Chapter Fourth, there is the resistance to those doubts which the modern astronomers tender in support of the correctness of the motion of the earth. At the end of it there are some proofs from the Heavenly Books in affirmation and support of the revolution of the sun and the stillness of the earth. Allah is the owner of all the things and the kingdom.

FOREWORD TO THE ESTABLISHED ASSUMPTIONS OF MODERN ASTRONOMY

We will describe here those assumptions that are accepted and admitted by the experts of the modern astronomy. In reality they may be correct or wrong, this book is to resist here some of them like the attraction, the repulsion and motion of the earth. And we are going to caution you at mistakes involved in these assumptions, And all the success lies with Allah.

(1) The body has a power to pull or attract another thing before it. It is a natural power or force which is called the power of attraction. This was discovered by Newton in 1665 A.D. when he had run away from his village to some other village to escape a contagious disease. He was in a garden when he saw a fruit falling down on the ground from a tree. He sat to ponder over this matter and he got an idea of Laws of Attraction.

My Statement No.1: The exigency or the requirement of the awakening of the idea of the relation between the falling of the apple and the force of attraction was nothing more than this that the fruit fell down and he sprang up because there could not have been any other cause of it than that. The complete details in this respect are given in Chapter II. Is it till 1665, thousands of years back all and all the philosophers and the thinkers were devoid of this idea? Isn't surprising that Newton, too, might have not observed any thing falling down before this falling down of the apple. Or is that he had any other

fancy and it was broken at this time of event by the fall of the apple?

(2) Actually, there is not any inherent natural inclination of leaning down or rising up or slipping forward or backward. On the contrary they have the tendency of centralization of power, by nature which is the resistant to the motion and the defender to a greater extent against the coercive effect. This force or power is latent in each and every thing (body) as per its weight. Hence, if a part of a body is separated and it is included in the other one, it will reduce in its power of centralization in proportion to the weight and will increase in its power to defend against the coercive effect or the attraction.

My Statement No.2: Firstly, what is the proof of it that this power is latent in the body itself? Do you say that it is the experience that if we want to give a motion to a body, it will resist to it more as much more it is in weight and it will require more power to realise its purpose.

My Statement No.3: Is it that you have forgotten your power of attraction? You want to give it a motion of different kind and you are conscious of its resistance of the same. This is your way of thinking although it is false of which the description will follow in Chapter II. And in our view the natural tendency of leaning of the bodies show resistance in its opposite direction and it is its aversion to the motion. This is your imagination and the ancient philosophy is in favour of its reverse that in each and every body there lies some kind of inclination, may it be straight or spherical, It will certainly resist any tendency that may be contrary to its own and will be obedient to one which it agrees to. For example throwing of the stone and making it fall down. Its falsification will occur in the chapter III, by the Grace of Allah. In our view,

in all the bodies observed so far, has a tendency of leaning. There is no need that it should be in all. The tendency of centralization of power is not found in some of them and there is no need to be worried about it. *Secondly*, this last statement is as such that it has not put a seal on the whole truth of the modern astronomy. The explanation to it is going to follow. It is not your own but of Newton's attraction that is the bone of contention in No. 8.

(3) Each and every thing (body) has the tendency to run away from the attraction of the other. This force is called the power of repulsion. Running away is resistance and setting in motion is repulsion.

My Statement No.4: The falling of the apple hinted at the force of attraction. And the thought of the attracter came after having seen the apple fallen on the ground. So the idea came to the mind that the earth has got the power of attraction. And when he saw the apple coming down, he realised the force of repulsion. And as a matter of fact any one of them is quite sufficient to bring it down. Then, what for two are required? IN "Hadayiq-un-Najum, it is said: If a bullet is fired on the equal level it will go in straight line, following its own nature. This hints at the force of repulsion.

My Statement No.5: The answer to this is in the shooting of the bullet. If you tried to put it in such a way that there may not be any movement at all, then it will not go ahead equal to a hairs breadth. Of course, if the level is not equal at all the places, it will come down in the shape of a shield. If you throw a stone with a catapult, it will come down to the ground no sooner it is sent away. This is the repulsion.

My statement No.6: It is the same thing that we had based on his (Newton's) guess. He saw the apple fallen on the ground, so took it for attraction. He lifted his eyes up and forgot it. He forgot the first idea and thought it to be repulsion.


(4) Whenever a body revolves in a circular shape, it is aversed to the center. Turn a stone around yourself having tied it to a rope. It will tend to loose itself and go away. As much you revolve it fast that much more it will want to loosen itself and will use more force to get loose. If it gets loose, it will go the straight way and as much forcefully you had revolved it, with that much force it will fall away at that much more distance. This is the repulsion of the stone against the centre.

My statement No.7: Here, the repulsion is taken for granted without any proof and the analogy of the stone is unagreeable. It is only the effect of your defence that you see its power against the opposite. As a matter of fact neither the stone has any repulsion against a man or the center, nor it has attraction for them. It is not at all the repulsion of the stone in respect of the types of the coercive motion. For the purpose of research, we would like to exclude all the forces that, in proportion to the motion, affect the body as a coercive agent.


Hence, ***My statement No.8:*** In the first division these are two, one is the causative factor (mover) and the other one is the Resister or the restrainer which may not allow the motion to increase. For example stop with your hand the slipping stone. Again the mover or the causative factor has two types. The first one is the attraction which may bring the moving object to the side of the coercer for example it may pull the stone towards itself and the other one is that which may throw the stone

towards the mover. May it be just as moving away the body from the restrainer as is evident or may it be to make it closer. For example in this picture, take.

A for a man's place, C is the place of the stone. The man strikes the stone with a stick and throws it to B from C. It is not the attraction. Otherwise, if it were the attraction. It would have brought the stone on the direction of C A. On the contrary it went to B in the direction of CB. It is a different direction. So this would be called the repulsion. Now as you see the stone is now nearer to the man being at B point rather than being at the point of C because AB is a perpendicular side and AC the hypotenuse. And AB is smaller than AC. So, in respect of the attraction and the disjunction there are two types and the conclusion is that out of these two types of forces, the repulsion has the duty to keep the body at a particular altitude while it is in motion. Annexture



For example, you may bring the stone towards yourself keeping it just touching the earth or push it ahead.



In respect of the point of positive and negative it is of two types of which one is that to take away the moving body to reach its destination. The modest of them has to maintain the mediocricily in respect of the unity and the diversity of the line of the motion. These too,

are of two types. One is the translatory. It has to change the line of the motion. For example in this figure, a stone is thrown from A towards C. While it is on its way, and has reached point B, is struck with a stick and is directed towards E. This will be translatory reflection.

In this motion when the stone has reached the point D, it was pulled towards the direction of R. This force may be called the translatory attraction. And it is thrown towards C and it is pulled down to A by the direction of B, then this action will be, upto B, called positive resister as it was taken away on the some line. When it returns from B, it will be called positive attraction because it brought the body (stone) on the same line. Thus all these have totaled to 13. Out of these, in one type when the stone is revolved around the head and thrown away, and here it is where the attraction has nothing to do with because it has not to attract it and bring it towards itself but only to restrict it is its purpose. Out of the remaining seven, only four forces are working here. One is the resister or the restrainer and the other three are, repulsive i.e. prohibitory, lifter and translatory. Throw away the stone to such a distance that the rope is tightened and stretched fully this will be the prohibitory. Keep your hand raised so that it should not fall down on the ground, it will be lifter, keep your hand revolving around your head so that the line of motion go on changing time to time. This will be the translatory force. Let these powers be constant so that the rope may not get loose and it may not come towards the earth and also it should not stop having stretched to one side and it is here the force of repulsion is working and its duty is to keep giving the body (stone) motion of a straight line. Hence, it is bound to go to the same direction from the first type of repulsion and at every translatory point it may take again the same straight direction. But the rope which the prohibitory force has kept tightened and the lifter has kept it raised and the translatory power that is changing its


course. All of them ore bent upon not to allow it go ahead. Helplessly, all the repulsive and translatory forces are restricted to this limit. And the man who is here as a center, is at the same distance every time, this is the resister or the restrainer whose work is taken in the guise of a rope. It formed the shape of a circle. To suppose it as force of attraction is just nothing but ignorance and madness. Here, the attraction has nothing to do actually. And there is nothing in the stone such as attraction or repulsion. On the contrary, here are the forces of restrainer and the repulsive. There will be as much resistance as much power you apply to revolve the stone. And it will be taken for granted that the stone is going away with that much power although it is not its urge to do so or not its own power to do so. But it is the power of your resistance to which you are supposing the power of repulsion. Note that here the words of those people are misleading and ambigious who generally name this power as a repulsion towards the center of the circle, only. But they have all the while taken repulsion for the repulsion towards the sun. And on R No. 18 they have assumed the sun to be the center of it.

My statement No.9: That they want the reality to be on this line because the body will refrain from the effect of the attraction due to its power of centralization and so it will be aversed to the power of repulsion and due to the combination of these two it will rotate around it of which the description is following in the next pages. Until it had not revolved, where was the center because of which there would have been the repulsion? That will be specified only after the rotation had been completed. But we will discuss about the center and the sun in the Chapter I because of their misleading contention.

(5) In their view, the rotationary or the circular motion is caused by the combination or the inter-relation of the powers of attraction and the repulsion. And the

revolving of the planets is due to the sun's power of attraction and due to their own power of running away (i.e. repulsion).

Suppose the earth or any other planet is on the point A and the sun on the point of C. The sun's power of attraction is pullings it from A to the side of C The power of the repulsion, in accordance with its law wants it to take towards the line of the tangent which means on that line where it will be perpendicular on the line of the attraction for example on AC. The effect of both the forces confronting each other is that the earth, neither it can go to the side of B, nor to the side of C. On the Contrary it passes to D in between the two. Here, too, both the same effects are at work. The power of attraction is pulling it from D to C and the force of repulsion wants to push it to E. Hence, the earth, having slipped from the clutches of both of them moves towards F. In this way the rotation (revolution) takes place. And thus the orbit that occurred due to this motion, in a casual way looks like a single circular line and in reality it is a wave-like line which is composed of numerous small straight Ones and every line is like a diameter of a very tiny parallelogram.



My statement No.10: here, as it is that the revolution occurs due to the repulsion is their discreditable speculation and they are very fond of this idea that the repulsion takes place because of the revolution. And that is so meaningless and unreasonale. But the modern astronomy is well used to lying which of the condemnation will take place in Chapter III. Insha-Allah.

Note: But as is described here that the attraction and the repulsion together cause the earth to make a revolution is

the very basis of the modern astronomy. At all the places the discussion is centered on and around it. On page No. 93, their theme is the same and on page No. 56, it has added a new fancy. It is like this that suppose that the earth was thrown in the vacuum the very time of its creation and at that time, had not anything come in his way to obstruct it, It would have gone to that direction only it met the sun on its way and it started confronting it.

My statement No.11: The assumptions cannot be the alternatives to the events. The purpose of the contender is not fulfilled by words like! 'Perhaps' and 'Probably'. These people might be devoid of the methods of reasoning. One thing can be proved by the observation or an evidence and there should be a cause in support of it but still there is some doubt and hitch which can be eradicated by some other ways. Such should be the procedure to establish a particular truth. But they have none of it. There is only the scope of probability. Whereas the conception Is positive and Its cause is fixed, then it is free from the doubts. So it should be said that perhaps this may be so. But a thing which is not proved, there is no scope of supposition and probability at all. At this time it should be contended like this, this is in accordance with our guess or suppose this way and this can be so and so etc. And here, there is no cause determined. So the contender and only that contender will admit the truth of it who is foolish. And where there is no cause fixed and the thing is positive and proved, then neglecting the doubts and relying on the probability of it, is a foolish idea. If a fact is not established from the beginning of its origin and no cause is determined for its truth and in addition to it there is probability of it and without doing anything to rectify it and without determining any proof of it, to consider both of them established is just as doubly foolishness and it is total ignorance. And if it would not do even otter the remedy

against them, the number of the mad people will increase to no limit at all. This point is to be remembered very well lest you be deceived by your opponents.

(6) The forces of attraction and the repulsion are equal on every orbit. Otherwise, the attraction would overcome and in such condition, for example the earth would be attracted by the sun to such an extent that it may merge within it. And if the repulsion overcomes, the earth would go on the line of tangent at straight way and the system of the revolution will be collapsed.

My statement No.12: They contend a particular thing and act against it at the same time. They proclaim something and talk against it, too. In fact they have the inclination, contradiction, & inconsistency of their own cause of which the discussion will occur in the Chapter I, by the grace of Allah.

(7) The repulsion is in proportion of the attraction and the speed of the motion depends upon the repulsion. As much there will be the force of attraction, that much more there will be the repulsion so that it may be possible for it to defend against it. And as much the repulsion will increase, that much increase will be there in the speed. It is evident that this is the result of the repulsion. Hence, as much it is far from the star sun, it will rotate on its own orbit slowly that much. The nearest to it is the planet of Mercury which revolves at the speed of one lakh five thousand three hundred thirty three miles per hour and the Neptune is farthest from all and its speed is eleven thousand nine hundred fifty eight miles per hour.

My statement No.13: this is believable and that one which has gone in No. 13 that the attraction and

the repulsion go on changing in proportion to the speed is just saying in reverse. It doesn't serve the purpose.

(8) The bodies are composed of democratia. Newton explained it as such that they are very small bodies and from their very creation they are by their natural trait prone to motion, heavy, hard and unbreakable. None of them is prone to division of it. Although our mind might sense their parts.

My statement No.14: ***firstly*** it is closer to our religious faith. In our view the composition of the bodies is due to the atoms and every one is an atomic point. None has got length, breadth or depth. Its division cannot be thought of. The ancient philosophy admits it to be original, with no parts and it could be subdivided into unlimited numbers with power. ***Secondly (15)***, Newton's theory that all the parts are by their nature prone to motion is apparently contradictory to No. 2 because as in reality the body is aversed to the motion by its nature and it accepts the motion only by force. It is contrary to its nature. But if it is accepted that from its very creation it has got the tendency of accepting the effect by force, and if it had not this capacity, then even by force it could not have the motion. And, in fact, the natural trait is against the motion due to the weight and heaviness of its own. This is a kind of force of which is the duty to act that means to oppose and resist the cause or the agent of motion and to accept the effect is dependent on its own will. To sum up, it resists due to its weight and accepts the effect by force. Then it is not objectionable. ***Thirdly***, it is all right. But this assertion is such that it would finish off the whole modern astronomy wholly of which discussion is going to follow, by the Grace of Allah. It cannot be guessed in what circumstance Newton was compelled to write down this word "heavy" which has weakened his own formed and

nourished laws of attraction. ***ADVANTAGE:*** Our vocal scholars distinguish between the weight and being heavy. This latter one is due to the kind and the former is due to its own individuality. This one is subject to change as per the determining factors and of which effect is to urge for lowering down to the utmost depth. It has nothing to do with the volume, weight and the multiplicity of the parts (components) of a body. A stick of wood has more weight than a chhatank of iron but iron is heavier than wood. And in *'Haqdaiq-e-Najum'* it has been maintained that the heaviness always pulls the body downward and further it has been said that the heaviness is an inclination inherent in a body as that is in all the bodies towards their centers.

My statement No.16: It is an indulgence rather than heaviness to incline or lean. On the contrary, it is an incentive to lean or lower down. For example, it says further that it is of two types. The first is absolute. It means the tendency of the heaviness due to which all the bodies are inclined towards their centers as all the components of our sphere are inclined towards the earth's center. It is always equal to the quantity of the matter of the body and here, there is no consideration of the volume of it. Hence, a stick (of wood) and an iron are both equal in respect of being heavy.

My statement No.17: That is to say that both the bodies are equal in respect of their absolute heaviness that is their inclination towards the center of the earth which is inherent in both of them in their nature. There is no scope of comparison in absoluteness.

Secondly (18) and that is why to consider the absoluteness equal to the quantity of the mailer is ignorance and nothing more. Will the absoluteness change in respect of the increase and the decrease in the matter?

Thirdly (19) this variation in the matter of the body, as is supposed to be, is impossible. It assumes it be same in the iron and the wood. As much the body is dense, the matter means the democritic parts are more. How can a wood be equal to an iron in density? These people when they come into this field, they tumble down in this way. They again contend that there is another positive heaviness and it is in a particular body different from that of the other body in respect of the difference of their types. It is different in two things of the same volume in respect of their mailer and to that proportion. Take an iron and a piece of wood, both equal, say equal to a finger in volume, then you will come to know that the iron is heavier than the wood. It means, in equal volume, the iron piece has got more mailer than the piece of wood.

My statement No.20 What is the difference? The absolute heaviness, too, was in proportion in respect of the matter. It means it will go on changing in proportion to increase and decrease in the mailer. The same case is with the weight also. It will change in the ratio of the matter in the bodies. If you suppose the matter in a perticular thing is lessened, the heaviness of the body will lesson, too and if more matter is added to the body, the heaviness of it will increase. Isn't this all based on the proportion of the two things. In all, they are of the opinion that the pivot of the heaviness is on the multiciplicity of the parts. If the parts are less the heaviness of the body is less. And if the parts in that body are more, the heaviness is more in that body. But this is not so. In their view, the weight and the heaviness is one and one thing only. We shall discuss most probably on this very topic.

(9) The matter of every body which is called the substance or the corpuscle, is such a thing by the means

of which each and every body fills its hollowness and thus resists others to come in that place.

My statement No.21: All these are the same democratic parts (components) and their increase or decrease is not dependent on the increase and decrease of the length, breadth and the width of the body. On the contrary, it is possible that two things (bodies) of the same volume may be different in respect of the density, for example, the iron and the wood or the pair of gold and silver are denser. The components will be more. On the contrary sometimes they may be less in a greater volume for example, iron and the cotton.

(10) The attraction changes In proportion to the mailer directly or in proportion of the square of the distance in a reverse position

My statement No.22: Here the mailer is to be taken for the attracting mailer and the change is to be taken for change of the power of attraction. It means as much the matter is that much more powerful will be the attraction. This is a direct (straight) proportion (ratio). As much more there will be the square of the distance of the body attracted, the power of attraction will be that much less. It means whatever the power of attraction is there on a distance of a matter, will be one fourth of it on the distance of two meters. And on the ten meters, it will be one hundredth of it. This ratio is inversely proportional because it is more on less and less on more.

The Result (Conclusion):

(A) The attraction is intensive on a dense body.
(B) The attraction is more intensive on a body nearer to the attracter.

(C) The work (attraction) on the perpendicular line is more intensive.

NOTE: This law is a clear proof because in view of it the natural power of the attraction is active on the basis of equally on each and every thing. To apply full power on or half or as much it desired considering the position of the body to be attracted is the work of that one who is conscious and has got distinguishing and discerning power. The natural power does not possess this kind of understanding sense. It is unable to examine and test the condition of the body to be attracted and then attract it in proportion to this full or less power. That is a natural trait. It is a power without consciousness and the will power. It has not got divided parts. It is one and indivisive power (thing). Its work, too, is indivisible. Its duty is to do its duty as per natural trait whatever thing may be there in front of it to work upon. Spread up a wet cloth in the sunshine to dry. Let one part of it be less wet than the other part. The duty of the heat is to suck and vapourise the water in it. The heat at this time, is the heat whatever it is, is working on both the parts of the cloth equally with equal attention. Hence the part less wet will be dry earlier Than the other port of the cloth because the heat being same and having the same intensity will be quite sufficient to dry the less wet part of the cloth because the heat being same and having the same intensity will be quite sufficient to dry the less wet part of the cloth. If the natural power of the heat were to work considering the condition of the opponent (opposite party) and if it were to use its extra power on it, it must have dried the other part of the cloth in as much time as is required for the first part of less wet. It would have meant, then, that it used more power to dry the more wet part of the cloth and used less power to dry the less wet part of the cloth in a fixed time. But it doesn't happen so. The sunshine (heat of the sun) uses it power of attraction

fully and equally on both the bodies. Hence it attracts more on less. And the same case is with the magnet. It will attract the iron particles quicker than its pieces. If it were to use its power in respect of each one of them suitable to them and in proportion to their qualities, both the things would have been attracted at one and the same time. Here, too, it is not so. The magnet had used its full power and it worked more effectively on the lighter one. May it be so that the magnet might have used its power, a part of its full power without any respect of the difference of both the bodies? If it had worked and used its power in accordance with the proportion they have with each other, both of them would hove been attracted at a time. But it did not do so. It worked and pulled both the things with its full power. And it worked more on the lighter one. Likewise, as the distance of a body with the agent of attraction increases, less and weaker is its attraction. If it were to work and use its power in proportion to the distance of the body to be attracted, the power of attraction would not have become weaker in respect of the difference in the distance till its whole power had exhausted because as the distance would have been increasing, the power of attraction would have gone increasing in proportion till its exhaustion of the whole power, and the ratio would have been the same. Of course, only when the power was fully exhausted, the power would have decreased as much the distance would have gone increasing because now there had remained the same fixed one and the only power. To speak the truth, occurrence of weakness is a must against the increasing of the distance. It is necessary and must be that the one and only fixed power should work at each and every place. It cannot be distributed or divided because the division of the parts is unlimited. This part is fixed. And why should it not be so? This preference is without own preference of it. Therefore, it is a must for a natural attracter to work with

its full power. It is grand advantage to be remembered. By the grace of Allah, it will be more helpful.

NOTE: This would not mean that the whole sphere of the earth is pulling every thing with Its full power but in proportion to its part of the surface as much it is in front of the thing to be attracted, As for example, the piece of cloth was not dried up by the whole sun-shine of it as it is spread up from East to West but that much part of it as much the piece of its opponent's part is visible and is in front of it.

(11) The attraction is in ratio of the matter of the body to be attracted. The body coming of 100 parts will pull the body ten times the power of the body with ten parts only. If you wish to pull a body weighing a seer and the other weighing ten seers, in one and the same time, will you not be required to pull the body of ten seers weight with power ten times of the power required to pull the one seer body?

My statement No.23: This would have been itself right, had there been consideration of the thing attracted and there were two attracters of it, the first being seeker of the change. It means every thing attracted will require power of attraction suitable to its matter and the distance. The attracter if it has that much power, it will pull it, otherwise it will not do so. As such both these proportions are straight. It means the thing to be attracted will seek as much more power of attraction as much more matter and the distance it has. ***Secondly*** the change of effect on the thing to be attracted is like this, As such both these proportions are in reversed position because as much the matter or the distance is more, the effect of the attraction on it is less. And as much the matter or the distance is less, the effect is more, in that proportion. But they have used this correct idea in a wrong manner. In it,

they paid attention to the attracter that it utilises its power suitable to the matter (substance) of the weight of the body to be attracted. This one, too, was correct in respect of the attracter's will power but it has been transformed in the shape of natural power considering that the earth will pull the object (body) as much the matter is in it. Now, it is evident that this is false. Firstly, just you have gone through its falsehood and if it were to attribute this falsehood to man, it would be said it is but ignorance. The man is concious and sensitive. The earth has no sense of understanding that it should see the thing to be attracted (i.e. its object) and examine its condition and speculate power to be used against it and that it should be agreeable to it so that it might use its as much power as is suited to it.

NOTE: If it is so, the first law on which the whole modern astrology is based and which is the invention of the Leader of the modern astronomy, Newton, will be deemed wrong wholly. When the earth comprehends and senses the matter of its object of attraction and selects its portions and parts of its power to use against it (the object), why will not it be able to comprehend and sense its distance and will select a part of its power suitable to that object in relation to its distance and thus its attraction will be one and the same at every distance. ***Secondly: (32)*** it be noted that we have very serious objection to No. 2 which will occur in No. 15. And it is that according to your point of view, variation of weight is an offspring of the variation of the attraction. And we have proved that the science of the modern astronomy has to adhere to this principle, otherwise the whole astronomy will prove to be a falsehood. Now it has asserted that the variation in weight to be an offspring of the variation of me attraction. For example, the body of ten seer weight will pull with ten times power. Now here, the variation of attraction is shown to be the product of variation of the weight. The body of

ten seer weight will pull with ten times power. Now it is an open truth. You can say the variation is not due to the weight but depends on the variation of the matter. They have cited the example of the variation of the weight that before our attraction me attraction of the earth caused to create the weight.

My statement(33):To require different attraction power, is due to the variation of the weight. When there is no weight in the matter before it being attracted, the weightless body will do require different power, may it be less or more, is it so? Would you like to say that the power of centralization will very in respect of the variation of the matter? Hence, it will require different type of attraction.

My statement(34): the power of centralization already in proportion to the weight (No. 2). Then it is only to depend on the weight. And the process remained continued. But it is a clear cut judgement that the No. 2 is dependent on Newton's assertion No. 8 and it is the uprooter to the modern astronomy which it con not admit at any cost. On The contrary it is on the look out to resist it everywhere of which the discussion follows in No. 15. As per the modern astronomy **(35)** this is correct that the power of centralization has nothing to do with the weight. On the contrary it is due the fact that the matter itself has aversion to the motion by its nature. Hence, whichever body has got more matter, it will have more power of centralization and when the aversion is more, then its power of attraction will have to require more power. Remember this statement (discussion) and now this objection is completely eradicated. Note: the modern astronomy has transformed one more law due to this mutual contradiction and inconsistency which is still more false. And it asserts that it is correct on the basis of its own

observation. But can observation only be sufficient to prove the validity of some thing? And this is another law.

NOTE (important) ***My statement :(36)*** Be these both laws mutually contradictory but they have made this evident that the change in attraction is based on the three factors. They are the matter of attracter, the matter to be attracted (the object) and the distance, in which only two are worth acceptance. The distance of the object (No.11) is pushed in a tune in the tambourine and pushed ahead a duck in the board of the chess. Any way the attraction of the absolute attracter on the absolute object will remain equal to that of the absolute distance. And as in (No.12) it follows that the attraction vanes in accordance with the speed but in NO. 7 it is contrary to it where it says that the speed varies in accordance with the attraction.

(12) Although the attraction varies in accordance with the variations of the matter of the object (body) but the absolute attracter for example the effect of the attraction of the earth is equal on all the objects, may they be smaller or bigger. If it were to be so, all the heavenly bodies, lighter or heavier, which are at equal distance from the earth, would have come down on the earth within a moment having been no inclination of their own. They would have its effect equal on all of them. It is just as the earth pulled down a matter (body) of one part with its one port of the power and the matter of ten parts with ten parts of its power. Necessarily, the conclusion is that there is one part of the power against one part of body opposite to it. Hence, there would not have been any difference in the effect in the real sense. But the difference is there. The heavy body comes down quickly and the lighter one comes late. The reason of it is that the atmosphere that comes in their way resists them. It is overcome in no time by the heavy bodies and so it resists them. It is overcome in no

time by the heavy bodies and so it resists it less. It is less affected by the lighter bodies and so it resists it more and it will come late on the ground. This can be tested with a vacuum pump (air-pump) by which the air from a pot is removed and when a rupee coin and a piece of paper equal to the area of the rupee are left loose in that vessel with the same speed, both of them come down and settle down on the base of the vessel at one and the same time. This is the conclusion of what has been written in the last four pages.


My Statement :(37) Firstly, Can you call him wise who says something and does not understand its meaning? The thing that has got more weight, overcomes the resistance of the atmosphere at the earliest possible. What is the meaning of the more weight? Isn't it that it lowers down (leans) more? But this is due to its own nature and it is that is named the natural declination (lowering down) of which a while ago you had opposed to. And if the earth causes it to decline more, it is only the difference of the effect of the attraction. If it was not more on the body, how could it bent (declined) more. Secondly, the effect of the intensity of the weight is not this much only that it should be inclined to the resistance more intensely and to overcome it but its main effect to decline more and more. The triumph over the resistance is achieved due to this tendency of lowering down. If the mountain has remained hanging in the air and it is not piercing the air an inch even, then this would be called your foolishness that you accepted the subsidiary (dependent) as the absolute (original) and you neglected and discarded the absolute totally. To exercise more and more effect on the resistance was dependent on declining more and more. But declining more and more is not dependent on being there anything to be resisted or not. That is only the effect of the excessive weight of its own (by nature). So, when the air is pulled out of the vessel, only the weight will remain and there will not

be anything to resist it, and thus the rupee coin will come down earlier and even it is possible That it should come down earlier than before because now the resistance of the air is not there which was before it to cause hindrance to it while coming down. The men of judgement and sense should see how totally this statement is! And they hove put the basis of their statement on their observation. So this is the state of their observation.

Remember the fallacy of their thinking as it is the clarion call of their more falsehood to follow which are totally devoid of the truth and the reasoning. And you would be interested and will enjoy to laugh at their follies. In Chapter II, By the Grace of Allah, in our view the really of the thing is that every heavy body has got its own heaviness and natural tendency to lean (declination) to the lowest depth and it achieves more in its purpose when it (the weight) is more and that is but natural as much it is lighter, it will lean less. if the atmosphere (air) were not to come in its way and confront it and if at all it confronted it, it will pierce through it less, then it is evident that there is a common reason behind coming down of the heavy bodies speedily and that is the tendency of theirs to coming down may there be any resistant in their way or not. And it is their inclination to pierce more intensively through the medium confronting them because of their own excessive weight. To think contrary, taking it for granted, even if air is pulled out from the vessel, even then the rupee coin will come down earlier certainly. May it be that you may not observe the difference if the distance is only a few fingers.

(13) When somebody is revolving (turning) in a circle, then the distance from the center to the repulsion and that from the attraction to the center are equal in the beginning. But now onwards they change their proportions in the manner of: the square of the speed

divided by the radius of the circle. AC is the speed, meaning it that is the distance of repulsion which the object (body) traversed in a second. The guide to it is AB, it means that it throws it (the object) till that point. Then it should have gone straight to that side only but the attraction AD pulled it to the direction of the center E, so the object turned it away to the side of center E. The difference between the small arc and the hypotenuse is very little. Take hypotenuse AC in place of arc AC, suppose H is the attraction and S. is the speed AD:AC: :AC:AE means H:S::S: Radius that means H= S^2**,** it means the attraction $S^{2,}$ this is the proportion to which the conflict of attraction and the repulsion will go on. And the attraction and the repulsion are equal in respect of the motion of the body turning in a circle and the value of the radius In a circle is determined and safe. Therefore, the attraction and the repulsion will very in this proportion: Speed ÷ Radius of the circle, for example, turn around a ball having tied it to a rope. When the speed will be double, the force on the rope will be four times and consequently the attraction, too, should be four times powerful.



My Statement :(38) This is no more than deception and fraud. In the first instance, they considered AD as the attraction AC is the dart of the arc and AB is the reality which is equal to DV, the sine of the arc mentioned and me sine of the dart cannot be equal to two quarters or three quarters. The sine will always be bigger in the first and fourth and in the second and the third. The dart will be bigger, always and due to the arc being smaller its excuse


of the paucity of the difference is most condemnable. Secondly, AB is not the reality. On the contrary, it is that distance of journey to which reaching of it due to effect of the pushing (repulsion) is called the proof of the repulsion. Here it is called the repulsion. And when there is so much effect, and if it does not lessen due to the effect of the repulsion, then there is no sense in expecting of its Increase. Necessarily the object can go to this much journey. It, firstly, adopted the arc AC, then the hypotenuse AC. So it was necessary that AB and AC I.e. the sine of the hypotenuse be equal. And this is always totally impossible. ADC is an equiangular, A & D are right angles or it is right angled triangle with equal acute angles and thus the excuse of being smaller had already eradicated. Secondly, AD is me dart and AC the hypotenuse became equal and this, too, is impossible. Now the triangle ADC which formerly was right angled triangle with different sides now became isosceles triangle and the original right angle became of 60 degrees. And thus one second became equal to 180 degrees. And one second is lying on the circumference ACD* and the circumference ACD. The circumference

ACD is at a distance of one second less on half. And both of them are equal because both of them have their hypotenuses equal to each other (reliable), therefore both are equal arcs (Article 3, figure 25). In short, there are so many transformations in respect of it. Fourthly, this is a fact that the Geometricians derive the hypotenuses from the smallest arcs from their places itself for example at the time of working with the solar and the lunar eclipses. But has to issue its common command. How will it do every where? See the half of the turn is equal to 180 degrees

* So it became half of the second and DAC became 89 degrees, 5959,30 and both are equal and proportion of the multiplicand is like that (Euclids, article 5, figure No. 5). (…..Cont. Next Page)

circumferential and its hypotenuse which is a diameter is only of 120 degrees and it is also diametrical and less than the 115 of the circumferential[*1]. Suppose the arc AC is 60 degrees, then the dart AD will be only 30 diametrical degrees and the sine CA nearly 52[*2], the arc will be nearly 63. Only a mad person would say they are equal.

Fifthly: (44) on the equality of the two powers that picture will not be applicable. For this purpose, this picture will do. AB is the sine of the repulsive agent. Having taken A, the center, on B the distance, arc BC is drawn which cut the circumference on point D and the diameter on C.



So AD is the distance of the journey and the effect of the reality. And AC is the effect of the attraction, AB & AC are the darts and the AD is the arc. No, not so. On the contrary its dart is AH in accordance with the given picture of Uclids. AH will very in accordance with the square of AD and not as per the attraction on AC.

Sixthly (45), in their claim (contention) the attraction and the repulsion, both, were there. And, taken for granted, this argument proves that claim. Then the variation of the attraction in respect of square of the journey which, without any reasoning, has been claimed

(Remaining) So one second is equal to 179-59-59. It means 1=647999.. 647998. This is as per the modern research (12) *may Allah forgive of it.*

1: It means 114 degrees 35 minutes, 29 seconds 47 quarters. *(May Allah forgive us)*

2: It means 51 degrees, 57 minutes, 41 seconds, 40 one third parts and 44 quarters. (May Allah forgive us of it)

the speed is not me speed of the journey. On the contrary they have made the traversing of the equal distance of the journey in a less possible time dependent on the claim of the repulsion i.e. the equality of the attraction and the repulsion. And thus they have roughened the figure such that they took the attraction for the dart and the sine for the repulsion and the hypotenuse for the arc. The men of justice should see and judge this condition of their being the worshippers and slaves of the fallacies how they are trying to put forth their false conception and ideas in the garb of the Geometrical Arguments (proofs) by force.

(14) In every circle, may there be the attraction or the repulsion; it is in ratio of Radius ÷ Square of the time required for the completion of a turn (rotation). It can be derived from what the proportion in both these forces of the attraction of the earth by the sun and the attraction on the moon by the earth is. Suppose the radius of he orbit of the moon is one unit, then the radius of the orbit of the earth would be 400 units and its period of the turn (rotation) would be 325. 27 days and that of the earth around The sun would be 365. 25 days. : The a attraction of the sun on the moon: attraction of the earth on the moon:: 1/(27.32): 1/(365.25):: 1:2.2. It means although the sun is far away, it pulls the moon more power fully than the earth. The end.

My Statement :(46) The agents of the proportion changed. It was to be said like this, the attraction on the moon by the earth: attraction on the moon by the sun….. And so on

. In short, it should have been 2 1/4 so that the result would be 2.237 which is nearly a quarter. Now for at least satisfaction it is proved that proportion of the moon with the earth and that is between the earth and the sun is

as is described a while age. And as before it they had claimed of it and in the conclusion they put that proportion which the moon has got with the earth and the sun. Well, It can be said to be due to the paucity of the difference of the rotation (turn) and the distance from the earth was taken for granted in place of the turn and the distance of the moon. But ***(47)***, even then the source of this contention is only this Law No. 14 and its source is the Law No. 13 of which the intensive resistance and opposition you have already gone through.

(15) The weight gets its existence due to the attraction and due to its variations it decreases. If there were not the attraction on a body in reality or being from all the sides equal, there may not be its effect; will there be any weight in the body? If we go to the center of the earth then all the atom parts of the earth will pull us with equal power and the effect of the attraction would vanish away and we would be weightless.

My Statement :(48) This idea of weightlessness is totally and wholly the clear falsification of that the body has no weight on its own and it gets existence due to the attraction. By the numerous declarations on the parts of the astronomy this has been evident. (A) That the density of the gold on the planet Mercury is nearly two times that of the earth. But being it smaller one the attraction of it is 3/5th of the attraction of the earth. The weights go on decreasing on it in the same proportion. The thing which weighs a ton on the surface of the earth, will weigh it on the Mercury only twenty seers. (B) On the surface of the sun the weight of a thing meansures twenty times that of on the earth. If it is a ton here, it will weigh there 28 tans. It means a maund here is equal to a ton there. And a ton their will be a maund here.

The resistance (falsification) of it is given in the chapter II, resistance No. 14. (C) The thing which is three thousand six hundred pound on the surface of the earth and the distance of it from its center is half of the diameter of the earth. If a thing is put at a distance of half a diameter from the surface of the earth, it will weigh only 9 hundred pounds and on the full distance of the diameter of the earth above its surface it will weigh four hundred pounds and of the distance of one and half the diameter it will be 225 pounds and on the distance of two diameters above the surface of the earth it will weight only 144 pounds because the attraction goes on decreasing in proportion to the increase in the Square of the distance and so also the weight goes on lessening. It means at a distance equal to four and half a diameter it will be only 36 pounds and at the distance of five and half the diameter it will be 25 pounds and at nine and half it will be 4 pounds and at twenty nine and half it will be only one pound. Thus three thousand five hundred ninety nine pounds of weight will vanish away. And as per speculation the weight of a thing at the Equator will be less and as much you move towards the Pole, it will go on increasing because the attraction at and near is less and that is more on and near the poles. William Harshall has said:

On the stars, means between Mars and Jupiter a man can jump up to sixty feet without any trouble.

My Statement (49) If it is so, then on Eurenius he will be like a bird and will go on flying wherever he would like to. He further said that if the man falls down from the height of the sixty feet, he will not cause harm equal to falling down from a height of an arm on the earth.

My Statement :(50) Then if he goes to the Neptune, he will be just like a ball of cotton and there he falls from the height of thousands of meters on a hard rock, even then he will not be injured a little. These are the flights of their fancies and they describe them in such a manner as if they had gone on the Mercury and the sun and carried out experiments of weighing there or just like having sat on them and jumping on them. The conclusion of all these fables and fairy tales is that the bodies are weightless by their own nature. **Otherwise (No.51)**, it would have been safe and intact on all the planets and spheres at all the places and at any distances. It would have been affected in respect of increase and decrease in its intensity in proportion to the increase and decrease in the attraction. Therefore, it is evident that whatever the weight of a perticular thing you take for granted, it will lessen at distance in proportion of the square of the distance. And the distance as per the modern astronomy[*1] is unlimited, so, naturally, the lessening, too, is unlimited. The weight of a mountain[*2] will remain there, equal to that of a mustard seed. And someone would go further and the weight will have no existence at all which might have been said to be original in reality. But this one is so brave has explained it in more and more explicit words. The text of which is: "The reason that causes the things (bodies) to fall down on the earth, the same reason causes weight in them. It means the force of gravity makes them heavy. The burden (weight) of the things will be as per the quantity of the gravity."

***1** *See No. 12-26*

***2** *My Statement :(52) The weight will lesson still more due to the distance of the other planet and the attraction of the other one. It pulled in the opposite direction of the other one. It pulled in the opposite direction of the earth. And if at all it may be so, even then it would not do because that will be, too, temporary, In short, the weight lies in origin and it is of its own.*

"These are the researches of the modern astronomy without any observation. They say the mountain hasn't got any weight. The mustard seed and the mountain have the same condition.

My Statement :(53) As the reality is and their variations of the weight have led to their deception in this manner that every body (thing) which is heavy does keep weight in their own nature. The mountain and the mustard seed are different things and there is no doubt about it. And as much each of them will display its weight in the garb of pressure in proportion to its weight and in addition to that if you add to them the attraction, provided it is there, it will increase its pressure and as much the attraction will increase the pressure took, will increase in that proportion. If a stone of twenty seer weight is put on a man, it will pressurise the man. If tied with ropes and two men pull it down with power, the pressure on the man will increase. If four men pull it from all the four sides, the pressure will still increase but the variations in the force of attraction will not affect the original weight. The attraction, may it be more or less or may not be at all originally, the weight, that is there in that stone, will remain Intact. But surely if any attracting agent from above side pulls it up or any spring like thing pushes it up, the weight will be felt less or may not be felt altogether. Even then, the original weight will be there intact but the attraction from down below with it being less or non-existent cannot make any variations in the original weight or its feeling because if there isn't any attraction from under below and there is no support of any kind or there may not be pushing upside, even then it is impossible to be the pressure of the original weight less.

In short the attraction was there as a supporter and as a creator but they took it for the creator of the weight. Really speaking they need such a stubbornness which may

prove the natural tendency of the weight. Really speaking they took it for the creator of the weight. Really speaking they need such a stubbornness which may prove the natural tendency of the weight and that is the natural inclination of declination of the bodies and the proof of it will totally annihilate the theory of attraction.

As it follows. And no sooner it has vanished off than the whole building of the modern astronomy will be collapsed as it is the only stone of its foundation. And as is their religion (faith) which is quite clear and evident from their so many claims and proclamations. And those who would like to accept the verdict No. 8 of Newton, have first to do away with the whole record of the modern astronomy and not only that but also all the laws of attraction pertaining to Newton. It is but clear that it is what Newton had said before 1665 A.D. till when the apple having fallen had made him guess of the attraction and it was what No. 2 was derived from. Any way, whatever it may be, we can all make sure of their all these discarded and fallen off claims and declarations that they are their own words. But they have no way of escape from the No.15. If they want to be the modern astronomy intact and continued, they are compelled to admit that there is no weight in any body of its own but it is there because of the attraction. This matter is to be remembered very well so that we may not be deceived in future. And what more should we say than what we have said already and that this is clearly falsehood. And further they are challenged to show and prove what they have maintained that the weight on the different planets and the spheres are different and they may prove it to be more and lighter.

My Statement :(54) Let it be told to the experts of the modern astronomy what for they are running from the line of equator to the poles or fly to Mercury and the

sun, if their contention has any truth? They should put the body (thing) in one and the same place in their own house and they will get the thing having increased its weight and decreased, too. Today [*1] it is one seer, tomorrow it will be quarter and a seer, day after tomorrow it will decrease to three quarter and some other day it may become one and half a seer. Is there any sane person to accept it as they say that all the planets, moons and the smaller stars (those planet-like heavenly bodies numbering about more than hundred and a quarter and which are in between the Mercury and the Jupiter and are discovered in the nineteenth century of which Jono, Vesta, Syrus and Plas ore very well known) are different in their distances and their own force of attraction. And their attraction is not so much of quantative difference, still when their whole attraction is confronting the earth together and a body (thing) be in between them and the earth, at one side, the earth is likely to create weight in it due to its attraction,

And their attraction together being to the opposite side of the earth will make the thing lighter. The weight will remain worth quantative disparity because of the overcoming of the attraction of he earth and when all of them and the earth will be on one side, their total power of attraction will create weight and will make it very heavy. And some are here and some are there, then the weight will be equal or so. And it will vary in respect of the changing conditions. Would you like to ask how could the variations of ten weight be known? The thing with which it was weighed, that also will be as much heavy or lighter.

My Statement :(55) How could you know the variation of weight on the equator and that on the poles?

***1** *this time and period is only speculative and not fixed*

You would say, by plumbline. We would say, here too, by the same.

(16) Every day-night [*1] the ocean confronts with tides (high & low) two times which are called high tide and low tide.

In this phenomenon water and perticularly in the bay of Fondi and near the city of Bristol where the River Safran merges with the sea, rises to the height of 70 feet and then comes down again. And at the very time when it rises at the one side of the earth it rises, too, on the reverse side of the earth. It means the high tide occurs on both the line of diameter at a time. This is the effect of the attraction of the moon.

Therefore, when the moon comes on the Mid-day(Zenith), just a few minutes after that it occurs. The sun too, has its influence on this phenomenon. Necessarily, when they are in the position of assembly and the confrontation of the sun and the moon , just one and half day after that the highest tide takes place. But the effect of the sun is very low. In Hadayiq-un-Najum it has been said that the attraction of the sun is 3/10 of that of the moon. In the laws of the astronomy it is 2/10 or 23/58. In winter, the tide of the morning is higher than that of the evening. And it is contrary to it in summer. In that season it doesn't appear in the small seas, big lakes and those waters which are surrounded by the land for example, The Caspean, River Ural, and the Mediterranean Sea, the Baltic Sea, the Jehun and the Sehun, The Ganges and the Jamuna etc.

My Statement :(56) Although we have no escape and other alternative to the happening of the tides

***1**: *Cor. No. 263: Here it is taken for 24 hours 50 minutes*

but on the basis of aversion to the guessing and urge to investigate and research, it is doubtful. The first reason: The moon will, of course, to one side of the earth. So who is that pulled up the water to the other side? This would not be called attraction. On the contrary it would be the repulsion. The Law of the astronomy etc.[*1] all and all explains to this clue in such a manner that the attraction is less on the greater distance. In the condition of being the water is far more from the moon. so the attraction was caused more on this water facing the moon than the earth and became more closer to the moon than the earth. So it rose up. And on the other side, the water is far from the moon and the earth (the land part of the earth) is nearer to the moon in proportion to the water[*2]. On that side. Hence the attraction on the water became more than that of the water and the part of the earth on that side became nearer to the moon than the water. So the water went away from the center of the earth and the distance from the center of the earth is the height, so the altitude of the water to that side became less.

My Statement :(56) Firstly, just as the variation is caused in the attraction due to the nearness and being far away, likewise a heavy thing is pulled less by the lightness and sluggishness of the object of attraction and the lighter one will be pulled more. As a matter of fact, the water on the opposite side is not so much away in proportion to the earth being attached with the earth and, moreover, the depth of the sea is not more than five miles. The average

***1**: *At the end of it, they have made foolish statement and then in astonishment admitted that its explanation is very complicated, they could not make their point clear. The speech too, was shaky and perplexed.*

***2:** *In Nazara-e- Alam they have written it ignorantly that the water on the other side remains still due to being far away (distant). But the earth that is there under the water is pulling it.*

distance of the moon is said to be 238833 miles and the equitable diameter of the earth is 7913 miles, so the distance of that land part of the earth of that side from the moon is 24674 miles hence, will the additional four to five miles distance will make any difference against such a multitude of distance? But the water is lighter in proportion to the earth. The density (heaviness) of the earth is six times that of the water, i.e. 5.6. So the difference in the distance will lessen a little in its attraction but the difference of the weight should have made up it and overcome on it. If not, then at least it will make up the loss. And having been the attraction on the earth as well as the water, equal, the water will remain attached to the earth at any cost and consequently the tide wouldn't take place. And it should occur on the other side of the earth which is facing the moon and the water to this side is nearer and lighter.

Secondly: (57) as per your view (No. 18) the sphere Earth is the sum total of the water, atmosphere and the land. And the moon is attracting its combination, therefore it should have been that they all and all be Pitted up all together at a time and not that the water to the other side of the moon might leave off the earth and the earth (land) on this side of the moon might leave the water. Now judge yourselves. If you consider that the earth revolves due to the attraction of the sun, then all the three components of the earth say the water, the atmosphere and the land are moving equally in the same manner in your view. Isn't it? and not that they would act separately. ***Thirdly(58)***,the moon would have been more than the water on the reverse side because it is nearest and lightest, too. And thus it would have left the water on that reverse side on your disposal for your foolish contention as the land part of that side might have left the water. Naturally, it was necessary that at the time of the tide there should not

have been, on both sides of the earth, water on the surface of the earth and no atmosphere (air) on and above the water. On the contrary there should have been vacuum in between both the sides. And this thing is spontaneously false. ***(59)***Why is the water from all around come to this pace and fills it up? This act is not the urge of their nature, not the effect of the earth and there isn't any need of any space (Vacuum). It is going to follow in no. 25, that the vacuum is not impossible in your view. Then why should mare and other waters come on their own? The second reason that the tides occur due to the moon's attraction but that should have happened on that perticular time when the moon pulls the water from exactly from the zenith of its height directly in the straight lines. . But the water rises up to that place where the moon passes on after the mid-day (the zenith) and till then hours had passed on 1. In the laws of the astronomy, they have two excuses for that. One is that the stillness of the water does not allow it (the water)to accept the attraction so quickly. Lastly, it is that the body has disliking for the motion. It will resist the instigator at its best and that i why the water does not rise up so quickly.

My Statement :(60) Firstly, the moon pulls the body (object)in a straight line only or in a slanting line, too. In respect of their former assessment it is totally and clearly a lie because the water didn't move at all when it was being attracted and when the attraction did not remain in reality, it raised to the height of so many meters. II means the existence of the effect does not occur due to the cause but it does occur after the cause had vanished and many hours have passed by. On the other assessment, when the moon came to eastern horizon, from that time onwards it was pulling (attracting) the water and it should have been raised on the exact mid-day and should have accepted the effect but it did so after six hours had passed on. It is

wonderful. As a matter of fact at the mid-day time the attraction was at its zenith and that, too, in such a way that it got more stronger moment after moment till it reached the mid-sky (midday time) with its full power and the water was totally unaware of it. When the attraction got weak and went getting weaker and weaker moment by moment, then the effect occurred after hours and hours had passed on. Here it is from now onwards resistance and falsification of the reply of "Hadayiq-Un-Najum" was completed because the extension of the cause is more effective than the intensity of the cause.

My Statement :(61) of course the heat of the after noon is more intensive than that of mid-day. The down of the winter is cooler than the night. But it is a difference of the intensity and not that it should keep on increasing extension of it for a long time and there should be no effect, in reality. When there may continue the extension of the weakness time to time, the beginning of the effect should be there, It means the mid-days of June and July may not have the real heat but it should come into existence only in the afternoon session. There should not be the cold for its name's sake at the midnights of December- January, but should start its intensity at the time of dawn. This kind of upturn effect might be occurring in the modern astronomy.

Secondly, (62) Till the power of the instigating agent (Stirrer) has not overcome a body, it will not stir (move) an inch in reality. If a child pulls a stone of a mound's weight, having tied it by a rope, he would not succeed in pulling it and if he overcomes it to such on extent that it may not be able to resist it, immediately it will move on. The effect of the resistance will not be apparent in reality. For example, a man should pull a ball and if its resistance is so much creditable against his

power, then there will not be the effect immediately and he will have to increase his power. And there will be the desired effect when the power would be sufficient for the purpose and not till the power Is fully exhausted and the child is tired and even it may not move at all and lastly there may remain the weak power and it mo go on lessening moment by moment and it ma respond to its decreased power. The resistance of the water in response to the power of the moon should be like that one mentioned in the second section which may pull up the whole earth, And this much water against it is nothing at all and still It is not stirred a little bit. And let it not move and at least accept that one in the third section and in that condition, the effect, al least, should have appeared and not that it should appear after only the whole power had been exhausted and the child was fully tired. ***Thirdly(63)***whereas the water resists the moon to such and extent, the earth is very likely to be more resistant and it may respond to it far more later than the water. And the rising up of the water to that side was not due to itself but it was due to the rising up of the earth, so it is but natural that when the tide occurs on the water on this side, the water to that side of the earth should be at standstill. And the effect on that side of the water might have died (exhausted) till the tide on this side of the water had occurred, although it occurs on both the sides at a time.

Fourthly, (64) in a day-night period only two tides occur. Now it is but necessary that four tides should occur, two of the water and two when the earth might rise up having affected by the attraction of the moon.

Fifthly(65), there should be four tides on the side facing the moon and two tides more should take place on the reverse side of the earth because they are the follow up of the earth and it had only two of the kind. Any way these

people go on talking whatever they like to in order to realise their fancies and are least bothered about what may happen to them and they fare badly in it. The second excuse is that the effect of the attraction is bound to be late in the depth of the seas and the water adjoining the shores.

My Statement :(66) How can you imagine movement (stirring) on the water lying at the depth of the seas.? As a matter of fact the seas have not the trench-like narrowness like that of the rivers. Hence, there is no question of the current. Moreover there is no air under the depth. And there the effect of the external air is fill. May there be a storm of whatever power, the water under the seas after that of hundred feet from above is quite still and motionless. *(Taaribat-e-Shafia)*. The motion of the shore waters is due to the wind. If so, can the motion in the direction of the seas, one of the four sides, towards the motion of the water leading to the delay of the effect to occur? See, as per our view the earth moves (revolves) from west to east direction. And during the same time it revolves around its axis due to the attraction of the sun. Both the revolutions go on simultaneously. The third reason, the tides result due to the attraction of the moon, If it is so, why doesn't it occur, too, in respect of the smaller stocks of water? Must it not be that the moon will attract whatever waters it come face to face? In reply of this the law of the astronomical science has laid down its arms. it contends that this is because of some local factor.

My Statement(67):If this is the reply, why didn't it say so before, that there is some local factor there, due to which this phenomenon is resisted. Hadayiq-un-Najum has tendered two excuses on it. The first one is that perticular type of waters are required for the tides, hence the moon pulls up that water only which is agreeable to it and leaves out the other unsuitable waters. So whichever it

pulls upraises. These waters are small types of waters. The moon, when it comes on the zenith, pulls up these waters all and all together at a time. That is why the tide does not occur.

***My Statement** (68)* Firstly, it is ignorance. If the whole, water rises up at a time, can its increasing and spreading up on the shores and then lessening and slipping down from the shores will not be seen and felt? Is the consciousness of wisdom so dull?

Secondly, (69) in your view the moon pulls up the whole of the sphere of the earth. Why doesn't it do the same in respect of the whole of the waters rather than pulling up a part of a big sea? You are, real talking non-sense. The second excuse is that the power of effect comes into action only when the moon is on its zenith (the mid-day) and it is only for a time being. These waters have spread up on a little space. The moon passes off from their side of the zenith. Hence, the effect does not occur.

***My Statement** :(70)* The moon will not be on the zenith at the highest degree on the big seas (oceans) but only on different parts at different times and it will pass by that part at the same speed, i.e. very quickly as before by the smaller seas. So, it is but a compulsion that there should not be the tides any where. And if at all its attraction is effective with its slanting lines on the water there, then is it possible that the tide should not occur there when just the moon has passed by from its mid-day point (zenith)? When it, from the dawn to the dusk with slanting lines, can cause to happen its attraction on the water all where equally, the tides must occur. It should even happen on the waters of lakes, tanks and what that of, even on the water of a jug if it is put on an open ground in the open field from the dawn to the dusk.

Fourth Reason(71): The passing of the sun and the moon occurs over the water daily being different place to place except at the time of the congregation and the opposition of the sun and the moon. Doesn't the sun attract the waters whereas the former Is a symbol of heat and the latter is moisture. And the heat is the attracter of the moisture. Whereas the sun is in respect of the moon, away, look at the proportion of both of them. The sun is away 373.33 times the distance of the moon but the matter of the sun is two and half crores of times of the moon or more than that. Necessarily the attraction should have been as per this calculation and during the night period there would have been four tides, two of the moon and two by the sun. But in reality only two tides take place. Consequently, it is evident that the attraction of the moon has the upper say on that of the sun. But it is not so. They have given two answers to it. ***Firstly*** In the Hadayiq-un-Najum, only the same excuse of the variation of the distance is given and has been further said that the attraction of the sun on the water is only 3/10 of that of the moon.

My Statement :(72) Firstly, its resistance (falsification) has passed in the contents of the question itself. And it is that, whereas you have seen the difference in the distance why ct you mark the proportion of their matters?

Secondly(73), let it be 3/10 but even then how can there be escapade from the four tides? It occurs two times due to the moon to the tune of seventy feet altitude (height) and two times by the attraction of the sun to the height of 21 feet. In the law of the astronomy its reason is so ambiguous and obsolete that it is pitiable to put the same on the paper and blacken it by that. It says the tides occur in such a manner that where there is as much difference in the attraction, there on that side the tide is more powerful than the other side, On the contrary, the distance of the sun from the earth

is equal to eleven thousand five hundred thirty five times the diameter of the earth, so the distance of the sun from the waters on both the sides of the earth will show the difference of 1/1 1537 in view of which the attraction will be nearly equal. But the distance of the moon from the earth Is equal to 30 times of the diameter of the earth. Hence, the difference in between the both sides will be 1/30. So the difference of the attraction will be evident, and the occurrence of the tides depends on this alone. And in the end the conclusion is given in this manner, the moon : the sun: 2/ ½ **:** 1.

My Statement(74) : To take the surging of the tides dependent on the difference of the attraction of both sides is absolutely ignorance and stupidity. Whereas there is attraction of the moon on one side of the water, necessarily, there will be Altitude (rising of the water), and may there be on the other side less attraction than on the former or be it more than that or may It not be totally.

Secondly(75), even then there is no alternative to the four tides, two of which due to the moon and two more occur due to the sun. The water rises up to the extent of 70 feet at the time of lunar tide and to 28 feet at the solar tides. The ***fifth reason*** is given as at the time of the congregation (assembly) or at the time of being the earth to same side of the sun and the moon, the highest tide occurred because of both the attraction work equally at a time.

My Statement :(76) During the time of confrontation of the sun and the moon, being the earth In between them, the absolute (total) effect will be divided between the two forces of attraction as each of then will attract and pull the water separately to the opposite direction. The details of its manners and the conclusion of the result and whatever the modern astronomy has said in this respect cannot be described and its resistance and

condemnation requires a lengthy procedure. Let it go. But it has to be stated that the highest tide occurs 1/ ½ days after the congregation of the sun and the moon to one side of the earth, and the full moon nights. There it was that the water took nine hours to accept and express the response to the effect of the attraction. And here, the effect is not visible for 36 hours. If the effect of the congregation was due to the two powers of attraction at a time, It should have occured at the very time of the congregation and not after 12 sessions i.e.36 hours.

The ***Sixth reason: (No.77)*** in the '*Tarbayeen*', too, it is said that the lowest tide occurs 36 hours after.

The ***Seventh reason: (78)*** If this was due to the attraction of the moon, the circle of the altitude would have been on the level of the moon. So the tides of the seas of North sphere and the South Sphere, of which the declination is more than that of the moon, would have been floating to the direction of the East.

When the moon had been on the East horizon and it (the flow of the tide) would have been southward in the northern part of the earth and northward in the south. And as much the altitude the moon would come up, the tide in the northern part of the earth would turn that much more to the southward. And in the South it would have been that much more inclination of the tide to the north-ward. Then as much the moon had achieved the altitude, the tide in the south region would have inclined to the north and that of the north to the south. When it would have reached at the mid-day point (zenith), the north tide would have been accurately southward and the southern one would have turned to the north. 'Mien it (the moon) would go tome west both the tides would flow to the westward. But in reality It is not so. On the contrary, the motion of the tide is

observed to be eastward. The explanation to this is such that the tide follows the course of the moon.

My Statement :(79)The object (body) to be attracted must follow the place of the attracter and should be attracted towards it and not that it copy the course of it. The moon by its own course of motion, towards the east walks nearly one degree in 2 hours. And in the same period of time the earth, as per your view traverses 30 degrees towards the east. And so, for every hour it lags behind to the west fourteen and a half degrees. So the tide is bound to move the direction of the attracter. It means it must go from the east to the west rather than copying its (the moon's) motion having turned its back to it and turning its face towards The East and as much it moves, it must be under the influence of the attraction of the moon.

The Eighth Reason *(80)* Why is the tide of morning in the winter season of more altitude and that of the evening in the summer season? In the winter the moon in the morning lime is more close to the water and in the evening it is away from it. In the summer season the condition is contrary to it.

The Ninth Reason: *My Statement (81)*. the movement of the tide Is due to the revival of likeness and not that the water that had risen at a certain place should, having turned its face to some other direction, go on flowing as if enjoying a walk over the surface of the water. All the parts of the waters come under the influence of the moon. So, all of them have to be affected and not that only one of them should accept the effect and go on running and the rest of them might remain lying and immovable. The shadow would be a good equivalent of it. When a man walks on, the observers of him Thinks that the shadow is walking with him. This is not so. On the contrary, when the

man was here, that place was concealed from the sun or the lamp & the shadow was on it. When he went forward, that place didn't remain concealed. Hence, the shadow disappeared. Now the next place ahead is concealed and the shadow appeared on that place.

In the same way, on every movement one shadow disappears and another one appears. This procedure goes on without any breakage, continuously, hence one guesses that the same shadow is moving and walking with the man. The same condition should have occured here. Therefore, in the Northern Ocean where the moon is to the southern direction of the water There it is compulsory that the southern part of the water should rise up first and the part which is to the north direction should rise up afterwards in the manner that the nearest one is nearest of all (first to gain). And this procedure is common. And, where the line of the attraction on any one who is the nearest of all will be nearest from the perpendicular line. Naturally the direction of the movement of the tide should be to the North from the south. And as per this rationalism, in the Southern Ocean, the movement of the tide must be from the north to the south. But in reality it happens contrary to it. In the North Ocean, the wave goes to the south. In the Southern Ocean, it goes towards the north.

The Tenth Reason In the Atlantic Ocean, i.e. the Western Ocean, the speed of the tide is seven hundred miles per hour. Between the West Indies and Ireland it is 500 miles, somewhere 160 miles, somewhere 60 miles and somewhere it is only 30 miles.***(82)***

Why is such a difference in the power of attraction of the moon?***(83)***

In short, the attraction of the moon didn't suit them. In the matter of existence and the nonentity, the accompaniment of two things is not the indication of one thing being the casualty of the other and not the cause of its

non-existence. But of course, after observations of these phenomenons, one would guess that the cause has some kind of attachment with these periods or timings. You would say it is but a cause.

My Statement:(84), Firstly, in our view every event has its cause and in a straight way it Is but the will of Allah, the Highest and The Glorious. He has connected all the events (happenings) with the causes and it is upto us to find out clues to them. Just now it has been said the laws of the astronomy hold, that the non occurrence of the tides in the lakes and rivers is an unknown thing. Likewise it has, at different places, related the elapsing of the moon to the difference of the returning of the tides. We need not bind us to know all these things. Who knows what relation the magnetic needle has got with the Capricorn (North Star) of the Ursa Minor (i.e. the two bright stars)?

Secondly, (85) we are convinced of the fact that there is fire underneath the earth. And the Glorious Quran, too, has said, "And the Oceans have got the fire underneath the water". The Hadith (the creditable narrations) point to the fact that, "Verily, There lies the fire underneath the oceans". The modern astronomy also admits to this fact. And it is in the year 1056 A.D. the smoke started coming out from under the Pacific oceans'. The modern astronomy, also, admits to this fact. And came out the volcanic substance (matter) from the depth of the ocean and it took a shape of an island on the surface of the water. And it had holes in it, out of which flames and flames were coming out and they were brightening the surrounding of ten miles area. The formation of vapour and the smoke underneath the seas is one of the causes of the storms and the cyclones. May be it that such a mass of vapour might be coming from under the seas and might be raising the waters and that is the tide just as the water raises its level

when it is heated and It might be coming down after the vapour has spread up and this may be the low tide.

The occurrence of the morning tide in greater proportion in the season of autumn, too, might be example of the same theory. In the mornings of the winter season the vapours come out in large quantity from the waters of the lakes. The water in the wells, in this season, is warm. Due to a layer of cold on the surface of the water, the heat directs itself to the inside of the water. And the night is bigger. Due to this long procedure of the heat when the vapours raised, The very time, the water got the capacity to increase its substance. And Allah knows well the wisdom of his creation.

(17) The attraction, getting out of its center, spreads out all around itself on the straight line and pulls the object to its center.

My Statement :(86) It would have been better to say that the attraction starts from the center and not that only the center is the attracter. But in (15) it has been mentioned that the HADAYIQ contends that the distance of the object is token from the center of the earth and the weight decreases as per its variations. In the some way, in the laws of the astronomy the distance is taken from the center of the earth. The conclusion of it is that the center is only the attracter. ***Firstly(87)*** these are the people who believe that every body has got the power of attraction. ***Secondly,(88)*** this attraction is in proportion to the matter of the attraction (No.10). But how can there be the variation of the matter?

Thirdly(89) The dependence of the variations in the power of the center on the creations of the density (heaviness) can be nearer to speculation, how can be the

volume of the sphere effective on the center? But it is totally contrary to the reality. The density (heaviness) of the Mercury (the planet) is more than that of the earth but due to the smallness of it the attraction of it (of the Mercury) is 3/5 of The density of the earth and it is four times that of the sun but the attraction is *1/28* (No. 15).

Fourthly(90) Moreover, they say that if he goes under the earth (inside), The components above him will pull him up and those below will, also, pull him downward and on the center the effort on the parts of all the components will be equal to all The sides. And this is as and more suitable to their laws.

(18) The sphere of the Earth consists to the water, earth and the atmosphere, all together. All these components are heavy. The air (atmosphere) is upto the 45 miles surrounding the sphere and it is so much heavy that on a space of on inch square its load (burden) is equal to the weight of 15 pounds. On each and every man of an average height the weight is about Three hundred ninety two maunds. The weight of the air from the surf ace of the earth to the 37 miles height is 144984,000,000,000 maunds. These are the speculations of the modern astronomy. In our view the components are four. Two of them are Fire and the air, light and rare, are bent on flight. The other two are water and the earth, the heavy and tempting to lower down (i.e. to decline). The modem astronomy has tendered this reason on the heaviness of the air that if you take a bottle and take out the air from inside it with an air-pump and weigh it, you will find it to be so light. A six inch mixture bottle, having its air taken out, weights lighter by two grains that is equal to 1/1/3 rattis. So, it is evident that in the condition of the moderate temperature the weight of six cubic feet air is two grains. The condition of the moderate air is for this only that if the

air is more hot it will get lighter and the weight will decrease.

My Statement (91) these contentions sound doubtful. It is nothing but their nonsense and misunderstanding. This is not the weight of the air. This is the weight of the other parts components) like the earthly (dust) ports, the vapour, smoke etc. which are mixed with the air nearest to the earth. This reasoning of theirs is nothing but a falsification of their own claim, what is the need of the refutation of the claim when every person by its own consciousness arid conscience knows that he doesn't feel the burden on his head for a Mastic or so even though he has got the burden of the air on his head equal to 392 maunds. What to talk of a man whereas the elephant with such a heavy burden on his body does not feel it at all. Hasn't he got the life and sense of feeling? They hove given two answers to this. The first one that the man, too, has air in his body. The air inside pushes it out and the air outside presses him and thus the equality is achieved. And the burden is not felt. If there were not the external air, the internal air would have torn off the body of the man and would have come out. Thus the external air granted the profit of safely rather than the harm

My Statement (92) What is the wisdom in comparing the two to three mashas worth air inside The vacuum of the man with the full fledged load, of 392 maunds of air on the head of a man? It is irrational what they speak. The repulsion of the earth overcomes the sun's attraction equal to its thirteen lakhs time. All the planets together, crores of times powerful than the moon, are pulling the sun and even then it is not stirred at all. The attraction of the moon overcomes the attraction of the earth which is more than it to the tune of maha sankhas, and not only it pulls up the water on the earth but also the whole

sphere of the earth. In their view two mashas worth air can bear the burden of four hundred mound of the air and make it equal to its own. Is this reasonable and rational thinking?

Secondly (93) Did you forget that of your bottle which you emptied it from its internal air and even being there burden weighing maunds and maunds of the external air it could not be broken?

Thirdly (94) is the internal air in the man different from the external air? No, not so. Then what for the external air has the quality of pressing and other inside has the power of pushing out.

Fourthly, (95) when the air is heavy, then the internal air, too, must be heavy. Moreover, with the mixture of it with the vapour it must be heavier. The heavy body pushes up the other body which is lighter than itself. The human body is heavier than the air, then how can the air lift up? It was necessary that the air inside the human body, too, should have been affected by the attraction of the earth and it should have pressed the human body downward. But they are adamant and insist that it pushes (lifts) up only. Hence, it became clear that the attraction of the earth is false and the heaviness of the air, also, is a falsehood. Not only that much but it is light and inclined to the flight. Secondly, this burden of the air is equally distributed on all the parts of the body and That Is why it is not felt.

My Statement (96) ***Firstly***, this is a strange logic that from one side the pressure may seem to be burden and if it is grounded from all the sides, the hundreds of maunds of pressure may not be felt at all, even equal to a ratti. Take a peach and press it from the above, having put it on the palm of a hand, it will flatten like

anything but take it In your fist and press it from all the sides, you will find to have it become an antimony. ***Secondly(97)*** the equal division is also wrong. We have proved in our geometrical calculations that the air which is called the sphere of vapours and also is called the world of the breeze has its level above the surface of the earth upto the distance of 45 miles and to all the four sides, right, left ahead and behind, it is nearly 600 miles. In such a condition if it has a load of 392 maunds from one side, then it has the load, of 5227 maunds from all the sides around. Then how could the equality be there? ***Thirdly,(98)*** The division of attraction on all and all parts of the body is also unacceptable. If a man stands on the ground, will there be pressure of the air on the bottoms of the feet? Similarly one is sleeping then there will not be the air on one side of the body from head to the feet.

Fourthly (99) if it is taken for granted to be correct then the man's head being nearly elliptical the area of the surface of the above head is equal to the half of the area of the elliptical surface of it and it is eighty inches. And as per your calculation the total load on only the above surface of the head will be fifteen maunds in the ratio of one inch: 7 seers. This clearly shows the division of the attraction is not in ratio of the parts of the body. And it is not divided between the other parts of the body. Can a man's head bear the burden of 15 maunds weight? Will it not be grounded into antimony? And here it is unfelt even its existence. This explanation No, 2 can best be exemplified with water that if you plunge into the sea you will not feel the burden of the water at all even though it is there in quantity of hundreds of maunds. Its reason is that the pressure is equally divided on all the sides.

My Statement (100) if it were to dive into the sea and thousands of hands reach the bottom of the sea;

even then the burden will not be felt although the whole load is on the head; on the sides only a nominal one and nothing on the feet. The reason is not this but it is that we have pointed at just before that a heavy body is inclined to push up anything confronting it. And the modern astronomy even admits it. Hence, the diver has to use his power against the water to go into the depth of the sea and he rises up to the surface with utmost ease. What is the sense in this that whosoever raises one, presses him too? The air which is lighter than the human body would have, had it the heaviness, crushed the man under its burden of hundreds of maunds weight. You, too, have just admitted that it has weight near the earth, then it should be fell a little, at least.

My Statement (101) Whereas those components (parts) of the dust vapour etc. in the shape of smallest article are mingled with the air in separate way, can the parts over the man's head, being in a smaller number, be adjoined to each other? The dust particles are in a greater number out of these which fall on the head. And their weight is not felt at all. Hence, the falsehood of both of these answers (reasons) is apparent.

My Statement (102): In this connection there are still more arguments and discussions, very minute in nature, of which the details would be very lengthy. So we don't want to go into It and there is not required the proof of its refutation. It has condemned itself. And as such we have already refuted their claim. The refutation of their claim to such and extent is quite sufficient as the proofless claim is itself false and discredited. ***(103)*** the witness of the conscience and consciousness is quite sufficient to accept the truth as so much a volume of the air is on the head and it doesn't cause any burden at all. Without any proof this observation could not be said to be false as there can be

mistakes in the consciousness of the sight (seeing). Whereas something is proved with a proof the refutation of the same without any proof cannot be supported by the consciousness. Hence, it is evident that the air is light and to suppose it to be heavy is false.


(19) The trade winds that is the local air which flows on the equatorial line (region) from east to west and which in the north hemisphere is directed to the equator line from the north and in the southern hemisphere, it flows from the south to the equator and in The Red Sea. It is always concious to keep itself parallel to the shores of the Arabian shores. It is very advantageous and useful for their trade and commerce. The reason of this phenomenon is given such that being the heat of the sun on the equator very much, the air there gets lighter and rises up and the air from the poles rush in there to bring about the equality. The motion on the equator is more because the orbit is bigger and so as much the motion occurs here, there cannot be that much from the sides all around it. Hence its revolution is not equal to that of the earth. On the contrary the earth will revolve inside it. And it will increase in the east and will remain lagged to the west. It means the air on the equator line will be eastward that means it will appear to be going to the west from the east. The northern wind (air) which flows towards the equator to bring about the equality is not straightway to the direction of south but it turns to the direction of the South West. And in the same manner, the southern wind is not straightway northern but ills North West because it cannot keep its speed as much that of the speed of the equatorial orbit. Naturally mat part of the earth will move forward and the direction of the northern winds will be south and the west in place of south. And the direction of the northern winds will be northern and western in place of north.

My Statement (104) *i*s the equality a must whereas the vacuum in your view is not impossible. Then what are the changes in the directions of the wind for?

(20) Had the earth been solid from its very creation and if it were to turn (rotate) on its axis, the waters on the altitude of equator would have been in the shape of heaps and there would have been the earth, the Polar Regions totally dry. That means, the earth being itself solid and hard would hove been equal. But the water was fluid and there was the motion on the equator more than all others, therefore it (the water) would have jammed to this side only and the Polar Regions where there is no motion would have been without water. But It is not so. Verity; It be evident that the earth was not made solid in the beginning.

(21) The earth is elevated on the equator and it is lower and leveled at the poles. From this tact it is evident that in the beginning It was made fluid only and due to its speedy motion its parts were assembled and overheaped on the equator and lessened around the poles, In *HADAYIQ,* both of these conceptions ore described in this manner that due to the rotation of the earth on its axis it was but necessary that the aquatic sphere (the whole waters) should have been of the shape of a shaljam (elliptical) because the light body (thing) has to cross over to the centre and it should gather exceedingly where there is the speedy motion to take a shape of a shaljam (elliptical). If the earth were to be so hard, the places of the equator should have been remained drowned under the water. And as a matter of fact there is mostly dry land on it, so it is clear that the earth itself is elliptical. It means it was fluid in the beginning and due to the axial revolution it has taken this shape and afterwards it became solid. And in the beginning of the *HADIQA III* it has been claimed that in respect of

the planets, there is not the conventional motion on the poles in reality. It goes on increasing and it would be fastest of all on the spherical zones. The science of physics tresses that the motion is necessary for the occurrence of the heat and the attracter of the fluids, too, hence it is compulsory that the ports should, having transferred from the poles, gather at the spherical zones. And it should also be a fact that the equatorial axis be bigger.




(105) This argument is far from the repulsion and nearer to the acceptance if at all it should: have been proved that the planets are fluids.

(22) Both the points of equinoxises are lagging behind 50.2" to the west every year. It is called the equinoctial undertaking. This falling back is correct of which the reason is coming of the zodiac circuit to the east against being proportional. It is as per the ancient astronomy. Hence, this intersecting point remains to the west and in its place another point takes place. So the connection of the point of intersection with the point of the equalizer of the mid-day is individual and not specific because due to the eastward motion the various points of the zodiac come on the point of the equalizer of the day, AHB the Zodiac (Circuit of the zodiac). The movement of the equalizer is from east to west and in it the spherical zone, too, is under its command. There will not be any change because of it but the spherical zone keeps its own slow motion be the east from the west. Today the point of intersection is on AB. Now to the point A of the zone came on D moving to it. Naturally the point E which was to the west of it will come to the place of A. Now the intersection


will occur on E which was to the west of A. When E will come to the place of A, moving to it, point T which is to the west of it will come to the place of intersection. Likewise when A will come to the place of D, then B must come to the K's place. And now, M which was to its west side will come to the place of B, the place of intersection. When it moved to K, L which was to its west side made intersection. In this manner the point of Intersection will be moving to its west direction on the points of the zone. And its quantity would be nearly ten seconds. What a clear explanation it is which the wisdom would not like to refute. But t is the modern astronomy which is keen to put the basis of anything on the action only. May it would do or not. They give this reason to it that the earth is swollen on the equatorial line and that is why the attraction of the sun on this belt is more than any other parts of the earth and that is also due to the foci that this belt of the earth is nearer to the sun in proportion to the others. And it pulls its every part towards the Zodiac and that port is inclined to go along with that belt because of the axial motion of the earth. Necessarily it moves in between both the directions, and the whole belt (zone) is perplexed. Hence, now on the intersecting points of the zodiac move ahead of it in the western direction. And this activity is continuous. But when the sun is on the equinoctial points for example in March and September for at least sometime, But to this much time at least this activity would be deemed to be false because the equator itself is united at this time with the circle of the zodiac, So how con they pull each other to itself? And the period of longest duration would have been that occasion when the sun would be in between the two Orbits. It means the Apex of the Cancer and the Capricorn. And in it the moon is more effective than the sun because of its nearness. And that is 7/3. After some more lines, it is said to be nearly 5/2. Due to the totalily of the attraction of the sun and the moon equinoxises decrease to 50.41" every

year. But the attraction of the other planets is contrary to their action. And it decreases the undertaking to the tune of 0.2" Hence, it remains 50.20" The figure of the undertaking is like this, ABC is the zone and R is the place of the sun on its point R. it attracts the point E of the equalizer ADB. But it is inclined to A on the same circle due to the axial motion of the earth. But in the conflict of both the attractions it will not go to either R nor it will go to A. On the contrary it will go to H slipping through both of them. Now some other point which was to the west of it will take the place of A as on intersection point.

My Statement (106)



it means moving of E to H will not be in the manner that it should move to the line EH slipping through the belt on E. On the contrary the whole belt will move in this manner that E will move there to R and there near to H. So A will move away from its place and in its place the point near to it will take the place of the intersection point and it will be the point nearer to H. It is not certain that the same point of the equilizer may intersect having moved from its place because it has been raised up jumping due to the attraction of the point E. So here there remained not the length suitable to AE. Necessarily A moved forward, and the point behind it became the point of intersection. And now this picture will be suitable to exemplify that. A was the point of intersection before at first. When C moved ahead and came to the place of C the part of the line of Equator AC, now become the part A, C. A, from its place of position of intersection went



ahead and it remained behind to the west of the point A, the intersection point of the zodiac.

Thus now the point T became c the intersecting point and thus it is nearer to H, compared to R, the former point of the intersection. In this manner in their view the intersection of the zodiac circuit and the equilizer of the mid-day i.e., the equator are both of specific nature. It is clear to be of their being specific on the basis that the intersection point goes on transferring to parts of the zodiac. The reason of it is that it is moved ahead because of the attraction and did not allow to remain the first point to be static and constant. If it is so, why to the western side in their view?


My Statement (107) we will explain it in our own manner. Although in respect of the two half,above the horizon and below the horizon, the direction of east and west changes. Our east is west to the Americans and our west is east to it. But there is no alternative to the uninterrupted sequence of the Zodiac and it moves from west to east. Wherever be the Aries, the Taurus will be to its east direction because after that the rising and setting will take place and the Pisces will be to the west as, firstly, at every place the Scorpio will be to the east of the Libra and the Virgo to the west. So whichever thing transfers to the uninterrupted succession of the zodiacs for example the moving of the Aries to the Taurus or the Aries to the second phase of the Vertex of the Aries which moves from west to east. And whichever thing may be in motion against the uninterrupted succession of the zodiac for example from Aries to Pisces or 30 degrees to the Pisces. It moves from east to west. In this figure, if A is in the east side on the Vertex of Aries, then surely A, T, H etc. are Pisces, Aquarius, Capricorn etc. may be AR, the arc, on the horizon upside because these rise before it, or may be it

down below the horizon, then A which is to the East of them, it is west to us. And Pisces, Aquarius, and the Capricorn etc. set earlier than that. And if the Vertex of the Libra is to the east side, it is necessary that T, H, R should be the Virgo, the Leo, the Cancer etc. in both the above conditions.


Now that the T became the point of intersection in place of A. in the first condition the Vertex of the Aries. And in the other condition the Vertex of the Libra having moved ahead, the following Virgo or its any point will become the Vertex of the Libra. In any case, if you so wish, you go on moving the point of equality against the uninterrupted succession. And thus it moved to the west. And it is but the intention of Allah. You thought that the undertaking can be done under the influence of the attraction. Now listen to the resistance of it.

My Statement (108) Firstly a very simple fact can be brought here and that is that the attraction of the sun is not only on the perpendicular line but also it is on all the parts that are facing to it although it is more on the perpendicular distance. And it is clear that the parts of the ring belt are not on any one direction, being the cuttings of the arc, but their directions are regulated in the archial system. The lines of attraction that will come on them will be subjected to the variation of the directions and their colours, too. And they will form different angles. Every thing will be caught in its angle which do you suppose is not regulated in the archial system? Then what is the reason that the rays may not become dispersed and scattered? The proof of it upto you as their spreading will be on such a proportion that the belt be adherent to its place.

Secondly **(109):** If there is the difference in the perpendicular and the oblique one and the nearness is also different, necessarily the attraction is different, so the repulsion will be different and consequently the speed will be different. Naturally the parts are different, so the belt is scattered to pieces.




Thirdly(110), there is more perpendicular attraction on the middle part of a thing and it will reduce step by step towards both sides of it. So it is necessary that the average part of the belt exceeds the most than its former place and all the parts to the last end should lessen step by step. And in this case both the parts of the places of the intersection be moved very less from their former places and the distance of the rest should go on increasing till the average part should go away more than its first place. But this is not possible here. ***(111)*** On the contrary, here the contrary position of it is a must because when the point of intersection of both the circles has gone back, whatever be the condition of the latitude of equator, will be intersecting in the middle of the former position. For example, A be the Vertex of Aries, B, the Vertex of Libra. Now the Vertex of the Aries has come to H. It is compulsory that the Vertex A of the Libra be on E. The arc connecting H, E, undoubtedly will intersect the former arc AS in the middle. So it is evident that the parts of the places of the intersection have gone ahead far more from their places and then the distance has gone on lessening till it didn't remain at



all. This is wholly contrary to what was the compulsion of the attraction. Hence to suppose the undertaking dependent on the attraction is ignorance and no more.

Fourthly (112) to take the attraction of the sun and the moon as successful for all the time is at random and without any basis, But it may be sometimes successful for example in the course of assembly (union). And at that time the undertaking must be speedy one lest it should be some times lagging behind and sometimes obstructing. All the ten parts may be pulling it to one side. For example, in this figure: AB is the zone of AH, the equator, D is the sun, R the moon. The point C wants to go to side AV and the sun is pulling it on to DC, but it is bent on going to the side CH and the moon is pulling t to the side of RC and its intention is to move to the side CT. Now that although the attraction is less due to the fartherness from the moon, is still more than, the ratio of 7/3 which is in their attractions. The effect of the moon will be weak, if it is less. The effect of the sun will be dull, if it is less. Both the effects will be equal if it is equal. Any way, there are three different effects active on it. In the position of the conflict, if the attraction of the sun and the moon are ineffective it will go to AC directly. Then there will not occur the undertaking. In the condition of lagging behind if it is not considerably dull. If it is the effect of the sun, it would go to CT, and if it is the effect of the moon, it will move to CH. Otherwise There would occur some other fourth line barring all these three lines, and in any way the course of the undertaking will not be regulated although it may be regulated in the unison with the observation.

Fifthly (113): The decreasing of the undertaking by the attraction of the other planets may be in the manner that the sun and the moon should have moved ahead of equinoxises and this (attraction) should have thrown it off



to the east or should have stopped it from the motion totally.

Secondly spontaneously the conclusion is that this is false because to stop is not in the capacity of the H effect of the attraction. And firstly, that is taking it to such a point on the zone by the intersector which was to the east of the former point can be thought of only when to be in the Northern hemisphere to the south of the equator or in the Southern hemisphere to the north because in this condition the planet D will pull S the point of the equilizer to its own side and it would be bent on going towards A and crossing the line CH will be far from the zone and in place of A, will intersect on point R which as per our former statement will be ahead of A on the uninterrupted succession of the zodiacs and it is to the east of it. But it is not in respect of the planets. In the Northern hemisphere their declination occurs more to the north and the south. And if it is contrary to it, it is rarely so. So on most of the occasions, in such conditions are in agreement with the sun and the moon and not in confrontation. ***(114)*** The obstruction to the equator to go ahead will not tend to move the undertaking from the west to the east so that it may go on ahead approaching the zone as much it likes. In any way the undertaking will be western only.

Sixthly (115) take it for granted that this is not rare. Then there must be the contract always because their declination will be to the south direction always in the Northern hemisphere. And in the Southern Hemisphere, It will be northward for ever. Arid this is absolutely false.

Seventhly (116) the resistance to the conception of being the attraction most powerful due to the nearness of

the moon has passed over in the fourth reason of the discussion of the tides.

Eighthly (117), it is absurd to think of occurrence of most effective function on the orbits that speaks of the utmost powerfulness of the attraction due to the utmost distance. And as much it is nearer, it may be weaker and weaker.

Ninthly (118), it is also strange to consider the equator utmost nearer due to its more height. How much difference of height is there from the poles to the equator? It is only about 13 miles. And the distance between the orbit and the equator is 23 degree, 27 minutes. It is equal to two crores eighty three lakh miles or more. Hence, when the sun will be in the orbits, it will pull the nearer orbits. Or will it, leaving the distance of more than a quarter to three crores miles in between, catch up with the height of only 13 miles?

Tenthly (119) so, it is necessary that when the sun may be in the summery orbit, all the orbits that are to its south may become northward. It will pull all those orbits that ore to its north. And the rest of the orbits that are upto the Northern Pole will be subjected to being their parallel circles pulled to the direction of south. In this manner, it may go on attracting, having left the orbit which was transferred to, the northern ones to southward and those at south to being their parallel circles pulled to the direction of south. In this manner, it may go on attracting having left the orbit which it was transferred to the northern ones to southward and those at south to the north till it reaches the equator. Leaving it, too, it would bring all those at north to the south and the southern to the northward. And when it moved to the southward, should attract all like those in the north side and the equatorial latitude to the south and the

rest of the southern ones at the north. Thus not only the equator but also each and every belt of the earth that may be parallel to it may be attracted towards the sun. And all those belts (rings) that are out of the summerial orbit all and all be pushed to the south for ever and all those are out of the wintery orbit be pulled towards the north. In this way the earth on and around the poles may go on vacating themselves and all those belts ore in between the two orbits, may remain covered with ice. And they may move on sometimes to the south and sometimes to the north. See, what a funny the undertaking of the equinoxises it is?


Eleventhly (120) what does it mean by having the function at the equator to be worthless? If not towards the zone, should it not attract and pull towards its own.? Hence, it is necessary the point of intersection not only should, leaving the intersection, move ahead but also should raise itself.

Twelthly (121) this function of pulling will not only occur on the equator but also it will be so on each and every orbit. It will raise the point to this side by day and at night it will raise the points to that side. Necessarily, the earth in between the two orbits would have been very much raised and the diameter of the earth might have gone increasing in length every year. And the shape of the earth, in the course of time, would have been like this. This is the result of your attraction and its system of the undertaking.

(23) The absolute declination is ever decreasing. In the times of Euclid it was 24 degrees. So, in Article No. 4, he has written the method of making 15 sides in a circle. And now it is 23.27 he has given its reason the some that the sun is pulling the belt of equator towards the zone. The laws of astronomy have overacted on it saying that the sun pulls half of the belt which is nearer to it and makes it

nearer to the zone and makes the other half away from it. But its distance (fartherness) is less than the nearness f the other. So it is only the nearness that goes on increasing and t will decrease too, in halves. The separator is that line which is lying in between both the points of the equality and it is the axis of that distance.

My Statement (122) Firstly, when two circles for example ARB, AHB intersect each other and there may not be their intersection but half on each half. The distance on the middle will be the most of all which is called the absolute declination and the utmost distance for example HC, DR and these arcs will be the measure of the angle A or B and A spontaneously both the angles GAC, DAR are equal. Hence consequently, if the HC, DR are both the arcs equal, then it is impossible that one half for example ARB be made far from, ARB. On the contrary, as much on half will be nearer to that of the other, consequently the other half will be nearer to the other half. Otherwise, the circle will be splitted into two parts. **Secondly (123):** What is the meaning of difference in making this nearer and farther?




Thirdly (124) both the halves of the belt (ring) change their distance and closeness from the sun daily. Whichever is nearer by day will be farther at night and conversely. Then it is as doing the work at night is nullified by the day and the function of the day to be done away at night. And thus the declination is going on decreasing year by year is null and void. **Fourthly (125)** what is the proof that the function of unloading will be reversed after a time whereas the declination is going on decreasing. Or will it ever begin to increase? Or only they go on making claims

whatever they would like to utter? And they have gone so far to write down that till the end of this world it will go on increasing and decreasing.

Fifthly (126) the unloading of the undertaking and the declination are, both, necessary. Both are the effect of a cause. And whenever the unloading will be reversed and the declination will increase, surely and certainly, the equator will be going away from the zone and the point of intersection will slip from west. Hove you ever heard of this? Or did anybody dare to proclaim such an idea or is it that the modern research is the name of making commands and claims without head or fail?

(24) The center of the sun is the real depth. Whichever is nearer to it is underneath (below) it and whatever is away from it is above it.

My Statement (127) this subject is ascertained and proved on the basis of the modern astronomy. Firstly, (it is wholly admitted that the sun is the only and absolutely heavy and all others are relative. Everything is bent on seeking closeness to the sun in proportion to its heaviness. And more than that it moves to its nearness. With this admittance that the function of the heaviness is to pull down to the lowest direction, necessarily, it is evident that the center of the sun is the real d e p t h.



Secondly (128) Like us, they, too, consider the Venus and the Mercury to be at the bottom whereas the Mars and the others above it to be heavenly, In our view, the reason of it is clear that the real depth is the center of the earth.

The Venus and The Mercury are closer to it, may they be on their utmost distance. And the Mars and all others upward it, are far away from it, although they may be on their lowest distance. But ours they are not in agreement with this whereas in the view of the modern astronomy the Mars on most of the occasions get close to the earth and is thus nearer to it and likewise the Venus and the Mercury are at for distance from the earth. Refer to the Annual Ephemeris i.e. the Al-Maknun and see for how many days the distance of Mars from the earth is. The correct figure is 9 as per the logarithism. It is a genuine fragmentation. And it is zero in respect of the Venus and Mercury. So they got the honour of being few genuine, the place of the most difference is that one when both of them may be along with the sun in the position of their conjunction. And the Mars at this time would be in opposition of their conjunction. And the Mars at this time would be opposite to them and the Mars would be nearer the earth and the Venus and the Mercury would be farther from the earth. The modern astronomy has shown at this time the highest distance of the earth from the Mercury to be 135631049 (more than thirteen crores) of miles and that of Venus 159551436, i.e. nearly sixteen crores of miles and the nearest distance of the Mars as 26388985 (not even equal to three crores of miles). In this case if the center of the earth be the Absolute Depth, necessarily the Mars should be below it and the Venus and the Mercury be above, to the upper side and it should happen often. As a matter of fact, it is not so. So they have taken for granted that the center of the sun be the absolute depth for the reason that the Venus and the Mercury are always nearer to it and the Mars is far away from it.

Thirdly (129) It is a pure explanation That the Venus and the Mercury have their orbits in between the orbit of the earth and that is why they are coiled the lowest

ones. And the orbits of Mars and the other planets are outside the orbit of the earth and so they are called the highest ones, it is evident that this being highest and the lowest is relative. It means being inside the orbits of the Venus and the Mercury are nearer than that of the earth and that of the Mars and others is farther away. Consequently, it is evident that, in their view, the center of the sun is the only absolute depth. We will lay more stress on the modern astronomy and the unforeseen researches of its exponents to prove its fallacy, if Allah so wishes.

(25) The vacuum is possible rather it is in existence in reality. It is as taking of a vessel or place its air by means of an instrument.

My Statement (130) they have repeated this claim of theirs place to place. The mention of air pump has passed by in No. 18. The ancient philosophy considers the vacuum impossible. In our opinion it is possible. But it is generally impossible by the proof of the working of a giraffe-like instrument ***1**. And the air is very rarefied body, what is the proof of getting off from the vessel, a

*1: *This kind of instrument has its mouth very narrow and (here are tiny holes at its bottom. If, having filled it with water, pressed by the thumb from upper side, the water will not fall down as there will not be outlet for the air to pass off. If the waterfalls, necessarily there will be vacuum inside. Now take of your thumb, the water will fall down. As much the water falls, that much air will enter the instrument. The injection type pump will have to be used here. Keep it on the level of the water and pull up its vacuum rod, the water will come up in the instrument. When the rod is taken up as…**Continue to next page*

rare part having rarified tills up the whole house because of its rareness and it is not felt at all. Newton (9 has written that if they were to be pressed to such an extent that there should not remain any pore in its body, then it would have been reduced to nearly a cubic inch only. Whereas this great sphere whose surface area***2** is two kharabs fitly nine arabs forty three crores ninety six lakhs sixty thousand

(remaining) *much ills taken up that much vacuum is created and it is to be filled up by the water. And when it is filled up and the rod has closed its mouth. Now you lower it down and see the water's not falling as it was not falling down from the giraffe-like instrument. When there is not the vacuum, it is not likely to come down, it was invented by a well known doctor, it was summer season. The smoking pot was brought before but the pipe was dry, so the smoke did not come. I asked them to till the pot with water freshly and when it was done, the smoke began to come. So I inquired about it with the doctor. He could not reply. I explained him that when it was dry the pores were open. When the pipe was inhaled by the mouth, by this attraction, as much the air was in the pipe was inhaled by the mouth, by his attraction, as much the air was in the pipe came inside the mouth, that much air from outside the pipe came into it through the pores of it and till the smoke came the effect of attraction was not there. When it was freshly filled up, the pores were shut down. When again it was inhaled, the air inside was pulled up into the mouth and the external air did not take its place. Necessarily in order to fill up the vacuum, the smoke came in there into the pipe.*

***2:** *On p. No. 266, He has written it to be more than that that is two kharabs, sixty one arabs, sixty crores and thirty lakhs. But as we calculated it* *(Cont…next page)*

miles is reduced to on inch of cube having pressed it, then the air which is thousands of time oft rare can it not be possible to it, having spread it up more and more, to fill crores of houses?

A Cursory Note ***My Statement (132)*** the men of justice should see what Newton said and that is absolutely senseless. If, at all the sphere of the earth, having pressed, remains worth a cubic foot then

MY STATEMENT would be ***Firstly(134)***, if it so happens, then the whole sphere which is spread up to kharabs miles will be a product of one lakh ten thousand five hundred ninety two particles. Each and every particle is equal to a tip of a hair and hence a meter is equal to forty eight fingers. Every finger is equal to 36 tail hairs of a Turkish horse. So the meter is equal to 1748 tips of hair. Having divided it by 36, each inch is equal to 48 hairs. Hence, a cube of an inch of the earth is equal to 110592 particles. What a clear cut lie it is.

(remaining) *on the basis of modem consideration, it came to as much we have mentioned above. We have referred to it in our magazine "Risala-e-al-Hindasah"* ****1** *as: Take the diameter +0.4971499=L circumference. And in the Usul-al-Hindasah, article No. 7, figure no. 10, it is: the surface of the diameter and the circumference of the great circle the earth = the surface of the sphere - as per the figure no.* (14) *surface of the diameter / 6 x diameter=the area of the body of the sphere. Hence as per the logarithm* above *mentioned, the logarithm of 6 will be 0.7781513, having lessened and making it three times the logarithm is added in the diameter 3L diameter +1.7189986=L area of the atmospherical sphere. The latest equilised diameter of the earth is 7913.086 miles. L3.8983459x3=11.6590377 +1.7189986=11.4140363 number=259439660000. And it was as desired.(see next page for* ****1**)

If this much earth has got so many particles, where will go those which are spread up on the area of the kharabs and kharabs mile of the earth? If you are short of understanding then see in a single line. If the earth was to be equal to a cubic inch in volume, its diameter would have been a quarter and one inch. It means it would have contained fingertip worth particles numbering to the tune of 59.553645, take it for 60 as a round figure. Then one and quarter inch is in decimal figure***1** like 1.240700. In this manner of calculation this whole universe would have been equal to a diameter of the earth. And now count out the particles in on inch's length. If this much in number they are what would be the calculation of eight thousand of miles?

---

*(remaining)*****1(131)** *this method of ours is short and abbreviated. We can say it in this way, too, that we have mentioned in the above mentioned Magazine that L diameter+1.8950899=L area of the circle. Then 2/5 of area of the circle (the great circle) x diameter = area of the sphere. Therefore, it is proved in the laws of the Geometry article No. 4, figure No. 12 that 1/4 of the surface of the sphere and the circumference=area of the circle. And as per article pertaining to figure No.10 surface of the diameter and the circumference of the great circle = area of the surface of the sphere. So the surface of the sphere will be equal to four times the surface of the Great Surface and its hexagon x diameter= the desired result= 1.8950899 L of 2 i.e. 0.3010300 is to be added and L of 3 to be deducted i.e. 0.4771213 or add to it L of 4 i.e. 06020600 or deduct L of 6 i.e., 0.7781513. In any case you will get 1.7189986. Firstly the diameter was 2L and now it is increased to 3L.*

***1** *in the reverse position L are of the sohere-I.7l896 =L diameter.* *(Remaining on next page)*

Secondly (135): When in a diameter there may be only sixty particles and that is equal to 66 miles of degrees i.e.65.9423 miles whereas the equalized radius (half diameter is 3956.543 miles). So when after having shrunk, as per our supposition, had it come to its original state as now, every particle would have been at a distance of 132 miles from each other and the earth would have not been felt at all.

Thirdly (136): and if it is taken for granted that these particles with the differences of the distances of their destinations were to be appeared separated from each other, a mad person only would have taken it for one body.

(remaining)Here the area is one and not the zero-mentioned number=0.2810014/3=0.9366713= 1.2407009. It means one inch plus the mentioned fragmentation which is nearly a quarter. Its advantage: ***My statement (133)*** *in the same manner where as the sphere will be taken for one, its diameter will be nearly one and a quarter. And if the diameter will be taken for one unit the sphere will be 131/250 means 13/25=minutely 0.5235989. And whereas the diameter is one, its logarithm and 3 times of it will be equal to zero. So the area of the sphere will be 1.7189986 only and whose number is itself mentioned above. And as per this 134, the quantum of the diameter should not be burdensome on the sphere because that much power will be the first of the diameter and third of the sphere And here it should be observed that there are 60 degrees in a diameter, it means 48 in an inch and the one inch of a sphere is 110592 as is the cube of 48. It can be verified in the manner that in one and a quarter of diameter there will be Logarithm 59.553645 particles. In the same way I.7749O83x3=5l3247249+1.7189986=520437235=L area of an inch cube = 110592 particles of the sphere.*

Fourthly (137): It would have been impossible to make abode there by Mon and the beasts or any living being on this sphere an and none could have built his house or building because there would have been the distance between any two particles equal to 132 miles and there would have been vacuum in between them.

Fifthly (138): If at all, the people were to live in the air, the people of India could have been seen from America and vice versa. And the rising and the setting of the sun and the moon and the planets would all have tumbled down and collapsed. There would not have anything to hide them from the eyes of man and neither the other living beings nor the particles in the vacuum would have been successful in if. All these conditions are necessary in the state of present earth because it is the state which would have been by spreading again after having shrunk. The particles do not decrease by shrinking. So the diameter of the earth is the some equal to 60 particles and in the whole of the sphere there are totally 110592 of the kind. If you would say the democratic particles are smaller than the tips of the hairs, then there will not be 60 in the diameter but more than that. ***My statement (139):*** How many as such they are and how much smaller they are this is only a game of the mind and there is no restriction to any body's thinking and saying whatever he would like to. So take a grain of poppy for the Great Circle and taking its 360 degrees go on calculating like a degree is equal to 60 degrees, every minute has 60 seconds, each and every second has all the decimal points will they be comprehended by any body's mind? This sun's sky which you call it the orbit of the earth and of which the circumference of the circle is more than fifty eight crores of miles, we would discuss and prove it in the Chapter (I) that one single decimal of it is equal to the one and a quarter lakh times of a tip of a hair. And there is no doubt

that one fiftieth part of on hair can not be separated from the sense of feeling. Hence, you con consider fifty particles in one democretisia. If not take it for 132 equal too a tip of a hair. Now you might have no objection to it. And whereas each and every particle is at a distance of 132 miles from another one, now each and every particle is at a distance of a mile from another. Does, now, the diameter of it is increased to the extent of 60 tips of a hair? Consider as many parts of a hair, then can the existence of the earth, even then, be felt? Can now the moon or the sun or any star set when still there is the distance of a mile at least in between the two parts? Note the awkwardness of the research of the modern astronomists and even then they are hell-bent on it to follow it. Isn't it the clear proof of their intellectual bankruptcy?

(26) The sky is nothing but an empty vacuum, without boundaries, unlimited. If a stone is thrown in the atmosphere and if there is no resistance to it by the attraction of the earth or the air, it should have gone ahead with one and the same speed uninterrupted for ever. Likewise if the attraction of the sun were not to interrupt the earth, it would have gone straight to one and the same direction with one and the same speed. These are all their fancies. Each and every faithful person has to believe in the heavenly books **(140)** and the distance is in existence, absolutely limited. And the idea of its being unlimited is condemned with the irrefutable and decisive proofs.

(27) The predecessors of ours, having committed mistake, became the accepter of the existence of the sky. And, on the contrary, we the followers of them, i.e. the modern astronomists, although don't accept the existence of the sky, even then to correct the arithmetical mistakes and the geometrical wrongs, depend upon these motions of the circles and follow the predecessors to accept the sky to

be in the shape of concave (arc) of a sphere. And it is dependent on the last limit of the sight of the observer and consider its center to be the center of the earth.

My Statement (141) firstly, this admittance, at least, is very important, that without the existence of the sky, the calculations and the geometrical activities go wrong. But this of their logic is unusual that the very thing is wrong on which they depend to correct their mistakes.

Secondly (142): as a matter of fact all and all the philosophers and the thinkers do accept that all the circles of the heavenly spheres are in the shape of convex, But they are not going to agree with it to be the convex shaped. So they took it for being in the shape of concave. And it too, required limitation and fixed it on the observer's end point of his sight. This much is not sufficient but also it is different to the different observers. If we consider the most accurate and effective sight, they are the instrument to see it far beyond. And the powers of these instruments, too, vary. If you take one such as you think it to be the most effective and powerful, there are no limit to it as every day, they are inventing more and more powerful instruments.

(143)Let the sight be direct or with the help of an instrument, its limit of distance depends upon that blue ceiling of the universe which the ancient astronomists call it the sphere of the breeze of vapours. And the modern astronomists call the same a simple, unmixed gesture of the end point of the sight (Seeing power). And in reality it is the sky of this world i.e. the concave view of the canopy of the moon, And 1 there were not the illuminating heavenly bodies, we could not have seen them. And these shining bodies be taken to any distance, of course in agreement with the angle of the sight, they can be seen and the power of the sight will reach to it. That is why as a matter of fact there is no limit to distance. Whereas, till now when these

instruments were not invented these concaves and circles were determined to the distance the eye could catch the sight upto. And whereas the more powerful instruments are invented, the world went on increasing and went on higher and higher. And in the future, too, this sphere of the universe will go on more and more high up, there will not be any limit because they require to accept one wrong notion to correct the mistakes of their arithmetics as well as the geometry and whatever manner they would like to.

Thirdly (144) the celestial (heavenly) sphere should have been, may it be taken for granted, by its own nature of this kind that from the absolute depth its distance would be equal. This is unreasonable and irrational, too, to take 1 for granted that this one of a concave type is higher to one side and less high to some of other sides. It would have been better to take its center on the center of the sun because that is your absolute depth. But to them it is their helplessness and compulsion to rectify their mistakes, arithmetical a well as geometrical to take the center of the absolute depth on the center of the earth in pursuance of the predecessors.

Fourthly (145): The modern astronomical experts cannot take for granted any of the center of the earth or the center of the earth or the center of the sun or any other fixed center, on which the whole system of the astronomy can be based. And as such without accepting one fixed center on which depends the whole system of all the celestial bodies and the skies, more discussion on this subject is going to be in near future. And it is certain that without accepting one fixed center - the whole system and the administration of the heavenly bodies (the whole universe) is going to be null and void. In short, these helpless people are in trouble who have learned all their theories and the theorems from there ancient forefathers

and require to discuss in their manner. But they are leaning to the converse laws to become the modern religious people. And they are unable to adjust to it. They are caught as if the rat in the mouth of a snake. having lost the sky, and having relied upon the sun and making all the planets to revolve due to the attraction of the sun, they are striving for their survival and are going on throwing their hands and legs all where. But they are not successful. By the grace of Allah, all this will be discussed and will be cleared of the snags And Allah will help.

(28) If the equatorial line is extended to the concave shaped heaven, it will form the Great Circle till it will make two parts of the celestial sphere, both being equal. This would be the line of equilizer or the equinox of the Mid-day, The Great circle is such a circle that makes two equal parts of the sphere.

My Statement (146) This much at least having learnt from their predecessors is good on their ports to accept but the modern astronomy would not allow it to go on and do of which the discussion follows very soon by the Help of Allah. *HADAYIQ* has made one vague and national Annexture to it and that is that consideration of the zone of daily motion of the earth as the decisive of the world has led to the existence of the equilizer of Mid-day in the heavenly world and the equator of the earth.

My Statement (147) It is strange to take the equator as the decisive of the world whereas the equator itself is a zone.

(29) The mother (Origin) of all the arguments of astronomy is the revolutions and the circles. We have marked the perplexity of the modern astronomy in the theories of the equilizer of the mid-day, the celestial


equator and the determining the zonal circle. They learnt it from the predecessors and without that they are unable to perform their functions of the astronomy. Helplessly, they are following and copying them in the functioning and arguments. But their unprincipled and wrong notions will not save their fleet of ships. And not only that much but also, they will not allow you to explain the celestial equator, correctly, It has been said in the laws of the astronomy that the Great Circle that is formed by the sun's annual revolution, is the Great Circle itself. Its surface is inclined (lent) on the surface of the equilizer at 23 degrees and 27 minutes and some seconds. This has been divided on twelve zodiac signs (Towers) equally. Six of them are to the North of the Equator and the rest six are to its South. Each and every zodiac sign has got 30 degrees. In the Hadayiq, it has been said that taking this circle of the orbit as the decisive for the world results in the existence of the heavenly space.

My Statement (148) Firstly All this is wrong. On the contrary the solar Orbit (which is called the orbit of the earth) is separated from the center of the world and it is situated on its own center. So its diameter's one point is at an utmost distance from the center of the world and that is called the apogee (Apex or the pinnacle). The second one is at the utmost nearest distance and it is called the Depth (the last lowest point). The figure to this will be seen in the following No. (33). Let us draw a circle on the center of the world from the distance of the Apogee which will represent the zone such that the other circle that will be formed between the secant of the dome of the universe and parallel to it will be the zodiac circle of which the center is the center of the world. Now the truth of our claim and the falsification of their assumption will be evident from their own admittance. If Allah so pleases. **Secondly (149)** Leaving it apart, by the scientific method, the like of it is

that only which is given in the Hadayiq, and not as it to accept the orbit as the zodiac circle which is subject to consideration and above which there are about one hundred and fifty more orbits. And their basis (foundation) is taken froth where the depth of the heavenly canopy is not sufficient.

Thirdly (150), you consider the orbit of the earth, at least, to be elliptical, then how it can be the zodiac circle ***(151)*** and to rely upon the metaphorical statements would not do because the functions of the declination and the latitudes etcetera are dependent on the science of the trigonometry and they are continued in the complete periphery.

(30) The intersection of the celestial equator and the zodiac circles depends upon the bisection that means bisection of both of them is by the points of the equinoxises (moderation). All those spheres, celestial and the earthly, in the modern astronomy, are called the globes. If you observe them you will find that both the circles are bisected. And it is such a thing of which every child who might have taken a first step in the ancient or the modern astronomy is well aware of it. And, also, just before in No. 29, consequently, it has passed in No. 23, that the division of the equator in two equal parts is, also, based on these very two equinoxes' points. And also in No. 59 of the same subject, it is said that these two Great Circles intersect each other on two opposite points. Naturally, it is quite clear that only those opposite points appear on the circle, in which there is the distance of half of the turn. And it is clearer than anything. In No. 157, it has been said that the arc of the equilizer or the points of



ascent is 180 degrees. Further more it says that this is a proof of it that the zodiac circle is itself the Great Circle because no other circle than this Great Circle can intersect the equator that is the equilizer (moderator), in such a manner. In any way this is such a matter on which the modern astronomy as well as all the thinkers of the world agree with each other.


My Statement (152) now from these three conclusions are necessary spontaneously.

A) Both these circles are equivalent.

B) Both of them are on one and the same center.

C) Both are the spheres of one and the same Great Circle.

Hence, it is evident there is no question of the bisection of all other circles, smaller or bigger they may be. Otherwise the part and the whole would be equal. The circle AHE bisected the smaller circle ABC on the points A,C. AC joined the two points with each other. So it is necessary that it passed through the centre of the smaller circle D. And now it became the diameter of it.



Now take the bisection of circle AHE, too, on the same points. If the same AC be the diameter of that bigger circle, too, then both the circles will be equivalent. And if its diameter is HT. the arc of it ACE, too will be half of it and HET, also, at all cost, i.e. the whole and the part will be equivalent ***(153)*** Hence, in this manner if the centers of the two equivalents are different, their bisection is impossible. The centers of the circles ARB and AHB are C & E respectively; the bisection has occured on the points A, B. And AB connected them. Consequently, it became the diameter of both the circles. It is in between the two equal halves of both of them. And thus it must pass through the centers of

both and thus D will be the centre of them. And this is impossible. Otherwise the whole and the part will be equal. And whereas these two circles will be on one and the some center, undoubtedly they are not two but one and only one circle, Moreover, all these three conclusions are consistent and they are proof to all those spheres earthly and heavenly, whichever are prescribed by the modern astronomy.

Advantages: (A) (154) On a plane surface, two circles will never bisect each other because for that purpose one and the same center is required for both the circles and it is impossible in the intersecting circles. ***(155)*** Uclid's article, No.3, figure No. 5

(B) (157) That definition of the zodiac circle in the Hadayiq is wrong because as per it the equilizer of the center changes.

(C) No.158 The definition of the laws of the astronomy is still more false whereas centre is different and not only that much but also the circles, too, are different in size being one bigger and the other one smaller. And whatever we said is the truth. And it is that **(159)** when their centers, both, are different how can both be the greatest circles? Because the center of the greatest circle must be itself the center of the sphere. See, the *"Ilm-e-Musala's-e-Kurrawi" chapter 1 (No.3)*.

(D) 160 Hadayiq only, whatever heard, told us as it was or in the same deceitful style took all the circles in a heavenly canopy (concave) of which the center is the earth. But they have forgotten that that is either the orbit of the earth or the canopy of the sky as per your view of which the alternative (equivalent) at any cost, is the center of the orbit. And how awkward it would be whereas the center of the orbit of the earth may be the center of the earth? They have taken the zodiac circle on the universal dome (the canopy of the sky) keeping it at the same time, on its own

center. In such a condition, neither it can be the great circle nor the celestial equator, be bisected by it. And if it were to be moved to the center of the earth, there will not remain the circle itself and there will not remain its place and also there will not remain the utmost distance of the new circle and the equilizer which is called the absolute declination. If there can be the declination of the zodiac circle, then the whole system and order of the astronomy is bound to fail and become topsy-turvy. And they are still making claim and proclamations copying others. They are not aware of the fact that their laws and principles all and all are going to be shattered sooner or later.

(31) The celestial equator and the zodiac circles, both are the individual circles. It means they are each one different identity and complete in itself so that none would change its own place in relation to one another and nor their condition should change against which the other type of circles that change themselves in response to the different conditions for example the circle of the Mid-day being different in each of the longitude and the horizontal circle which is different in its longitudes and latitudes.

My Statement (161) undoubtedly this is the truth and all the spheres of the modern astronomy, celestial or the earthly, both stand witness to this fact that they make both of the circles unchangeable. On the contrary to the horizon and the mid-day which have the system of changing themselves as per the conditions time to time. But this acceptance of the modern astronomy, by their action as well as practice and its expression on their parts is nothing but only the conventional and which has shattered the very basis of their laws and the principles of their astronomy. Let us leave them on their own. The discussion on the slate of their zodiac circle is just passed by and again they take the center of the orbit for the center of the

earth. How can the individuality remain intact when the type of it is itself changed? And very soon we are going to discuss all about the equilizer.

(32) The poles of south as well as the north are not still (motionless). On the contrary they revolve around the circle of the zodiac and due to the undertaking of the equilizer their turn of revolution around the axis of the zodiac is 25817 years. The undertaking per year is 5O°.2. And in each circle, there are 1296007 seconds and they are divided by 50°.2, it comes to 25817.

My Statement (162) The modern astronomy is habituated to speaking conversely and always so, of which the discussion is going to follow soon, and they are hell-bent on accepting that the poles of the world are in motion and the earth is revolving around that circle of which
the diameter is 19 crores of miles or nearly so and its orbit is equal to that of one star and the earth is revolving on that circle. As a matter of fact the poles of the orbit are motionless and the South Pole and The North pole which are the Poles of the world and also the poles of equalization and which are situated on both the shores of the revolving axis of the earth, might be raised to crores of miles up due to its revolution and also will toll down to the depth of crores of miles. But, apart from that, the first and the foremost thing is that now the celestial equator did not remain the individual circle. On the contrary it is new to every moment whereas the place of its center is different at every moment.

Secondly(163) It will not allow the supposed celestial canopy to take rest for a moment because they have taken the center of the canopy as the center of the earth (27). And it is subject to rise and fall to the tune of crores of miles up and down. Naturally the center of the

concave (canopy) will change every moment and again it will go to another side for crores of miles inside. And will leave the vacuum at the first place and in between the two. And this is what we have said of that. They take all this and the circles for the celestial concave.

Thirdly (164) Let it be taken for granted, although reluctantly, that the circle of the zodiac, too, be taken on this concave and the center and that they are changeable. So naturally, the zodiac circle, too, will go on changing, moment by moment. Will it, in this condition, remain identical to its individuality? Or is it that it will, only, be kept unchangeable, may its celestial equator remain intact or not and that its center will remain firm and fixed. And there will not be any need to its change. But then what will happen to the declination and hundreds of the problems? Any way, here they accept to follow the celestial equator and the zodiac circle and there they, on the some time started to go after the principles which ore dependent on the laws of the predecessors and not that only but also mixed them up with their own awkward and wrong notions and thus it become a dirty mixture of tonic. This is how the modern astronomy is and its researches are, never seen before.

(33) The earth and the planets revolve on their axis. Its reason is that it has been proved in the science of Physics that every particle is, by its own nature, inclined to take light and heat from the sun. If the planets were not to make the conventional revolution, their parts would not have got the light and the heat as well. My statement: This reason is not guided one.

Firstly (165) the attraction, the power of concentration and the repulsion are there in all the parts (particles) but one more power should be taken for granted

along with them and that is the power of stimulation but there is no proof of it.

Secondly (166) with a slight blowing the particles of the earth and the granules of the sand are separate from each other. If it is so, then hasn't their this natural longing this much power at least so that without being separated they could be made to turn around? Then why do each and every particle and the granule of the sand not make its journey to the sun with its own spherical motion? The part of it which is opposite and face to face can not be finished for hundreds of years till it is not removed from its sight. If that is so, what of the part that is concealed from the sun and what for it does not come forward for the light and the heat?

Thirdly (167): The earth has got as many pores in its body that if it is pressed wholly, it would remain only equal to an inch (No.25).So it is evident that no part of it is connected with another one. On the contrary all and all are separated from each other for a long distance between them. Then why doesn't each and every one of them revolve on its own separately so that it would have got the light and the heat to all around it? Thus each and every part remained with the light and the heat because of revolving around the axis of the sphere only. And thus each and every pail remains deprived of its full advantage.

Fourthly (l68): Any way al the parts of the upper surface derived the benefit from the conventional motion of the sphere, And still, the parts inside the earth, all and all, are deprived of the heat acid the light, Then how could all and all the parts be benefited and when? Why don't the parts inside come up for seeking the light and the heat? Do you like to say that the parts upside have prevented their exit?

My Statement (169) *Firstly*, it is wrong. This earth of the volume of an inch when it is spread up to the area of a quarter to two crores of miles, and it might have so many pores in it why (25) do they not come out from all these pores of the earth?

Secondly (170) those particles that are upside but concealed from the sun are kept prevented by the upper most particles that are opposite to the sun. Hence, the conventional motion cannot take place.

Fifthly (171): The sun too is revolving on its own axis, is it desirous of any light and heat from any one else? To sum up, this reason is senseless. But we will give you the reason of it on the basis of the modern astronomy itself.

So ***My Statement (172)*** its reason is also the attraction and the repulsion. The attraction varies in proportion to the distance i.e. being near or farther. Hence, it is much more on the perpendicular line (distance). For the totality of the planet for example, the earth, its moving to the orbit is the response of its repulsion against the attraction, But even then, the attraction is different on its parts and those particles that are facing the sun have got its attraction more than the other particles and the most of all on those parts that are under the perpendicular distance and there, too, that part has got that much more attraction as it is nearer to the perpendicular. These particles move away to escape the severest attraction, moving away from the complete opposition to the sun and vacate their places to give room to others and push off them ahead and those again push off the others. And thus the turning of them causes the revolution of the earth on its axis. (10) The particles which were behind the facing of the sun, come directly opposite.

Now in order to save themselves from the opposition, they push those that are ahead of them off and thus this process

goes on and thus the turn of revolution continues for ever. By the way, the earth, due to its utmost distance and being the tiniest in comparison to the sun in volume, it is just like a dot. Hence, the sun's disparity of appearance is 9 seconds or less than that even. Hence due to it there may not be negative difference so much of the opposition as well as of the disappearance. On the contrary all and all are opposite to the sun.

My Statement (173) Firstly, in the general view point, this much is sufficient that if it is so, why is there night on nearly half of the sphere? Why not it be wholly lit up because each and every particle of the earth is facing the sun. ***Secondly (174)*** If it is not so, at all, then what for is this variation of the appearance whereas this much is the quantity of the whole of the diameter? Clearly, it should be the most of all of the whole surface. This much is sufficient for the variation of the attraction.


Thirdly (175) take it for granted that all and all the particles are face to face, what would happen to the difference of the perpendicular distance and that of the slanting one? And as such the difference is still on. In all, all this discussion is based on those assumptions which are undoubtedly, the fixed lows of the modern astronomy. And it is only acceptable to them although neither this one is free from the criticism nor that one. On the contrary, we will, by the Grace of Allah, clear in the Chapter III that both the reasons are absolutely false. And why shouldn't it be so whereas these false laws are dependent on the modern astronomy? Even then it is more secure than that and more authentic than the laws of the modern astronomy.

NOTE: ***My Statement (176)*** Whatever the reason, in any case the spherical motion of the earth that is in reality conventional motion means the motion of the total (whole) sphere is not an unitary axial motion but a

long drown uninterrupted motion of the successive particles coming after each other. The reason of it is as per the first one, the particles behind push off the particles ahead of them to take their place and to come to the opposite, face to face with the sun themselves. Then those who are behind them push off them and take their place. In this manner the process goes on uninterrupted and on the second stage those one who are face to face to the sun push off those who are ahead of them and those particles push the others ahead of them and these to those whom that are ahead of them. In this way this motion is created and the whole motion in succession becomes the one and the total unitary motion, This motion, on the basis of the first reason

(177) for all the particles turn by turn is of the natural manner and compulsory, too. And those particles which are hidden from the opposition, for them its natural one and those particles which are face to face with the sun, for them it is compulsory because they are pushed off by those which are behind them and these are pushed off from their place achieved by them in pursuance of their own desire of their natural urge. So, when these will be pushed off from their place of facing the sun, by their own nature will have to come in motion naturally and they will bring compulsion on those who have come just before face to face. And this motion is compulsory on the second stage for all of them because it is caused due to the attraction although the repulsion may be natural. That is as I understand.

(34) ARBC is the elliptical orbit of the earth AR, RB, BC, CA are all the tour belts (girdles) And the diameter AB is the longer one. On both of its shores the whole distance passes through the center. CR is the




smaller diameter. On its both the shores the shortest distance goes through the center. They are the focus on the lowest part of which the sun is standing at. A, the point of the apogee of the sun is at the farthest distance from the sun. And B' is the point of the depth, which is lowest depth. The earth, on the point A is at the utmost distance from the center and the sun. Having moved from here onwards, it goes on decreasing and coming closer in the belt AR, the first belt closer to both of them (i.e. the center and the sun) till t is at the lowest distance AR at R from the center, In the belt RB, the 2nd belt it goes on away from the center but still it goes on decreasing its nearness to the sun till it reaches the lowest point or the depth B and here it is at the utmost distance from the center and it comes nearer and nearer to the sun. Thus in this half of the lowest part i.e. the ARB, it goes on increasing its nearness to the sun and its speed too, is more. The climax of the speed occurs on the point B and then on the same time it decreases its speed. In the belt BC, the third one, the earth goes on coming nearer to the center and goes on away from the sun till it comes on C and here from in the belt No. four CA it goes on moving away from the sun as well as the center till it reaches to its utmost distance at point A. In this half of its zenith BCA, only the distance from the sun goes on increasing and the speed goes on lessening. The climax of the dullness reaches at point A. Again the same turn begins. All these problems are tackled in general books and they are themselves clear. And the nearness, the distance from the sun and the condition of the center can be observed only in the above figure. And in our opinion, too

NOTE: Here we have taken the belts in view of the nearness and fartherness of the center. Line CR is taken as the middle in between the *two centers as here the distance is average or it may be taken on the center of the world because here the speed is average one.*

in contrast to the diameters and the nearness and fartherness from the center are only possible in the basis of the spherical knowledge and the rest are impossible. Whereas, if we take it for granted that the orbit of the sun is round and the earth is on the E point and the orbit being the elliptical, then all this of our discussion is agreeable to all. Only thing that is to be done is to replace the sun by the earth.

(35) The variation of the speed in the manner of fastness and dullness is dependent on the other center. As a mailer of fact, its speed is not fast or dull. On the contrary it remains equal always and it traverses the equal arcs in the equal times. Laws of Kipler, speak of the same second law.

My Statement (178) this is also unanimously accepted fact. So, there is not any kind of long tailed discussion or the geometrical proof required.




For the beginners in our opinion, they can fancy this idea by this figure (picture). AHRT is the orbit of the sun and the external center of it is D. AKLE is the zodiac circle. The center of the world is on D. AT, TR, RH, HA are four equal quarters of the external center i.e. the orbit of the sun and which it cuts in equal time but the zodiac circle opposite to them has got different arcs. When the sun comes on T from A, the center of the world passed to the line CB from the point C. So in this period it cuts the arc AB which is more than the quarter but in comparison to BK is smaller. When it comes to R from the point T, The arc BL of the zodiac circle opposite to this

quarter came to appear which is bigger then a quarter. In this manner, still, to more quarters are balanced there. So whereas the sun, in realty, has got its speed one and the same for ever, increases its speed in respect of the zodiac circle and decreases, too. During the six monthly term of TRH, BLP intersects it which is more than half. And during the half term of HAT. PAB moves on which is less than the halt and it is far less than it. Hence, it appears to be fast as well as dull, although its speed is always one and the same. Same is the condition of the earth in view of the modern astronomy. Be praise to Allah and here it is the foreword ends with our prayers for the blessings of Allah to our leader Mohammad and his family for ever.

RESISTANCE OF REPULSION LEADING TO THE FALSEHOOD OF MOTION TWELVE (12) PROOFS IN RELATION TO THE EARTH

FIRST RESISTANCE ***Statement(179)*** To start with, this much is sufficient that the force of repulsion is without proof and any claim without proof is false, weak and like the condition of the stone which is given in No. 2. The same condition is quite sufficient to be its example.

SECOND RESISTANCE ***Statement(180)*** Draw Line AB from the center of the circle on point X on the circumference. Then, on both the sides of the line XB, draw six equal lines in which CX, DX be the tangents and EX, GX, HX & FX divide both the right angles equally. Then join all of them to point A. It will be clear that every line of them will be equal to its corresponding line. And AE will be greater than AC, AG is greater than AE & AB is greater than AG. In the same way AH is greater than AF and AB is greater than AH because in triangles AXC, AXE AXG, Line AX is common & XC, XE, XG are equal and the angle on X has gone increasing as every first is a part of the other. Necessarily, the bases AC, AE, AG will, also, go on increasing. (Uclid's Theorem 1, figure 24). Now consider AB join GB. You will get isosceles triangle GXB in which both



the angles at points G,B will be equal. And it is clear that in triangle AGB angle G. whose diagonal is AB is greater than angle XGB. Hence, AG being the diagonal of a small angle B. is smaller than AB. (Fig. 19). Necessarily, B is at a greater distance than all others. And as much you come towards the tangent it will be nearer to the center. All that now the earth was at the point X and because of the force of the repulsion, it was inclined to go away from the center. In that condition it must move to XB because to this side only the fartherness is a pure fartherness. And all others are relative ones as they are in a sense, distances and in other sense they are nearness. Why did it acquire some other than the unmixed pure distance (or direction). It is due to its preference of its own liking. In that condition, whatever line it inclines to, to the other side there is its alternative. Why did it not go to that side is a negative preference of it. And as a matter of fact, both of them are humbug and falsehood. The earth is not an animate concious thing which may have the choice of its own intention in any condition. When it moves to XB, the turn or the rotations will be impossible. If the force of attraction overcomes it, it will move nearer to A, and if both the forces will be equal, it will remain on X. It will not move to the direction of any of them. Necessarily, it will not revolve.

RESISTANCE THIRD ***Statement (181)*** In any case, it must remain on the point X as in your view, both the forces of repulsion and attraction are equal. (No.6)(***182)*** And if there were variations in the velocity or motion on the circle due to the difference of speed, even then, both of them would have been affected equally (No.13). Any way equality is a fact. And taken for granted that there may occur relative variations in the repulsion as well as attraction, because of the variations of the speed, then as from the beginning of the universe when the earth was at the point X. where could you find its circle (orbit)

where would be the variations or difference of the speed and what to talk of its motion? Naturally, both of them are wholly equal to each other, that is why the earth is standing where it was from the very beginning of its creation and it will remain at one and the some point. As a matter of fact, your own theory of the forces of repulsion and the attraction has proved the very stillness of the earth. And all the praise be to Allah.

FOURTH RESISTACE ***Statement (183)*** so it comes to be known that there is nothing as a force of repulsion and not of its necessity to direct the earth to its line of tangent. And without such a thing, it is not possible to regularise the earth's turning (motion) around the sun. Hence, there should be some translatory power (pusher) to push it towards the line of tangent all the time. If it is the sun that pulls it towards itself, then the average of both of them will fix its rotation of the earth. It will require verification of this process. Take a big size nail, bury its one end in the ground and tie a cord or a rope to it and tie a ball to the other end of the rope. Strike it once, and the rope will tighten. The ball will not turn around it. It will require pushing it and moving it continuously, it can not be the effect of the sun. On the contrary, it is inclined to attract it towards itself. In that condition, there should be some other planet to attract (pull) the earth to its line of tangent and to move all the time with the earth. Then, where is that sort of planet which works as a force to move and rotate the earth? And if at all, we take it for granted that there is such a planet then the question arises as to who has made it revolve? It will require some other planet. And there will start on unending process. There is such a process that is impossible. Necessarily, the revolution of the earth is purely humbug and falsehood.

FIFTH RESISTANCE ***Statement (184***) to select one of two equalities or similar things is the act of wisdom and not that of an unconscious nature. Naturally, it is clear that the earth is not at all concious and a master of its will. In that condition, if at all, we take it for granted that it has the power of repulsion and that its force of repulsion throws it on its tangent i.e. it forms right angle against the force of attraction. But the force of repulsion has no connection with the tangent of that side and due to that the earth will be transferred towards the planets like Cancer, Leo, Virgo, Orion and Taurus. But it has an allergy to the tangent of that side also. In this condition, on what basis could it happen to adopt one side and discord the other one? This kind of preference would be without the will to prefer and that is unsound and false. and, at all, taking it for granted **(No. 185)**, it is like to choose one of the sides at random and by conjecture, why not it should adhere to so that had it not reached to its point of zenith that it comes back. And thus will fulfill the requirement of both the forces of repulsion and the attraction as well. To sum up, this kind of motion cannot be an act of the force of repulsion.[*1]

***1:** *If you were to say that the will of Allah has fixed one direction for the earth, although it can not be expected from you, as the men of physics have totally forgotten it and they are adhered to the nature and the matter, or it could be said about them that they are hell on the theory of the forces of repulsion and the attraction, even then the will of Allah can do all that He wills do. And if it is turned to Allah, then the fleet of the scholars of the modern astronomy is* deemed *to be drowned to the bottom of the sea. Let the truth be with Allah or you. The heavenly books will make apparent the existence of the skies and the motion of* the *sun of which the description comes at the end. And you will have to believe it.*

SIXTH RESISTANCE ***(186)*** all this is clear. It is a fact that the force of repulsion will move it towards the right angle only (No 5). If it were to bring it to the acute angle, then it would be like moving it close to the sun. It may be termed as the repulsion. But the modern science of astronomy does not consider the orbit of the earth to be a circle but elliptical. And in that condition, all the angles other than the angles on both the sides of its diameter will be acute angles to which they admit themselves. So the theory of the repulsion is wrong and false. And the attraction or the inclination is considerable. Advantage: Testing be done either on falsehood of repulsion and that of the motion of the earth, or it be done on the falsehood of the orbit being oval. First of all to note, just before it has been mentioned if there was the repulsion, the orbit (of the earth) would not have been elliptical (i.e. oval). But it is oval and the theory of repulsion is false. Consequently, the theory of motion is falsehood **(187)**.

And lastly, if the orbit were to be oval, there would not have been the revolution and, so, would not have been the orbit. The result s that if the orbit were to be oval (elliptical), there would not hove been the orbit, the very thing, itself, is its falsifier. Hence, the theory of ovalness of the orbit is falsehood. Now, the modern science of fl. astrology has the right to accept the falsehood of which it so wishes. But it should be remembered that the ovalness is that one thing against which, in the 17th century, KIPLER, having gone through eight years of astronomical observation, and having toiled hard over the same, and having established that the orbit of the earth is a circle and for that he had to discord nineteen theories. Nothing could do. At last, he granted that the orbit should be optical (elliptical) and completed his calculations and that became the basis of the laws of Kipler. It would not be easy to

discard the theory of the motion of the earth so that we might be relieved of all these perplexities and fallacies.


SEVENTH RESISTANCE ***(Statement 188)*** it is clear that the repulsion is related to the attraction and the attraction from all the sides of the sun is equal and as much is the attraction that much is the repulsion (No.7). Naturally, to every direction, the repulsion should be equal. And as much the repulsion as much will be the distance. Hence, it should be that the distance from all the sides of the sun should be equal. The sun should have been on the center exactly. But it is at a distance of 31 lakh miles on its lowest focus from the center. Naturally, the theory of the repulsion is false because it requires such a thing which is contrary to a firm and expected thing,

Advantage: ***(No.189)*** the theory of being the orbit elliptical is discarded because when the distance is equal from all the sides, the orbit must be a full circle and not optical or elliptical at all. But they would not disagree with their assumption of the ovalness. And, so also, not a wise man can admit to be the sun on its very center. Because the observation from years to years confirms its falsehood. Necessarily, we must say good bye to the theory of the force of repulsion and that of the motion of the earth.

EIGHT RESISTANCE ***(Statement 190)*** having caught in the mess of the repulsion and the attraction, the earth cannot form its orbit. (No.34) in which you have heard that the distance of the earth in its half part of its depth from the sun is the lowest one and in the half of the zenith the distance is more and in the first and the third girdles (i.e. belts) the nearness of it to the sun goes on increasing and in The second and the fourth girdles the distance increases. These are decided matters and no one has the capacity to opine against them. But this game of the


repulsion and the attraction will not go on for ever.

Take AC as a diameter and A its shore and V be the center. Let it be that either the attraction of the sun to throw away the earth from A to C or the repulsion wanted to throw it towards B in the right angle direction and the forces of equalization, having admitted that the forces of the repulsion and the attraction are equal, (No.6), did not allow to move it to any of The sides. On the contrary, they brought it to the point D bisecting the angle A, on the line AD. Hence, the distance of the earth from the point C will be CD. Angle ACD be taken for granted equal to one tenth of a degree or even less than that those wave-like isolated straight lines which may be called the diameters of smallest oblongs and which at every part of the motion of the interaction of the repulsion and the attraction, having escaped from them, fall in the middle of them and form a wavy and curvy multiple angled figure, their angles may not be detected even by any an instrument due to their being smallest of the extreme point. And thus, with a regulated circular shape, it would form a circle like shape or like an oval. In triangle ACD, angle A, will be half of the right angle and C, is that smallest angle equal to non-existent one and the angle D, is an obtuse angle is equal to 135 degrees less the angle C. Necessarily, CD, being the diagonal of acute angles, is smaller than AC, That means the distance of the earth became less, Now, at D, there is the same haggling. The force of attraction is pulling it towards point C, and the repulsion is throwing it towards the point E, in the right angle and the forces of equalization are inclined to bring it to get it escaped and to bring it to the point X, on the bisector HX, of the angle CDE. Then the angle DCX is



also, so much smallest and CX, the diagonal of an acute angle is smaller than CD, the diagonal of an obtuse angle. It means the earth moved closer further to point C. The same condition will occur at point X, and CH will be smaller than CX. The same condition will continue. And, in that case, the earth will have to move nearer to the point C. Hence it is not possible to form any orbit of 1 basically if it were to be a circle, the distance should have been equal at all the sides. But here we observe that it is different. And if it were to be elliptical or oval, the diameters will be different from each other. One of them will be the longest and the other will be the smallest. In that condition, two belts (i.e. girdles) will make it nearer to the center and two girdles will make it farther to the center. One half will make it closer to the sun and the other one will make it farther from it On the contrary, here we have observed that, only, the nearness is increasing and to such proportion that at last it will merge with the sun and thus there will not be a circle on a single orbit. And thus it will form a shape of its turn like this .

RESISTANCE NINTH ***(Statement 191)*** Taken for granted, you are aversed to accept the force of attraction and the repulsion to be equal Take it for granted that angle CAD be greater than half of the right angle, then we can challenge that it can extend only to that limit that it will be less than a right angle together with angle C. It means that angle ADC, must be an obtuse angle and that if it were to be a right angle, angle CAD, also, will be equal to angle C, because both of them are together the supplementary angles to the right angle to make it equal to two right angles in



the part of the repulsion will be one tenth less of a right angle and the part of the attraction will be only one tenth which is in comparison to it equal to nothing. And if it were to be an acute angle, it will be still more nothing. Take it for granted that AE, in the perpendicular line of the right angle. It means starting from point A. it has formed a right angle on line CB. So, the line of the acute angle cannot fall lower than it i.e. AE, Otherwise, in triangle AED, the right angle and the obtuse angle, both, will come together. As a matter of fact, it cannot, also, come on AE, otherwise the right angle and the acute angles will be equal. Necessarily, it will fall above it. May it, like AG, cut GC, AC, so that this acute angle be equal to A, or like AF, it may be smaller than AC. Or may it be (this acute) greater than A, or like AG, greater than it (i.e. AC) or may it (this acute angle) smaller than Angle A. In any condition, when this line (AD) fell above (i.e. to ifs side), then this angle became smaller than angle BAE and the part of the attraction could not reach one tenth of a degree. All these things are not reasonable and not popular or acceptable. If angle BAE, be, at least equal to one tenth of a degree, in comparison, in the right angle there are 54410558400,000,000,000 one tenth parts. To sum up, the force of repulsion which was taking it towards B, took it to the distance of five maha sankh forty four sankh nineteen padam fifty five neel eighty three kharabs ninety nine arabs ninety nine crores ninety lakhs ninety nine thousand nine hundred ninety nine one tenth parts, And to speak of the force of repulsion, this poor one which was bringing it to the side of C. could only pull Ito the equal of one tenth part of a degree. This is neither reasonable, nor there is any cause that one would accept this much difference, Do you know **(No.192)** that how much is the area of a one tenth part of a degree? The orbit of the sun or as you think of it to be the orbit of the earth whose diameter, in average, is equal to eighteen crores fitly eight lakhs of miles and this is

not equal to the one part of a lam ports of a hair's tip. And the circumference is 360 degrees and 60 minutes. And we found, after calculation, that one minute of its orbit is equal to twenty seven thousand thirty five miles. And one mile is equal to 1760 meters 48 fingers. One finger is equal to 6 jauhar which is equal to six hairs of Turkish horse's tail. So, in one degree, there will be 4931161804800 hairs only and they are not equal to at least more than fitly kharabs. And in one degree, there are one tenth parts numbering 604661760,000,000,000 which means they ore more than six sankhs. If we divide it by, it will come to 0.0000008. It means one tenth part of the orbit is equal to one part of a hair's tip's one lakh and twenty five thousand parts. Does it not mean that the force of attraction could pull the earth only this much? And rest of the effect was carried off by the force of repulsion? Hence, it is a must that the angles H, F, D, all of them be obtuse angles and the distance (i.e. fartherness) must go on decreasing for ever. Not only that much but speaking from the point of justice, angle A is to be smaller than the half of right angle, then it should be a very little difference. And angle D, etc. will be a little less than 135 degrees and the nearness as per the variation will go on increasing continuously till the time the earth will embrace with the sun and mingle in it. Now, what do you think of the talk of forming the orbit?

TENTH RESISTANCE ***(Statement 193)*** It is not only that we have come to knowledge of the variations of the distance only, but also, in the first girdle the distance of it (i.e. the center of the earth) went on decreasing, in second part it went on Increasing, in the third part, went on decreasing and in the half of the zenith part, it went on increasing (No.34). What is the reason that the force of repulsion should bring about such a different phenomena? It is not so concious as to take suggestions from you and act accordingly and do different acts as per your suggestion

in a certain girdle and go on changing the course of action and bring about different results. If to say, in first and third girdles the force of repulsion becomes weak and in spite of increasing the distance it goes on decreasing. In girdles second and the fourth it gets stronger and the distance goes on increasing.

(***Statement 194)*** This is only a fancy. Firstly, what is the reason of its difference in its strength and weakness?

Secondly(195) as to why its regulated action is on these particular girdles?

Thirdly(196) in the second girdle distance from its center increases. And it gets closer to the sun. Is that the same force of repulsion which becomes strong in the matter of the center & becomes weak in the matter of the sun? And, as a matter of fact, we observe that the speed s continuously going on increasing which is, in your view, the proof of the force of repulsion.

Fourthly (197) in the third girdle the distance from the center goes on increasing, and the distance from the sun, is it caused by the force of repulsion, one and the some? And we see that the same force of repulsion becomes weak in favour of the centre and becomes powerful in favour of the sun which is the proof of non-existence of the force of repulsion. but to say,

(No.198) that the force of repulsion is one concious and very foolish and it hates both the center and the sun but it is struck on its head, gets up but only with one eye of which side it is struck and keeps on sleeping with the other eye of the opposite side. In such a condition, your system will be like this. See the given figure No. 24, On point A, i.e. on its zenith, the force of repulsion is fast asleep

snoring with both the eyes close and the attraction force of the enemy is doing its action to bring the earth, unknowingly, closer to the center as well as the sun and it does not pull it openly lest the force of the repulsion wakes up. Hence, it is pulling it as if cajoling it. And, thus it brings it to the point P. It means that one shore of the diameter is brought to the lowest distance (or the depth) where the nearness from its center is the maximum. Now the force of repulsion opened its that eye which is to the side of the center and that is the side where from it had received the blow and it ran away with the earth from its nearness to the center and began to increase its distance (from the center), But it is, still, sleeping with the eye that is to the side of the sun. It is unaware of the fact that it is making it away from one enemy but it is making it nearer to the other enemy, it would have been right on its part to run away towards the jungle, leaving that orbit, so that it would have escaped from both of them. The attraction is never careless and it is, still, on its assignment to such extent that it is successful to pull the earth to the B point where its nearness to the sun is maximum. Then the eye to the other side opened and started carrying the earth away from the sun while it slept with the eye to the other side. It does not know that it is making the earth away from the sun but at the same time it is bring it nearer to the center till it brought it on point X again nearer to the center to its maximum limit. Even then, both of its eyes opened at one time and it ran away with the earth taking the earth away from both of them (i.e. the center and the sun). It at last reached point A. It has taken so much exertion and toiled so hard for the whole year. So it was exhausted totally and went fast asleep with both the eyes shut tightly. This is a fanciful and romantic story. It is you to believe it. But a sane man will not accept it without any sound proof.

ELEVENTH RESISTANCE ***(Statement 199)*** Here, now, one more door of resistance is opened. Each and every sane person knows that the assignment attributed to the force of repulsion is to make a thing away as the work of the force of attraction is to make something nearer. And you, too, yourselves say and affirm that as much there will be the attraction that much will be the repulsion so that it may resist it (No.7). Further, it is said that as much the repulsion would be there, there would be that much more speed (No.7). This one also was nearer to the speculation if at all it increases its speed which might have led it away. But it is bad luck on the part of the repulsion that the speed which is increasing is that one which makes the earth nearer to the sun, it means in the lower depth. And if you take it from the center, the first girdle of the orbit is ready to resists it because as much the speed increases, the nearness to the center increases. How would you justify this repulsion to work against its assignment?

TWELFTH RESISTANCE ***(Statement 200)*** let's forget about the speed, be it blind or lame. But the force of attraction if it is a thing to be reckoned with in the half part of The lowness of the orbit, we can observe with our own eyes, that it goes on increasing its nearness to the sun day by day. So, f there is the force of the repulsion, then it should, also, go on increasing as actually the force of attraction went on increasing, and not only to speak it, and as actually it went on increasing, it was inevitable, that the speed should have become foster. But all and all the men of wisdom agree and as it is clear to you, too, let it be the sun or the earth, the speed of every thing that rotates on this orbit, is similar to each other. It is not slower at certain time and faster at other times. They cut equal arcs at corresponding times equally, although it may be fancied, in view of the other circles to be some one slower and the other one faster (See No.35). It will be proved that the

force of repulsion is false because an indispensable choice requires a compelled choice. It means the increasing of the force of attraction is true to our observation. And if at all there were the force of repulsion, then it would have increased at this time without fail and as it would have increased the speed, too, would have been faster. But actually, it was not so. Hence, not only the force of repulsion is a falsehood but also the revolving of the earth is a falsehood because without the force of repulsion, its wheel might not move or it can be said that its revolving depends upon two wheels, one is the force of repulsion and the other one is the force of attraction so that one of them slipped away and made the vehicle of the earth to bury under the earth itself such that it may not make a movement. And be praise to Allah.

SECOND CHAPTER

RESISTANCE OF ATTRACTION *1

LEADING IT TO FALSIFICATION OF MOTION OF THE EARTH

Fifty Proofs

FIRST RESISTANCE ***(Statement 201)*** the whole skill and expertise of the scholars of the modern astronomy is involved in the mathematics and the Geometry but their capacity in the rationalism is little or probably closer to zero. They are devoid of logical approach and do not hove the manners of discussion and argument. They go on proclaiming without any basis, with no head and argument. They go on proclaiming without any basis, with no head and tail, taking lead from their make-belief leaders and granting their baseless presumptions as accredited principles. And they are so assertive in their opinions and faiths as if they have observed their authencity with their own eyes. They are so assertive to say that your observation might be wrong but not theirs. You might have conquering and sound proofs against them but they would not listen to you at all. They would hear you but would not wish to understand, if they understand a certain point even

NOTE: There is no opposition to the theory of attraction. There is no cause to deny it. The attraction of magnets and the electricity is very well known. It is the only purpose of us to resist the attraction of the sun and that of the earth. The opposition of the former is for that assumption that the motion of the earth is only because of it and of the later for

they have admitted the theory of the attraction is based on guessing only and not on any sound proof.

then, they would not listen to you at all. They would hear you but would not wish to understand. If they understand a certain point, even then, they would not admit it. And it at all admit the fact in their heart and mind, even then, they would not like to budge an inch from their pride and ego. The theory of attraction to them is one of such problems and to them it is so important that all and all of their solar system as well as the whole of their knowledge of astronomy is based upon their own ego and understanding. And, if at all, it is false, every other thing is false to them. Their assumptions and suppositions are, all and all, a make-belief of their own. It is like a childish play wherein they raise a mount of bricks and no sooner one of the bricks fall than all and all of the rest come foiling down. The future of such a thing is based on its sound reasoning and not upon a wayward guess. Newton sees a fruit falling down and he just guesses that the earth has a pulling force called attraction and it pulled the fruit and mode it to fall down. What is the proof? There is no answer to it.

Firstly (No.202) the rationalists admit to exist the inclination towards the lowest part in the system of the heavy bodies. Then, was not that inclination sufficient to make it (i.e. the fruit) to fall down?

(No.203) Or was he unaware of the inclination? Didn't he understand that the heavy body requires that place which may be able to bear the burden (i.e. the weight). Only that fruit will fall down of which the connection with the branch will weaken. And that weak and frail connection, now, is not able to bear its burden. Otherwise all and all of the fruits would have fallen down at one and only onetime. Here, (as we conclude) the fruit

(of our consideration) came down from its branch because of its weak connection. As soon as it left it its branch of the tree, it was the softer layer of the air that it came across and it was not able to support it at all. Hence, it was in need of denser layer like the earth or at least water. Was he that much short of understanding or had he decided upon some absolute proof against his vanity of the inclination? Or, when he had not anything to fall upon, made out the theory of attraction? It is only a probability. To Icy a foundation of a science on a doubtful and proof less idea (or assumption) is only the work of mad persons.

(Secondly 204) It is wonderful that the (so called) experts of the modern astronomy, on every step [*1] assume the downward inclination in heavy bodies and take it for granted that there is an upward inclination in the light bodies. But they don't understand that this kind of inclination will nullify all the inclination wholly. If the heavy body falls down because of its inclination nature, does it suit to prove the existence of attraction? It is the ignorance of him from the belief, probability manner of reasoning, position of the claimant and inquiry. An event requires a cause of it. When a sufficient and sound cause is present there and you, too, are sure of it, then to leave It and ascribe it to a factor of which there is no proof, can it be called sanity'? Supposing that, if the sufficient and reasonable cause is not known, then to consider a cause to a certain thing is condemnable. Here, to pretend that we hadn't the knowledge of the cause has been sufficient for the excuse. But when there is sufficient cause and that too,

*1: *(No. 34): The heavy one, always, pulls the bodies downward. (No.37): It inclines the bodies to the downward direction, (No.39): The bodies are in need of nearness to the absolute always. The water, as per its nature, is inclined to the slope from the height (No. 212): As much the vapour is light,*

more and more, it will go up. No.217. The vapour is lighter than the air. Hence, it has the inclination of going up. 2 *:No. 217: The particles of water, being* *Cont. next page*

sound and confirmed, then to run away from it to escape is not possible. Further, as to resist and nullify the unreasonable and unsound theory of attraction, this much is quite sufficient. Henceforth, it is clear that their faith in the theory of the attraction in absentia compels them to deny the existence of the natural inclination, If ever, because of their foolishness, they persist on their stand and are aversed to the reasoning without proof, then (No. 2, No. 11) and the proof of the natural inclination and albeit the probability alone makes the theory of the attraction null and void for when there is the tendency of Inclination, then what is the need of the attraction and where is the need of the proof? This discourse and some proofs be remembered for the future.

SECOND RESISTANCE ***(Statement* 205)** I would take it for granted that due to falling down of an apple on the earth, led to the fancy of the devil of attraction. But how can they establish the force of attraction in the sun on the basis of which the fallacy of revolution was established? Is it that it was seen to fall an apple on the sun? Is it necessary that whatever is proved in relation to the earth should also be same with the sun? The earth is dark (i.e. without its own light) ***(206)*** and it is illuminated with the light of the sun, so should the sun, be, also, dark? If it is dark like the earth, then it must have been illuminated by some other

(Remaining) lighter due to the heat of the sun intend to go upward. The same is true about the burnt particles of the earth due to inherent heat. No. 215: *The clouds, in proportion to their weight and lightness come down or go up. No. 115: The freezed bodies, with all their factors (pans) are inclined towards the earth and the liquidic*

matter, each and every pan of it, isinclined towards the earth, No. 41, N. 217: The air, having got lighter, due to the heat, goes, upward and same is in No. 9 & 12.

agent. In such a way this speculation will not spare the third agent and the third agent would be illuminated by the sun, the former was a procedure and the later is a revolution or a turn. And both of them are impossible. This fanciful logic is the handiwork of irrational people who are devoid of the rational knowledge. Otherwise, every wise and sane person knows 1 well that to assume an unknown and unseen like that of seen and observed one is nothing but a pure speculation, a fancy and a hallucination.

THIRD RESISTANCE ***(Statement 207)*** you are of the opinion that the repulsion is a must for the attraction on the ground that if there is no repulsion, then due to the attraction (of the sun) it (the earth) will be pulled to such an extent that t will merge into the sun. And as such we have nullified and resisted the existence of the force of the repulsion. So, automatically, the theory of attraction is nullified by itself. Hence the falsehood (of attraction) is indispensable and obliged.

FOURTH RESISTANCE ***(Statement 208)*** the sun is the first, foremost & reliable witness on the falsehood of the Theory of attraction. In its orbit which they take it for the orbit of the earth, there is a point at an extreme distance from the center of the earth and we call it the Zenith and there is another one at the maximum nearness and we call it the Depth. They are observed every year, the sun is cit a maximum distance from the earth i.e. at its Zenith on third of July or so and on third of January it is nearest to the center of the earth. This difference is to the tune of Thirty one lakhs miles or more. In view of the modern research the average distance of the sun is nine crores twenty nine

miles. And as per our calculation, the difference is 2 degrees, 45 seconds in between the two centers. Hence, the farthest distance is equal to 94458026 miles and the maximum nearness is 91341974 miles and the difference is 3116052 miles. If the earth is revolving on its oval orbit around the sun, in the lowest focus of which lies the sun as per the claim of the modern astronomy, then in comparison to their power of understanding, there is a question for them and this is that as to why not the earth was totally

I. This page in the Original hand written book is torn. On its P. No.128 & 130 it is given to be 1259700, on page no.316 *is given to be 245 126.361 and it is his habit to say differently at different at different places. (l2). 2. Qs & Ans. in Astronomy .p. no.1 (12). 3. Observation of the universe p.no.7 (12). 4. The fresh findings are like this: The diameter of the orbit of the sun is 18 crores 58 lakhs mites, the earths equiliser diameter is 7913.086 miles, the diameter of the sun is 32 minutes and 4 seconds less than its circumferential minutes. Based on this law and the inventions, we have in our decrees (Fatwas) Vol.*1st*, Magazine Al Hanial Namir Fil Maai Al Mustadeer, we have quoted it to be 8269.0457 miles, the diameter of the orbit l497l4990=87661956, so the circumference = 4.3344538 miles, so the minutes of the circumference= 4.43113418, so the circumferential minutes=6 seconds + 1.560539,so the diameter of the sun in minutes= 5.9377957, so the diam. of the sun in miles=3 18983459, so the diam. of the earth=5.934498,so the proportion of both the diam. 6x3as the sphere: diam of sph.: triangular diam.= 6.1183494,so relation of both the diams=1313256. So, the findings, the celestial circum. of he sun=58 crores 37 lakhs 8 thousand miles and one mnt. and one mnt. of circum. = 27023.5 mIs. & diam, of the sun 866554.2 mis & it is 109.509 times of the dia. of the earth and the bulk of the sun is equal to the volume of thirteen lakh thirteen*

thousand one hundred earths And Allah knows the truth best. (12 from it)

pulled up (and merged in the sun) by the continuous attraction by the sun for the powerful, great, intensive and extensive period of thousands of years? In view of the modern astronomy the sun is equal to the volume of twelve lakhs thirty five thousand one hundred thirty earths. Some are of the opinion that it is equal to ten lakhs and some have quoted it to be fourteen lakhs. And as we calculated it on the measurements of the modern astronomy on the basis of the original oval shape of the earth, it is (i.e. the sun) equal to the volume of thirteen lakhs thirteen thousand two hundred sixty five earths. In such a condition how can the earth resist and stand against the sun and how long it would revolve around it? It would have, at the very I first day of its revolution merged in it as it is in volume not even equal to one part of its twelve lakhs of parts. Can you imagine that there are 12 lakhs of people together pulling a man and he is trying to go away from them and he would not be pulled up by the 12 lakhs of the people? And he would be rotating around them. And it is absolutely and rationally falsehood that one thing being strong and then to be weak. It requires some cause or the other to defend it. When in the half of its rotation around the sun, the earth was pulled by the sun towards it to the extent of thirty one lakhs of miles, then in the half of the rotation of the earth who is that made it (i.e. the sun) so weak and the earth ran away from it to the extent of thirty one lakhs of miles? And as a matter of fact the nearness of the earth depends upon the strength of the force of the attraction of the sun (No. 101). As a matter of fact, having brought the earth on its lowest girdles it was a must for the force of the attraction of the sun to become more and more effective and the earth should have, step by step, to increase its nearness to the sun. and not that having the earth come nearer to it, the

force of attraction on the part of the sun should have weaken and the earth should escape from its claws and it should go away to such a fartherness. As to joke it, perhaps the sun is getting more and more ration from July to January and consequently its power gets on increasing And, in the months from ,January to July it remains without food and becomes weak, If there were two bodies equal to each other, then this would have been reasonable to think that in a certain half of the turn or the period of the rotation one of them overcomes the other and in the other half of the turn the other one of them overcomes the first one. This would not be an offence that it is twelve lakh times bigger than the earth and it pulls it to the nearness and makes it at the nearest distance of more than 31 lakhs of miles and in the time of its very youth it should become so weak and dull and the whole turn of the revolution be divided in the proportion of 1:12 lakhs in the two half parts of it. On this they tender this obsolete excuse that at the point of the depth the strength of the force of repulsion increases and it frees the earth from the claws of the sun and moves it away.

My statement No.210 This is an excuse of those who have lost the baffle and it is without head and toil. Firstly, the increasing and the decreasing of the forces of attraction and the repulsion is obligatory and at any way the repulsion would increase as much the attraction would increase. And, in any condition, they will be equal and proportionate Nos. 56, 13, 14. Here, if the repulsion is at its maximum limit as the speed is fastest of all, the attraction is, too, at its maximum limit because the nearness from the sun is more. The repulsion should seize from the attraction but only it overcomes it. When they are equal, even then, it seizes from it. Isn't unreasonable? ***Secondly (211)*** if at all one of the equal forces overcomes the other, why should it be the repulsion only? The attraction, too, was equal. Then


why shouldn't it, also, overcome. This preference sounds unnatural.

Thirdly (212) if at all there is anything special in the repulsion that only it should overcome in the state of equality, then it had the equality from the very day of its creation. Why didn't it come on other points? Why did it prefer this point only? ***Fourthly (213)*** why was only this point obligatory? ***Fifthly (214)*** you are assertive on the point of equality but we are observing that the attraction is steadily and continuously overcoming from the point of zenith to the point of the depth. The overpowering of the power is well evident from this phenomenon. The force of attraction is bent upon to move the earth nearer to the sun while the force of the repulsion is inclined to throw it away. But it is a fact that from there to here steadily and continuously only the nearness of the earth to the sun is increasing. Although the force of repulsion is increasing its speed, on level of degree it is at par with those of the attraction in order to save itself. Even then it is not successful and only the effect of the attraction to pull it to the sun is succeeding. Then what does it mean that in the nick of its youth it is overpowered by its weakness discarding its power of overwhelmness oil of a sudden?


Sixthly (215) the force of repulsion has, if at all increased, it is perticularly on the point of the depth and here, too, it did not pull the earth away at least equal to the distance of a hair's breadth although it was so much near to the sun. Further more, from this point (of depth) its nearness to the sun will go on increasing but also having slipped ahead of this point the force of repulsion will also weaken its speed and will become slower on every step. Now here it is, it will, all of a sudden, seize the earth from the sun and will take it away. It is marvelous that didn't do so when it was at its zenith of strength but, on the contrary could succeed to do so when it was so weak.

Seventhly (216) It is miraculous and surprising that as much it is weak that much forcefully it is seizing the earth from the sun and as much the dullness in its speed it is increasing the fartherness of the earth from the sun to that much proportion till point A where the dullness of it (i.e. the repulsion) is to its utmost limit the distance of the earth from the sun is maximum. Can a rational mind agree with such a topsyturvy assumptions? Not, at all. It is helplessness or compulsion that makes one to do what it wants to. The Law of the astronomy has developed an excuse on it that the circle which is around the center of the sun, in that circle the orbit of the earth lies when it is on its zenith point. Hence, t comes towards the sun. And its orbit lies out of this circle when it is in its depth. Hence, it slips away from this circle.


My statement Firstly (217) which circle should be taken for granted as a convenient equalizer that may be around the center of the lowest girdle (i.e. the point of depth) and not around the center of the sun and so also it (i.e. the circle) must have passed through the point of zenith as well as the point of depth equally. In the given figure, AHBR is a zonal orbit and X is a center, the sun is below it on the point F, A is the zenith, B is the depth, AX & BX are distances which are equal, circle ABFD is convenient equaliser. And if taken for granted, a circle is drawn on the center of the sun from the distance of the Zenith so that the earth may come on this circle in its period of zenith and will go out of it in the term of its depth period. It means it will not be on it but inside it. Then what is the cause of its fixation? Why not a circle be drawn on the center of the sun from the distance of the point of depth



so that the earth may be on it in the term of depth period and it B may be not on it and not inside, too, but actually it may be out of it. Why not the trustworthy and considerable convenient circle be considered so that the earth may pass by on it in both the terms of zenith as well as the depth? ***Secondly(218)*** what is the necessity to bring the earth to the direction of the sun to bring it on this circle and to take it away from the sun to make it separate from it (i.e. the sun)? To bring it nearer to the sun is nearness, then is it not a upturned down logic to bring it from a distant place and to make it flee from the nearness? Perhaps, an incentive is attached to the point of zenith so that the bird of the earth (i.e. the earth -bird) be attracted towards it and caught. And as if a danger signal is attached or tied on the point of depth to make it alert and cause it flee away. ***Thirdly (219)*** in such a condition the earth would be on this circle only for a moment or two when it will be on descent point of the zenith, is there in that circle itself some peculiar quality to cause such a phenomenon? What is the sense in coming (nearer to the sun) for half of the year and to run away from it in the other half of the year? Necessarily, this is not reasonable. It is, thus, evident that these are the make-beliefs and excuses to interest the school children. These are pure fallacies. Depending upon the inter actions of the forces of the repulsion and the attraction, no orbit can take place in opposition to our rules that the earth is stationary and the sun is in motion of which the center is at a distance of thinly one lakh sixteen thousand fifty two miles from the center of the universe. If the sun were to be fixed and at standstill, the distance or the fartherness of the sun from the earth would have been same and equal for ever. But



due to the slipping away of the center, when the sun will be on the point of A, the distance of it from the center of the earth would be AH. It means it would be AB, the radius of the sun's orbit +BH, the distance between the two centers, one being the center of the sun's orbit and the other being the center of the earth. And when the sun will be on C, its distance (from the earth) will be equal to HC. It means BC, the radius of the orbit of the sun -BR. The difference between these two centers, in both terms will be equal to double the difference between the two centers. This is so on the real oval orbit but it is taken on the real average elliptical orbit later on. X is the centre of the sun's orbit, B is the highest focus and the H is the lowest focus on which lies the earth BH is token for the distance between these two focuses.



And XH is half of it because the average distance AH, is just one being on and between both the focuses. And XH is half of it because the average distance AH, is just one being on and between the focuses. So the overage distance is half of the distance between them = highest distance - half the lowest distance. Necessarily, the sun will be, from the earth, at a distance of difference between the two focuses and half of the new two centers. And these are the points that they themselves will be fixed for the measurement of the distance between the sun and the earth. Isn't it so clear in which there will be no room for tussle between the attraction as well as the repulsion?

FIFTH RESISTANCE The moon is another just and accredited witness in favour of the fallacy and falsehood of the attraction. In the laws of the astronomy No. 209 I hove myself raised a question against the modern astronomy of which the explanation is that although the moon is being pulled by the earth from a considerably small distance and the earth is pulling it from a longer distance, even then the body of the sun having been lakhs of time bigger than the earth its power of attraction on the moon is 11/5 It means that if the earth pulls the moon towards it five miles, then the sun pulls it towards it eleven miles. And there is no doubt this increase in the pulling of the moon is going on for thousands of years. And if that is so, even then the moon didn't merge with the sun and didn't leave the earth till today. Why is that so? So it is evident that the theory of the attraction is a fancy and falsehood. I have replied to this that the sun is pulling the earth as well some times more than the moon and sometimes less than that and that is in proportion to their distance from the sun. Hence, as much the sun pulls the moon, the earth, too, in order to save its own moon, is not required to resist the attraction of the sun that much but only as much it is more than its attraction on the moon. And this attraction is less than that attraction which the earth has got on the moon. So, the moon does not merge with the sun.

Statement No.220 The explanation of the reply (in detail is like this the merger of the moon with the sun depends on that attraction which might separate the moon from the earth. The attraction of the sun is effective on both the earth and the moon And as long they ore equal, the effect of the attraction of the sun will not be able to separate the moon from the earth as it is also existing from the very beginning of its origin. Albeit, the difference between the attraction of the earth and that of the sun would have led to the separation of the moon. But the earth

is pulling the moon with its power plus the difference between the attraction of it and that of the sun, therefore the separation will not take place. Take it for granted that the sun pulls the moon 99 meters and the earth pulls it 45 meters. In that condition the sun's attraction is 5/11 times that of the earth and the sun, if, pulls the earth at a distance of 90 meters, then upto 90 meters the earth and the moon are equal. So the sun's attraction on the moon will be only 9 meters more. But the earth's attraction on the moon is 45 meters, so it is saved from the attraction of the sun and that is why it does not merge with the sun.

Statement No.221 It's a nice reply that the moon was saved from a long journey. It was made to make a short journey. Now, that the attraction of the earth on the moon is more why doesn't merge with the earth? The aim of the question was at the difference of the attractions, and now it has ended. Hence it is evident that the moon will not fall on the sun, nor it will fall on the earth.

SIXTH RESISTANCE: ***Statement No.222*** it is interesting to note that the moon comes close to the sun at the time of their meeting (gathering) and at the time of confrontation it goes away at utmost fartherness. Although at the time of their gathering the sun's total attraction that is 1/16 both the attraction taken together, only 3/8 effective on the moon as it is in between the sun and the earth, In that condition, the earth pulls it towards it equal to five parts and the sun pulls it eleven parts. In view of the difference of the force of attraction the moon was pulled only 6/16 parts towards the sun, But no, not at all. On the contrary, it pulled it very lightly. As is explained in the fifth resistance, at the time of the confrontation all the 16 parts of the attraction poll the moon towards the sun when the earth is between the sun and the moon. So both of them pull the moon to only one side. Hence, there it was the effect of the difference of the attraction and here it is that

of the collectiveness of the power of the attraction of the sun and the earth. Here it is three times more than that or even more than that, naturally it should have come more close to the sun at the time of the confrontation than at the time of the gathering. On the contrary, it is against it. Consequently, it is proved that the theory of the attraction is a falsehood. In the Laws of Astronomy, t has been argued about the nearness and the fartherness as follows. At the time of gathering the earth takes away the moon from the sun and it goes on making itself away till it comes opposite to the sun. At that time the sun and the earth pull the moon at one direction. So the moon comes closer to the sun till it be come a part of the gathering.

Statement No.223 How is it that during the time of the confrontation the earth remains inbetween these two illuminating bodies during which the process of making the moon nearer to the sun continue to remains so? But then the earth keeps off itself from this process and goes to one other shore and from that till the gathering time occurs goes on pulling the moon to the opposite direction of the sun and its force of attraction is to a greater extent more than that of the sun as it has gone just in the Fifth Resistance. Even then, still the moon is being pulled further closer to the sun. Is that, perhaps, the earth has admonished it, speaking in its ears that where so ever it (i.e. the earth) may be and where so ever it may pull it (i.e. the moon) and whatsoever much powerfully it may pull it, even then he should continue its course of action and go on coming nearer to the sun and it should not listen to it at all because the sun is elderly one and it should respect and obey it. And the moon is (as if) so gentleman-like that it has adhered to its course of action that it was just about to fall in the lapse of the sun that means it would have come in the state of gathering. Now, at this juncture, the moon has to repent on its admonition to the moon and rushing

forth ahead seizes it from the clutches of the sun and takes it away, in the middle of the course, to a far off distance. Having reached there, it again forgets its purpose of action and blows the same advice in the ears of the moon. Do you think there can be taken for granted to exist such a foolish earth by the modern astronomy? Naturally, all the men of wisdom of this world hold faith in the fact that every cause has on effect and if the cause ends its existence, then the effect itself vanishes. And if, in its place, some other cause takes place, the effect, too, changes. But in view of the modern astrology the cause (pretext) ended its existence long long ago. And the opposite causes are created here in succession day by day but the effect is still existing, not of the opposite causes but that of the ended or dead cause. And the effect of these live causes (or pretexts) is nil and non-existent. It means, at a time the causes are existing and these causes are in progress and at the same time the effects are nowhere.

SEVENTH RESISTANCE ***REFERENCE*** **No.224**

So, that relation of five to eleven was a self pretended and assumed by the modern astronomy in which is the Law of Newton states that the attraction changes according to the area of the distance in reverse position, and that was right. Its resistance has gone by in the No. 14. If this Law of Newton were to be correct the attraction of the sun, on the moon in proportion to the attraction of the earth, would have been 1/5000 of it. This, too, is very rare, in most of the times it is less than that the maximum distance of the moon from the earth is 251947 miles. The shortest distance of the earth from the sun is 91341974 miles, Suppose the sun is at its shortest distance and the moon is in the state of the gathering at its maximum fartherness and the distance of it from the sun and the earth is at its lowest difference and in other states (i.e. its oppositions) of it the difference will be more than that which will make the attraction of the

sun much more than the attraction of the sun much more than it. In this rare condition the distance of the moon from the sun will be 91090027 miles. And if at all the power of attraction on the part of the sun and the moon were to be equal, the proportional ratio would have been like this, the attraction of the earth over the moon the attraction of the sun over the moon (91090027): (251947). Suppose the first one, then the fourth ÷ third =second means 63477290809/8297393018860729= 0.000007650269 = the sun's attraction on the moon. It means if the attraction of the earth on the moon were to be ten crores, the suns attraction would hove been only 765 that is one part of one lakh thirty three thousand three hundred thirty three parts. but the sun's power of attraction in relation to the power of the earth is 27.2 or 28. If the quotient is multiplied by it, it will be 0.0002, it means if the sun pulls the moon to its own direction a mile, the earth pulls it to the tune of five thousand miles. And if the speculation made in the Fifth Resistance is included in it, the attraction of the sun compared to that of the earth will remain zero. And there is no doubt this attraction is going on for thousands of years, then as to why the moon, till now, did not fall on the earth? If the theory of the attraction were to be correct, verily, it would have fallen down so long before. Indeed, the theory of the attraction is an absolute imagination.

EIGTH RESISTANCE ***Ref. No.225*** whether the moon has got anything to do will be seen in the state of the gathering of the sun and the moon when the sun will pull it from one direction and the earth will be there to compete with it. At this time the sun and the earth are, both of them, to one and the same direction. The law of the astronomy has, in Sixth Resistance, made a good remark, that due to this state the moon is nearer to the sun. Well, ***(No.226).*** The earth might, also, have been pulling it for the cause of the sun. The earth is wise as that both of them are pulling the moon only to the side of the earth. Here it is that the

question may be posed as to why, then, the moon does not fall down? Would you like to soy that the planets on the other side ore pulling it apart from them ***Ref. No.227*** Thousands of times it has happened that all the planets including the earth are to one side and the moon alone is at the other side and as such the attraction of the planets is not taken for granted. And, verily, it is unacceptable, too, as they are, all and all, stationary. So, the pressure from all sides is equal and that is why the effect is zero. Now why does not the moon fall down? All these majestic elephants altogether are pulling this tiny bird (i.e. the moon) with all their might and in the process they ore totally exhausted and the bird is there as if it cares a little of them What kind of attraction is this? Surely and certainly it is a foolish indulgence.

NINTH RESISTANCE ***Ref.: No. 228:*** we have already cut down the very semblance of the theory of repulsion and if at all, we fancy it to be then this fact comes true of it that it increases in proportion to the force of the attraction and so also its speed depends on the ratio of the repulsion, No.7. Verily, it should have been, in this condition, that the planets around it were isolated its speed should have decreased due to the inter-complication of their power of attractions and thus their force of pulling is getting feeble. When all the planets were on one side of the earth its speed would have always been more because it has to face the sum total of the various attractions. But it never so happens, On the contrary it remains on the appointed course to which is ordered to by the Divine Decree (As is said in The Holy Quran:). It doesn't care for the assemblies and constellations of the planets. So also it has nothing to worry about their isolations. Hence, wholly it is evident that the theory of attraction is an imaginary past time.

TENTH RESISTANCE: ***Ref: 229*** The high tide and the low tide of the oceans is the best witness of the

futility and the falsity of the theory of attraction. The sea water rises up to meters high and some times it reaches 70 feet two times daily and then afterwards it lowers down to its own former level. If we attribute this phenomenon on the port of the attraction of the moon, it is, as if, to say good-bye to the attraction of the earth. If you put the moon at its nearest distance of 225719 mites and consider the attraction of the earth from its center so that the distance of its water from its center will be 3956.5 miles. So as per the law of Newton if the attraction of the earth and moon were to be equal, their ratio of their attraction on the water would have been like this, the attraction of the moon the attraction of the earth:: $(3956.5)^2$: $(355719)^2$ Consider the first as one, then the third - the 4th = the attraction of the moon. It means 15653892.25/50949066961 =0.0003072450 but the attraction power of the moon is 0.15th of that of the earth. So multiply it by 0. 5 the product would be 0.000046. It means if the attraction of the moon on the water is 23 that of the earth will be five lakhs. Or if the moon pulls it with one unit of power, the earth will do the same with 21727 unit of power. Then, how would it be possible to the water to raise itself a distance of a hair's height? We took the distance of the moon from the center of the earth as per the conclusion No, 17. Otherwise it has nothing to do with the distance of it with the center of the earth. And we have proved (No.218) that if at all there is any kind of attraction even then it has nothing to do with the center of the earth. The whole sphere is totally an attraction. If at all, it is true that the maximum intensity of the attraction is directed towards the center of the earth, even then, till the body and the true center is not ascertained, it will remain under the influence of the attraction. Hence, a stone lying on the earth is also, heavy and it has no weight. But this attraction proves that the earth has attraction. Then, surely, it must be attracting even anything heavy adjoining thing. The most powerful

attraction depends on the utmost nearness of the thing to the earth. And this is this utmost nearness. So, the attraction of the moon has no connection with the attraction of the earth. And, even in any case, we take it for granted that the disjunction is a must for the attraction, then take a measure of a finger as an example. And assume that the moon separated the water from the earth for the measure of a finger. Further more it is impossible to increase the distance, even equal to one thousandth part of a hair, then what to think of seventy feet? The average fartherness of the moon is 238823 miles and every mile is 1760 meters and each and every meter is equal to 48 fingers' width. So the distance of the moon in the measure of fingers will be 2017661.1840 arabs fingers. The square of one finger is one square of the moon's attraction and the square of its distance is 281856004070956653420 which would have been the aft radon of the earth if the power of attraction on both the spheres were equal. But the moon has got only 0.15 and so it should be divided by 0.15. It will be 2280187904000271397110 which will be the attraction of the earth. It means that if the attraction of the moon is one, the earth's power of attraction is Sankhs over and above 271 mahasankhas. Hence, the stretching of the water by the moon is absolutely impossible. If it can happen so, then certainly the earth hasn't got the power of attraction, if you say so, it is alright. The men of modern astronomy, too claim, that the moon makes the earth raise high to the extent of meters. Then how can it be so hard on the port of the moon to raise the water upto seventy feet?

MY STATEMENT NO.231 The idea of raising the earth by the moon high up is nothing but an irrational talk. The earths weight is sixteen thousand nine hundred ninety three mahasankhas and twenty sankhs tons. To put it into figure it will be 16993200000000000000000000 tons. It is 49 times bigger than the moon. That is not only but also its volume is equal to 81.5 times of the weight of the

moon's volume. Can you imagine a tiny thing of a one and half of chatank overpowering a solid five seer of weight? Or is it that the moon has been bestowed upon with some kind of a mechanical device to pull the heavy things towards it? If it has one of such a thing the earth has got forty nine of that kind. And before it pulls it to a width of a hair, it will pull it down and dash it on the ground. And, for just to take it for granted that the moon raises the earth up, then what of a hundred meters it might pull to a hundred miles. That is to say it is impossible that a drop of the water be raised. There was no other mightier factor so that the moon might have been deprived of its pulling and seizing the earth whereas the earth is pulling the water with a mahasankhas units of powers. Hence, how can the moon pull it towards itself? An example to this would be that a piece of a metal sheet is nailed to on iron-ball of seer weight you con pull it towards yourself with your hand but you cannot separate the piece of metal attached to it unless and until you take out those nails that hove been fixed to the ball? Here the nails of that kind are fixed to the water for thousand of years. Unless and until these ore removed the water cannot move an inch, may thousand of moons pull it to their direction together. But here it is argued the point of not only the pulling of it but of raising it meters above. Isn't it absurd? So to speak of the truth the force of attraction of the earth, it is absolutely non-existent. And that is our purpose. Be you may certain that it is evident that this much has led to the falsification of the attraction of the earth but, yet, that of the moon remained intact. As I said before our purpose is to prove the falsehood of the attraction of the earth and it depends on the sun's power of attraction. As it has been mentioned before that having considered the attraction of the earth, it has been attributed to the sun, too without any sound proof. When it has been proved to be falsehood, the speculation has no value at all. Then, where from will it come to the sun? Or it would be

proper to say that the law of the modern astronomy which says that there is attraction in each and every body in proportion to its matter and the basis of which it was supposed that there exists attraction of its kind in the sun and it was because of which it was assumed that the earth has got motion is false. And when it is known that some of the bodies have the force of attraction and some have not, there is no need of any argument as to the attraction of the sun. It may be possible that the sun might be one of those bodies that have no attraction, secondly the occurrence of the high tied cannot be connected with the force of attraction of the moon due to various reasons of which description has passed by in no. 16.

ELEVENTH RESISTANCE ***Statement No.234***

The explanation in support of the tide of the other side leading to the raising of the earth and leaving the water of that side is the glittering proof of negation of the earth's force of attraction. It is fact that there was the force of attraction of both the earth as well as the moon on the water opposite to them and in that condition we took it for granted that the force of the moon overcome but at the same time both of them ore pulling the water to the other side towards the earth only, then how could the earth leave it? At this side the force of the moon's attraction was some what less but that of the earth was to its point of culmination where there was none to oppose or resist it, then what is the meaning of leaving it?

TWELFTH RESISTANCE ***Statement No. 235***

This is an important point to note that the modern astronomy has admitted the fact that the attraction of the moon on the water s not dependent on the earth and when it is opposite the moon it rises up more than the earth due to the lightness and nearness to the water. That is a very important thing. It has ended the very problem of the existence of the sun's attraction. If it were to be true, then

when the moon can raise the water at seventy feet the sun's attraction which pulls the earth from the distance of thirty one lakhs miles should have pulled the water in proportion to the ratio of 70 feet and 16 thousand miles, and it would have been so tremendous and stronger. And the water opposite to it would have been raised to the altitude of lakhs of miles having left the earth behind. The earth, then, would have been completely dry or the power of repulsion, due to the power of attraction. would have turned the water more speedily than the earth as the water would have spread up and the whole earth would have been drowned or every years all the jungles and the cities would have been drowned with no trace of them and in their place there would hove been seas and all the seas would have been barren lands had the water continued to remain on the same space of the earth.

THIRTEENTH RESISTANCE: ***Statement No. 236:*** No doubt that the air is more lighter than the water and compared to me water it is nearer to the sun. So the attraction of the sun should have been still more powerful and there would have been no trace of the air on the planet of the earth, Or the repulsion would have token it up and it would have revolved t more speedily than the earth. And if at all, had the air, like the earth, rotated around the direction of east, then as per your speculation and calculation, it was a must to a stone thrown high up in the sky to go away to the direction of east and fall it at a very distant place. The fastness of the air is only two times that of the earth. And the stone for example rises up 16 feet in duration of two seconds and it comes down within one second. So in this period of three seconds, the earth would have traversed 1519.2 meters. But the air which was holding up the stone in this duration should have traversed 3038.4 meters. Hence, the stone would have fallen at the distance of 1519 meters. But actually it fats at the same

spot from where it was thrown. And if the air had blown from east to west then the stone would have traversed 4558 meters to the direction of the west because the spot from which the stone was thrown up in the sky traversed in that duration of three seconds, 1519.2 meters to the eastward and the stone was flown by the air with it equal to its speed and that is 3038.4 meters in west direction. Totally it makes up the distance of 4558 meters which is equal to 2 ½ miles or more. But, in fact it tolls only there and there from where t was thrown up in the sky. So, verily, both the attraction of the sun as well as the motion of the earth are false and obsolete.

FOURTEENTH RESISTANCE: ***Statement No. 237:*** How clear and decisive this thing would belt you take a sheet of paper cut it into two equal parts. Let one of them be as it is spread up and make a ball of the other part in such away that its base be one tenth of the first one. Put them, one each, in the pans of the balance scale. If the attraction exists, the weight of the former should be ten times the ball of the paper because the attraction will vary in proportion to the matter of the attracter (No, 10). And the matter of the attracted and the distance are one and the same. And comparatively, in areas of the base, one is ten times the other one. So on the sheet of the paper the attraction is ten parts of the earth and on the other one i.e. the ball has got one part of the attracted area of the earth. And considering that the weight occurs due to the attraction so the weight of the one half of the sheet of the paper should have been ten times that of the ball of the paper. But as a matter of fact it is not so. It is rationally speaking is false. Hence, the attraction is a falsehood absolutely. On the contrary their inclination or declination is depending on their natural inclination and in a way and the only way the inclination is in proportion to the matter

or the substance and here the matters are equal. Hence, the weights are equal.

Advantage ***STATEMENT NO.238*** And now it is evident that the assumption that the weight of a thing on the different spheres is different (No.15) is only a self conceived fanciful idea. Otherwise, as there was the attraction of the sun and the earth in proportion to 1 and 28, so would hove been the proportion of both sides of the earth and the water as 1:28: & 1:10

FIFTEENTH RESISTANCE: ***Statement No. 239:*** As much the density of a thing, that Much more is the attraction, No. 10. It is a must for the sheet of the paper and the ball to come down on the earth in equal time from the same distance in the sky. If the resistance of the air on the sheet of the paper is ten times, then it is also true that the attraction of the earth on it is ten times. In a way the ratio of the seeker and the resister is equal at both the places, so there should have also been the equality in coming down of both the things. And as a matter of fact the sheet will descend late. Thus it is proved that the seeker or the achiever is not the attraction but their natural tendency (or the inclination) which in both of them is equal. So the achiever (or seeker) being equal to one unit, the resister (or the preventer) is ten times of it. Necessarily it i.e. the sheet of the paper will come down late.

SIXTEENTH RESISTANCE: ***Statement No. 240:*** As much is the density of a substance, that much more is the attraction No.10. Hence, the weight is more. On the basis of this assumption the weight of the water in comparison to that of the air should have been increased. But actually it is contrary to this. Abu Rehan made an experiment on this subject. He weighed 468 grams of gold in the air. Then he put the pan with the gold on water and the weight pan in

the air. The gold weighed 385 grams. It reduced, in weight 20% or more, We ,too, carried on some kind of experiment We weighed gold bangles and found its weight one chatank tour rupees one and half mashas. We weighed the same again having put the pan with bangles on the surface of the water and the weight pan in the air. Here we found it reduced to one chatank three rupees. It reduced one tenth or more of its original weight. This difference changes in accordance with the variations and disparities of the seasons and the atmosphere. Abu Rehan had taken the water of River Jehun and he weighed the gold in the city of khawarzam in the season of autumn. We had taken well-water of our own city (Braily). The season was winter. The reason of natural inclination is evident. The nature of inclination makes the thing decline in proportion of the weight and the density in which it resists the volume of the goods. The resistance is as per the variations of the quantity of the density (of water as well as the air) in which the thing is weighed. This density has increased the weight of the thing in the ratio of the circumstances. The weight of both the pans of the scale is the same. In the air the resistance on both the pans was equal. When one of the pan touched the water, though it had the some tendency of inclination, but the resistance to its inclination is more stronger than that pan which is in the air. The water is more dense than the air to a greater extent. Necessarily this one is declined less than the other one in the air. That is so I understand and think of. But this would not happen on the basis of the attraction as this because the density of the water which has increased the resistance has increased the weight in that proportion, too. In this condition the resister and the achiever should have been equal and the former condition should have prevailed. When t is not so, undoubtedly the theory of attraction is false. As per the Law of the nature, the reasoning on this phenomenon is such that the water pushes up the pan upward. So it

supports the gold and thus decreases the weight of it. I have, Firstly, to say ***(No.241)*** that if it means the only resistance to going down, then it is surely correct and you have also noted down my reply to that. And if this idea is that the water pushes (throws) up as mentioned above, it is clearly a sheer ignorance. In fact the water throws up that thing which is lighter than itself. It tends to lower that anything. If it were to support a thing heavier than itself then the iron, not only it and anything would drown in the water.

Secondly (242): If it is so, this attraction on the part of the earth will freshly be resisted and falsified. When the water throws away the things lighter than itself, it is evident that there is the tendency to push away, in its nature and the pushing (i.e. the repulsion) is contrary to the attraction. So there is no attraction in its nature and that is only the earth of which it is the part and parcel of it. When it is not in the earth, whence will and on what basis will it come in the sun? And where will go the whole system of the motion of the earth?

SEVENTEENTH RESISTANCE ***Statement No. 243:*** Fill up a big size balloon and another small one with air tightly and having tied their mouths tightly try to drown them in the water. You will find that to do so the bigger balloon will require much more strength than the other small one. When you are able to press them into the water, leave both of them to come up. The bigger one will come up on the surface of the water sooner than the smaller one. It is just as you throw a bigger stone and a smaller stone in the sky, you will observe that the bigger one requires more power & time to go up a certain altitude and the smaller one requires less time and less power to go up to that much altitude and the bigger one will come down earlier than the smaller one. If the pressure on the water were to lift up the

balloons and if the attraction of the earth were to make the stones toll down, there would hove been less force on the stronger and more force on the weaker one, then the smaller stone and the smaller balloon would hove come up earlier and the bigger stone as well as the bigger balloon would have taken more time, of course you would argue that the bigger gets more area of pushing, so it will be pushed more forcefully but at the same time the object to push or repulse is also bigger, so it will be less repulsed, In short the fact is this that If the relative ratio is proportionate, both of them will float at the same time. So does the bigger balloon have more repulsion? The same is with the attraction. If you think that the bigger balloon and the bigger stone made haste on their own wish and the bigger the thing, more it is capable of to pierce through its space or the layer in its course. But firstly to speak (224) the bigger one has to go through more area and the ratio is equal ***(No. 246)***. Now to say that the bigger thing accepts less effect of the force, why does the bigger balloon come up earlier by the pressure of the water? And why does the bigger stone come down earlier due to the attraction of the earth? Do you presume the force of attraction is in proportion to the matter? Then there was more matter in the bigger stone, the force of the attraction of the earth was more on it and that is why it went up late and came down earlier.

My statement: Firstly (No.247) this is condemnable. See No.11. ***Secondly (No.248)*** this statement itself resists the effect of variation, No. 12. ***Thirdly, (No.249)*** this is the same thing that the attraction has nothing to do with the matter. The atoms in it are themselves heavy in their nature (No.89), then why should be the effect of the attraction when they are themselves inclined to come down to the lowest depth in pursuance with their nature? Fourthly, the bigger balloon itself has

more matter inside it in the form of the air and the modern astronomists, too, admit that the air, too, has got weight (No.18). So, undoubtedly, on the bigger balloon, the attraction of the earth is more but it was pressed down so late, as to why it should be? And why does it come up early? Do you say that the water itself is more heavy than it and that is why the earth attracts it more powerfully and so it is repulsive to the upper side? ***My statement Firstly*** This is the some discarded idea that the attraction occurs in accordance with the thing or the agent of attraction. Secondly, the repulsion will be in proportion to the weight. The water is heavier than the bigger balloon and this bigger balloon is heavier than that smaller balloon, then the attraction of the earth on the bigger balloon is more than that on the smaller balloon and the repulsion is more on it, so the bigger balloon should have drowned itself earlier and the small balloon should have sprung up earlier. But the thing is contrary to it. At least they should have reacted equally in proportion to their relative factors. To sum up, there is no coherence at all. And f, leaving apart the force of attraction, you consider the tendency of their nature all of them are before us. The air tends to go up and the stone tends to come down. The settling down of the balloon into the water and ascending of the stone amounted to acting against the nature. That is why the bigger one showed more resistance and it took more time to achieve its object. And the lifting up of the bigger balloon as well as the falling down of the stone was in accordance with the demand of the nature. Hence, the bigger one took more time.

EIGHTEENTH RESISTANCE ***My Statement:*** There is no reason as to why should there be different attractions of one and the same attracting agent on things similar to each other and at the same distance. Note on distance (No. 11). The mercury of the thermometer at one fixed place in the moderate atmosphere. The attraction of

the earth is effective on it to the proportion of its distance from it which is the natural demand of its mailers and the distance of them from level of the earth. Now, when the atmosphere (i.e. the air) gets hot the mercury level lifts it up. Does the force of attraction of the earth was less? Why did it decrease? At this time, too, the earth and the mercury were the same matters and the distance, too, was the same. It did not cut off anything of the earth or the mercury. The level of the mercury will remain steady till the heat is the same. Then as soon as the atmosphere (air) will get cold, the level of the mercury will come down and will not stop at the normal line, even. Will, now, the force of attraction increase? But why? As a matter of fact, still the earth and the mercury are the same. There is no change in their manors. The distance is also constant, Do you think that the coldness most have stitched a patch on them? This difference cannot be attributed to the variations of the air as the mercury is always heavier than the air. If the heat in the air has caused some lightness in it, it is a fact that before this also it has occured more than that. Actually, the difference between the lightness and the heaviness of the air requires the mercury to come down more and more as the obstructing agent is lighter and so there will be less resistance. As a mailer of fact it is contrary to the nature. Necessarily, the theory of attraction is false. The truth is that coldness is an inductor to heaviness. And the heaviness is inclined to the lowliness, the heat is an inductor of lightness and the lightness seeks elevation.

NINETEENTH RESISTANCE ***My Statement:***
The vapour takes place and goes up, Their formation is subject to the particles of water and the air and in their view the air is also heavy {No.18) and the water is heavier as it is heavier than the air to the extent of seven hundred seventy or eight hundred or eight hundred nineteen times of it. And it is evident that whichever thing is composed of

some heavy and heavier components must be heavier thon that heavy components. So the vapour is heavier than the air. Even it doesn't seek for any such an excuse which is required by the water to throw away the oil as it is a fact that a heavy thing throws away the lighter one and the lighter one to the heavy one. Then, what is the reason of being thrown away? If at all, the earth attracts a thing, then what is it that takes away that thing from it and carries it away upwards? Is it some planet or the other? If so, consider that time of night when at mid-sky or rather than that at the horizon there is not a trace of any a star at this time when the planets and the moon may be from Tauras to Virgo and it be the rising time of the first point of the Aries or the stars, all of theme together would have snatched the earth from its very lap from the distance of miles to be numbered in mahasankhas There would have not remained a trace of any a desert cliff of this world. All and all would have been lifted up and carried away by the stars. It is impossible to think that the earth is attracting them. It is impossible that she would have repulsed and pushed them off as there could not be two opposite qualities in a certain thing. It is contrary to the urge of the nature. Hence, it is proved that the attraction of the earth is a fancy and falsehood. On the contrary the air is light and those components which it is composed of are atmospherical and anal. They become more and more light due to the heat and those aquatic components which are parts of it and are in its clutches get lighter due to the heat as you will find when the water is heated, the particles of the water rise up. Naturally, the anal particles of the atmosphere flew with them high up. It is a fact that whichever is light is inclined to go up. Hence, it is natural and must for a heavy thing to seek depth or lowliness. Thus whereas two opposite are attributed to a certain thing. There exists none of them. Naturally, this is a quite sufficient proof of the wayward and unfounded idea of the attraction , it is proved to be

falsehood due to the second fact of this example .Would you like to ask why didn't we get any advantage from this? To explain it, it is like this. The heat of the sun caused the components of the atmosphere get light and thus the attraction of the earth on them got weak and the atmosphere surrounding it on which there is more attraction threw it up as you have seen the water throwing up oil. ***My statement: Firstly*** does the vapour rise the very time as in the case of water where it got hot and from there it slipped to aside to take it away to a cold place where it may not get heated? Allah may forbid us. On the contrary, it should have risen up as soon as it was formed. But it is appoint to ponder. Will not the heat that will cause the atmosphere get hot will cause, also, to get the side atmosphere to get hot, too, as in the case of the sun of which the heat caused the vapour from the water to rise up or is it that the heat of the sun caused the adjacent water, too, to get that much hot as the former one were it that it, having the aquatic components, was heavier than that?

SECONDLY: As if I have said it contrary to your belief. You assume that as mush the less attraction, there will be less weight (No15). That is to say the lightness is due to the dearth of attraction and the paucity of attraction does not occur because of the lightness.

THIRDLY: the same as occurred above. The matter is the same and the distance, too, is the same. Why should be there any slackness on the part of attraction due to the heat as that to say the heat made a certain thing light? Would you like to contend that the heat is inclined to rising up by its own nature and that is why the heat and the air ascend (i.e. go up)? And the coldness, by its nature, seeks depth or lowliness and that is why the water and the dust decline? Then certainly, the lightness will occur due to the heat. But this will, only, admit the truth of natural declination whereas it will refute the theory of the attraction.

My Refutation: As has passed in the 4th of No.18 that, if the attraction exists, what is the reason for the air inside to rise up which is just as to support hundreds of tons load whit this power. No, it cannot do so except do away with so that it cannot be felt at all.

Resistance To An Assumption & *Firstly My Statement:* Every wise person knows it well that a mustard seed cannot be equal to a mountain in weight. It may not be effective in comparison to the whole mountain to the balance of the scale. But if, at all, the theory of the attraction is correct. It will do happen so. On the contrary the mustard seed may outweigh the whole of the mountain. Of course, the declination (descending) of the pan is the effect of the attraction. The pan on which has more attraction will go down. And if the attraction on both the pans is equal, both pans will remain on the same level (No.15). Now you take two such spheres having equal attraction in both of them. At equal distance they may have equal attraction or may not be so. Then take another ones having different power of attraction for example the moon and the earth. Now, the mustard seed and the mountain be supposed nearer to the moon in such a way that power of attraction of the moon may make up the weakness of its attraction which is say to be 3.9 of the diameter of the earth as per the law of science of astronomy, although as per our calculation is about 3.1[*1] The same confusion continues

[*1] in law of astronomical science the matter of the moon is 1/15th of that of the earth and the distance of the moon from the earth is equal to 30 times the diameter of the earth. And in the modern astronomy it is established that the attraction is as per the matter uprightly and the distance is in proportion to the square of the distance inversely. Hence, in order that the attraction of the moon and the earth be equal to the body it should be at such a distance that its square be 75 times the square of the distance of the body from the moon I have to point out that in this way we got two equations here. Assume that E, is the distance from the moon and the distance from the earth be L(Next Page

there is no need of its research. The only conclusion is that when the mustard seed and the mountain are at such distance that it should be to the side of the moon equal to the 3.9 of the earth's diameter and it should be 26.1 to the side of the earth. The distance between the earth and the moon is equal to length of earth's diameter. If the power of attraction of both the moon and earth is equal, both of them will remain on this line. No one will go to the side of the

$L^2 = 75\ E^2$: +E =30: L^2 /75 = $(30-L)^2$ = 900-60L + L^2 : L= 67500-4500L +$75L^2$: = 67500-4500 L + $74L^2$. On the contrary $74L^2$ –4500L = - 67500 : L^2 –4500L / 74 = -67500 / 74: The complement of the square L^2 –4500L / 74 + 5062500 / 5476 = -67500 / 74 + 5062500 / 5476 = -4995000 / 5476 + 5062500 / 5476 = 67500 / 5476: L –2250 / 74 = 259.81 / 74 This square root is minus (negative) : L=2250/74=259.81/74=1990.19/74=26.894:. E=3.106 and due to some other equations, although all the power from the first stage is inclusive of the second. So talking the square of the first equation:. L =75 E :.L=8.6603,(30-L) =259.809-8.6603L:.9.6603L=259.809:. L=259.809/9.6603=26.895:.E=3.105.
Morever --- this book is accustomed to say something at a place and something other at different place. Here it took the ratio of the matter as 1/75 and as you see above it has showed the moon's attraction 0.15 of that of the earth. On this distribution the equality would be like this 3L2=E,L +E=30 :.3L =20(900-60L+L2) =18000-1200L+20L2 :. 17L2-1200L=1800. on the contrary L-12001/17 = -1800/17:. 12-12001/17 +360000/189=3060000/189-3060000/189=5400/189:.L-600/17=32.379/17=. This square root is negative :.L=367.621=21.625:. E=8.375 or 3L =20(30-L):.L 1.73205L=4.472136:.(30-L)134.16408-
0.472136L=134.164080:.L=134.164080/6.204186=21.635=8.375.
How much difference it is! At one side three times the diameter of the earth and at other side less then eight times of the diameter. It means there is a difference of forty thousand miles. If the attraction of the moon was 0.15, the matter of the moon should have been in proportion to that quantity and not as 1/75 and the matter was 1/75, then it was necessary that the attraction should be, too, in that proportion and not that 0.15 because the attraction is in proportion of the matter. If you say it is 1/75 on for example, I would say, it is never so because nearly it is 1/75 = 0.013. By elevation, too, 0.0128 is 0.013 and if by mistake, the presumption was wrong, it is just knowingly the real position was taken for granted. Hence, it means a fact cannot be taken for example but fact is that not this is a fact and not that one is a fact. This is only the fancies of these people.
The numbering of statements ends here. In the original handwriting volume it is not more there. ***Abul Naeem Azizi.***

moon and not to the side of the earth. Hence, it is necessary, if they are in the pans of a balance scale, both the panes of the scale will be at level with each other. And if at all the pane containing the mustard seed lowers down from this line of equally towards the earth a little and the pane bearing the mountain remained the same line, then the mountain will remain there and there on its place and the pane of mustard seed will lower itself down still more because the force of attraction will go on increasing in proportion to the distance increasing. And if the mountain pan just rises itself towards the moon for a very little margin and the mustard seed pane remained on the same line or equality, and the mountain pane will rise a little more because the attraction of the moon will increase on it steadily. And thus when the mustard seed pane came to this side of the line and the mountain pane went to that side. This procedure continues and there will be no limit to the lowering down of the mustard seed pan and rising up of the mountain pan. If there can be any reason to this kind of variation there will be no excuse of being the mountain and the mustard seed equal in weight. Can a man of moderate and normal wisdom agree to this conception? Would you like to say that the power of attraction remained equal? All right. But it is a fact that the mountain itself is heavy and that is why the very pan of it will lower down. Statement: First thing that you have forgotten again. In your view the weight occurs due to the force of attraction (No.15). But when, on both sides, the attraction is equal.

Where from did this increased weight come to the mountain only? Secondly, even through the mountain is weighty by its own nature, there the difference between the mustard seed and the mountain is this much that its pan should not lower down. No, not so. It will come down to the earth and as it was not dependent on the attraction to lower down. In the same way it will have not to depend on

the attraction to come down on the earth. On the contrary its own proportion of weight will bring it down to the earth. So it is evident that the attraction is a falsehood. Otherwise the seed of mustard would have been heavier than the mountain as it is the nature of the attraction. And consider the tendency of the declination. It may put both of the mountain as well as the mustard seed on the sky. And there will be the same ratio between them which is on the earth because their own natural tendency would not change.

Resistance To The Conception: 2nd Statement In agreement to both of the bodies, both the equinoxes have their motion direct to the west. And in No. 22, we have made it evident by the absolute proofs that it may possible that it cannot be regulated by the attraction. If there is attraction, it (i.e. their motion) will never be regulated.

Resistance Of The Conception: 3rd Statement the absolute declination is decreasing in a steady and regulated speed every year and it may exhaust the total attraction, (No.23).

Resistance Of A Conception: 4th Statement if there is the force of attraction, then the whole system of the rings of the earth would go on eroding and year by year the earth may erode on the Polar Regions more and more.

Resistance Of A Conception: 5th Statement barring the intersection point of the intersecting lines of the equinoxes, it will go up.

Resistance Of A Conception: 6th Statement The diameter of the equator will be increasing every year.

Resistance Of A Conception 7th Statement: The earth will be shaped in from of +. All these assumptions have been explained in No.22.

NEWTON'S EXPLANATION ABOUT THE ATTRACTION

Resistance Of A Conception: 8th Statement: As is the formation of the bodies dependent on the nature of the heavy particles, and of which the Newton himself has affirmed (No.8), then the heavy body itself by its own nature is heavy without depending on the force of attraction of an attracting agent. And it is not heavy actually but it has the tendency to slanting or declination towards the heavy bodies of two things, one that will incline more will be taken for heavier than the other. Necessarily, it is proved that the bodies are themselves inclined to the lowest depth. What more proof of the truth of the declination of the bodies and the falsehood of the conception of their attraction do you require of which the discoverer of the attraction, Newton admits himself?

Resistance of A Conception: My Statement: It is evident If at all there is the attraction of the earth It is not that (supposed). But it may be a forcible and compulsive point which has aversion to the motion and its purpose is the heaviness of the weight (No. 2). So whichever the body or thing the earth attracts. Its weight only due to which the pan of the balance scale lowers it self down. Naturally, the tendency of lowering down to the utmost depth is the natural instinct of the things. Consequently, the idea of attraction is vile and meaningless. And about the last passage: Spontaneously, it should be known that the bodies require different powers for their attraction. The mountain cannot attract with that force with which the mustard seed does it.

This controversy is only due to their weights. As much is the weight, that much power is required to attract it (No.11) because the weight is inherent in its body

already and it is not due to the force of attraction .On the contrary this variation of the power of attraction is ramified on it. And this is the natural declination.

Proof On The Basis Of Unity And The Effect Of The Attraction In No.12 it is mentioned that the attraction is the same on all the kinds of boodles, bigger and smaller they may be, if there was not the resistance of the atmosphere, all the bodies would have descended with and the same speed and the modern science puts so much faith on it that it holds it to be established on the basis of the observation .It says what more do you require than the observation? These reasoning are based on this same number of description.

THIRD RESISTANCE: MY STATEMENT If the descending of bodies were to be due to the force of attraction and its effect be the same on all of them and if the weight, too, exists due to it (No.15), then the weight of all the bodies would have been the same. The mustard seed and the mountain would have been equal in weight. The balance scales, measures of weight all and all, would have been of no importance and of any use. The whole system and the order would have been shattered to pieces and 2would have collapsed totally. Now, would you like, still, to assert that the weight exists due to the attraction? And the attraction is in proportion to the matter of the attracted (bodies), (No.11). So, whichever body has got more matter has more attraction on it and whichever body has to more attraction on it is heavier than the others.

My Statement: Firstly, No.11 is clearly to be condemned as much as can be. Secondly, weight will not do, The actual basis of weight is that it should decline I.e. come down or lean down more and more whichever body does not lower down it self more and more, however it may be so big, cannot be more in weight as is there example of the tool of the cotton winnower. Its iron end comes down so fast than the other part winnowing the

cotton. And more the declination more the speed of coming down it requires. Naturally, in two things traversing, say ten meters of distance that one which will lean or decline more will traverse this distance in less time than the other one. This distance is covered on the basis of the tendency to lower down. Whichever lowers down more it's covering or the traversing is more. So its speed is more. On the contrary, the modem astronomy is of the opinion that all the smaller and the bigger are subject to one and the same speed in them created by the force if attraction and that had not been there any external resistance to it, they would have come down on the earth at equal sped and in equal time. So, the attraction causes all of them to lower down equally and it was the cause of the weight in all the boodles and not the weight does it. But actually due to the attraction all and all the bodies the mustard seed and the mountain, all become equal in weight. Does it thus require any more proof of al stilly talk? Than this? Necessarily, the idea of attraction is false. Moreover, the bodies have their own weight and they lean down due to their own natural inclinations or the instinct inherre5 in them from the very time of their creation. Those which are bigger ones, come down earlier than the smaller ones and that is why their (i.e. the former) speed is more.

Resistance Thirty One: My version (Statement) Every wise and sane person knows it well that it is due to more inclination of a particular thing to pierce the air more speedily. And if in fact it is not inclined to lower down, it will not pierce the air through, if it lowers down a little, it will pierce the air less I.e. Slowly, if the tendency is more powerful, more it will pierce it through. That is more speedily. But as is established that the attraction causes all to lower down at equal level, then they must all pierce through the air equally. Then the resistance of the air is deemed to be an absurdly. So it is but compulsory that both the mountain and the seed of mustard should come

down the earth with equal speed and at the same time. Isn't it madness? To say about a thing to be light or heavy is only a blunder. Heavy is that which learns down much more, when one thing does not learn on its own, the attraction causes it to learn and it makes all of them to lean. Hence, there is no body light to press the atmosphere lightly and there is no thing heavy to bring more pressure on the atmosphere.

Resistance Thirty Two: Every man with common sense is quite well aware of the fact that the resistance takes place on account of the apposition to it. The thing which is inclined to come down and you are raising it up, it is but natural that it will resist and which ever leans more will make more resistance. And two things that leans equally will make equal resistance because the opposition is equally will make equal, one and the same. And just before, it has been proved that all the things are equal in learning and so no body has more resistance than any other thing. Hence, why can't you lift a mountain with that much power with which you lift the one side of the winnowing tool? If you cannot lift the mountain, how do you lift a tin stone when on that, too, the effect of the attraction is such as if is on the mountain. And here there is no resistance of the atmosphere, too and as we have proved before that the weight is due to tendency of a body to lower it down and there is nothing but the weight only.

Resistance Thirty Third: My Statement: Put some oil, air and water in a glass. Why does the oil come up when the effect of the attraction on both of them is equal. If it happens so due to the pouring on of the water on the oil why does the water come up when the oil why does the water come up when the oil is poured upon it?

Resistance Thirty Fourth: My Statement: The stone is drowned, but the stick of wood floats. Why does it happen so when the effect is same?

Resistance Thirty Fifth: ***My Statement:*** Now see the vapour will take out the total vapour of the theory of the attraction. And the smoke, too, will make it baseless. Why do both of them rise up? The air presses than. Why don't they press down the air? When the effect of the attraction is equal on all of them? It is compulsory and necessary, too, both of them should remain stuck to the earth, and they should not rise up equal to a hairs' breath even.

Resistance Thirty Sixth: My Statement. If a mountain were to fall down, it will tear off the earth and would rush in to the earth. As they say it is not due to the power of the mountain, as it has no tendency to come down, not it has the weight of its own being it due to the attraction. But as a matter of fact, if there is the effect of the attraction on the mountain, in the same way it is on you, too. Then why don't you pierce through the earth having fallen down on it from above? If you contend that it is due to the force of striking of the mountain with more in intensity, then it would like to oppose it in this way that for the striking requires two things, one is the intensive weight and the intensity of the speed. And whereas the equality of the effect of the attraction is there on both the things, as far as I know it, then what is the meaning of this difference? Morever, there can be thousands of excuses and transformations. This is such a research and the observations by own eyes that the modern astronomy boasts of. Allah may save us from it.

Proof On The Basis Of The Total Attraction: We have made it evident in No.10 and 11 that the agent of attraction attracts its object of attraction with its whole power and that to think it as the force of attraction of the unconscious attraction is more and more in proportion to the increase in the matter of the object of attraction is totally ignorance and insanity. And, also, the modern astrology contends that each and every body has got a

concentration point worth its matter which is aversed to the motion and it makes resistance to the attracter in proportion to its power. The following proofs have their basis on these very enlightening premises and there in lies their solution. Every thing is not attracted by the whole sphere but only that part of it which is opposite to it from the center. If the whole earth attracts each and every thing with its whole power, all the things will be in trouble. Hence, for the equivalence of the power of attraction, equality of the earth with the surface of the thing which is visibly opposite to it is taken for consideration

Thirty Seventh Resistance: My Statement: Spontaneously, it is known and the modern astrology, too, admits that the air and the water resist the thing that try to enter into them. In the manner suitable to them, for example, of the paper it is more, and less of the iron and the stone. This proof is lrrefutable and final because the lowering down of these things is their own act. That is out of their own natural instinct and not due to the attraction of the earth. Therefore, the resistance in a particular action is not the confrontation against that who is doing this act. Now there are four types to ponder over. If the resistance is stronger than the subject of the action i.e. the doer and it alms at opposite action, the inverse action will take place. And it will only deprive it of the desired goal. Or if the resistance is equal to the agent of the action in power, it will not allow the purpose to be fulfilled and if the resistance is weaker but considerable. It will take some more time to happen. It means the action will take place in accordance with the desire of the doer but it will be late and unconsiderable. Actually the effect of the resistance will not be apparent. Now we see that the air having its height of a meter and water of half a meter or even equal to a finger resist the bodies. The proportion in them is remarkable wonderful and surprising. Whereas to their opposite stands the earth spread up to the area of four

thousand miles of which a tiny piece equal to them would be far more in density and power and not that whole of the earth. These are compared to it equal to non-existant. They would not be worth its resistance. Verily, it is evident that the descending of the bodies on the earth is not the handwork of the earth but on the contrary, it is their own instinctive behaviour and in respect of them, air, and water can be of all the four types.

Thirty Eight Resistance : My Statement: A small piece of magnet and a tiny electrized atom can attract the iron and a piece of paper. If there were attraction of the earth, it would it self have very easily pulled them up to it having the earth spread up at a vastness up to the extent of four thousand miles, not only these tiny items but such as thousands of time bigger than them. What are they worth in comparison to them in capacity? Surely, they would not have been able to seizes them from it and escape its clutches. Of course, lrrevokably this act of the iron and the particle of the paper to be attracted and to unit with the earth was but of their own on which the power of the magnet and the electrization overcame.

Thirty Ninth Resistance: My Statement: The ripe apple falls down on the earth and the unripe one, even if it is bigger than the former in size (or volume) doesn't fall down. And there in no doubt that a column of iron whose surface in front of the attracter is equal to ten thousand to that of the apple, even if it is equal to ten thousand tons in weight, the earth will pull it towards itself. Here, we find the power that can pull down an iron column of ten thousand tons weight with ease will not be able to disconnect an unripe apple from its branch. So, it was necessary that the ripe and unripe fruits, all and all, to fall down at a time. But it doesn't happen so. Therefore, undoubtedly, the attraction of the earth is a falsehood. On the contrary all and all come down on their own due to their own inclination inherent in them. The inclination of

lowering down of the unripe fruit did not overcome its strong connetion with the branch of the tree and that is why it remained hanging. The tendency of inclination or coming down of the ripe fruit overcame the weak connection of it with the branch of the tree and so it fell down.

Fortieth Resistance: My Statement: An iron column on the area equal to a fool of a man may not be shaken by a man of ten thousand meter height or even by an elephant whereas the surface extent is the same and due to the equality of the forefront surface the attraction is also the same, i.e. equal on both the man and the column. So it was necessary that it may be impossible to the man ti lift his step, let not to think of his running like wise walking down of every animal, fight of birds, all and all would have been impossible. But it is going on. Hence, the idea of attraction is false.

Forty First Resistance: Take water and oil of the same weight. Pour out the oil in a glass and then pour out water on the oil slowly. The water will go down under the oil. The modern science itself is convinced of it that it is so due to being the water heavier than the oil. Even then this will not falsity the attraction. It is simply to say so. On the basis of the attraction this water is not at all heavier than the oil. The weight, if it were to be, dependent on the attraction is more and that is less on the water because firstly it is in comparison to the oil, is far more from the earth which you had contended in No.16 that the water to that side even through is adjoining to the earth. It is far away from the moon. Secondly, the flow of the oil, in respect of its flow on the water, is less in space than the oil spread up in that glass, so its attraction is smaller. It is presumed that due to the extensivity of the matter the weight of a thing is more. It was refuted by taken both the things equal in weight. Actually, when the whole water is not yet poured down than the will push the oil up. In every sense and every respect, the water itself is lighter and the

oil has reached earlier, hence it was compulsory to the water that it should remain up but it goes down to confirm the falsehood of the attraction. Now there has not remained any alternative except its own concept No.8, that is to say a good bye to the combination of the heaviness and the weight. And be confirmed that although the water may be equal in weight or, rather, it be of less weight, as per the natural view of heaviness. It is heavier than the oil. Hence, it is desirous of the lowest depth and it tends to push the oil upwards. Now, we are at home and it is proved that the attraction is false and vain and the declination is confirmed.

Forty Second Resistance: If there is the attraction of the earth, it is necessary that there should be as much more weight of a creation body as much less will; be the matter. And as much it is more in the matter, that much less it will be in weight. For example, a paper of a square mater space will be heavier than the cube of one meter iron. And a cube of which the opposite- earth space be one space be one square meter and its altitude (i.e. the height) one hundred meter will be still more light. And as much the attitude will increase, the iron matter, too will go on increasing, that much less and less the weight of the column or iron will be equal to a tola in weight, the iron column will be of less than the thousand lakhth part of a Ratti. Now listen to the cause of it. As much is the matter of a body, its power of centralization, the resistance of the attracters is more and still more. And as much more the resistance, the attraction is lesser in proporation. And as much the attraction is less, that much less is the weight. And as such it is supposed to be the weight exists due to the attraction whichever will pull less, will lean less and the laxity to lean is the cause of its laxity in weight. The result is that as much the matter is more, the weight of the thing will be less. Of course, every sane and rational person knows it well that the effect of resistance on the

stronger is less and it is more on the weak one. When the attracters of two things are equal, their power, too, will be equal. And the effect of two equal powers will change inversely in view of the variation of the matter of the thing attracted. It means as much the matter of the object of attraction will be more, the effect of the attraction will be less in proportion. Necessarily the weight will be that much less. What more transformation than this do you want? See more description in the 44th resistance.

Forty Third Resistance: My Resistance: Attraction as it is the cause to bring down a body from above, so it is the resistant to a thing going up wards from above, so it is the resistant to a thing going upwards from the down as it just gives motion against the attracter. As an example of a parable of a wrestler and a body is given in resistance No. 48. And as such it has been proved and established that as much less the matter is, the attraction is more in proportion to it. In view of that it was compulsory that the column of iron with its thousand mater attitude be lifted with a tip of a finger. Likewise, the sheet of paper should not have been lifted by hundreds of wrestlers as it that of the column of iron. So if the attraction is safe and intact, the earth and the heavens will be subject to chaos and the whole system of the universe will be turned up and down and shattered in pieces.

Forty Fourth Resistance: My Statement: It was necessary that the sheet of that paper should come down quicker than that column of iron with a thousand meter altitude, because as much the matter is less, the attraction is that much more and so is the declination on the part of that thing and as much more is the declination. It will come down that much earlier. Although, actually the fact is contrary to it. So it is evident that the declination is not due to the attraction but it is due to their own power. So whichever has got more matter, it will have more inclination to decline and consequently more it will lower

itself. So the lowering down of it will be earlier barring the resistance of the atmosphere, (No .12). ***My statement: firstly***, just we have established the fact that there is no resistance power in the air in real sense of it. ***Secondly,*** even if taken for granted that it has, it will be in respect of the surface in front of it which the modern astronomy *[1] as admitted to be. And on both of them the opposite surfaces and the resistance of the atmosphere is equal and n that sheet of paper the attraction is in comparison to that of the iron column is thousands of time on more, than its coming down earlier was unquestionable. If you so wish you can say that the weight takes place due to the attraction in proportion to the matter. That means as much more the matter; the weight is more to that

Proportion and the thing or the body will lower down in that proportion, as the weight is in inclined to seek the lowest possible depth. Here in No. 42 to 44, we got the answer to this problem. My statement in this regard is that this is only an indulgence in fancies. Firstly the weight which will be caused b the attraction, has no basis.

But the leaning is the effect of attraction directly and it is not that the attraction may cause new effect in the matter which may be turned as 'weight' and it may be in proportion to the matter. And that effect may urge the matter to lean down. There are four thins to be taken into account. These are the matter and the point of centralization of power and the resistances in respect of that and the fourth one obedience i.e. leaning down having been influenced by the effect of the attraction. The first three things are not due to the attraction but only this fourth which is the effect of the attraction. And undoubtedly, it is the effect of the attraction itself and not it is that the attraction caused it to lean down. On the contrary, it led to creation of some other fifth thing which is inclined to lean

*1: the air resist the bodies while these are coming down in proper and suitable manner in consideration of their quantity and not if the weight. The resistance is equal. Let it be a ball of leather or of iron.

down. If it were so and the fifth thing which now is called the weight and it were to be in proportion to the matter due to the effect of the attraction, then here there would have started two other processes. Firstly, as much more the matter, that much more would be power of centralization, consequently more the resistance. Hence, the effect of the attraction would be less. Here there is not a single sentence or clause that would lead any a wise person to doubt of its truth. Now this has been established that as much the matter, the weight would be that much more. Hence, the leaning will be more. Secondly, as much the matter is less, that much the power of centralization would be less, so the resistance is less and that will lead to the attraction to be more, proportionately. Now the result is that as much less is the matter that much less is the weight, so the tendency to decline would be less. The result is that as much the matter is more, the effect of the attraction is less and declination is more and that as much the matter is less. Hence, the leaning would be as an opposing factor to the effect of the attraction as, here, it (i.e. the leaning) increases when it (i.e. the effect of the attraction) lessens and decreases when it increases. Will any man of wisdom and sanity accept this? If that were to be so, which animal (i.e. the fancy) is the effect of attraction except the leaning? As it is supposed, the effect of it was to make a thing pull to itself and bring it nearer and closer to itself. So as much nearer the thing, it would suggest the intensity on the part of the attraction and less the power or the effect of the attraction less it will attract the thing. And if the thing to be attracted is far above, there will not be caused closeness. But, as a matter of fact, the leaning more of a thing is the intensity of the effect of the attraction and less the leaning, less is its intensity and not contrary to it. That will,

otherwise, prove its falsehood. Secondly, Even if we suppose this self-evident thing to be wrong one, there is no escapade from the above mentioned three things. Now, consider the discussion of NO.42, whereas the piece of a paper and the iron column with ten thousand meter high altitude will be equal on balance.

MY STATEMENT: the reason of it is that the attraction will change inversely as per the variation in the matter of the object attracted. It means as much the matter will increase, the attraction would be less, as already mentioned, and the weight exists because of the attraction (157) and will change as per the matter of the body in a straight way. It means as much more the matter that much more the weight will be. The attraction is the cause of the weight. As much the cause is weak, so naturally the subject of the cause will be weak. The matter is the center of the weight, and as much the center (locality) is wider, the situation would be wider. So in the condition of the attraction being equal on two bodies, the weight also will be equal, although the matter of both the bodies may differ as much as they could in the matter of their substance. In the iron column, as much the weight must increase due to the matter being more, that much less it must be due to the paucity (weakness) of the attraction. And in the piece of the paper as much the weight should decrease due to its matter being less that much it should increase due to the exceeding power of the attraction. This weakness and power to one side and the abundance and paucity to the other side are in relation to the matter. Try to understand this on the example of two colours. One of them is gaudy and darker ten times than the other. Dip a meter of cloth in one that is the gaudy one. You will see the cloth getting the colour ten times gaudy. Dip the other one, ten meter, in size. It will catch the colour very light. But the colour is one unit on each part of a meter, so on the ten meter cloth it will be totally ten parts (units). And it is equal to that one

on the one meter cloth. In the same way, take it for granted that one part or unit of attraction causes one seer of weight in one part of the matter, so by the ten parts of the attraction there will be ten seers of weight in one part of the matter. And by one part of the attraction, it will be ten seers on ten parts of the matter because due to the one part of the attraction as per the each part of the attraction there is one part of the weight and thus ten seers on ten parts. Hence, in ten parts of the mater there is ten seers of weight by one part of attraction. In this way in both of them weight will be equal i.e. ten seers. And in (43) this might be said that at as much ease you lift the piece of paper from the earth, with the same ease you might lift the iron column of thousand meter attitude or as, in the manner, thousand of people cannot lift that iron column in the same manner the piece of the paper, too cannot be stirred, at all. And so, the weight of both of them is equal, in No.(44), we saw that both the paper and the column lower down at one and the same time and all the preparations and the necessities were in vain. So it is a fact that the attraction is a falsehood. So, here we came across two theories, one is true and its truth lies on the basis of the attraction that as much the matter is in a body, the weight of it will be less in that proportion. And the second one is based on that supposition of the falsehood that whereas the attraction is the same and equal in all the bodies, bigger and smaller, will be equal in weight. And both of them are absolutely wrong, so is the attraction totally false.

Resistance Forty Fifth: ***My Statement*** Suppose three logs of wood of equal surfacial area fall down in a lake from high up, one remains floating on the surface of the water, second one goes to the bottom directly, the third goes underneath half of the depth of the water and again comes up and remains floating on the surface of the water. What is this difference for? There will be no answer to it but it due to the difference of their matters. In which the

matter was more, remained to the bottom. And in which the matter was less than others remained floating on the surface of the water. And that one which had got matter moderately, went to the half the depth and came back upward and that was because of the attraction. There is no alternative to this reply. The truth was an event, so its revesal was necessary and that is it that whichever has the more matter, less was the attraction on it and its weight was less and it was necessary that it should remain on the surface of the water. And whichever had the less matter, less all others, had to go to the bottom of the water as per that wrong supposition which contends that the equal attraction will cause equal weight in the different matters, then why should there be the difference?

Forty Sixth Resistance: ***My Statement:*** What was the reason of the third log of wood not to go further than the half the depth of the water? The attraction (power) by which the earth had brought it down, still now, is pulling it with the same power, so should it not have the same effect till the end? The power of resistance on the part of the medium of the water has been resisted and nullified in the third resistance. And, if at all, there is still it should have been only up to the time these logs touched the water. When the attracter is one and the same, and the resister is one and the same, and moreover, now the attraction is more powerful due to their being nearer to the earth, and the resistance is less, then when the medium of water had remained only half, the very time to stop it going ahead and not to pierce it through, what is it all for? Would you like to say that its going inside the water was not due to the attraction of the water but it was due to the effect of its striking which had caused and affected the water? This first log of wood did not strike the water so much that it should have pierced it through. The second one a full striking and it reached the bottom of the water. The third one was moderate and hence remained moderate.

MY STATEMENT: Firstly, Accepting the attraction and not accepting its effectiveness and motion downwards is so strange. The striking was made by the same motion which the earth had caused with its attraction on the log of the wood and same power had made it pierce through half of the water. Then, why did it take the other log to the bottom? Secondly, for the striking two things are necessary, these are the intensity of heaviness of the striking thing and its speed. With whatever power you strike a leaf of a tree or place a metal ball of any weight on the ground very slowly, it will not give hitting. But if you hit the ball on the ground with a considerable power, it will give a good striking. And in this function, the severity of the speed has much more credit than the intensity of heaviness. A ten times of lead will not, having thrown by the hand, give as much effect as that will be given by a bullet of a gun, in the above condition, by the bad luck of the attraction, the force of speed and the intensity of the heaviness, both of them, are under the control of their tendency of declination, i.e. the instinct of lowering down to the utmost depth. Whereas, the bodies have the heaviness in them on their own and come down with their own power and they are different, that is why whichever has got the heaviness more than the other will have more inclination to come with that much more speed and its striking will be more powerful in proportion. And this would be less in which less of that has and the moderate will have modreate. And if you consider the truth of the basis of its attraction, you will find that in the first one the matter is less than the other and that is why it has more attraction than that of the others. Its speed will be faster and the same will be heavier & powerful than others. And it will strike more powerfully than the others. And in the second one the matter is more than all others, so the attracting is less than all others. Hence, its speed is weaker than the others and its weight, too, is lighter than all others.

So it's striking was nil. And on this wrong supposition, the effect was equal on all of them. Then, what does the difference of the striking mean?

Resistance Forty Seventh: My Statement why this third log of wood drowns at first and comes up jumping again? And there is not the tendency in it to come up on its own, (No.2). Otherwise all the wood logs would have been flying in the sky. And, so also, it is not the repulsion of the earth because it is attracting them itself. Not it is the attraction of any other planet. And if it were so, then when the log of wood was nearer to it and it was at a distance far from the earth, that planet should not have let it fall down. And as if on the very time it kept itself restricted and sat idle. When the earth, heaving pulled it towards itself, brought the wood to the half of the depth of the water and the attraction of the earth become more intensive due to the nearness of the wood, the planet above woke up and it carried it up by its overwhelming power of attraction. If that was to be so, why didn't the first log of wood come up and why does it not pull it up from there upwards? It is easier to pierce through the air than that of the water. Naturally, there is other alternative than to think that the water pushed it up, and driving off it's from own place threw it on the surface. Consequently, the causally of the water is self-evident. If there were no water, the earth would have pulled all the three towards it self and would have united them to itself. But a problem arises there and that is that the water is, also, a part and parcel of the earth, (18). So, it should have been, too, the attracter rather being the repulsive agent. Would you like to say that this is, in all, the result of the striking? The law of the body (mater) declares that any other body strikes a certain body. It resists it with the same force as much the powerful the striking is. This instinct of protecting oneself and resistance is in the earth, too. With as much force you strike a ball on the ground it will spring up with that much force. As per

the statement, firstly, the striking is wiped out. The truth was to be proved on its inverse reality. And the supposition is falsified. Because to accept its authencity is just as to believe in the tendency of natural declination and to do away with the attraction. And when there is no question of the striking ten what of the answer (explanation) is sought? Secondly, the wooden log gave this much powerful striking that it could pierce the water to reach the bottom of it, then why shouldn't it have come up with the repulsion of that much force? Thirdly, the water is bent on repulsion in its response, and the earth is attracting the object towards itself. What capacity has got this water that it should resist it and overcome it, too and having snatched it from it bring it up on the surface? Fourthly the water received striking the very time when the log of wood touched it surface. Why then it did not respond? Would you like to explain that the water is soft and light and till the log of wood reach the surface, it had that much force, still, left with it so as to split the water but as soon as its power was exhausted, the water, too, was wary of its resistance.

MY STATEMENT: if the wooden log were to derive its power from the attraction of the earth, it would not have been tired at half of the depth of the water. Verily, it is not the attraction but the wooden log came to that distance because of its own power which is its own trait and it could pierce through half of that water and then after that the water repulsed it back. Any way there is no answer to this question except this that this log of wood is heavier than that one. It forced its way up to half of the depth of the water on its own capacity. But it is lighter than the water. And very heavy body seeks to merge itself with the heavy one. If any other lighter one has reached their and this one has got the power. It would have thrown it away upward and would have taken its place there and it would have made it its own abode. For example the oil in the glass and it has been discussed before. So it did not throw of the

other log of wood because it was heavier than the water. And the depth that is the lowest depth is its destination and is its place of settlement. Hence, it is evident that the heavy body is the seeker of the depth and the heaviest one of the utmost depth. The natural declination is the synonymous of it. Naturally the attraction is false and irrational. This resistance of attraction has resulted on these two reasons. This is the one of them. And the other one is that they have got themselves the weight in themselves which cause them to lean to the lowest depth on which lies the basis of this difference. Then what is the need of this attraction? In short, make a short interval, and the same sentence is sufficient as it is spontaneously evident that the floating of the first as soon as it touched the water surface and having gone half the depth of the water and returning back of it from there to the surface of the third one, these both things are totally against the very root of the requirement and this is not it but only it is due to the resistance of the water. If there were not the water, certainly all the three logs of wood would have reached the bottom of the water and thousand times more water's attempt would not have successfully resisted the earth. Hence, it is not the function of the earth but it is the different powers of the logs of wood that determined their fate. Consequently, the attraction is the fancy and senseless. And the declination of the tendency to lean is a confirmed and ascertained fact. ***And Praise Be To Allah, The Highest, The Greatest And Glorious, And May Allah Bestow Our Leader And Our Caretaker Muhammad And All His Associates & Whole Of His Family And May Peace Be Upon Them.***

THE ANCIENT PROOFS

By the Grace of ALLAH, those 12 against the repulsion and these forty seven against the repulsion have been revealed to the consciousness of this Fakir by the Grace of Allah. No discussion on repulsion has gone through my perusal. I have seen some of the writings on the topic of attraction of which we can make explanation as well as can make triplication of the proofs.

Forty Eighth Resistance: If there were to be attraction in the earth, not even a part of it could have been separated from it because it is impossible to face and overcome its power. *(Miftah-al-Rasad)*

My Statement: it was this and only this absolute attraction which was the source of their all the thinking and their assessment. And the same was discussed in our past discourse and we had made it clear that as much a part of the earth be separated, there is that much power of which no man can overcome it. It will pull its opponent without any hitch and very easily, howsoever he may be thousands of maunds heavy. And that the same full power of it is ready to function on each and every apponent of it. So not only a part of it but even a leaf of a tree could not be lifted from it. Because due to the paucity of the matter that past is firstly more heavy as it is proved on the basis of truth on the event due to the attraction and this wrong supposition the weight is less, as well. So look at the power of attraction, which you are going to confront with. A2 year child can lift a plate of tin very easily. But if any a wrestler is clutching it to his cheast with both of his hands a child not a feeble man can move it from that wrestler.

***Resistance Forty Ninth*:** If there is, at all, any attraction, it must be, in its parts, too, so that, whereas, the physical tendency is one and unitary then it is necessary that having mixed up a small stone with a big one, it must

stick to that. Morever, the bigger one must pull up the smaller one to it self on its own. (Miftah-al-Rasad)

My statement: its clear-cut answer would be that this would have occurred if the earth had not pulled it to it. What worth is the attraction of the bigger stone in comparison to the attraction of the earth and how can it be evident? But the magnet and the electrified rod may give its evidence. Their attraction against the earth is evident. In the same manner that of the bigger stone would have been evident provided there were the attraction but it is not here at all. That is why there is no attraction with the earth, too, because the nature of the body is one and unitary. So is my understanding.

Fiftieth Resistance: the earth escaped from the attraction of the sun due to its repulsion. These feeble things cannot escape. You would find excuse with it that the sun is undoubtedly attraction them but the earth is pulling them and these thing are very close to the earth and crores of miles away from the sun. Hence, the attraction of the earth overcomes and the sun cannot lift them up. We would like to say that the earth is bound with the parts with its attraction. See, now, along with these two proofs of the (Miftah-al-Rasad-condemnation), one more proof in the world of the predecessors is mentioned that if there were the attraction, then the smaller stone would have come earlier (Shariah-e-Tazkirat-e-Tusl unto Allama-al-Khizri). It means that it is clear that the attraction of the attracter will be more powerful on the weakest one. So the small stone will be pulled up earlier. But as a matter that they fall down due to their own tendency oh leaning down which is more in the bigger one.

My Statement: to be it most on the weakest is dependent on the equal powers. And here the attracter of the smaller is also small, so this much is in addition that both of them should have their surface facing to the earth been equal. Now as the truth on its evidence this would be

the resistance no, forty fourth and on that wrong supposition, this much, too would not be sufficient that the smaller one will still not come earlier. On the contrary, it will come at the same time with the bigger one. Now, we will have to take this situation in this manner that the bigger one is thousand times of the attitude and in the facing of the surface it is half o it. Now this objection would be neutralized that the bigger one is thousand times of the attitude and in facing of the surface it is half of it. Now this objection would be neutralized that the attraction of the smaller one is more. Suppose that the bigger one has got ten parts of a matter, if the surface facing (opposite) were equal, both would have weighed ten seers each of which the discussion is passed before. But the surface facing (opposite) of the smaller one is double. Hence the weight in the bigger one would be ten seers and the smaller one would weigh twenty seers. Naturally, it has to come down earlier. As a matter of fact, the situation is contrary to this. Hence, the attraction is a fancy and the falsehood. And there is a open space for the natural declination (the tendency to lean to the lower lever). And Allah is the praiseworthy and the highest of all and he is the best knower.

CHAPTER III
43 Arguments about

INVALIDITY OF

THE MOTION OF THE EARTH

All the twelve and the fifty arguments, against the repulsion and the attraction, were in the resistance of the motion of the earth and all these totaled 62 arguments. The modern astronomy is based on these two without which they cannot do anything. We are ready to cite more examples in refutation of the attraction as well as the repulaion that would lead to the invalidity of the theory of the motion of the earth.

Argument No 63: My Statement: All the philosophers of the world and the modern astronomists are unanimous in their opinion that the celestial equator and the zodiac zone are both equal circles. So, the conclusion (No.30) is that all those circles, celestial as well as earthly, that are decided by the ancient as well as the modern astronomists have the same stand. But this would not be possible if the zone is taken for the orbit of the earth. As is the equllizer lying on the celestial concave (canopy) and that is unanimously agreed to (28). If the zone is taken for the orbit as it is the assertion of the law of the astronomy (29), then it would be known that this is a diameter of 19 crores of mile where as that of the celestial canopy (circle) is arabs and arabs of miles and which could not be, till today, estimated and calculated. And as per the discussion, if you like to compare the celestial circle with the encirclement of the orbit taking it for a zone, you will find that their begin equal to each other is impossible because the center of this hollow is the center of the earth, (27). And the same one is the center of the equllizer, too, (28).

So, it is the Great Equllizer. But the equivalence of the center of the orbit and that of the earth is impossible. Hence, necessarily, the zone is a smaller circle because had it been the bigger one, its center would have been the center of the celestial circle (Advantage 30) and the equivalence of a smaller one and the bigger is impossible. So to take the zone for the center of the earth is absolutely an absurdity, (Argument 64). All and all the thinkers and the philosophers of the modern astronomy are in full agreement that there is one and only one center of the equllizer and the zone. (Conclusion 2, No.30). All and all the celestial and the earthly spheres that are considered by the ancient as well as the modern astronomists stand witness to this fact. But this would be spontaneously impossible to take the turn (revolution) of the earth on the orbit and to suppose that the center of the zone the center of the orbit. And now the center of the equllizer is the center of the earth, then the circumference must lie on the orbit. How can a circle of a center and a circumference be congruent? Isn't it a total ignorance?

Argument No 65: My Statement: it has been agreed unanimously by the philosophers and scholars of the modern astronomy that the intersection of the equllizer and the zone result in the bisecting of each other, (No 30). All the spheres that are formed and considered, celestial as well as earthly, by the ancient as well as the modern astronomy, stand witness to this. But if the earth is revolving, the center will not remain one and the same. So the bisection is impossible. Consequently, the revolving of the earth is falsehood.

Argument No 66: My Statement[1]: Morever, all the

[1]***My Statement:*** *equivalence, unitarism and the centralisms has got generalization and peculiarism due to their causes. The orbits (both) are equivalent and not the other two. And the surface (level) of the equllizer and the equatorial line are uni-central and both these are not…**Cont'd next page*

thinkers and the exponents of the modern astronomy are in agreement on the point that the equllizer and the zone, are real celestial or spheres or virtually they are the great circle. In all there are 30,29,28 celestial circles as per the ancient and the modern astronomy. They, all and all, agree on this point, but as regards the revolution of the earth. It is not possible because there is not the equivalence, not the unitary center and not the bisection is correct, on these reasons, the revolution of the earth is wholly a falsehood.

Argument No 67: My Statement: All the thinkers and the scholars of the modern astronomy are unanimous of this opinion that the equllizer and the zone of the circle are individualists (31). All the spheres, celestial as well as in the modern astronomy, testify on it. But if the earth is revolving, none of them will have its individuality (See 31, 33). Naturally, the revolution of the earth is a falsehood.


Argument No 68: My Statement: All and all the scholars of the world as well as the exponents of the modern astronomy are in agreement on this point that there are twelve ecliptics (the sign of zodiac) and they are all similar and the equipoised and every sign has 29 degrees. All and all the spheres that are considering in the ancient as well as modern astronomy stand witness to this fact but if we take for granted the zone as the orbit of the earth,

---


equal to each other. Each and every sphere has not got its zone and the orbit equal, not they are uni-central. And both of them are general due to their bisector. When there occurs bisection, both must be equivalent and uni-central, too. The bigger and smaller or the uncommon central circles cannot bisect each other. And if they have got the equivalence and the uni-centralism, then there will not be bisection. Not the intersection is necessary, for example, the orbits and the equllizer and the equator. No doubt, the equivalence and the uni-centralism together make the bisection of the circle of the sphere equal.

then six of the zodiacs will be of forty degrees each and consequently, the other six would be of only 20 each. The explanation of this is to follow in the next two forewords.

Forward No.1 My Statement: In two equivalent circles, if one of them passes through the center of the other, it is necessary that the other one also must pass through the center of the first one. ABH which passes through the center of ABE, the Center being C. necessarily its center must be R through which ABC passes. Otherwise if it is T, then its radius is TC. Or if it is H, then H, must be the radius or AEB. It means it is equivalent to RH. Any way the whole and the part will be equal.




Forward No.2 My Statement: when two equivalent circles have passed through the center of each other, their, intersection will be trigonometric that means the arc of one will fall inside the other. It will be one third of the circle and will remain the two thirds of it outside the center C, R and the intersection points A&B be joined by straight lines. Thus they will be the hypontenuses of all the radii and the four equal arcs AC, CB, AR&RB. Naturally each and every arc became of 60 degrees because the radii are not the hypoeneouses. But, now, angle ACB, ARB, both are 120 degrees each. And AHB&AEB are 240 degrees each, here the first circle is the equllizer and the second one is the zone. A is the first point of the Libra, H is the Cancer, C is the Capricon, so the six zodiac signs that are in between the Aeries and the Virgo become of 40 degrees each. And there are six other zodiac signs from the Libra to the piscus, each of 20 degrees and they are in the arc ACB.



The first six mentioned above are in the arc AEB. None but a mad man will agree with this condition. That means the product of the revolution will be only madness. These people followed the Copernicus and blindly agreed to this theory with out any verification of the fact. And it will lead them to make the whole record of the astronomical science topsyturvy.

Argument No.69 My Statement: All and all the scholars of the world and the exponents of the modern astronomy are unanimous on the point that the undertaking of the equinox is a very light motion to such an extent that it is not even equal to a full minute in a whole year. It is only 50.2 minutes, (22). And a turn (Revolution) is complete in twenty five thousand eight hundred seventeen years (No.32) but if the earth is revolving on the zone. It is necessary that the turn should be completed in every year, and it should cross over to three zodiac sings in every three months. And this has the motion which is not able to traverse the distance of one degree. So can it traverse one degree daily?



ABCD is a zodiac circle. When the earth is at point A, the equllizer circle became X, which intersected the zone at the J, vertex of Aeries and at R, on the vertex the Libra. When the earth came on point B, the equllizer circle became PH, the vertex of the Aeries and T, the Vertex or Libra. When the earth came on the point C, the equllizer circle became Y, and the E, The vertex of the Aeries and K, the Vertex of Libra. When it came on D, the Q became the equllizer and L the Vertex of Aeries and M, the Vertex of Libra. All these four circles intersected the zone into 12

equal parts. For example the arc of the zone AB is the one fourth of the full turn and as per the second foreword the arc AC, from X, is 60 degrees. Necessary in the middle CT is also 30 degrees. In this way the same condition is in all the other quarters. Naturally, and necessarily in the Vertices of all the four times of the Aeries C, H, E, L there will be 90 degrees distance. Hence, in this way the Vertex of the Aeries makes its turn in full on the whole zone every year. And in each and every quarter of a year it traverses the distance of three zodiac signs, it means it traverses one degree per day. Then what more ignorance can be thought of than this? Verily, the concept of a turn or a rotation on a full circle is absolutely false.

Argument No.70 My Statement: All and all the thinkers of the world and the scholars of the modern astronomy are unanimously agreed upon this that whosever makes a turn over this orbit, (let it be the sun or the earth), traverses through all zodiac signs in a whole year. But if it is the orbit of the earth, it is not possible to traverses a minute, then what of the one degree? When the earth was on A, the Vertex of Aeries was the C. the A which is 60 degrees must be behind it and it was the Vertex of the Aquarius. When the earth came on B, then H is the Vertex of Aeries. This is, also, 60 degrees ahead. Then surely it is the Vertex of the Aquarius. In this manner, wherever be the earth, the Vertex of the Aeries is 60 degree ahead of it. And the earth will remain on the Vertex of the Aquarius, only, and always. Necessarily, it will be impossible to it to enter into the zodiac signs. In the past the factors leading ti the existence of the weight have falsified the existence of the attraction and the repulsion. And it has proved the motionlessness of the earth. Here, now, the concept of the rotation (turn) of the earth it self has proved the earth being motionless and that it is at the very place where it was from the moments of it s creation. And it will remain so till it exists. What better proof can be of it that to suppose its

turning (on its orbit) it self asserts and ascertains its being motionless? The exponents of the modern astronomy remained unaware of the grave flaws in the overwhelming zest to follow the Copernicus theories. And it is very strange that those who have refuted these (modern astronomical theories) could not give clear cut argument, more clear than the sun, then such as ours till today. That was one thing but on the contrary to it they have given such arguments that are not useful at all. The adversaries did not pay attention to this that to take the zodiac zone to be the orbit of the earth would lead to dash the very science of their astronomy to the ground and make it topsyturvy.

Argument No. 71 My Statement: Where as the C is the Vertex of the Aeries and the earth is on the Vertex of the Aquarius, necessary T is Vertex of the Aeries. When the earth came on T and the Vertex of the Aeries is always 60 degrees, it must be ahead of it, so there must be one more zodiac sign in the middle of the Vertex of the Piscus and the Vertex of the Aeries.

Argument No.72: when the earth came on the point C where there was the Vertex of the Aeries, the Vertex of the Aries went ahead of the Aeries of the Aries to the tune of 60 degrees.

Argument No. 73: when the earth came on the point B where it was the Vertex of the Taurus, the Aeries that was 30 degrees behind, now went 60 degree ahead. And it leads to.

Argument No. 74: every zodiac sign will be sometimes ahead of the Vertex of the Aeries or sometimes behind it because the Vertex of the Aeries will make a full turn through the twelve zodiac signs every year. So there will not be any fixation of the zodiac signs of the north or the south. As if they are all northern and at the same time southern, too, and so also, a perticular one zodiac sign will not be northern, not the southern whereas the Vertex of the Aeries will remain on it only.


Argument No. 75: Hence, the determination of all the four distance is refuted.

Argument No. 76: when the earth came to the point T, where the Vertex of the Piscus is and the Vertex of the Aeries is 60 degrees ahead of it and there is no doubt that the Vertex of the Aeries is 30 degrees ahead of it. Thus there will be two Vertices of the Aeries. Consequently, there will be two Vertices of the Libra. So the intersection of the two circles will be at four places and this is absurd and impossible. No two circles can intersect each other at more than two places (Uclias Article no 3, diagram 10). In short there are hundreds of transformation. Now see what calamity would have occurred if you consider the turning of the earth. And it is that the whole astronomy would perish totally.

Argument No. 77 My Statement: All the philosophers of the world and the scholars of the modern astronomy agree that circle showing the absolute declination of zone to the equllizer is called the declining circle and it is a determination circle of which the arc passes through their interesting middle point & has it self a determination quantity and not the smaller or bigger arc which not may not help to fix the quantum of the declination. But the zone is the obit of the earth, then it would happen in this manner only and the fixation of the declination will be impossible. For this determining the fixation of it is necessary that both the circle should be equal and congruent and if the third one congruent to them passed through their axis and it should show the declination. If the cut off circle are smaller and bigger, there will not be possible to determine the declination quantum. If you take it equal to a smaller one, why should it not be taken equal for the bigger one? And conversely if you take a different one than both of them, then what is the reason of it, and again there is a problem how much it

should be different and there is no suggestion as to be taken towards the smaller one or the bigger one. There will not be the determination of the declination. And there is no doubt the arcs off all these problem circles will be different. And if you take one of them, its value will be different in comparison to any other smaller or the bigger one. Naturally, there is no way to the determination of the declination. And, as such, we have already proved in our argument No 57, that having taken the zone (the zonal circle) for the orbit of the earth would not lead to the determination of the equality of the equalizer and the zone, so the determination of the declination is impossible. But it is genarly accepted to be probable. Undoubtedly, the turning of the earth is false and absurd.

Argument No. 78: if you take the equality for granted having forsaken, all and all the claims and the proclamation and the experiments of your own modern astronomy, take right here a circle equal to the equator parallel to it and name it an equalizer so that the calculation of the declination may be arrived at directly. All and all the thinkers of the world an the modern astronomists are unanimous on this point that the absolute declination from thousand of miles is going on to be 24.23 degrees or less than it (23.29). But the earth is revolving, so the absolute declination will come to 60 degrees and the distance of those equivalent circle passing through each other's center (Foreword 1) will always be equal to half of the diameter (i.e. the radius).



The circle AHB has its center C, and AEB is on the center R, so HC or RE will be the radius of the circle. This is on the plane surface In it the value of the radius (half the diameter) that is of the 60 diametrical

degrees is 57-17-44-48-15 but if the distance is taken, of the sphere, from its circle, their equal declining circle which will pass through the points HC or RE. This radius will be its hypotenuse, hence the declination of the zodiac circle will be full 60 degrees in place of 24, 23. And any body will call it a falsehood. Naturally, the revolving of the earth is absolutely absurd and false.


Argument No. 79 My Statement: All the problems that are solved in relation to the celestial sphere with the help of the science of the spherical trigonometry there should be in their triangles one arc of the zodiac circle. More specially, whereas, the other one (arc) should be of the equalizer. For example, by the declination of the planets*[1] and the study of the moon the derivation of its functioning and the rising, proves to be totally wrong having supposed the zone to be the orbit of the earth, because the foundation of it, on the celestial sphere, is Just like nothing at all. It is a great circle of the zone. And most particularly, its basis should be that the zone and the equllizer, both be equal circle and both of them should have their one and the only center and the intersection of each other should be on the basis of bisecting each other.

*[1] *on this problem, we have got our own special magazine 'Al Burhan al Qaweem Alal Arz wal Taqweem' in which we have given 18 explanations and transformed them into six. Then in each of them are as many parts of distance are possible, which the total is 35. We cannot read all& all from the handwritten book. But we have discussed as to how in each and every illustration the longitude and the latitudes can be drawn. And also showed they both be drawn separately. Then we have determined on the basis of the geometrical pictures of light and shade all the methods of drawing the longitude from the latitude and vise versa. All this description is included in the said magazine. We have also written some sentences on this deliberation in the Usul-e-lim-al-Hayiyat, No97, in which the diagram of the monstrous error is drown like this.....**See next page*

In short, both of them should be the great circle of the one and the only sphere, and we have proved that it is all and all impossible if the zone is taken for the orbit of the earth. Hence, the concept of the revolution of the earth is totally false.

***Argument No.80 My Statement*:** Here are some of the premises of the repulsion. There are two kinds of relation. In two things, it is additional, opposite and contrary because in a particular these cannot be at a time. Firstly, it is simply considered one for which there is not any fixed purpose. When the consideration is made, then one thing is attributed with both the qualities in comparison, as for example, when in the counting of the thing. If it is started counting from this side, this one particular will be first and that other would be the second. If you start counting from that other side, then the condition is contrary and thus there is no purpose present in being their first and the second. It is only dependent on your own consideration. Where from

Let E Q be the equator (i.e. the celestial equator), F is its pole and ES is its zodiacal circle, R is its pole. Z the place of the planet, FZ is the absolute declination and the RF is the part in between the poles. E, (E), is the absolute declination.



A is the Vertex of the Aries. Angle ZFQ is the sign of the full rising. Angle ZRS is the full longitude RZ is the complete latitude. Till this the diagram was there. Then there was the triangle. We derived FB by the angle FZB. Then added to it the absolute declination RF and derived the RB and from it the angle R which is the competed longitude. Now to derive the latitude take the triangle RZB of which the side RB& angle R already known. So, from them taken RZ, the complete attitude, we derived the attitude. This is spontaneously false, whereas FZB is the right angle. Now can RZB be the right angle? It means the whole and the part are equal. So let it go. We have nothing to do with it. The experts do know that by this very diagram from how many ways it is proved that the zone cannot be the orbit.

you start the counting, the thing to that side will be the first. The second one for which in its counting the purpose, is determined. Here, in two things, for one thing one contrary attributed will be fixed and for the other thing, other one. We cannot make any change in them on the basis of another consideration, for example, the first and then on the consideration of time. For example, the year hijri one undoubtedly came (passed) before the second year of hijri. We cannot say that the second year happened first and year came afterwards.

(2) In these events on particular thing can be attributed with two opposites in consideration of the two things. This will not be the relative change but the depending change. But it is not possible in consideration to one thing only because it is a relative change. For example, the year of second hijri is before the third year of hijri and after the first year of hijri. But these two attributes cannot happened to be in consideration of one thing only, in this phrase, Zaid, the son of Umru, the son of Bakar, Umru is the son and at the same time father, too, but it is so for two different persons. This would be impossible that Umru be the father of one person and son of the same person.

(3) In such eventful relations, there are some which may be worth attribution to one thing incidentally, although in such incident events, the view of the individuality, there can be the capacity of both the opposite qualities in one and the same thing. But here, too, there is the impossibility that from two different points of consideration both the opposite qualities be accepted in one thing only. Otherwise, the relative proportion for example: Zaid was born in the year one is older that Umru who was born in the second years. Now here, we cannot say that Umru is older than Zaid in any other view although it was possible in view of their individuality that Umru had born

in the first year and Zaid in the second year. Then to be bigger and smaller in age would have been a reflex action.

(4) The upper port and the lower part are too, from among these incidental proportions. The ceiling is above and the courtyard is below. When you are standing on the ground, your head is above and the feet below. Not a single wise man would say that being above and downward is not incidental and that it is simply depending on one's consideration. On some other consideration the selling is down below and the courtyard is above and that your head is down and the feet are above. That is, in fact, neither the ceiling nor the head are above, nor the courtyard and your feet are below. On the contrary, these are like our own minds, in our control and our own consideration. If we wish so, we can consider the head and the ceiling above or the feet and the courtyard. But would any body even a mad person say so?

(5) When this is the incidental proportion, there must be, in the very root of the event some purpose or the other whish is not in control of anybody's considera5tion or the choice. For the being of upper your head or the ceiling is not the determining factor or for the being if you are hung, our head will down and the feet will be above. So it is evident that these properties are not demonstrative on their own self but they are incidental and their source is something different and they have got for that the head and the ceiling.

(6) The comparative relationship, in fact, is fixed on both the ends. That means there is the limitation drawn. For example, Zaid is the first son and the last one. There cannot be any other before the first one. Otherwise this first one will not be the first, and not after the last one. Otherwise this one will not be the last one. And some times there is limitation to only one side. And the other side remains unlimited in comparison to that as if they are the conjunction and disjunction of and the only thing.

Conjunction is limited and there is possibility of increase and decrease. But there is no limitation to the disjunction and as much there will be distance, it will be the disjunction only. Of course, the limitation is not necessary to any of the side in view of relative relation because this is under one's on choice. So, the being of the upper and the below are the incidental proportions. Hence, there should be the limitation to one side of the thing. Otherwise, there will remain the simple consideration. When the belowness one every count is belowness and the upperness is upperness then there is no scope for anybody of his purpose or the source to be fixed. Whichever you like the upper side, is upper and the rest are below and vice versa. And that upper will become the below of it. Necessarily in their limitations there must be at least one condition out of the three. There should be either two opposite things in it6self, one being the upper and the other below, because neither being the upper is on its own upper and nor the below on its own below. And all other things are in them, those nearest the upper one are above incidentally and likewise those things that are near the down one are down incidentally. And in this condition every thing is up as well as down in consideration to the nearestness and the farthestness. This condition will be of limitation on both the sides or it should be upper in its own so that the upperness more than that may be impossible and you go opposite to it unlimitedly and as much you go on it all and all the downnes and to go down it is possible from the most down below or the downiness be fixed on its own and there should not be and further downward movement possible and as much you move opposite to it is all and all the upper part and from every upperness there may be still more upperness. In this way all the three conditions are sufficient in determining the incidental relation on their own.

(7) And there should not be there in need of any more aboveness further from it and it should not be there in

need of any more incidents. Because it has been already achieved and there is no reasoning from outside, hence, its acceptance is irrational and indiscriminate.

The refutation of the ancient philosophy, by the Grace of Allah, is going to follow in the *Tazyil-e-Jalil.* There is no need of it here. And the modern astronomy, too, agrees to the fact that the upperness is not limited. The problem of the end of the utmost distance is not bending on us because in our view the atmospherial vacuum is imaginary distance and that may be ended with the delusive imagination. Then again you will suspect and it will go ahead and it will not end to any limit. Again you will not stop to suspect and third distance will start. It means the being of below is determined and whatever downward distance there may be, it would be near to it and it would be only additional lowerness. Whatever is far away is the upper whit out any end because all the sides of the belowness are equal. No one has superiority over any other as there is not the distance (the fartherness) more to one side and less to the other side. On the contrary, it is unlimited to all the sides and equal to all the sides. Because any two unlimited distances starting from one starting point cannot be more and at the same time less in the length. Otherwise, whichever remained short will be limited, hence, it is necessary that the real depth should be one thing present and limited in all the expansion of all the expansion to very side of which here should be the upperness and the pointing of the depth from every side be towards it only and should end there only. And whatever upperness may increase should increase towards it, i.e. the real Depth.

(8) Here it is eve dent that the depth itself should be a point, solid one, unsplitting. Otherwise, there could be the various points presumed in a body or a surface or a line. And two which the pointing of the consciousness would be different and it will be farther from each other

and there would be the upperness and lowerness of their own among them and the Real Depth will remain a single dot only.

(9) This fixed point which is in the middle of all the extentions from all sides and which made it the center of the sphere. It is possible that it may be the center of the existing sphere and which itself be in the position to be the depth on its own. And not that it should be on any consideration and any terminology. Otherwise the relations will not remain incidental. In the vacuum of the atmosphere. There is not such point that might be distinguished in fact. It will be distinguished from our point of view and not that it will be on its own determined or being the depth.

(10) It is necessary that this center should not have the self protecting motion. Otherwise, there would have been one thing out of the two i.e., the upperness and the belowness that would keep it at one and the same place and these should change their places. It is possible that due to its self protecting motion it should come near to its center of the upperness (the utmost fartherness) and should go far from the depth (its downnes) or it should be that due to its on urge of keeping itself on its own places, the upperness (the last point of the height) and the depth change their positions in the manner that the upperness should be the depth and the depth should become the upperness. For example, one house is one some other place of which the courtyard is near (close) to that depth of its own and the ceiling is far away. Then that center should become stirred up and it should move upward and necessarily the ceiling will be close to it and the courtyard will become far from it. Now, here, we should have to say that having sat idle and doing nothing the ceiling of the house came down simply directly and the courtyard went upside. And a man who was simply standing there without any purpose, would be there still standing but his head is

down and the feet upward. Now that these premises have become well-ordered and well-arranged, we will see when you are standing on the ground upright and the direction of the upperness (the infinite height) has gone far from you upside, then on the basis of the sixth premise it is necessary that the direction of the depth should fix its place to the side of your feet. Now it is to be seen whether it is this sphere of the earth or after that. But, spontaneously, it is evident and each and every sensible person understands that as in the manner you are standing on this on the earth and your head is above and the feet are below, the same condition is there in America. Or on any part of the surface of the earth, a man may be standing he too will be experiencing the same condition. It should not be said about the American that they are not on the earth and that the earth is above them. Or their heads are not upside and that the feet are upside. Thus it is clear that the limit is in the earth itself and its center is the real depth. Hence, on the basis of the tenth premise the protecting motion as such.

Argument No. 81 My Statement: That existing sphere, of which the center is the Real Depth, must be the sun of the earth or some other planet or a star. First thing is that the modern astronomy would not accept this fact because it does not believe in the existence of the skies. Secondly, but it of the opinion that the sun is motionless and it is in the central position. Then it is necessary that when the exponents of the modern astronomy are standing on the earth upright at noon, their heads should be down and their feet up because the head is near real depth and the legs are away from it. Whereas, the motion of the earth is spherical, at the time of the sunset, they would be in such a position that the head and the legs might be at level with the center of the sun. Then in this position there would remain no position of the head, not the legs. But, of course, at mid-night they would come into the humanity, and the

head would be up and the legs down. After the sunrise the same position of equalization would occur and the head and the legs would be in the level. And again when it is about the mid-day, their position will improve and the head would be up and the legs would be down. And all the time, without moving an inch here and there, they would be doing such acrobatic feats. The same condition would occur to the courtyard and the ceiling because at a time the courtyard would be up and the ceiling would be down. Some other time its condition would be reversed. The same would be the condition of the trees standing on the earth. You would see that at the time of mid-night the foot of the tree is below and the branches are up. Then at the noontime the tree is the same but the branches have come down close to the earth and the root is above. At mid-day you would say the vapour is not going up but going down and about the stone coming down to the ground, you would say it flew up. And there are so many transformations for example, the same condition would be with all other planets and the moons and the stars. Out of them, whichever you take for the center, the same kind of transformations would occur in them. Necessarily, the earth is the very motionless center and the self protecting motion is an absurdity.

Argument No.82: My Statement: Every sensitive man knows it well that in all the six directions, left and right, front and back change themselves with changing of the man's sides. If you stand facing the east, then the east will be in front of you, and the west is to your backside, to your right side will be the south and to your left side is the North. And if you turn your face to the West, every thing will change. In this matter, your body parts, mouth and the back and the arms are plying the part of the consideration. To which direction they would be, they will show the left and right. But in the direction of the upside and the downside, your legs and heads have no consideration of

any sort because it is always where your head is it is upside and to which side your legs would be, that would be the downside. Morever, these directions are themselves determined. Whichever is to the side of your head is the upper side when you are standing upright and to your other side is the down (depth). If you turn opposite, i.e., head down and legs up, even then the upside and the depth will remain the same. The only thing that will happen is that it will not be upward to the side of your head and not to the side of your legs, it will be the downward because at this time your head is down and the legs up. If the center of the sun, as is the concept of the modern astronomy, be the motionless center and the real depth, then the same condition would be of the up and down which occurred to those four directions. When the sun comes in the comprehension (scope) of the perceptible horizon after a short period after the mid-day or a short time before the sunrise and you sleep having your legs to its side direction, then your head is up and the legs down because they are close to the center of the sun. And the very time you sleep with your head upside, then your head will be downwards and the legs upside because now the head is close near to the center of the sun. In the same manner, whichever planet or a star you consider, or take a moon, the same condition will occur except the earth because having taken its center of the real depth, all the phenomena are in the usual manner. Necessarily, that center is stationary (still and motionless) and thus the motion of the earth is a fancy.

Argument No. 83 My Statement: Each and every wise man is well aware of it that the motion is a cause of the heat and the warmth. What of a wise man but a mad one, too, in its unconscious state of mind, knows this matter well. And that is why in the season of the autumn the body beings to tremble and shiver so severely so that by its movement heat may be created. The wet clothes are shaken in the open air so that they may get dry. All these

are so clear and spontaneous that even they are acceptable to the modern astronomy. Sometimes, we see that from the sky some hard solid burning and blazing bodies fall down. Their occurrence, in view of some is that they come from the burning mountains of the moon. They are the rocks let loose from the moon because of their intensive heat. They are out of the moon's power attraction and having come into the zone of the attraction of the earth, they fall down on the earth. Again there was the objection to it as to why they get cold in a very little time. And why did they get cold while they traversed the distance of the lakhs miles? The answer to this is given in this manner that had they come down cold from the star or had they become cold in the course of their journey, even then they should have become blazing and illuminating due to the fire in them because of the speedy motion whereas the motion is the cause of the heat and its intensity leads to the blazing and illumination. Now, you can just think of and speculate the intensity of the earth's motion and its unitary burning and illumination. And you see that this earth whose orbit has got its diameter equal to eighteen crores fifty eight lakhs of miles and its turn every year is complete in three hundred sixty five days and five hours and forty eight minutes, if such were to be the motion (speed) of the earth that is per hour sixty eight thousand miles. And to its thousandth part, not a train, even the fastest one, can catch up with it, and this kind of forceful motion which is continued for not a day, not a hundred years but for thousands of years uninterrupted. Then who can speculate its utmost intensity and the heat which reaches the earth? And it should have made its water dry far before, its air could have been turned into firing flame and the earth might have become a blazing fire ball on which no animal could have dared to breath and none would have been able to put his feet on it. This would have been a great feat, at least, But as we see, the earth is cold and its nature is also cold (peaceful), its


water is even colder than it. Its air is so pleasant. Hence this should not be its motion. On the contrary, it should be of that mountain of fire which is called the sun. And it had to be the fire due to it's that much motion. And this argument (proof), so clear, is deterrent to make this motion of the sun on which depends the rising and setting of the planets related to the earth, Because if it were to be related to the earth, it means it would revolve a thousand miles or so, per hour. And such a fast and forceful tuning, can it be connived at? If you would say this transformation is fit to the moon although its orbit is so small but even then the length of it somewhat less than the twelfth part of it comes to nearly two and a quarter thousand miles per hour. Then as to why this clear and so forceful motion didn't make it hot?

My statement: This, too, is the creation of the modern astronomy in which the heavenly existence is not accepted. If at all, there is movement in the vacuum of the atmosphere. It was necessary that the moon should have been hot like fire and the light of moon should have been like a severe sunshine. But in our view whatever is in the heavens (skies) is floating in its own orbit. It may be possible that the part which the moon might be floating is cold and the creater, the most powerful and the wise, might have made it so cold that its heat is being equllised by it. And it does not allow the moon to be hot and as is in the narration (the hadith) about the sun that it is being made cold with ice every day. Otherwise on whatever it might have passed over, would have been burned to ashes (it is adapted from Al Tabrani's ***Rawah Al Tabrani*** Un Abi Imam (R.T.U), unto the prophet (S.W.A.S)

Argument No. 84 My Statement: The daily motion of the earth that is its turning on its axis is the cause to make everything on it to seek for light and the heat or the repulsion against the attraction of the sun.

(33) Any way it is the urge of the nature and there were so many other alternatives to it. If the earth had revolved from the east to the west, even then these two objectives could have been achieved in the same manner as by going it from west to east. Then, why was this only one choice fixed? Isn't this preference without preference which is impossible to an unconscious power? Hence, the concept to the motion of the earth is false.

Argument No. 85 My Statement: On the basis of both these reasons it was necessary that the equator should have been in the level of the zodiac circle. EKLM be the sun and AHBD be the earth, EA, LB are the tangents to both of them. The sector AHB of the Earth is bigger than it's half. And it is opposite to the sun and bright because of it and the other sector ADB is smaller than the half of it and it is dark and concealed from it. And HD is the surface of the zodiac circle and it passes to the center of the sun and the center of the sun is adherent to the zodiac circle. CR is the Equator HT being the poles, HC, RD are the absolute declination. And it is clear that in the sector or EML the top most point is M and in the sector AHB, H is the upper most point. So MH is the shortest adjoining line of all. So in the earth, point H is more close to the sun and it has gone increasing all ground up to A & B till after that the facing to the sun in direct manner. Hence, the attraction on 'H' is the most of all and the attraction and the repulsion are equal. (No.6) so it is necessary that the repulsion, too, be most all of here. And



in the revolving sphere the repulsion at the zone is the most powerful of all. Then up to the poles, their parallels have become smaller and smaller till on the poles itself there is no motion. So it was necessary that HD, the axial motion should be the zone of the earth. It means it should have been the equator. But it is not so. On the contrary CR is the zone. So wherever the attraction is less, the repulsion is more there. And wherever it is more there the repulsion is less. And this is a falsehood, undoubtedly, the concept of the motion of the earth is wrong. In the same manner, for seeking the light and the heat, those parts that are below the AB, should move ahead and push ahead those parts which are ahead of them. And the zonal motion should have been occurred on HD and not below the parts of A B, which are already drawing the light and the heat. Those would have moved ahead and the zonal motion would have remained on CR.

ARGUMENT NO.86: ***MY STATEMENT:*** In the conventional motion, all and all the parts of the axis, from pole to pole are static. And we have already proved In No, 33 that if the earth has got this motion, then not at all, all the spheres have got their unitary motion, and for that there should be the poles and the axis. Whereas every part has got its separate self protecting motion. And as such each and every part has got there in the repulsion and the urge for the light and the heat. Naturally the staticness or being stationary of the parts of the axis is absurd where as on line HD where there is neither the attraction, nor the power. And more ahead of it the opposition is still remaining, then there is no doubt left in the falsehood of the motion of the earth. And Allah may bestow our Prophet, Muhammad. With its best of the blessing and peace be upon him and his family and his associates. The modern astronomy that in its writings on mathematics it has by the geometrical proofs, proved that when a small sphere is opposite to a bigger sphere, then the smaller sector of the bigger one.

The tangent lines of the bigger sphere will come out of its diameter fro its last points as in the diagram from hypotenuses E&L. And those of the smaller sphere for the hypotenuses A&B and they will touch its ends. Hence, in the process of illuminating by the sun of the earth, it is less illuminated by the half of the sun and it is more brightened by the less than half of the earth. And in the process of illuminating of the earth by the moon the occurance is revered.

Argument No. 87: My Statement: In our statement No.33 we have proved that all and all the parts of the earth have got the power of self protecting. Firstly, it is in the self protecting motion of the own and every such tendency of self protecting there is the power of defence because it changes its place and whichever confronts it in its way, it pushes it back. Secondly, here this much is not sufficient, but also the movement of the parts is compulsory. Hence, it is not only the self-protection but it is a collision. If the axial motion were to be due to the attraction and the repulsion, as in No.33, we have discussed it in it, hence it is evident that if the nearest distance is different, the attraction will be varied, again it will lead to variance of the speed, necessarily, the compulsion will occur. And if it is not so, there must be some reason of it. And way laws of the modern astronomy admit these judgments in fact, that

(1) Some of the parts of the earth are in front of the sun while the others are concealed from it, totally.

(2) The variations in the facing of the earth to the sun, its nearness and fartherness and the refraction of the perpendiculars of the interconnected lines is quite certain.

(3) Due to there variations, it is certain to be the variations in the attraction.

(4) Because of its variations, the repulsion is also varied, in the manner of increasing and decreasing.

(5) Owing to its variations, there is difference in its sp4eed.

(6) Whereas the difference in the speed, there is collision and decisive compulsion. There is no other got than to accept all and all these judgments. So, whereas the judgments is so authentic and trustworthy, it is but natural that, may all and all these judgments. So authentic and trustworthy, it is but natural that, may Allah protect us, there should have been continuously earth quakes in the earth. Every man would be feeling the parts of the earth slipping and sliding under this feet and the man will, not be able to stop himself from feeling his motion along with the circular motion like that of the latitudes of the earth. It is like our feeling the mirage when we are sitting in the train and more especially in the old trains, but by the Grace of Allah, here it is not so. Anyway, the axial motion is only absurd. And it is a place to be thankful that the acceptance of it by the modern astronomy is itself calamitous to it. Somebody had said that had the earth been in motion, we would have observed it moving. The answer to him for that was given as such that if the motion were to be different or had its parts moved separately, it would have been felt so, without fall. One continuous and smooth motion is pertinent to the earth as a whole sphere. That is why it is not felt at all such as the motion of the boat is not felt by its rider till he does not lean to a side. By the grace of Allah, we have proved both the things that if the earth had the motion, necessarily its parts would have got it separately and that it would have been, certainly, unievelledd, varied and compulsive. When it was compulsory to feel it on one ground, whereas here are two at a time, so it was bound to be felt clearly but it is not there in origin. Hence the earth is static without any doubt.

Argument No.88 My Statement: The water is more light and rare than the earth. Naturally, in its parts, there

should have been intensive collision and stirring and there would have been the cyclones and storms in the seas.

Argument No. 89 My Statement: And what more can be said about its lightness and rarity? It was necessary that throughout the day and night from east to west and from bottom to top, the batches and batches of the air would have collided with each other, they would have thrashed and slapped each other and there would have been tempests and cyclones, if it is not so. Then, undoubtedly, the axial motion of the earth is a falsehood and its being firm and static is firm and certain. And, all the praise be to Allah and may His best of the blessings be bestowed upon our leader and his family and his associates.

THE ANCIENT ARGUMENTS

Till now, we paid out attention mostly to the refutation of the rotation of the earth around the sun. In the first chapter barring the resistance No. one, in general, the remaining eleven and the chapter third, except the last seven. All the remaining twenty is in the same manner in refutation of the motion of the earth. All of our predecessors were hell bent on the refutation of the axial motion of the earth, We should select out of them such ones with which they have explained their point but many of them have been rejected by rationalists. But we will support and ascertain them and will assert their being correct and perfect by their own admissions. Moreover, and those which are exaggerated in their explanation, we will do it in other way and will correct of those arguments which upon the predecessors have their put faith on and in out view they are false and incomplete, we shall deal with them. Allah will give us the ability to do so.

Argument No. 90: If you throw a heavy stone high up in the sky, it will fall down where from you sent it, if the earth where revolving from the east to the west, it

would have fallen in the west and as much it took the time to go up and come down, in that time where from the stone was thrown that place went to the west side of it due to the motion of the earth.

My Statement: The axial revolving speed of the earth is 506.40 yard per second. If the stone took the time of 5 second to get up and to come down, the place from where it was thrown slipped to the distance of 2532 yards. So the stone must fall down to west side at the distance of one and half mile. But in fact, it is not so.

Argument No. 91: If two stones are thrown to the east and the west the n the stone to the west side will seem going faster and that one to the east will seem to be slow. It should not be so. On the contrary it should be that they both must fall down to the west only.

My Statement: Or they should fall on the head of the thrower. As to explain this it should be like this. Those stones were thrown with that much force that they should have fallen to different sides in three seconds at 19 yards. The stone thrown to west has moved to 19 yards to west from place of its throwing in the much time the place where from the stone was thrown has slipped to 1519 yards to the east. Hence, this stone will fall at the distance of 1538 yards from the place of its throwing. And the stone to the east will not be able to slide a finger's distance from there because the place of throwing will take it with it due to the axial motion of the earth to that distance had the thrower thrown it having saved it from his opposite forces, then in three second it must fall to the east at a distance of 19 yards only. And in the time the place of throwing the stone will reach 1519 yards. So it will fall to the west at a distance of 1500 yards. And if it had been thrown parallel to the latitude, it would come down on the thrower of it the very moment and it will fall there and there only But nothing of these things happen. Hence, it is clear that there is not motion of the earth as such, and it is a falsehood.

My Another Statement: On the contrary, the best of all would be that this argument should be explained in such a way that it will be three separate arguments in place of the one because where there is only one part, there will be only one argument. But whereas there are hundreds of the parts, and there can be each and every part separate, and each is in a position of its transformation, then that each part is an argument in itself, let us think this way. Two birds fly from a branch of a tree with the equal speed to that of the earth which is 1036 m.p.h and one to the east and the other to the west. Then the one flying to the west will reach the distance of two thousand seventy two miles because as much it went to the west, this branch, too, went with it to the east. And the one going to the east didn't move a hair's length from the branch because as he is flying, with the same speed the branch of the tree, too, is going along with it. But we, practically, observe that both of them having equal speed, going to opposite to each other, go to the same distance.

Argument No. 92: If their flying speed is more than that of the earth, for example, 1037 miles per hour, the west-bound will reach 2037 miles to the west and the other east bound with the equal speed will go only one mile to the east. This, too, is spontaneously absurd and contrary to the observation.

Argument No. 93: If their speed of flying is less than that of the earth, for example per hour 1035 miles, then that one west-bound will reach at the distance of 2071 miles to the west. And its opponent, the east bound having tolled for an hour and having traversed 1035 miles will find itself only a mile away, from the branch of that tree and that, too, to its west. Isn't it awkard that he just flew to the east direction and found itself to the west of the place? All this is absurd and wrong and so also against the observation.

Argument No. 94: It is a just you traverse a certain distance and the fartherness from the place be hundreds of

times (khizri). But each and every man of sense knows that, for example, a bird flies from a certain place and as much it flies, that much is the distance of its flight from the starting point. But here it flies a mile only and the distance is thousand miles or more. Then it is obvious that if the speed of flight of the birds is one mile, the east-bound will fly in an hour 1035 miles and west bound will, also, fly the same distance of 1035 miles.

Argument No.95: In a certain time the distance, totally, from the starting place of branch, for example the mentioned one in the bygone argument, the particular tree and to its both the sides of the east bound as well as the west bound. In one and the same times, will be twice or something less or somewhat more of the earth's speed. (khizri)

My Statement: Firstly the speed of flight of the two birds should be equal to each other. And secondly, whereas the speed the west bound should be more than that of the east bound. And thirdly, whereas it should be contrary to it and so lightly, because may it be an arrow, or a bird or a ball, none of them traverses at the speed equal to one tenth of that of the earth. Naturally, if we consider the speed of both the birds as to be 1035 miles and 1037 miles, then in this condition the birds will have to shed their feathers as just before it has been mentioned that it is totally 2072 miles per miles which is double that of the earth and the west bound should fly only two miles and the east bound only one mile, then that one former would be at the distance of 1038 miles while the other latter would be at the distance of 1037 miles, totaling it to 2071 which is only a mile less than that twice of the earth, but we just observe that the total distance is not at all more than two to three miles. Hence, the motion of the earth is an absurdity.

Argument No. 96: Any bird that is to our North or south, in the air, cannot be hunted by an arrow (Miftah). The specification of south or North is of no value. On the

contrary the objection on that of the east is the most evident and it should be added in the transformation because that bird which was at the distance of ten yards from us would fall down at the distance of hundreds of miles. The explanation of it is such that till one lifts the arrow and the bow, adjusts the arrow on the bow, pulls the chord of the bow and lets the arrow go to its destination and takes barely two seconds and the hunter does all these action seeing the bird at ten yards distance from him, then during that much time the bird will be at a distance of one thousand thirteen yards due to the motion of the earth. And in this condition the arrow is left its destination as is the custom, the arrow will go straight in the direction of the north and till then the bird is in direction of North East. Or the bird is to the direction of south and the bird goes to the west. In all the tree conditions the arrow did not go to the direction of the bird. And that of the going of the arrow in the east direction is the most foolish act. And as regards its going to the west, although the direction is the same, the bird will cover the distance of 1023 yards. In this way more we throw the arrows in all the three directions and we change our destination with changing of the aim, then the bird that was in the east direction, will be in the west at more than one thousand or more miles away. And it was in the direction of north or south, it will be at the distance of one thousand and thirteen miles or a little more which is the square root of 1025863.84 [1] Any of the arrows is not reaching the destination. Take it for granted that all these action were completed before the bird came within the range of 10 yards. It means already before hand, due to certain reasons the arrow was rut on the bow and the bow was kept pulled up and stretched as to strike the bird when it would be at one thousand yards distance. And every

[1]: That time the distance was 10 yards and the earth slided 1012.8 yards. Both these sides make a right angle. And now, the distance is their hypotenuse.


thing was perfect and the arrow left the bow at the very moment when the bird was within the range of only ten yards and in the direction of the aim, then the arrow will do hit the bird. Because the also, like that arrow did not remain under the influence of the motion of the earth. But if the arrow reaches its destination in two seconds, then we, in the same time, would go to the east at the distance of one thousand thirteen yards. This will be just like those distances between the arrow and the bird in the second condition. And now the same condition would be ours. The same distance would be between that and us. So, now we will have to make a return to find out that hunted and fallen dead bird. Such kinds of events are fancies only to our hundreds of time observations. Therefore, the motion of the earth is absurd and absolutely false.

Argument No.97: An object (body) which might be still and static in the air, would seem to us flying very fast in the direction of the west (Miftah).

My Statement: In the modern physics it has been established that the air resists a thing to go up. The birds protect themselves against this resistance by flapping their wings. This power that they apply in such a condition is more than their body weight, hence they can go up. If it is less than their bodies then they will come down. If it is equal, they will remain static, and its example is given by the bird namely skylark which remains in the air static only by opening its wings and flapping them very often. In this condition it reaches its nest straight way.

Argument No. 98*[1] A bird which is sitting on a

[1]: This argument with the same title was added by us. Then we saw it in some other periodicals, and also saw the in the Hikmat-ul-Ain that a bird flying to the east would not reach its destination. And so wrote in its commentary before that.



column at a distance of a yard from its nest in the west of it, would not be able to reach its nest flying to it till day of judgement because it (the column) is sliding to the east at the speed of 506 yards per second. How can a bird cope with the speed of the earth? These seven arguments are in the refutation of the conventional motion of the earth. The refutation can be achieved, in the same manner as this, on the basis of the self-protection motion of the earth.

Argument No. 99[*1] For example, the earth is revolving around the sun. Take it for granted that A is the

[*1]: This argument is the reverse of our argument No 99. It was necessary that it should have come to the mind along with it. Some of our predecessors were in agreement with it that the earth is always climbing up and some of them believed that it is ever coming down and both of them have got two different opinions. One is that of being earth alone. Second is that the sky, too, is climbing up or it is coming down. I had not paid any attention on these absurd concepts and the argument on them because they were not pertaining to our purpose. Then, I happened to pass through the comment of Mujesthi that Batlimounus has given two resistances against second concept. One is so weak. It states that if it were so, then the earth would have merged with the sky. And not only that but also it would have gone ahead piercing through it. In the second one, he has kept the same transformation which coincides with that of our argument No.100 it states that the stone would not have descended to the earth. But he has described in it this way that if the declination of the bigger bodies is more then their speed of motion is more. And the resistance to its truth is that coming down of it is not dependent on the being of it heavy but it is because of its own tendency of lowering down towards its opposite bodies. Hence, it is possible that the stone may not lag behind. On it Allama Qutb Shirazi has given a reply that let not the stone lag behind, at least the speed of ascending so that as much it ascended should at least come down that much and in that period the earth came down and as much it came down, may come down still more than that. In the Sharah Mujesthi there is the refutation of it that it is possible that meanwhile the speed of the lowering down of the earth may lessen down and it may be so little that it may be felt, at all. Any way, it is but clear that all these, both, have no concern with our argument. This argument can be found in the book of

…..See next Page

apogee (the point of climax) and B is the last point of the depth and C is the sun and D be the earth. Say for example, India is towards D and America towards E. So if the earth is moving towards the Apogee, then the Indians and if the earth is moving towards the depth. Then the Americans wish to fire a bomb in the sky with as much power as they went to, the bomb will not go ahead of the cannon's mouth a hair's length at all because the bomb to which direction goes, the earth is following it and that too, at the speed of 19 miles per second. Hence, how can the bomb go ahead of the earth?

Argument No.100 My Statement: If the earth is moving towards the Apogee, then the Americans and if it is moving towards the depth, then the Indians throw a stone upwards their heads of the distance of 16 feet, it will not come down to the earth till the dooms day because it has been thrown to the opposite direction of the earth. The attraction of the earth would have brought it down to the earth at the speed of 16 feet per second. But till then the earth slided to the tune of 19 miles and in this condition it would be able to pull it down less than distance causes paucity of the attraction and its own speed remains the same 19 miles per second. Hence, the stone thrown up cannot come down to the earth. In these eleven arguments there are seven from the predecessors and we added four more on the same question and two more have come from the modern astronomy.

(…Remaining) Mujashti, Jaunpuri and ours No.99 is pertaining of its refutation. Batlimous, only left it contented on the refutation of the descending saying that whereas we have refuted its ascending, so naturally, its descending, too, is false because it is as to ascending from one side and descending from the other side. Jaunpuri, has, also given one more un-useful refutation that if the earth were to climb up, in the same way the stones, too, would ascend because it is their instinctive behavior. Hadyah-e-Saeediah has added one more addend a to it that a bigger stone can be thrown up more easily than a smaller one on the basis of its own tendency to do so is stronger. It is but evident that this inclination depends on its physical declination which is not accepted by the opponents. Our arguments are firm and clear and they may not be opposed to.

First Reply: The air, the rivers and whatever is on and with the earth are in motion alongwith the earth because of their dependence. Hence, the stone that may be thrown upward will not leave being parallel to the place of its throwing. Two birds that may fly to the east and the west, they will separate themselves from the branch of the tree only due to their own self-motion and the motion of the earth will not influence it in any way because the air is brining them alongwith the earth. Hence, neither the eastbound will remain static not the west bound would fly more and the eastbound one, neither it will fall down to the west and nor its distance would be more than its flight and nor the total sum of their distance would be more than their own motions.

My Statement: And as in regards to the west bound one, it is not far from reality that it should go to the west because of its own motion and to the east because of its dependence on the earth and the air, whereas the first one is the natural motion and the second one is the horizontal one. For example a ship is going to the east direction and in it there may be a shield that may be to its west. Pour water on that shield and you will see water going to the west due to its own speed and at the same time, there is no doubt, than in the same condition the ship is carrying it to the east. For example, take it for granted that you pour down water in the sea opposite a tree on the shore of the sea. You will see that the water flowed to the west a distance of a yard and during that time the ship moved ahead to the east for four yards, the water will be three yards away from its opposite sign of that tree and parallel to it, if the ship were to be static. This water would have gone away from the tree only a yard to the west. If the water had been stationary and the ship in motion, then it would have been at the distance of four yards to the east. In the same manner the air is taking away the bird alongwith the earth. So the bird will be on the same parallel latitude and at the same

distance of ten yards provided it does not move itself to any other side. That one who is static in the air, is so static that it has no motion of its own. He is going alongwith the air uninterrupted because of the transversal motion as the ship is static and it is moving alongwith the boat. The next would be at a distance if a hand and the tree is taken it away alongwith the earth and the air is taking away the bird alongwith the earth. The earth will not catch up with the ball (or the bomb) because in the air in which the ball is, the air is taking away it, too, alongwith the earth in the same speed of 19 miles per second. So in this condition, as much it was possible, it went ahead with the air equivalent to the earth and its own power of resistance. The earth will not go away from the stone with its own motion because the air is taking it in the same direction and with the same speed. Hence it will remain at the same distance of 16 feet and it will come down to the earth due to the attraction of the earth within a second. Five reasons were put forth in the authencity of this concept. And in your opinion two of them are correct. At the beginning of the statement three reasoning's were considered

(1) The horizontal movement of the atmosphere in persuent to the earth.

(2) There is an incidental movement in whatever is in the atmosphere due to their dependency.

(3) Being of these motions equivalent (simllar) to the subjective (its own) motion of the earth so that due to it the distance as well as the facing of each other of the things should remain in order. And it is clear that the proof may depend on many a factor but if one of the factors is proved to be faulty, this one is quite sufficient for the cancellation of all other factors. It is not necessary that all these factors should be false. Hence, the concept is taken to be refuted on the basis of all these three fundamentals.

Refutation No. 1: That atmosphere has encircled the earth and it, with all its components make

continues motion to different direction. So they are not the dependents of the earth and that one which has overwhelming power over its dependent cannot be dependent of one that is already overpowered. So there is no need of being its motion be incidental to that of the earth.

My Statement: Firstly, here, there is no difference being one triumphant and the other vanquished and nor there is any hindrance due to continues and perpetual motion. Our purpose is depending on that relation due to which the motion of one be related to that of the other. The cloths have covered the man and the sides of it stir up and make movements due to the air (wind). This is their perpetual movement. Moreover, besides all these, undoubtedly they are in perpetual motion due to the motion of the man himself. We are the seekers of information. Non-existence of exigency is not sufficient but there should be the exigency is non-being. The opponent requires only the reasoning. But it should be said that the opponent is the claimant of the motion of the earth and we are against it. And this image that he has set before us in these arguments is itself a proof of our opposition to the motion of the earth.

My Statement: It is being observed that these reasoning insisting on that, if the earth was in motion, these things might have happened. In this, we ourselves are the claimant that if the earth were to be in motion, these events would have happened for example, the stone would have fallen to the west side. Yes, of course it would have been so, and if we connive at it, even then the bounds of triumphant and the vanquished are still there and unnecessary, too. If the vanquished were to be the absolute and the triumphant were to be vanquished (dependant) then it was necessary that it should have been that in motion due to its associates, incidentally. Then there was the need of these bindings. But there, too, they are not needed, at all. If

two wheels are within each other and if there is not such a relation that the motion of one resists the motion of the other one, then which ever you turn that will turn also provided there is not other perpetual motion in any of them. Consider a gear or a wheel. They turn but not that road that which they turn. May be there the binding of being the one non dependant and if it is dependant, it will turn, also, on its own.

My Statement: The dependence of a body on another body is not binding as situation to situation. And, most probably, the binding of being triumphant (enclosing) may be essential for the ancient astrology of Greece to defend them in their theory that a planet is under the control of revolution. The revolution is in continuation due to its processor being representative to another processor and lastly the heaven (sky) of all the heavens. Thus this revolution is incidental depending own each other's motion. And each one has got its own motion separately.

My Statement: In our view, first of all the heaven is not in motion as it would be described in the end by the grace of Allah. And there is no need to know laws of the Philosophy, the similitudes, the expansion, the heaven, the revolutions and the bearers of it. If the need be there it would only be at the time of the research. But these motions are never incidental in the horizontal motion the revolving one parallel to the earth is itself static and the motion of some other is attributed to it. For example, the Jars ship or grain filled in the packed vehicle. And here these heavens and the other parts are themselves in motion due to the daily motion although the cause of their motion is the motion of the celestial circle of the heavens. If the sky of the zodiac signs were not to be in motion, how can the rising and setting of the planets and the phases of zodiac signs would occur? Surely and certainly, the transfer of them place to place is going on with them, too, if there were any other means in their occurrence, this self-

produced (spontaneous) motion would be dependent on some other one, For example, the turning of the key with the turning of the hand. It is not the transversal or the horizontal motion in which there is not the transfer along with it but it is attributed to it through some other.

And Secondly ***My Statement,*** And Allah is the Most Right One. In our view the fact is this that in the self-created (own) motion no trace of motion parallel the latitude of the earth could be found, till the time in the compactness of whatever is the incidental motion and whatever is the self created motion, may change its imaginary place due to its conventional (positive) motion. We mean here, by the imaginary place that atmosphere which has circumvented whatever is the incidental motion. So it is clear that the carrier is into one part of the atmosphere encircling it and it is revolving in the compactness of the carrier. When the carrier will make its conventional motion, consequently, the revolving will come to the other part of the atmosphere from the former port. If it is full static itself, necessarily, its situation will change due to its conventional motion as its imaginary place changed although the accepted and recognized place is intact. On the contrary to the carrier or the eccentric, if both the complimentaries are taken for one body it will remain intact in its compactness but due to their revolving its imaginary place (position) will not change. So this will not be in motion parallel to the latitudes because of their motion in Jaunpuris "Sham's Bazigah", this claim has been made that if it does not turn along with it, then 1 will stop its revolving. It is meaningless on the basis of two reasons.

(1) This one is not situated in its path and nor it is so adhered to it that it may not allow it to revolve it on its own.

(2) And take it for granted it is in its path obstructing it and not allowing to revolve, then will it stop from revolving? There cannot be any scope for that due to

the conventional motion. And if it is even stuck to it, then it will do revolve due to their revolving. But this transfer of their position will also be applicable to it provided it may be in connection with the other, Then it would not be parallel to the latitude but to its own, in short, in the condition of the self-created motion, there is no scope for the parallel to latitude motion except this condition mentioned above. And whosoever claims and challenges t is up to him to make the explanation. The philosophy has got only the claim and so they run away from the compulsion the partnership means to go along with each other and not that one may be stationary (static) and the motion of the other may be attributed to that one. The discussion on the functioning of the wheels just is over, in that view the arguments of both the parties in relation to the motion parallel to the latitude has no scope here. Avisina and later on Jaunpuri mentioned before hove claimed that the motion parallel to the latitude of the earthly sphere do exists in partnership with the heaven (the celestial Sphere) on the ground that every part of the earthly sphere has taken its opposite part of the heaven as if its own natural place and due to the unconsciousness it s not known whether having left it, it will find some other part, nearer and opposite to it, Helplessly, it has made itself dependent of it. Hence, when it moves ahead, this, too, moves ahead lest it break its association with that The objection on it was raised as to why the circuit (the celestial orbit) of the heavenly bodies be in motion parallel to the equator due to the circuit of the earthly sphere. And its parts hove not held fast the parts of that one whereas it has got its separate motion with it. To this their reply was that the poles of that one have made dependent to themselves to their own opposite ports and that one is not on their poles. Therefore, its poles are turning round due to the motion of those parts. Consequently, the whole sphere is turning.

My Statement: These stories like that of those of that Shaikh Chilli (the eccentric) were to be accepted and believed by our Muslim brethren, then as to why these self conceited men of wisdom did not think at least when this earth and the zodiac circuit hove got this motion for the protection of their own place, then should it not be their own natural motion rather than the motion parallel to the latitudes?

Thirdly: The opponents need not take it for parallel to the latitude as to them the atmosphere, the surface of the earth and all is one sphere and the only one and it is in motion due to its own unitary motion.

The Second Refutation This second is the refutation of the first one. Why should the water and the air which are on the earth follow it because they are not adherent to the earth and the river in motion parallel to it may not force it due to its adherence to it, to move in parallel to the earth. Otherwise, the motion of the whole world of the earth might become parallel to the latitude because every one has got the adherence within adherence. Now, it is but compulsory that the stone that may be thrown up from the ship will not come back to the ship. On the contrary, it will fall down to the west because the river is in motion parallel to the latitude due to motion of the earth. The ship will go along with to the east but the stone is not now over the ship, it is in the air and the air s in motion parallel to the latitude. And till the stone might come to the ship, it has slipped away at a distant place.

My Statement: Firstly and only the sky of the planets, the only one, that is attached to the sky of the whole universe. How could, in your view, its parallel motion would go to the sky of the moon having stopped down at least the seven stair- cases. Secondly, the same, whereas the whole sphere is the one unitary sphere, then all and all the whole one is in motion.

The Third Refutation The first one is the refutation of the second one. Any body that may lift another body and it may settle on it, then its motion due to the motion of the other one is parallel to the latitude and that is guaranteed. And*[1] If it does not settle on it and it is not able to control it then it will not be depending on it and will not follow it at all and there is no question of its motion should make it in motion. This is a very clear and spontaneously evident and its denial is a great fault.

Fourth Refutation The second one is the refutation of the second. This has been described by the learned Scholar Qutbuddin Shirazi in Tohfa-e-Shahiah that taken for granted that the air might come to motion due to the circular motion of the earth, even then the effect on the big stones should be less than that of on the smaller stones, Because as much bigger the body, will be less affected by the stirring of the other. So, in all these seven arguments (i.e. the 11 arguments) we will once more show you the heavy bodies and once the small bodies. At least there should be the difference between them. For example, we throw up a stone and a feather. The feather will come there and there only because it will be affected so much by the

[*1] *This one, undoubtedly, is a reasonable thing. This was accepted by Miftah Al Rasad before it was so done by Hadiyah Sadiyah. But in the chess board he added a duck and a tune in a violin. It made it rotten. He says: The motion of the air making the bodies in motion parallel to the latitude is not possible practically because the motion cannot be thought of. But when a body in motion parallel to the latitude gets place in a body in a motion naturally on its own or by force, it cannot be done to come into motion of its own natural motion. But it's seen every where in motion by the motion of its own nature. Then how* can *it be transformed into the motion parallel to the latitude. Then how can it be transformed into the motion parallel to the latitudes. My statement Firstly, this how is explained by the condition of that water which was poured down on a shield in a ship in motion. Secondly, those bodies that can be lifted up by the air, for example, the vapour and the smoke of the vapour, their motion is not aversed to the motion of the air, then its full negativism is not proper*

parallel to the altitude motion and the stone will not fall down there and there but will fall down to the west because it will lake the full benefit of the air. But actually it is not so. It is the reverse of it. And the stone comes down there and there only and the feather changes its place. From the side of the opponents, Allama Abdul Ali, has in the Sharha Mujasthi given three answers.

(1) Having taken the partnership for granted to deny it is a strange denial. The partisanship*[1] of the air is taken for granted and not of the stone. This is a strange objection, In the Commentary of the Mujasthi, it is said that the reply can be in this way that the aim of objection is to deny the partnership with the stone. On the contrary if it is in motion, then it can be only due to the compulsion by the air. And as such the air became partisan to the earth because its orbit is the dependent of the earth. The stone has no such a relation with the air.

*[1]*In the Sharha-e-Hikmat Al Ain, there is no partisanship. Otherwise it's only possible when both the stones fell flown. And in the Sharha Mujasthi, the statement is as such that if there were the air to be in motion like that of that motion, it was necessary that the stones should not have fallen down.*

***My statement:** This argument is wrong in the sense of pa4anjhip of the air to the earth because had it wished it could have remained behind. And the first refutation seals its refutation. Undoubtedly, it is probable that the stone may be aversed to the partisanship with the air after having accepted the partnership of the air which if the air were to accept, even then the stone would not accept it with it and it would not have come down. And firstly, he was impressed by the wisdom of the Khizri. But later on the owner of the Tohgat, in the refutation of the partnership of the air with the earth, says that if there had been the partnership with it, then the stones would not have come down. And I take it for granted so. Secondly, and he is right. Verily, variation of the effect in the two stones lies in their partisanship with the air and not the partisanship of the air with the earth. This reply was given by the earned Khizri, in his Sharh Tazkerah and Jaunpuri has kept it as it is.*

***My Statement*:** Firstly, doubling the answer is unnecessary. Secondly, this excess is on exaggeration and without purpose. Is the dependence on the heaven useful for partisanship? If that were so, all the skies (the universe) will be dependent. And if the very aim that there is such a relation with the *air,* and if is somewhat doubtful, even then there is not that much with the stone at all.

My Statement: There is the adherence with the one surface only and here it has been encircled by all the sides. Secondly, the variation of the effect between the two stones, one of them smaller one and the other bigger one, become evident by the experiment. And that here it is excused on the basis that the bigger stone would not be thrown upward and nor the smaller one would be affected in its motion due to the air. The Allamah said that a stone of one seer weight would not be deranged and at the same time he can throw a stone of three seer weight upward. That answer itself is absurd. Firstly, whereas it can be pushed down from upside. ***Secondly,*** he himself made a difference that the smaller one will be affected by the air and not the bigger one. That was the aim of refutation because they may not be affected equally. Secondly, in the acceptance of the difference of being smaller and bigger in being affected by the motion is the judgement of the rationality. It does not require the experiment. ***(3) Thirdly,*** the variation of effect on the smaller and bigger is existing in the motion of compulsion. They ore equal in the motion of the parallel to the latitude. In a ship, the elephant or the cat, both of them will traverse the same distance of the journey. Allamah said that it has been ascertained that the motion parallel to the latitude of one body due to the motion of the other is possible only when this one should be the representative port or it should be its natural place, The stone has not got both types of relation, then if at all the motion of the air be of the type of parallel to the latitude, it will give motion to the stone and that, too,

coercively. And this is not prevented. For example, the Jaul's ship can give a coercive motion to another thing. The thing in motion parallel to the latitude con give coercive motion to some other and this one can also force the motion parallel to the latitude, provided that be the self-protective movement. For example, in the Jaul's ship, some branches of a tree may come opposite to it and will pass by due to its collusion. Every self-protecting motion has got the power to protect itself but it is not in the conventional motion of which the research will be made by us in the excessive exaggeration, so the analogy is in spite of vast difference. In the Hadyah-e-Sayeediah this third one is refuted in this manner that in the motion parallel to the latitude, too, the equivalence is not intact. If you put a log of wood and a stick in flowing river, you will find that the stick will flow faster.

My Statement: Here it is not simply parallel to the latitude but also there is the coercive motion because the waves coming from behind are pushing ahead those which are ahead of them. For example, the stick is more affected by the log of the wood.

Fifth Refutation: The third one is the refutation of the second one. The non-adherence of things with the air is evident spontaneously. Otherwise, no bird would have been able to fly, not the cloud would have moved ahead. And whereas, it is not adherent (stuck), then it is not impossible that the air might [eave them off. and the stone thrown might fall down to the west. And so many other transformations (in the Work of Mujasthi) are only but a weak and unfounded reply. Not being impossible, the falling is not necessary. The motion of the celestial sphere of the universe, too, is not without the motion of the other celestial spheres. But it never occurs without them. (Sharha-e-Mujasthi)

My Statement: The refutation of being the motion of the celestial spheres parallel to the latitude has already

passed by. Tusi was not so much a fool that he should have given question against a question and reason to reason. The main point is that the refutation of the common facts without any reason is simply showy, it is not acceptable by simply saying probably or but etc, it is but common that a body keeping its adherence weak is not always dependent on it in its motion but most probably leaves it off, Don't you see that the air is flying them up and having gone to some distance they fell down? Then what of the stones? But it does not happen contrary to it. Since long this world is existing it has never been heard that a stone was thrown upward and it tell down in the west at a distance of thousands of yards. And such more transformations are made. Had it happened so, the history would have been full with such stories. This is the most uncommon thing and it cannot perpetuate only on the basis of probability. Whereas there is no liability, in the common way, there could have happened contrary to it, too. Moreover it would have often happened so. And if there is the liability, then it should be such that the stone should have been stuck into the air, and its refutation is spontaneous. This one is the extremity of the explanation of this argument. And if by being it stuck into the air, its being there stationary is taken, undoubtedly it is correct but at that time the same refutation to it will be applicable as is in the Third Refutation.

Sixth Refutation: The refutation of the third is that the air is very mild and rare. Its components get loose with a mild effect. Then if in this condition it makes motion parallel to the latitude, even then it is not necessary that it should live along with the earth in any condition. So, whichever is, by now, in the air and opposite to a certain place on the earth, how can it remain opposite to that place?

My Statement: Like the third one, this refutation is correct. The only thing is that, firstly the binding of the motion of parallel to the latitude should be forsaken so that

there should not be any ob objection that the air nearer to it is the motion of its own. ***Secondly***, it is not necessary here to say that the place will not remain along with so that there should not occur the need for the argument of the reasonable and objectionable. And, lastly at the end, he himself admits that it will not remain opposite to it. On the contrary, he should have said that there is no need of remaining opposite to it. If you would like to say that it will not remain along with it, then what is the proof?

My Statement: The rational wisdom and the observation both are witness to it and the modern astronomy*[1], admits that the ports of a solid and dense body, remain intact while in motion, till it is not so strong that it might loosen the connection of them and the parts of them. And the parts of a light and fluid body get loosen with a little motion, and they don't follow the order of this system. Then, it was necessary that with such a forceful motion of earth the air and the water should have been dispersed all around. And it would not like this that every port of them that was opposite to the part of the earth should remain along with it, As if it is a very solid and hard body and it is fixed in the other very solid and hard body, by nails. By these discussions it is clear that the motion parallel to the latitude of the objects and their following the course of the air and the water is the lame excuse on which the foundation of the house of the modern astronomy lies on. It is baseless due to two reasons.

This Chapter III was complete and I was intending to write down and begin with the fourth chapter when I received from my dearest son Maulavi Husnain Raza Khan the Sharha Hikmatul Ain and I found in it two more refutations which are both about the refutation of the First.

*[1] *If you shake a fluid body, you will be the cause of its un-level surface. This is a perfect law.*

I have adapted them as they are and refuted them, too. They are as follows:

Seventh Refutation: If it is in motion due to this motion, then we should hove felt it. This can be refuted only when we don't come into motion due to its motion when the ship is moving fast and as much fast it moves, the air that is tilled up in it, will also move along with it with the same speed but it will not be felt by the passengers in it. It means when the ship is static it will not come into motion with its own self-motion.

Refutation Eighth: The clouds and the air, while in motion towards the east, might not be felt so. And more especially when the speed would be very slow. On the contrary, their motion to the west will be impossible although so much stronger pushing is received by them casting them to the west.

The coming into motion of the air due to the motion parallel to the earth is to its opposite direction. The slow and soft self motion of a body is not hindered by the presence of the person riding the ship, Otherwise the rider of the ship might not be able to move against the direction of the ship because it is speedier than the motion of the air inside the ship and he does not prevent the feeling of this soft motion , otherwise, the stone thrown in the opposite direction of the ship would go away and it may not be felt and likewise the air of the fan may not be felt when it is in the opposite direction.

My Statement: These, both of them, are refutation that are the outstanding argumentations were taken by us as the own creation of the author of the "Hadyahe-Saadiyah" The seventh of them is fully in conformity with Argument No. 105 and the eighth one, its both the parts, conform with the Arguments Nos. 101 & 102, The rest two are of the same type, Thus they are five in all. Or, those are just adapted from these two. And we will make research to

make them nullified. But the explanation, still more, is necessary, so please wait for the same.

My Statement: Any way, the modern astronomy has given the proofs of being their both the assumptions to be false. The basis of their so-called assumptions is on two things. One is the motion of the weather and the second one is the circular motion equivalent to the motion of the earth and whatever things are on and into it. The refutation of both of these is made by itself on the basis of this motion being dependent on the water and the air. First, they made a claim that the air on the equator does not move alongwith the earth. It follows and lags behind it from the western side. (No.19) ***Secondly*** the winds that come from the side of poles for equalization do not move alongwith the earth. And helplessly, their direction is changed (No.11). ***Thirdly,*** if the solid earth had revolved on its axis, the water upon the polar regions would have left its place and would have come to the equator and would have made a heap of itself there (20). ***Fourthly*** the earth was in the liquidic form in the beginning. And due to the motion it did not remain in its shape of the sphere. It become leveled on the poles and swollen on the equator. (No.21) ***Fifthly,*** In the Fourth chapter it will be seen in the discussion of the doubts in relation to the motion of the earth pertaining to the claims of the Modern Astronomy. As its claim that whichever is in motion in South to North direction, will be in motion on the same level and the earth will revolve underneath it. And that one will not revolve alongwith the earth. Hence, it is proved that neither the air nor the water depends upon the earth. That is they ore not the followers of the earth. And it is the same about the other bodies that are in them. So, both the assumptions are false and the excuse of the motion parallel to the latitude is nullified.

SECOND ANSWER

When the modern astronomy could not depend itself, helplessly, had to rely on some other false assumption that whichever body is in some other body in motion, its motion fills in that body to such an extent that the motion of the body having stopped, it remains in this body having separated from that body. My statement: That means a stone in the air is not in motion parallel to the latitude. On the contrary to it as if the stones mad to run away to the east side with the speed of one thousand miles per hour and more than eleven hundred miles per minute outside. Now it is to be judged by the people of the justice to think whether any body has heard of such a strange thing or more strange than that. The opponents are unaware of the method of argument. They are unable to give reason to it and helplessly want to prove it with these six examples. And we should describe the above statement as a contribution unnecessary. The examples are as under:

Fill up a glass with water and tie it to the mast of the ship. Keep another one under it. The drops that will toll down due to the motion of the ship, and they will not go, out of that gloss under (Hadayique). This means that it is so due to the motion of the ship and the motion is created in the drops, too. And these drops, too, are as much in motion as is the ship itself, Hence, They don't leave their parallel body. In the second example, its wording is as follows:

Being in partnership with the motion of the ship they tall down below the mast. From it, it is evident they mean what the other modern astronomists have said that in that body, too, the same motion was created. And if due to the parallel to the latitude motion i.e. the motion of the ship the air upto the mast and these drops due to the motion of the air are in motion parallel to the latitude, then leaving apart this that as to how the parallel to the latitude motion

of the air should have reached the mast? Then that much air which is filled up in the ship is quite sufficient for the reply of this that if ever the drops of water were to be in motion accidentally, due to the parallel to the latitude motion in the air, then how can it be applied to a stone of a hundred ton weight which the air cannot bear the burden and what of that it cannot even support it? There are three refutations against it in Miftah-Al-Rasad.

The first one is that even if we take it for granted to be so.

My Statement: Which of the observation do they talk of where the drops don't fall off the glass, then you stand on the top of your building and having on the ground a glass, pour out from a pail of water by your hand by jerking it and see that some drops fall down. There is no guarantee that the drops should fall down into the glass down on the ground. On the contrary most of the droops will drop out of the glass there on the ground. This but is the habit of the people to describe their fancies and imaginations in the garb of their observations.

Second: The wind that is giving motion at the ship will give the motion to the drops, too.

My Statement: It means the steam-ships, too, are helped by the wind. If it is not in conformity with its direction, then they apply the curtains (i.e. the sails).

Third: The above glass is tied to the mast in the ship. It is pushed by its motion to its own direction. This pushing also is received by the drops and they are directed to the same direction. And it does not allow them to drop against their former opposite (the paralle signs). If you throw your hand to the side with full of water, the drops will fall to the direction to which side you had thrown down your hand and not where they had separated themselves from the hand and exactly not to their opposite of the place they had separated.

My Statement in Respect Of Fourth Refutation

In the second example it is as (2) if you drop a stone from the mast of the ship, it will come down directly and will foil down on at its foot. As a mailer of tact, till it comes down from above the ship slipped away far from the original place but it will not leave its parallel having been partisan to the motion of the ship. (Hadayique)

My Statement: The whole basis is on the imagination. As if this one (the opponent) climbs the mast and from there throws the stone and its coming down on the perpendicular line is experimented. What was the weight of the stones? What was the condition of the wind? What was its direction? What speed the ship was journeying at? What was the direction? What was the height of the Masts and to how much height is the air affected due to the motion of the ship? Of what weight was the stone with which you had climbed up? Had you left it with holding it in your both the hands? Had you left it slowly or had you thrown it off and to what direction had your hand extended to? Had you left t straight way parallel to the opposite sign? Had the stone settled down there and there only where it had fallen or had it jumped up? What is the answer to this limit? The fact will come to the light, had these questions answered thoroughly and that is as if they had a dream in which they had seen the drops falling in that glass below only. By the grace of Allah, the absolute arguments are going to follow and only after that their eyes would be opened and will see as there is nothing of what they were dreaming at (No.12).

In Chapter SECOND, arguments No. 30 to 36, you have seen how these people present their fancies in the garb of their observations. And more solid example will be seen in Chapter IV (Insha-Allah). In chapter IV, we are dealing with the same claim of these people that eminent

Geometricians have made experiments and found that if you throw a stone from above, the stone will not fall down straight way there and there only. On the contrary, t falls oft the east direction, Now here their proclamation that a stone. if thrown down from the mast, will fall straight way there and there only, It is a thing so strange. There is no question being a stone to be reckoned with. And a drop falling from the glass tied to the mast tolls down in the glass put below it is wonderful. Here they forgot the motion of the earth. In short their tongue has no limit to anything as if a dozen of ploughs are working before their tongues. And whatever they desired, were prompt to say and got free having based them on their observations.

(3) If a horse or a carriage is in speed and they stop abruptly, then the head of the rider goes ahead of the rider. As soon as the ship touches the bank of the river, the passengers are likely to fall down their faces to the ground if they are not cautious, the reason of it as this. The motion of the carriers had entered into the passengers and as much as it was of the carriers. Those carriers stopped and become standstill and this motion was still in the passengers. And that was the effect of it.

My Statement: Firstly, the ship may not strike the shore or the horse or the carriage may run slowly and steadily and in that condition they stop all of a sudden or they may be running speedily and they may stop steadily, then nothing may happen. Why should it happen so? Now, the motion had not entered in them. And the reason behind it is the sudden stroke and not the other way. This is also the type of dozen of observations that the train may start from the station all of a sudden and if a passenger, if he is not cautious, he would fall down. Then this time, which motion was there? This is nothing except the sudden stroke.

(4) Let the water be filled up in a vessel. Shake it and stop it all of a sudden, you will see that the water is still shaking it means the motion is still filled up into it.

My Statement: If it is filled up with flour, then why does it not keep shaking? The motion can be tilled up in a stone, why should it not be filled up in the flour? Secondly, the water is light and rare, the shaking of it gave it the motion itself and being the less solidity of its parts, it lasted till long time. And it is not due to this that the motion of the shaking agent came in it, too. It is humbug.

(5) An English acrobat sets up two poles of such a height, in the ground that a horse may pass down below it. And at that much height, he ties a rope to both the poles. Then he stands up on the back of the horse playing tricks with the boll and galloping the horse, as soon as it aches the rope, the horse passes through these poles and down below the rope and at time he jumps up over the rope and suddenly he is on the back of the horse playing tricks with the ball as usual. The reason of it is this only that the motion of the horse was in the rider and that of the rider was still in the ball, only thing that he had to do was to jump up.

My Statement: Firstly, whatever was felt by the acrobatic teats of the acrobat, you hove to reason on it, it has so many hidden factors.


Secondly, suppose the back of the horse is from its neck to its hind part about one and half yard and if the rope is tied to the poles at the height of twelve Girhas and the acrobat is standing near the neck of the horse. In as much time the back of the horse will pass through the poles and under the rope, in that much time the acrobat will come above the rope on the back of the horse. And if the rope is less than twelve Girhas above, then there will be still easier. And if t is more than that, even then it will be less than the height of the rider. Otherwise he would not have to jump up. So the purpose is that in such a short journey,

the jumping of the rider is more than the speed of the horse, in comparison. Is it so impossible? Specially, to a trained horse, patting the horse, that much time is quite sufficient to shirk and break the speed of his own. And if you don't believe it and the same condition you want to put forth in which the journey of the acrobat, passing through the poles is more than the passing of the horse, then our explanation will have no scope. In that case it would be far better because then your explanation itself would be the worst of all. You are filling the speed of the horse into the acrobat then where from that much speed will come into him? For example, the rope is two yards high and he came just near to it and sprang up and again he came on the back of the horse where he was formerly. Then it is just the horse passed by the rope in that much time. That is equal to the width of the rope. It can be taken for a finger's width. And the acrobat, in that much time, passed on to the distance of 193 fingers. This is for 96 at the time coming and 96 at the time of going. And the rope is equal to only a finger's width. And the acrobat is then not an acrobat but an engine in which there is the power of 193 horses. When the power of 192 horses came to it then the one can be taken for having come from else where. The horse need not exert itself for it. And now take the ball. That is but the trick of the acrobat's hand, the hunter, at the time of firing at a flying bird speculates before and that how much during that time the bird will pass on. The rest of the reasoning comes in an orange.

(6) If you play with an orange like the acrobats do as throwing up and catching it down, while you are traveling in a train, you find that the orange falls in your hands although during the time of its going up and coming down we hove moved somewhat ahead. Then it is clear that the train's speed is transferred into the orange and it does not allow it to separate it from its opposites.

My Statement: This assumption is absolutely unreasonable that one body in one time itself should make two different motions of self-protection in two different directions. Naturally, if two motions were to gather in an orange, it would have moved up in a slanting line[*1] and would have come down in the same slanting line.


For example, a train is going from A to B. You are at A. You throw the orange up. This motion is carrying to it towards C but the motion of the train which is transferred into it, is trying to carry it towards B. And both the forces are not so opposite that one should pull it from ahead and the other one from behind. If both the forces were equal there would not be any effect in fact. Otherwise, it will go to the one overwhelming one. Here, it is not so. On the contrary both the directions ore different and not the opposite to each other. So the orange would accept the effect of both of them. And it should not go towards C, not towards B. Then it should have been the effect of one force only, Necessarily, it has to go in between both of them towards E. As you say the sun pulled it towards it and the repulsion pulled it to the other side of the right angle. Hence it neither come here, nor went to the other side, On the contrary it passed by in between the two. (No.5) Then



[*1] *in reality this line should not have been a straight one. On the contrary it should be similar to a collection of many a small straight lines. It should not have been an arc, also. It should only seem to be as it has passed in the discussion of the earth. But they are many very small lines and there cannot be made distinction, therefore the arc is taken for equilateral triangle as we cannot distinguish between a smaller arc and a hypotenuse.*

when it reached B and the thrower's effect was exhausted; the attraction or the natural inclination of the earth, as you call it is bent upon bringing it towards E D. But the motion of the train which has entered the orange wants to bring it towards line E F and in that condition it would have liked to come down on the E H, And in that much time you reached from A to H and the orange came down into your hands. This is the manner in which the two motions can act together. But we see that the orange never makes this kind of triangle into its going up and coming down. It means the triangle AHE. It climbs up straight way and comes down in the same manner and if there is some refraction, then it would not go up in the same manner up, nor it would come down so you would say that it happens so, But the refraction is light. So it is not felt.

My Statement: It is never so light. On the contrary, it is extensive. Take it for granted that the orange is thrown up with such a power that it should go up a yard's distance and only one minute should pass in between its going up and coming down and the train is running at the speed of 30 miles per hour. So its speed is 15 feet in a second. It means it will go ahead 14.6 feet exactly. Now in the triangle AFH, the base AH is 15 feet and the perpendicular ED is 3 feet.



So both the angles[*1] A&H are 21 degrees 48 minutes each. Hence, angle AEH will be 68.1-12. It means the disjunction of the orange from the earth is less than one fourth whereas the distance from the face of the man is three limes more. Take AH, a line and the orange went to the line A E. Can any a senseful man think of so much slanting turning to H. Whereas you connived at the motion

parallel to the latitude of their earth and took for granted the transferring of the train's motion into the orange. In such a condition having the combination of two self protecting motions, it is up to you to find out the solution to these two figures. These motions are above ones' heads. Can you find this excuse?

It is so because the orange and the man, both of them, are equal partners in the motion of the train. Hence, it always remained opposite to the head and the slanting line was taken for straight one. But this condition that the orange was thrown up a yard upside, will not accept this excuse. Some people took for the ship, in this example, that it would throw away the orange and said that it was thrown up with full force and comes into hands.

My Statement: Firstly, this is even easier. To throw it up on the perpendicular line is possible only when the hand is kept straight and pushed up in such a way that the hand should not be slanted to any side. This would be a very light motion. To throw up is to be thrown in a slanting line and it is always so because the line itself will be slanting. Let the ship be going to a certain direction. You stand up against the direction in it and throw the stone with full power and a strong jerk of your hand, then see as to where the orange goes. Secondly: Take it for granted that you threw it ahead in a straight line, it will not reach the desired goal because the air does not allow it to go in a straight line. You have observed that the fire balls (crackers) thrown up in the sky do not go up in a straight line. And they do not come down in a perpendicular line, too, And as such these fire balls were thrown with full force in a perpendicular line. Then who is that made them slanting in their going up and coming down? And who is

[*1] in an equilateral triangle:
ED : AH:: tangent A : H = 3 x 60 / 7.5 = 24
of the tan of the triangle. The quantity of the angle = 21.48.

that who gave them so much power? In the same manner, having stood on the ground, fire a bullet from your gun. Will it go straight way and come into the gun again? These are very spontaneous things. So it is clear that there is no fixed direction of their slanting (or the refraction). In the same manner, the orange thrown from the ship with full power can be caught up into hands only but in a slanting position, otherwise that, too, will go to a uncertain slanting direction. And thus it will be open to you like the stone relating to the mast that it is none but your dream and here there is much more scope for discussion like that of the glass at mast and so on. But we are bent upon making objections and refutation that will be applicable to all the examples.

My Statement: Firstly, as many examples we gave there in all and all is the presence of the power of repulsion in the motion of the self-protecting motion. See argument (87) where you will find that every time there has occured inclination of one unitary motion in the object repulsed, by which the stone thrown has come to motion. And as this motion, now, resists the obstruction, the related object, too, is not safe from its effect. in the riding of the horse, the whole body is in motion, in a bus a man feels giddy and in a ship a passenger is dozing and feels his head turning. Taking it for granted, if it so happens due to the intensity of the motion, then having come to end that motion or having separated it brings some change, then that is wonderful. The interval is for this reason that the stone comes in motion only after the motion of the hand comes to standstill and the stone separates from the hand. It can not be speculated that the self made motion of the air and water cannot make repulsion twice. The self created motion, be it absolutely own or may it be self created its research will be made in the discussion of the excessiveness of the exaggeration later on. When t has not to move ahead or elsewhere, it has no repulsion power because it has not to

defend against any body in its way. It is on its own way and if any other body is in its compactness in such a manner that it has connection with the body of the sphere from all the sides as it is in respect of the sphere of the atmosphere, in that condition if the sphere can lift it up, it will go on lifting it. There will not be a stirring in it, a little bit even. Otherwise it will fall down. And here the stone, so big one, to which the air is supporting and it cannot keep on supporting it for a moment is out of rational mind because when it is stillness all where, when a leaf is not able to stir up, at that time the air may take a 100 ton rock in its lapse and fly with the speed of thousand of miles per hour, Whereas the circular or spherical motion does not give any motion to that one which is in the compactness of that one which is revolving due to the above reason. Then as to what effect that is transferred in the mind of the stone? And it is spontaneously impossible that a stone may fly on its own thousands of miles. Hence, these examples make it evident that the motion of the earth is mere fancy. Would you deny it and say that the circular (spherical) motion too, is pushing it and the air, too, which is in its compactness or would you say that this is not our found out self-made motion after a research in (No.33)? In short the idea of motion of the earth is false.

One: A minor tempest of thirty to forty miles per hour speed can uproot trees, can shake forts. In comparison to that this one for the whole day and night with the speed of 1036 miles per hour, so intensive wouldn't it has made every thing topsyturvy? What is a man compared to it? It wouldn't have spare the mountains even. In the same manner those eight mountains representing the three arguments numbering 87 to 89 in refutation to No. second to ninth and five in the excessive exaggeration have been mentioned, all and all would have been false and baseless and will remain false, Still more fanciful that you considered the motion of the stones etc. to be coercive in

place of being it incidental. There is no excuse from this fourth resistance because in the inductive motion the variation of the effect In comparison to powerful and weak is necessary and compulsory. If the effect is only for the stopping, men who will carry along a stone of a maund's weight? And if a stone of one maund of weight can be thrown in a minute to the distance of 20 miles then a smallest one of a weight of a Masha can be thrown to the distance of a thousand miles. Then how can there be the equality? Any way, it is proved that the motion of the earth is nothing but a bare falsehood.

Secondly: This statement was to make your reins to get loose. Now let us make it straightened. When the motion is transferred into a body, it is never under obligation to anybody else till the motion ends. As soon as it is exhausted, it falls down suddenly due to its own natural declination or the attraction of the earth. Moreover its power is exhausted slowly and steadily. It gets weaker and weaker and at last the declination or the attraction overcomes it. Both the points are clear from the stone thrown. If ever the motion of the stirrers had to fill in the bodies, there must have been keyed the motion in the stone on the running ship and it must not stop even after the ship has stopped and for some more time The stone should have been in motion and it should move ahead a little more distance. In the some manner the vessels and other utensils are put into the box, they should, also, for some seconds move ahead. If the ship were to break into pieces, even then the passengers should go some distance ahead in the speed of the ship. In a train, if a plank in the middle of it breaks down, it will not at once fall down. It must go at some distance and then stop only with its own inclination or the attraction of the earth. Even if the horse falls down, the acrobat should go some more distance with the speed of the horse till the transferred speed comes to an end and it is affected by the attraction of the earth. Those drops that

were falling in the glass below, should, now drop out ahead of the glass below in the direction of the journey of the ship. On The contrary, till they come down and the ship stopped. They should go ahead out of the ship because the glass below has stopped and in those drops the transferred motion is still there. In the same manner, while the ship stops and we drop down a stone from its mast, it should not fall down below the foot of the mast ahead of it. And if it is falling and is in the middle of its course and the ship is stopped, then it should change direction. And also, in a running carriage, those passengers whose backs are to the direction of the horse and the carriage stops suddenly, their heads should not go ahead but go back as if they have been given the key to change their direction here & there. And now, in a running train, an orange is thrown up, it should not come into hands but fall down some distance ahead. These are ten of its kind and there are still more in hundreds. How many transformations have you come across? ***Thirdly:*** A stone that is put on the ground and it is revolving alongwith it. And this revolution is not of his own created because neither it is a sphere, nor it is revolving on its axis and the motion in it is the transferred motion whose follower is moving ahead and intersecting the circle of the earth. If the air and the earth stopped revolving for some time, even then the stone will go ahead. As you said that even if the instigator stops, its motion in that still remains. So it must be the self protecting motion in respect of it. Moreover, it is a fact that the earth and the air, too, are moving alongwith it and by which the system does not change and It is not that it does not want to change the system. On the contrary, the system does not want to leave it, at all. Hence, there is no doubt that its motion on the circle of the earth is in such a manner as the whole of the sphere of earth and other planets have got on their axis and it is undoubtedly the self-protecting motion. And the self-protecting motion defends itself against its


opponent. So it is necessary that the piece of the stone that is kept on the ground and which you can get it move to the east with a push of your finger, you cannot move it a lift le bit to The west with the help of power of your hands and feet because in it the power to go to the east with the speed of one thousand miles per hour. Will this much force can accept your manly power? Will not it throw you off in the reverse? ***Fourthly:*** The poor stone is intoxicated not only by the only power but also the motion of the earth, too, is taking alongwith itself to the east with the speed of one thousand miles or more than that and on its own axis the motion is causing to run it towards its axis at the speed of eleven hundred miles per hour. And one body, at a time, to two direction can it make motion in three conditions?

(1) One should be the self-protecting and the other be self-created (i.e. the conventional), for example the turning of a bingo.

(2) Both of them should be the self-protective but incidental, for example the clothes of that man who is in the ship and is walking to the west while the ship is going to the east.


(3) One of them should be self produced (Spontaneous) and the other should be incidental, for example, the above mans motion in the ship. But both of these should be self protective and both be subjective. And this is impossible, wholly, Otherwise, one and the only body may be at two places at a time, Of course, if two instigators are giving it the motion to two different and opposite directions, then it will not go to any side and it will pass on to a side in between the two forces. As for example, it has been described in the refutation of No.6. So this stone that is put on the ground and you having connived at the incidental one and you have your self filled in the motion, then both of them will be the subjective ones. And we have described that in respect of it that the eastward motion, too, is not conventional but it is self

protective. In this condition, a stone and only one at a certain time cannot make two motions such as self protective as well as subjective to two different directions.



On the contrary, it will pass through in between the two. Now, consider that the earth is at C place, the stone is at the B place. The ascending motion of the earth filled it with the motion to go towards E. Hence, the stone will not go either to C nor to E but it will make its flight towards F. In this condition, not only the stone but also all, like the boxes, holds, cots and the utensils, etc. and all the men, animals, will be flying in the air. Now, you might have realised how absurd it was to run away from the incidental motion and keying the bodies with motion[*1]. Necessarily, those eleven arguments too, are unparallel. (excessive exaggeration). The seal of all the books of the Greek Philosophy, i.e. in the "Hadyah-e-Saeediah" the discussion over the motion of the earth is over. Out of them 8 arguments on the refutation of it are from my own and one refutation out of them has passed in ***Second Refutation*** and two will be there in the Appendix. Five of them are to be discussed here. These arguments are in respect of the opponents motion of the earth and the others are related to it and about the air and so on. These are dealing with the conventional motion of the spheres. And it is an extensive discussion about it and more especially in the manner of the Greek Physics in which is Hadyahe-Saadiah, also.

[*1] it is doubtful of being of these five as natural as you will see in its source of adoption 'Sharha-e-Hikmatul Ain'. The discussion on the refutation of parts in No.768 has passed by the successive arrival is not far. On the contrary they are very clear. Otherwise, the mentioned commentator, whatever has furnished about them in respect of their refutation would have been pointed at in Hadah-e-Saeediah or having seen them, these arguments would not have been made.



(Argument No.101): The eastern motion of the air is so forceful that even if it is to blow in a usual manner, will be felt so severely. And it blows western it would not be felt at all.

(Argument No. 102): How do the feathers etc. being light bodies, go to the west when the wind is at standstill? The fact is that the forceful eastern wind leaves them behind and goes to the east itself.

(Argument No. 103): If two birds fly with equal strength in still air, one to the east and the other to the west, their flight will be equal. Why is it so, although the air is in favour of the one and the other is in opposition to it? The same can be observed in two ships.

(Argument No. 104): The bird flying to the west backward with full speed goes fast and the bird flying to the east is slow because the background of the first is helping it and that of the other is opposing that. The air is revolving to the east, so its effect was necessary as the background of the first one is weak and the hindrance to the eastern motion is stronger. And in the second one the effect is as the two ships.[*1]

(Argument No.105): When a man comes opposite to a speedy wing, he will find the air resisting and protecting itself. But here, in going to either west or the east, there is nothing to be felt.

My Statement: The outcome of these five arguments is that the thing in motion resists the opposite thing. And this kind of resistance is absent here. So, the circular motion of the air is false and that motion was

[*1] Here it has been resorted to much more details as we see that this claimed motion has no effect on the seas (rivers) and the air. On the contrary, we see both of them are still if the ships bound for east and west run at equal speed, they will travel the same distance. And if the water is flowing and the wind is fierce, the opposite will be slower. And if both have the motion to only one direction, then the opposite will be very slow and the favorable will be very speedy And if they are opposite to each other (i.e. the air and the current of the sea) then of which The speed is more, in that proportion one will be more speedy than other and the other, in that proportion will be slower.

compulsory to the motion of the earth. And the absence of necessity is the absence of the necessitated. Hence, the motion of the earth is false. But it is there in the motion of self protection. For example, the waves of the sea and the breezes of the air, in which every thing behind a place tends to come forward, So it resists the other. And now, in this air or water, if for example, a man walks down, he comes to such a place were the thrashing and beating comes in succession. So, if this mouth is opposite to it, he will get apposition and if his back is towards it, he will get supporting. But the unitary conventional motion is applicable to the whole sphere and not the motion of the different parts, that is their sum total of the successive self protective motion because in Greek Physics a body is one and solid one and there are no parts in it practically. And if at all, it is composed of different parts, even then the waves of water and the thrashing of the air is not a hindrance to the conventional motion. In It. no part resists and any other part in the manner that in its way some one might be coming towards it or it might be still and static or in the same direction but slower. These are the three situations in which the resistance is possible. And all of them are absent here. On the contrary, all the parts are going to in their course at one and the only direction at equal speed. Hence, if one part wants to go ahead, it should have vacated its place for another before reaching it ahead. And here, when the tempest is not the resistance, then of what there will be the feeling of? If you like you can feel it because it is your own condition, For example, a man entered in that situation, necessarily there occured the change of connection spontaneously. So it is but compulsory that the incoming should make the resistance.

My Statement: The resistance is possible only when this one must be walking on. A part does not move, on the contrary, the whole sphere is in motion in place of its few parts, now the man is there. A part under the

connection of a whole body should not resist the other. So no one will resist it either.

If you would like to say in this manner that the part, having been the part of a man, moves against the direction in that body, then it will be obstruction and there is the resistance to every obstruction.

My Statement: When it is dependent where can be the resistance? It is itself moving ahead alongwith its motion and it does not resist it. On the contrary, it pierces through the water or the air with its own motion. The air helps him to a certain extent or not. Here, there is not at all the resistance in the parts. So in this situation, a man wherever he wants may enter or walk down to such a place on which there is no resistance from any direction. The motion is not its controller. It is itself its partner as well as the dependent. So he will not get support from any side, nor he will be obstructed. So is the scope of such arguments in respect of the bodies and like that.

My Statement: This discussion was all but in the manner of research. The conventional (man made) motion cannot be refuted by these arguments. But we have already proved that this motion of the earth, if it is there, will not be the conventional one. On the contrary it is an absolute motion of the self protective motion. And in the self protective motion, there is the scope of defence. In this manner all these five arguments will prove to be correct. Its basis lies in the resistance of another body, And our arguments numbering 87 to 89 are in respect to the opposition and resistance of the parts and those are more accurate and correct. And be praise to Allah and may He bestow upon his Prophet best of the bounties and upon his family and the companions. These are totally one hundred and five arguments. Out of which ninety are of our own and fifteen are taken from the predecessors. But the first of the Chapter One fifty of the Chapter Second and thirty three of the Chapter Third 84 to 105 barring numbers 99

&100 resist and refute the existence of the motion of the earth around the sun and around its axis, both of them. The last eleven of the Chapter One and 63 to 82 and 99 & 100 from the Third Chapter, totaling thirty three are in refutation of the earth's motion around the sun. In this way its rotation around its axis is refuted with 72 arguments and the turning around the sun of it is refuted by the eighty five (85) arguments. And all the praise be to Allah, the Greatest of all, and He may bestow upon his prophet Muhammad all the good things and his family and his companions.

(ADENDA)

THE RESISTANCE AND OTHER ARGUMENTS IN ANCIENT PHILOSOPHY

By the Praise of Allah, I have presented one hundred and five arguments, so forcible, against the motion of the earth. There are still more such ones in the books of the predecessors like Mujasthi, Batlimous, works of Tusi and its commentary by Allamah Barjandi, Tazkirah-e-Tusi, commentary on it by Learned Khizri and Shams-e-Bazigha of which Jaunpuri boasts of Hadyah-e-Fazil khairabadi and so on. And they trusted these arguments. In our opinion, these all and all are false, I am going to discuss on them in short. And Allah Knows the truth and I seek help from Him alone. There are such ten explanations. Some of them are like those that have passed by. And we have corrected them and have explained these, too. We should keep them before us because the thing compared to should be similar one. And we have chosen from the ancient philosophy some pure laws which are quite sufficient for the refutation and by the grace of Allah, we have written a solid book by name Al-Kalimatul-Mulhamah of which the reference here is quite sufficient. Allah is the most Right One.

Explanation First: Two ships set off with equal speed. One is going to the east and the other to the west. If the earth is in motion and me air is following it, then it 5 necessary that the one bound to the east may seem to be very speedy because it is going with the help of two powers (motions), one of which is its own by its sailor & the other is the motion of the sea transferred to it by the motion of the earth. And the west bound will seem to be very slow because it is moving only with its own motion

and it has the opposition of the motion of the sea to the direction of east parallel to the latitude. On the contrary, it shouldn't hove felt at all. To consider the air in motion due to this motion of the earth would not be of any use, otherwise the repulsiveness will increase. Now the east bound is moving with the help of three forces and the west bound is to face two powers. (Hedayah-e Assdiayah).

My Statement: This argument is the reverse of 91. There, the air was not taken for being the follower of the earth because the one bound to the east is slower than the west-bound. On the contrary, it should have itself become the west bound. Here, the sea and the air hove been taken for the dependents as the west bound is more slow than the east-bound. Moreover, its speed should not have been felt at all. On the contrary, in spite of making it so short, it should have been said like that on the contrary, the one bound for west should hove been seemed going to the east.

My Statement: I tried for the reverse but could not do it. In fact it did not show up, If the earth has got the motion and the seas and the air are its followers, then all these mountains, trees, the ships, and all the men, the animals and all that is in and out of these are the equal partners in this (in being the followers of the earth). But it does not make any difference in t because they have got their own way of distinction, These ships, with as much speed they move, will be felt that much. If they have moved with equal speed, they will be seen at equal distance, one to the east and the other to the west. For example, if they sailed on from a tree on the bank of the river as the opposite (sign) and there are some people, also, standing on the bank of the river and if the ships are partners in the eastward motion of 506 yards per second and the tree and the onlookers got separated from the ships and each ship if sailed one yard per second, then necessarily, there would have been the distance of two yards between the two ships after one second and the

opposite tree would have been to the west direction from both of the ships, the west bound would have been at the distance of 505 yards and the east-bound at the distance of 507 yards. And the onlookers on the bank of the river would have seen the ship bound to the west going to the east with the same speed and it as if, jumped to 505 yards in a second and its motion could not have been seen or felt. But the trees and the onlookers, all and all, are riding the same boat with the same speed is taking away to the east side. So, the east bound ship, in the same second, moved to 507 yards, while the west bound to the distance of 505 yards and the tree and the onlookers to 506 yard. All and oil are to the east, so the distance of the east bound ship from the tree and the onlookers s only one yard to the east direction and that of the west-bound is one yard only. Therefore, the onlookers having looked at the ships and the passengers of the ships looking at the tree would think that in that one second both the ships have moved away a distance of a yard each and that the east bound has moved to the east and the west bound to the west. An example of this would be that ship which is going to the east ten yards per second and the length of the ship is 20 yards. And there lies to the middle of it a tree on the opposite shore (bank) of the river and there are some onlookers, too, near the tree. Now two persons from the passengers walk on from the middle of the ship to the east and the west. Both of them, with the equal speed reached last point of the ship (the stern or the hind part and the front part of the ship) in two seconds. They have taken care not to change the speed. In that condition, certainly, one reached to the eastward and the other to the westward of the last point of the ship. But the onlookers will, from the shore, see that one that went to the east is at a distance of thirty yards because in two seconds the ship moved to twenty yards and this man ten yards. And that one who went to the West has become eastern to them in spite of becoming western to them. But

he has moved only ten yards because this man went to the west twenty yards but the ship took him to the east twenty yards. Hence, practically, it was just as going of him to the east only ten yards. So the onlookers will see him and that one, both, moving to the east faster to the east and slower to the west. In the same way, the riders, if they look at the tree, they will feel that the tree has remained from the two men to the west, thirty yards from the eastern one and ten yards from the western one. And if their speed were to be equal to that of the ship, in one second the eastern one would move twenty yards to the east and the western one would be at the place where he was before to the west. He will not leave his opposite tree and the onlookers because as much he moves to the west, the ship carries him to the east that much. Both the speeds, having been dropped, the opposite remained the same and intact. So the thing you wanted, the same was felt here by the riders of the ship and the onlookers because the onlookers and the tree by the means of which the riders (passengers) speculated that they were not the partners in the speed of the ship, on the contrary to the former condition, they are equally partners in it. Hence, there does not remain any distinction and every body will feel the ships own speed. And if not, then for its distinction, those should be the onlookers who would be out of the sphere of the earth and the atmosphere so that they may not be the partners in its speed or may be those of the ones living on the earth but in the condition of something like static one. But that is not to be here. And it is to be in the other planets, then they are not so near but far away and to such on extent that from this ship cannot be observed as it is just a dot from there. A cloud is near, just two/ three miles high up but t is itself the partner of the atmosphere and it is included in the earthly things. And it is, by the means of the ai partner in the speed. Hence, distinction is non-existent and the objection is null and void.

Second Explanation: Two birds fly, one to the east and the other to the west with the equal speed. If the air, too, is in motion alongwith the earth, the east-bound will go very fast and it will seem that the west-bound is at standstill in the air or it will be felt that it is very slow. And it is not so, it is necessary that it should fly to the east and lag behind to seem in the west. (HADYAH)

My Statement: This is not a new thing. Here the bygone explanation and the past argument No. 91 have been taken together which is quite true against the non-acceptance of the dependence and if it is taken for granted there is the first explanation which you take for dependence, then it is false and if you don't accept it, even then it is false. You can only accept it in the light of this clear discussion that just you hove heard of and if you don't do so, it means there will remain the birds' own motions on the ships. Thus the root of the very basis of the argument is uprooted. In short, this explanation is very weak because one is exhausted of the splitting of the falsehood.

Third Explanation: The daily motion is the fastest of all. And we have observed that as much is the body rare, its motion is foster. The air moves faster than the earthy bodies. So this motion should be only applied to the sky (the either) because it is lighter than the air and the fire. (Writing of Mujasthi, article I Chap. VII). This is only and wholly a rhetorical speech. (Sharha-e-Mujasthi)

My Statement: Its equivalent can be given from this also that the revolving of smaller bodies is easier than that of such heavy bodies. (Saadiyah)

Firstly: The opponent is not accepting the existence of the sky and the rare one is known to him. That is he accepts that the air as the partner in the motion (of the earth).

Secondly: What is the proof of being the sky rarest. If you are thinking of the components high up, then the air

is the rarest of all. And this one is higher than these, then this one is the rarest of these.

My Statement: This should be taken for a straight declination in The sky which might bring down the whole construction of the ancient philosophy to down. Its claim is that if the sky is not heavy, then it should not be light also. Would you like to say that its rarity is such that it cannot be seen?

My Statement: Firstly, in this the fire and the air are included. Secondly, a thing without color cannot be seen how so much it may be dense. Thirdly, you cannot see is your ignorance. This bluish ceiling that is seen by all is, undoubtedly, the sky of the moon of which the discussion on Islamic view point will be there at the end of this argument.

Fourth Explanation: Rare bodies similar to the particles that is the negation of the circular motion of the sky. And the dense bodies with different from the particles that is the positivism of the earth. This is contrary to the physical science. (Article of Mujasthi)

My Statement: Firstly, These people have no sky. Their theme is itself negative to negative. ***Secondly:*** The particles of the earth are not different in nature because it is plain and uncomplicated like the sky and it has got difference in the extra affairs for example the undetected territories etc. This is will known proved, perfect and completed and in its orbit the planets and their movements, their directions and whereas none could negativate its flatness of these eight planets and if there is such a thing in the universe, no objection to it. Ignorance does not mean non-existence of knowledge.

Thirdly: What is the problem of the physics that says that the density is an obstacle to the spherical motion. The extreme limit of it is this that if the rarest is the most proper, it is only a lecture.

Fourthly: If the negation is occured, then it must be of the motion of the nature of the earth. But what is the objection to the coercive motion for?

Fifthly & Sixthly: follow after the Refutation No. Sixth.

Fifth Refutation: In sky the starting point of the declination is the circular one and in the earth it is straight. So the nature of both is opposite to each other, lithe earth has got its spherical motion coercive, then the sky would be its partner. And the partnership of different nature is not allowable. (Writing of Mujasthi) Allamah Barjandi has made two objections on it in his Commentary.

The First: In your opinion piercing of the sky is impossible, then how could it be known that there is no straight declination in its parts.

The second: It can be such that there might be the straight declination in the parts and it might be circular declination in total.

My Statement: Firstly, when the partition of the sky is impossible, then to ask about the impossible one as to where from it can pierce is of no meaning at all as there cannot be the straight declination. And

Secondly: the transformation of piercing is on the basis of the transformation of the straight way declination. And its transformation of the sky and the parts, of both, is given in one and only argument, although they are her and their arguments and proofs are false.

Thirdly: When the nature of the whole and the pad is unitary just as the earth, then the end of the requisite of the nature is necessary. Such kind of objection from the Allamah (Learned) is surprising. The correct objection will be formed by us.

So My Statement: The opponent itself is not in favour of the sky. In such condition the origin of the circular declination is impossible. *Secondly:* He would not accept the origin of the straightway declination (Leaning)

in respect of the earth. In his opinion the falling of a stone (a pebble) is due is to the attraction of the earth. *Thirdly*: In your view the circulator motion of the sky is not natural and it is natural in the earth. Then how can there be the partnership in the requisite of the opposite natures? And this is impossible. *Fourthly:* and if at all taken for granted that it should be false, then it is but the natural motion. The coercive one has no relation with partnership. *Fifthly:* sixthly and the seventhly, will occur shortly.

Sixth Explanation: The motion of the earth is caused due to the fact of its changing new shapes and phases. The earth does not require such things because it is changing its conditions and postures due to the revolution of the sky itself. The learned Khizri, in view of it said,

"It is in it whater is in it."

My Statement: *Firstly,* the opponent is non acceptor of the sky. *Secondly,* the revolution of the sky is not proved. *Thirdly,* the source of the circular motion is not established. *Fourthly,* on the contrary, we have proved that in view of the Laws of the ancient philosophy, the circular motion of the sky is impossible. All things and the explanations are included in our book, Al-Kalmatul-Mulhamah", And Allah is the Right. All these three reason are refuted in the fifth explanation too, and likewise the last two are refuted in the third and fourth explanations. *Fifthly,* non necessity would have been n the condition when the poles the directions and the quantum of the motions were unitary in the earth and the sky. Any difference in them would lead to the change of the postures. The earth need not, in all these things, do its revolution on the line of the sky. And if it were to differ in anything, then it would have been the changing of its mode from the motion of the sky and its revolution would have been of different nature. Then what for is the indispensability?

Sixthly, Taken for granted that the earth is compelled to submission but we observe that the sky of the

skies (the universe) is itself doing the daily revolution and the zodiac sky, in the words of its representative, is in agreement to it and in its poles and the direction etc. is in revolution of the same kind, If it has the difference with all of them, then all these eight would be in agreement with each other. And if there is much more difference with some of them, then if there is in the earth motion like that of the Universe, then why should be there the indispensability from one only?

Seventhly, Taken for granted that all the skies are n motion in one and the same manner and the earth, to, is in agreement with them in this respect, Even then what objection was to the earth from the motion? Those are concious. Having the knowledge of it none thought of the others motions sufficient for himself. Then how could the earth know that it is in motion due to some other so that it should do the same?

Eighthly, is it necessary to change the postures only because of the sky? What of the sun (the sphere of fire) in motion? The water and the air are static, they can change the postures of it (i.e. the earth).

Ninthly, the opponent has nothing to do with the changing of the postures by the motion of the earth, On the contrary, it has the aversion to the attraction or with the acquiring of the light and the heat of the each and every thing of which the discussion has passed on in the 33rd experiment.

Tenthly, Moreover, we have mode it clear in the ninth place of "Al-Kalimatul-Mulhamah" "that there is no need of any cause or purpose for the motion on and that the own motion con be their very purpose of the nature.

Seventh Explanation: Tusi as well as Jaunpuri, whom I had trusted till today after the discussion, in its Shams Bajigah refuted the two correct arguments numbering 90 & 91 and based them on it that in the nature

of the earth lies the source of the straightway declination which can be evident from the falling of the stone in the loose manner in a slanting position and that whichever has got the source of the straightway declination, it is impossible for him to make its motion circular by natural disposition. And this has been interpreted in "Hadyah" as this, that in this condition the source of the motion cannot be circular.

MY Statement: This argument too, cannot be compulsory, nor it can be conventional. *Firstly,* the opponent is not in favour of the declination. *Secondly,* he does not consider the circular motion (or the spherical motion) to be natural. On the contrary, it takes it to be due to the attraction of the sun or the repulsion of it. If it, were to depend on the repulsion, it would have been natural and at the time of its attraction, its occurrence would not have been against its own nature because the natural motion occurs only when there is the occurrence of repulsion. But it passed by in between. This is not as per the natural Inclination. *Thirdly*, the refutation of being it natural is over. Then what for objection is to the coercive? *Fourthly,* the source declination being one natural and the other coerce the combination of both of them is allowable. Rather than it is worth happening and the stone, thrown upwards is the combination of the both.

Eighth Explanation: It is but clear that the motion the earth cannot be natural and intentional, It can be coercive as well on the basis that in their view permanent and as such the coercion has permanence. Otherwise it will require explanation appearance. The Learned Khizri, quoting this, too, said, "it is there what is there" And the Allamah Barjandi in his ' Sharha Mujasthi' has explained it that it cannot natural for it has not got the declination straightway it is intentional as intention has got its own

mind and elements have no concern with the mind (or consciousness). But after its composition, it is not coercive because it is permanent in their opinion and impossible to be a coercive one permanent. In Physics there are proofs on all these, and of its not being part to the latitude is evident Hence, in any condition earth has not got the spherical motion. And this is absolute proof.

My Statement: *Firstly***,** of not having the no motion of the earth the discussion is over. But there still one more reason on which the discussion is in our book 'Al-Kalimatul-Mulhamah'. *Secondly,* opponent accepts in respect of the earth of its unconscious and so unintentional. Otherwise, before combination of the connection with the mind (or consciousness), negation of the mind is objection. *Thirdly,* the modern astronomy is in agreement with occurrence of the earth as it is the truth. Hence, the pute is not permanent but it is factual only. *Fourthly,* ever it is nullified, ills but the perpetually and not the motion. *Fifthly,* in our view this assumption that coercer is not permanent is correct on the basis that in the permanence cannot be any thing worth coercing because the universe as a whole is the occurrence of the ports. The philosophy has no proof to it. In this respect our book *'Al-Kalimatul-Mulhamah'* has got twelfth place.

Ninth Explanation: In their opinion this motion is unending. So, verily, its originality from the bodily power is impossible, Khizri has called it to be probable.

My Statement: *Firstly,* no falsification of the motion has been done except of its being perpetual. *Secondly,* they consider it the everlasting occurrence and the coercive motion to be physical that is due to the attraction of the sun. Naturally, If the argument (the proof were not to be the research-oriented, it would not have

proved the transformation based on the will of Allah in respect of its motion but it was compulsory. This premise would have been correct on the basis that cuffing oft of the physical power is compulsory mentally but its acceptance to the modern astronomy is far from the fact and still more non acceptable to the Greek Philosophy. In its clear cut discussion, the place of our book 'Al-Kalimatul-Mulhamah' has got 22nd place.

Note: Last page after the completion is not to be found.
(In fact this book ends here.)