

BAHA'I FAITH REFUTED

The Baha'i faith is a relatively new world religion. It claims to be revealed by Jesus and Muhammad and Moses and Krishna and other alleged manifestations of God.

The Baha'is have published an important account of their faith and its apologetics called *Baha'u'llah and the New Era* by J.E. Esslemont.

Abdu'l-Baha, the most important member of the sect apart from the founder and the one who knew him best and who was his son, read the first nine chapters of the book and corrected 1, 2, 5, and part of 3. It is complained that he hadn't the chance to revise the whole book and died before he could complete it. But these revisions must have taken the form of clarifications rather than amending for Abdu'l had already sanctioned everything in the book when he and the author spent a whole winter talking about it and studying it (page ix). Abdul must have approved of the content of the book and it would not have taken him long to cross out the errors in it if there were any and he would have done this before working on clarifications and grammar and the style. The National Baha'i Assembly of England carefully examined the whole book and decreed that it embodied all Abdul's doctrine. It is safe to say that the version that now exists is akin to the Bible in the Protestant Church even if it is not given that degree of honour in the cult. The book says that God through Baha'u'llah said that Abdul'l'Baha was infallible (page 64).

The leaps we have made in science and technology are attributed to "a great outpouring of the Holy Spirit through the Prophet Baha'u'llah" though he was born in 1817 and died in 1892 (page 4). That is a superstition for we have done better since he departed this life. Maybe it means that his presence in the world increased the power of the Spirit in the world? But then one would expect the great scientists to have been Baha'is.

What sense is there in their argument when the Prophet, the manifestation of the Holy Spirit, could not reveal the secrets of science?

The book says, "Were all the former prophecies swept into oblivion, He would still be His own abundant and sufficient proof to whose spiritual senses are open" (page 7). So, this man who worked no miracles was his own proof! This is really saying that we should feel that he is God and his Prophet and believe in him because of that feeling!

Two of his ethical rules were that begging and taking strong drink are sinful (page 21). It is obvious that there is something wrong here.

Who could believe in a man who did no miracles and who promised to do one if the Mullas signed a document promising to believe in him and desist from persecuting his followers? (page 28). If anybody else did that we would say that we can see through them. And he was saying that miracles are evidence for a valid divine mission for the Muslims wouldn't have wanted one if they are not and he wouldn't have agreed unless he accepted that miracles were signs though he claimed to be a Prophet and did none! He was declaring a sign to be necessary and yet he gave no sign.

Zoroaster said that after three thousand years of war the saviour who would bring the world peace would come. Muhammad said that God would come to bring peace after conflict on the day of judgment and resurrection. Yet page 43 says Baha'u'llah who obviously did not fulfil these prophecies did fulfil them. They may say that parts of them are still to be taken care of but then anybody could claim to be the one foreseen by the prophets. Two of the worst wars ever, the First and the Second World Wars, took place after Baha'u'llah's decease.

His son Abdul, talked like a masochistic Catholic saint when he said that to be chained and mutilated for Baha'u'llah's sake would be his glory and pleasure (page 50). The son of a fanatic is likely to be the same as his father. Abdul did not care about his children when he fathered them in prison (page 52).

Abdul said, "A man may call himself a Baha'i for fifty years, and if he does not live the life he is not a Baha'i" (page 69). A Baha'i has to be good and selfless and helping everybody. So there are no Baha'is at all for nobody will do all the good they can in this world. Look at the starving millions.

People not seeing the will of God as interpreted by this cult was blamed solely on prejudice and on having a sinful heart (page 72). This sectarian doctrine attempts to arouse hatred against those who do not follow the Baha'i way. It blackmails Baha'is not to lose or to change their faith.

Baha'u'llah wrote in the book, *Words of Paradise*, "Blessed is he who prefers his brother before himself; such a one is of

the people of Baha” (see quote in Baha’u’llah and the New Era, page 73). This conflicts with the doctrine of Moses and Christ who said we must do all things for the sake of God and love our neighbour as ourselves – not more than ourselves. Baha’u’llah declared that the basic doctrines were the same in every religion but this proves him wrong. He was a fraud for he knew that Jesus never taught that.

Abdul said, “If we investigate the religions to discover the principles underlying their foundations we will find that they agree” (page 74). Christianity has three persons in God and Islam has one person in God. The only similarity in them is that God is personal, perfect and is one being who is not the creation and neither cult can sincerely believe that God is perfect. They impute many evils that they just call God to their God. The Baha’i faith says that all things are part of God for God is the creation. This tells us that he is not personal and not perfect. He is just a single being.

The Baha’i will say, “There, they agree that God is one being. That is the most important part of the doctrine and the religionists agree on the important tenets”. But surely it is more important for God to be absolute love than it is for him to be one being? I am not saying that it is more important for God to be love than to exist for that would be absurd. If God is one being he is without composition for a man for instance is made up of a huge number of beings or existing elements. It is more important for God to be good than for God to be spirit or one. The religions do not all teach the same basics. Baha’is regard seven men as the manifestation of God apart from Baha’u’llah. Zoroaster – founder of the Zoroastrian religion, Christ, Moses, Buddha, Confucius, Krishna – one of the revealers of Hinduism - and Muhammad. All of these taught the same things except in detail according to the Baha’i faith. This is a ridiculous doctrine. Now could people who disagreed be manifestations of God? They had huge differences too. Jesus said that we must do all things for the love of God alone and Buddha did not care if God existed or not and did not tell us to love him or one another or he held that personhood or individuality was an illusion.

There are a lot of religious founders left out. What about the founder of the ancient religion of Jainism? What about Joseph Smith who founded the Mormons? They picked Zoroaster whose cult is smaller than these today. Size was not the criterion. If it was then the religions that had the most member should have been claimed to have possessed the greatest manifestations. Islam is smaller than Christianity and yet Muhammad is considered to be better than Christ. Baha’u’llah founded a smaller religion and is supposed to be the best of the whole bunch. The choice of prophets was arbitrary and obviously eccentric.

What evidence is there that Christ founded Christianity? The two-faced apostles told a lot of lies and we have to go through them to hear about Jesus which raises the question, “Can we know Jesus this way at all?” For instance, they said that sinners could do good works and then that they could not. The Koran was written after the death of Muhammad by vicious and deceptive and fanatical people – so you can’t be sure that he founded what is now Islam either.

What kind of God would manifest himself, say in Jesus, and not work to unite the religions based on other manifestations like Buddhism and Zoroastrianism? Bahai’ism is the ecumenical cult and yet its ecumenism is forbidden by its teaching that religions are one for if they are one they would not be separate religions and there should be no new religion even like Baha’ism to cause more separation and conflict.

FURTHER READING

- Baha’i, Francis Beckwith, Bethany House Publishers, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 1985
- Baha’u’llah and the New Era, J.E. Esslemont, Baha’i Publishing Trust, London, 1974
- Christ and Baha’u’llah, George Townsend, George Ronald, Oxford, 1983
- Concise Guide to Today’s Religions, Josh Mc Dowell and Don Stewart, Scripture Press, Bucks, 1988
- The History and Doctrines of the Baha’i Faith, Jim McCormick, Great Joy Publications, Belfast
- The Light Shineth in Darkness, Udo Schaefer, George Ronald, Oxford, 1979