

[Price 6d. each.]

# MUSLIM INDIA

AND

## ISLAMIC REVIEW.

RELIGION, ETHICS, POLITICS, LITERATURE, ART, COMMERCE.

*A Monthly Journal devoted to the Interests of the Muslims.*

Office: THE MOSQUE, WOKING.

Edited by KHIWAJA KAMAL-UD-DIN, B.A., LL.B.

---

VOL. I.]                      DECEMBER 1913.                      [No. 11.

---

### Contents.

	PAGE
Muslim Peer and English Press	401
Why I Became a Mohammedan	415
<i>By Lord Headley.</i>	
Sacrifices and Atonement	419
The Peace of Islam	425
Lord Headley and the Islamic Society Dinner	427
A Beautiful Parable	430
Muslim-Hindu Relations	431

---

Price Six Shillings per annum post free in advance;  
and in India Rs. 5.

*Single copies to be obtained from the Publisher, 99 Shoe Lane, London, E.C.,  
and in India from Azeezmanzal, Lahore.*

London:

J. S. PHILLIPS, 99 SHOE LANE, E.C.

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

# MUSLIM INDIA

AND

## ISLAMIC REVIEW

---

VOL. I.]

DECEMBER 1913.

[No. 11.]

---

### MUSLIM PEER.

#### WHAT IS ISLAM?

"MOHAMMADAN PEER" is the echo of the day in the West. The embracement of Islam by Lord Headley and Baron Allanson-Winn has created a unique interest, which has travelled from London into the four corners of the world. We are highly gratified to note that "the rare event," as *Pall Mall Gazette* styles it, has been received here in good spirit, and the Press comment is also not unfair. But it has also advertised a terrible ignorance of Islam. That a Mohammadan cannot be a true Muslim without subscribing to the spirit of what was taught by Christ Himself, is a Quranic truth; but it was a hard pill for the people here to swallow when they heard from the Mohammadan Peer that through his Islam he has become simply a better Christian. The Rt. Honourable Lord only culled in one word what he read in the Quran in the following words:—

And who forsakes the religion of Abraham but he who is weak of judgment, and surely we have chosen him in this world, and in the life to come, he is no doubt of the righteous ones.

When his Lord said to him: "*Resign\* yourselves to Me,*" he said, "*I resign myself to the Lord of the Worlds.*"

---

\* The italics in all these verses are ours; they give a clear conception of Islam, which literally means "resignation to God." The concluding portion of the above quotation also gives the Muslim belief as to the message of the other prophets. We, however, don't believe what is now ascribed to and added to the teachings of Jesus and Moses.

And the same did Abraham enjoin on his sons and on Jacob: "O, my sons, ALLAH has chosen for you (this) faith, therefore let not death come to you *unless you are resigned*." Were you witnesses when death visited Jacob, when he said to his sons: "What will you serve after me?" they said, "We will serve your God and the God of your fathers, Abraham and Ishmael and Ishaq (Isaac), *one God only, and to Him we resign ourselves*."

This is a people that has passed away, they had what they earned, and you shall have what you earn, *and you shall not be questioned as to what they did*.

And they say, "Become Jews or Christians, you shall be the followers of the right way," say Nay, but (follow) the *religion of Abraham*, the sincere one, and he was not one of the polytheists. Say: "*We believe in ALLAH and in that which has been sent down to us, and that which was sent down to Abraham and Ishmael and Isaac and Jacob, and his children, and that which was given to Moses and Jesus, and that which was given to the prophets from their Lord; and do not make any distinction between any of them, and to Him do we resign ourselves*."

The Quran—Ch. 2 : 130, 136.

This is the gist of Islam, a self-evident truth ; yet it appears an anomaly to many. It only betrays wrong conception of religion in Western mind. With him religion, perhaps, is belief in dogmas, though they may demand mutilation of rationality. In fact, if human salvation depends upon our belief in the peculiar aspect of a certain memorable event in the life of some particular man—say crucifixion of Christ—it is no religion but a school of thought, and must lead to diversity of opinion and difference of belief. But if religion can rightly be identified with good beliefs and actions—because beliefs are the fountain-head of human actions—revealed to man by God from time to time in order to work out his salvation and bring him to that stage of spirituality where he becomes at one with God—there can be one and only one religion of God—the blessed gospel of complete submission to the Will of God and implicit obedience to all His Commandments, and this literally means Islam. This religion of obedience was taught to Adam when "the Lord God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat: But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it." The same religion of commandment and submission found its manifestation at the Mount of Sinai. Jesus came simply to deliver the same message of Islam when He said to His disciples:—

*"My doctrine is not mine but His that sent me."*

—St. John vii. 16.

"I can of my own self do nothing: as I hear I judge: and my judgment is just; because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father

which hath sent me. If I bear witness of myself,  
my witness is not true."—St. John v. 30.

In the same spirit Lord Mohamad exclaimed when he said,  
"Follow words of God, and do not follow my words if you find  
them at variance with the former."

It is "Divine Commandments and their obedience" which  
is religion of God; it is their doing and teaching which in the  
words of Jesus makes one great in the Kingdom of Heaven.  
Did not Moses receive revelation, improving upon what was  
already in human possession? Did not his successors for  
generation after generation receive more Divine light after the  
revelation of Ten Commandments? Christ also did "not come  
to destroy but to fulfil the law." He never branded it as a  
curse, as promulgated by the Church built upon Pauline super-  
structure. Human mind had not sufficiently developed even  
at the advent of Jesus to receive the law in its 'full-fledged  
shape,' a fact admitted by the Holy Founder of Christianity  
Himself. Its full evolution demanded elapsing of a few more  
centuries. It was for Mohammad, as prophesied by Jesus, to  
receive the law in its perfection. Even in ordinary human life  
we find gradual growth. Till a certain period of life we grow  
physically, morally and intellectually; we are then in need of  
constant change. But when a certain age is reached, our ways  
and habits become settled for good. Our diet and our raiments  
assume some sort of permanency; our knowledge may increase,  
but we need no change otherwise. Human race reached its age  
of discretion and majority when Mohammad came. He received  
perfect law from God, and based his religion on rational basis.  
It was the same old religion taught by generations of prophets,  
with Jesus amongst them, but in a rationalised form with  
necessary additions.

Our Muslim readers in the East will naturally be anxious  
to know something of their new Muslim brother, who is sure to  
receive heartiest welcome from his co-religionists in the whole  
world. We cannot do better than make\* some selections from  
what appeared in the week following the announcement of this  
noble addition to the ranks of the faithful in more than eighty  
dailies and weeklies of the United Kingdom and Ireland :—

## EMISSARY OF ISLAM.

### MORE CONVERSIONS IN HIGH PLACES.

### CONQUEST OF ENGLAND.

### A MEANS OF SCOTCHING THE UNREST IN INDIA.

Following the announcement of Lord Headley's conversion to Islam  
we may expect very soon to hear even more sensational news of con-

---

\* See page 405.

versions in high places, according to Mr. Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din, B.A., LL.B., who is the man best in a position to know.

Mr. Kamal-ud-Din landed in England thirteen months ago to convert as many Englishmen as he can to his faith. He is a remarkable personality. After a successful and lucrative career in India as a lawyer, he has constituted himself the emissary of Islam in these islands, has come here at his own expense, started a monthly review, and with three friends has taken charge of the Moslem Mosque at Woking.

Since he came he has frequently met and corresponded with Lord Headley, who contributes an article to the current number of his review, *Muslim India*.

During the past few months he has delivered several lectures, including an address to "the heretics of Cambridge" on the comparative merits of Islamic and Christian principles, and an address to the ladies of the Lyceum Club on the position of woman from Judaism to Islam, in the course of which he elaborated the thesis that "the Lord Mohammed is the only vindicator of female rights."

Mosque and house are on the outskirts of Woking, buried away in a strange old corner of parkland that is dark with conifers. Here, in a large bare room, Mr. Kamal-ud-Din received me and explained his hopes for the religious conquest of these islands.

A few more conversions in the House of Lords and the House of Commons, he contended, would be the best thing for our rule in India that could possibly happen.

"Lord Headley is now our brother," he said. "He can come to Mecca. He would be welcomed there. If he went to India he could do more for you by one visit than ten Viceroys could do in all their lives. All who embrace Islam are our brothers. Races, boundaries, nationalities do not count.

"If you had some more Mohammedans in the Lords and in the Commons there would be no more unrest among the Moslem population of India. They would say, 'There are Moslems in that Parliament. It is our Parliament.' In about fifteen days you will see. When the news of Lord Headley's conversion reaches India there will be a great outburst of feeling, good feeling, for England. You could hold India without any difficulty at all if you would only take pains to understand Islam, and if a few more of you would embrace that faith.

"All the unrest among the Moslem population has been due to religious and not to political causes. It has been agitation not against your rule, but against some offence to our religious feelings, done doubtless through misunderstanding.

"No good Moslem can have anything to do with sedition. What is the part of India where Christianity has gained the strongest footing? Bengal. What is the part of India where sedition is greatest? Bengal."

Mohammedanism, Mr. Kamal-ud-Din holds, is the religion of the future. He hinted at the remarkable developments shortly to come which I have mentioned.

He complained that his faith has been bitterly misrepresented in the matter of polygamy. "If it goes on this suffragist sex war will be the ruin of your country," he declared. "We do not have anything like that. Islam allows polygamy, but only in special circumstances as a remedial measure for things that would cause much trouble if steps were not taken. In India, you will find not one case in a thousand of a man with more than one wife."

Mr. Kamal-ud-Din spoke of our own missionary efforts in India and of the condition of things in England with the most scrupulous courtesy, but it was evident that he was not profoundly impressed with the state of our religious faith. He has made a few converts, but he explained his business is simply to lay a true, plain, unvarnished account of Islam before the people, and to leave their own hearts and consciences to do the rest.

"But do not fall into the mistake of thinking we are hostile to Christianity," he urged. "Our faith includes belief in the teachings of Christ."

—*Manchester Dispatch*, November 18, 1913,

\* \* \* \* \*

## ENGLISH PRESS ON THE MOHAMMADAN PEER.

### PEER OF 58 CONVERTED TO MOHAMMADANISM.

After a career which has included amateur boxing, civil engineering, the editing of a local newspaper, and expert advice on coast erosion, Lord Headley, an Irish Peer, aged 58, became a convert to Mohammedanism.

The conversion was announced at a meeting of the Islamic Society, held at Frascati's, Oxford Street, by the Rev. Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din, who is attached to the Mohammedan Mosque at Woking.

"Those who know me will believe I am perfectly sincere in my belief," wrote Lord Headley in a letter read at the meeting.

Lord Headley may be described as a muscular Mussulman, for when at Cambridge he won both the middle-weight and heavy-weight boxing championships. He has written more than one book on the noble art of self-defence. He writes very well, by the way, and has done a good deal of journalistic work in his time. For a couple of years he was Editor of the *Salisbury Journal*.

He has also done a lot of civil engineering in recent years. He superintended some coast defence works at Youghal and similar works on the coast to the north of Bray Harbour. He also did some coast defence works at Glenbeigh, his place in one of the wildest parts of Kerry.

The problem of coast erosion has particularly interested him. At Dover in 1899 he read a paper before the British Association on the history of the reclamation of Romney Marsh.

Lord Headley is a grey-moustached, handsome man, with a fine intellectual forehead and good features, while his habit of smiling when he talks gives him a happy appearance. Some time ago he had rather a serious illness.

He has been married fourteen years, and has several children. His wife is a daughter of the late Mr. W. H. Johnson, who was Governor of Leh and Jumoo. Lord Headley was at one time working as a civil engineer in India. It was only in January of this year that he succeeded his cousin in this Irish peerage, which was created in 1797. The family has estates in Yorkshire, as well as in Ireland. They must be pretty extensive, for the late peer owned over 16,000 acres.

Lord Headley is not the first British peer to be converted to Islam, for the late Lord Stanley of Alderley was a devout adherent, having been fascinated by its teachings while serving in the diplomatic service in the East. Another conversion which caused some stir a few years ago was that of Mr. Quilliam, a Liverpool solicitor, who had imbibed the faith of Mohammedanism while in Morocco, and eventually became Sheikh of the British Isles.

The chief centres of Mohammedanism are in London, Manchester, and Liverpool. In the last city there is a Mohammedan community of about 200, but they are most unostentatious people, and hold their meetings very quietly. At one time there was a Mosque in Liverpool, but that has now been done away with.

The religion, of course, recognises no form of priesthood, believing in direct communication with the Deity. Mohammedanism was practically first introduced into England by a prominent Liverpool citizen, and its members include prominent Society people and not a few

University men. Physically the members of the Mohammedan religion are an extremely fine race, due to the strict laws of teetotalism and the strict hygienic methods which govern their course of life.

Polygamy is allowed by creed, but no member is allowed to have more than four wives. In England there are very few members of the religion with more than one wife.

—*Daily Sketch*, November 17, 1913.

\* \* \* \* \*

## HAPPINESS IN ISLAM.

### LORD HEADLEY'S EXPERIENCE OF MOHAMMADANISM.

#### A SIMPLE CREED.

Lord Headley, whose adhesion to the faith of Islam is announced to-day, has long been in sympathy with Islamic teaching, and he would like to see it adopted in the Western world. "There is," he says, "comfort and freedom from bigotry and intolerance in Islam which is, to my mind, the religion of gratitude, faith, and love, the religion of charity and peace."

These thoughts his lordship has expressed in two articles in *Muslim India & Islamic Review*, of which we have received a copy. The spirit of praise, he writes, is the essence of the Muslim creed—the main supplication is for Divine direction and guidance. Though my gratitude for God's favours and loving care has been profound from my earliest youth, I cannot help observing that within the past few years, since the pure and convincing faith of the Muslims has become a reality in my heart and mind, I have found happiness and security never approached before. Freedom from the weird dogmas of the various branches of Christian Churches came to me like a breath of pure sea air, and on realising the simplicity, as well as the illuminating splendour, of Islam, I was as a man emerging from a cloudy tunnel into the light of day.

"Bigotry and fanaticism," he goes on to say, "have wrought havoc in the contending Christian Churches, but this cannot be said of Mohammedanism, which is an united Church, save only for some minor disputes as to the descendants of Mahomet.

"How much better, then, would it be if we in the West made up our minds to abandon the complicated forms of religion at present obtaining, and to adopt Islam?

"Islam is the religion of grand simplicity; it satisfies the noblest longings of the soul, and in no way contravenes the teachings of Moses or Christ."

Lord Headley points out that the Christian religion had its origin in the East, and asks: How is it that we do not complain about the nationality of Christ, Who we must believe was a swarthy Asiatic? His mother, the Virgin Mary, was an Asiatic, and Moses and nearly all the inspired prophets were Easterners. The Holy Prophet Mahomet was, like the others, an Eastern, and was given his instruction from on high; the Holy Koran contains the Word of God like the Bible and other inspired works, and confirms the Bible and previous revelations. The Koran gives additional teachings, emphasizing the importance of those teachings, and *above all* insists on the abandonment of all that savours of idolatry; the SPIRIT of the revelation being that no other name should be even mentioned along with the holy name of Allah our All-Mighty Father—the All-Seeing, the All-Merciful.

He declares that the spirit of Islam soars far above petty jealousies and the racial distractions of East and West, and if Eastern Christianity led by the great Prophet of Nazareth has gone so far towards enlightening mankind, there seems to be no valid reason why the more extended

and simpler Islamic faith expounded by the great Prophet of Arabia should not continue the good work. There is a great similarity between the characters of the leaders, as anyone will find out on inquiring into Mahomet's life. Also a study of the Koran will reveal the fact that there is nothing antagonistic to previous revelations—Mahomet's instructions, as laid down in the book, completely back up the Bible's teachings, extending them to suit the requirements of the time.

Lord Headley, it may be added, is the fifth baron, having succeeded his cousin in January of this year. He was born in 1855, and is an engineer by profession.

—*Pall Mall Gazette*.

\* \* \* \* \*

While, in view of the large Oriental interests of the Empire, there is a certain fitness in having the Faith of Islam represented in the House of Lords, the actual conversion of a peer to the Mohammedan religion is an event rare enough to cause remark; and so Lord Headley is likely, for the next few days, to be a much-interviewed man. It says something for his broad-mindedness that he does not propose to sever his connection with the English Church. There are many in this country who have no room in their lives for one religion. The man who can find room for two is to be congratulated, both on his largeness of view and his adaptability to varying requirements.

—*Pall Mall Gazette*, November 18, 1913.

\* \* \* \* \*

### THE FAITH OF ISLAM.

Sir,—In your issue of to-day's date you have quite correctly and succinctly stated my views on the subject of the Muslim faith, but I observe that, under the heading "Notes of the Day," the writer speaks of having the "Faith of Islam represented in the House of Lords." Considering that more than half of his Majesty's subjects are Mahommedans, this would, perhaps, be desirable, but I must point out that I am not a member of the House of Lords, and am not likely ever to seek election, so that the honour of championing the cause must be left to some other peer who will, I sincerely hope, come forward and admit that he has been touched by the simplicity and charity of Islam.

Your writer is also a little mistaken in supposing that I have two religions. I have only one—surrender and submission to God, and beneficence to all His creatures—for this is the meaning of the word "Islam." It seems to me that Christ also taught this, which explains why it is impossible to be a good Mahommedan without also being a good Christian.—Faithfully yours,

HEADLEY.

St. Margaret's, Twickenham, November 17.

—*Pall Mall Gazette*, November 19, 1913.

\* \* \* \* \*

### WHAT IS CHRISTIAN?

Sir,—Lord Headley, in his letter published in to-day's issue of the *Pall Mall Gazette*, in which he further explains the process of thought which has led him to adopt the Mohammedan religion, has fallen into an error which, though palpable, has, nevertheless, been the cause of much oblique thinking on the subject of Christianity. He says, in concluding his remarks on the duty of surrender and submission to God and beneficence to all His creatures, "It seems to me that Christ also taught this, which explains why it is impossible to be a good Mohammedan without also being a good Christian."

If Lord Headley will pardon my saying so, far from explaining anything of the kind, it only goes to prove that he has not yet grasped the elementary fact of what essentially constitutes a Christian. A Christian



is not necessarily a man who does his duty to God, or man, nor need he necessarily be kind, beneficent, or even socially moral. Though he lacks all these virtues he is yet "more of a Christian" than the best Moham-medan who ever lived.

A good Christian of necessity possesses these virtues, but his being a Christian depends neither upon the possession or admiration of them any more than his religion is made perfect by them alone. The Christian religion stands for far more than the mere possession of virtues.

A man, whether he be good or bad, *is only a Christian if he has been "born again," that is to say, if he has been through the Sacrament of Baptism, and no amount of kindness or other attribute which must contribute to the making of a good Christian can ever make a man one (good, bad, or indifferent) who has not been baptised. He is simply not a Christian at all.*

I hope you will find a space for this in your valuable columns, as it touches on a common view of Christianity which is both erroneous and dangerous.—Faithfully yours,

(Rev.) BERNARD HENRY BERLYN.

St. Alban the Martyr, Fulham, November 18.

—*Pall Mall Gazette*, November 21, 1913.

\* \* \* \* \*

#### WHAT IS CHRISTIAN?

Sir,—The rev. gentleman who writes under this heading in your yesterday's issue rather misses my point. He holds that it is impossible to be a Christian unless you have been baptised. I affirm that you can be a most excellent follower of Christ's teaching and obey it in the spirit without ever having heard of baptism or the Lord's Supper, and without believing in the Divinity of Christ or the Trinity. Surely, it is far more important to carry out in your life those divine precepts enjoined by Christ than to rely on a mere form like baptism for salvation? The one is the spirit, the other the letter. Again, I must point out that all good Muslims must be followers of Moses, Christ, and Mahomet—the Prophets of God. I hold that any good and earnest follower of Christ is to all intents and purposes a good Christian, even though he may not have been baptised. I know many Mohammedans who carry out Christ's teachings with a fidelity that would astonish many a baptised Christian. Accident of birth is alone responsible for the omission of the baptismal ceremony, but, as Muslims, they are true to Christ's teaching though baptism has not taken place.

Take my own case. I happen to have been baptised, and being at the time an infant of tender years, my opinion was not asked, and I had to submit much as, some eighteen years later on, I submitted to confirmation, simply and solely to please my father, who wished me to be confirmed. As to believing that the baptism, the confirmation, the belief in the Divinity of Christ or the Lord's Supper are necessary to my salvation, or that if I cannot "think of the Trinity" as did St. Athanasius I shall be everlastingly damned by the God of Mercy—I simply don't believe it, and never did, and, what is more, I feel sure that half the people who outwardly profess these opinions merely do so for appearance sake. A well-educated man told me not long ago that, without believing in any of the dogmas, he always went to church every Sunday, and took the Communion once a fortnight. He was a nominal Christian, having been baptised, yet he found no difficulty in acting a lie every Sunday and a worse lie once a fortnight!

To my mind the real Christian is the man who tries to show it in his life by obedience and submission to God and endeavouring to do his duty to his neighbours, and by avoiding anything of the nature of a lie. But I fear that the rev. gentleman and myself are not quite on the same

platform, so that we cannot well join issue, and it will, therefore, be best to gracefully disagree and leave it to your readers to say which of us is right. I have taken the liberty of sending a short article on this subject to the *Observer* next Sunday, the 23rd inst., and hope it may throw some light on one or two points.—Faithfully yours,

HEADLEY.

\* \* \* \* \*

### WHY I BECAME A MOSLEM.

Lord Headley in an interview with the *Daily Mail* representative said the following:—

“It is the intolerance of those professing the Christian religion which more than anything else is responsible for my secession. You never hear Mahomedans speak concerning those of other religions as you hear Christians talk of one another. They may feel very sorry that other persons do not hold the Mahomedan faith, but they don't condemn them to everlasting damnation because of a differing belief.

“The purity and simplicity of the Mahomedan religion, its freedom from dogma and sacerdotalism, and the obvious truth of it make a special appeal to me. The earnestness and the sincerity of Mahomedans, too, is greater than anything I have seen on the part of Christians. The ordinary Christian man puts on religion on Sunday as a respectable habit. When Sunday is over his religion is discarded for the rest of the week. With the Mahomedan, on the contrary, there is no distinction between Sunday and any other day. He is always thinking of what he can do in God's service.

—*Daily Mail*, November 17, 1913.

\* \* \* \* \*

### MANY CONVERTS.

The announcement of the conversion of Lord Headley from Christianity to Islam has caused a slight stir in certain circles, doubtless by reason of the position which he holds, but those who are well informed as to the progress which the religion of the Prophet is making among Britishers, not only in Mahometan countries but here in the British Isles, and in London particularly, know that conversions from Christianity to Islam are of almost daily occurrence. They are not given the publicity which attends generally upon conversions from Protestantism to Roman Catholicism or from non-Christian religions to a Christian faith, but they nevertheless occur, and that frequently. The late Lord Stanley of Alderley, whose brother was an ecclesiastic of the Roman Catholic Church, is the only previous Mahometan convert from the peerage, but in all the professions and walks of London life there are to be found numerous converts. At present there are two mosques in England—one at Liverpool and the other at Woking, the latter being provided with an excellent Oriental library—but for many years past a movement has been on foot to erect a mosque in a central part of the West End of London.

—*Belfast Northern Whig*, November 19, 1913.

\* \* \* \* \*

### PEER'S CONVERSION.

Lord Headley, in an interview, explained that in publicly identifying himself with the Mahomedan faith he was not departing in any way from the beliefs he had held for the last twenty years. “When the Islamic Society asked me,” I said, “to their dinner the other night I was only too pleased to be able to go and to tell them how deep was my attachment to their religion. . . . It is the intolerance of those professing the Christian religion which more than anything else is responsible for my secession. I was reared in the strict and narrow forms of the Low Church party. Later I lived in many Roman Catholic

countries, including Ireland. The intolerance of one sect of Christians towards other sects holding some different form of the same faith, of which I witnessed many instances, disgusted me. You never hear Mahomedans speak concerning those of other religions as you hear Christians talk of one another. They may feel very sorry that other persons do not hold the Mahomedan faith, but they don't condemn them to everlasting damnation because of a differing belief.

"The purity and simplicity of the Mahomedan religion, its freedom from dogma and sacerdotalism, and the obvious truth of it make a special appeal to me. The earnestness and the sincerity of Mahomedans, too, are greater than anything I have seen on the part of Christians. The ordinary Christian man puts on religion on Sunday as a respectable habit because he thinks it is right, and possibly because his father and his grandfather before him always honoured Sunday with the same observance. When Sunday is over his religion is discarded for the rest of the week. With the Mahomedan, on the contrary, there is no distinction between Sunday and any other day. He is always thinking of what he can do in God's service.

—*Liverpool Evening Express*, November 17, 1913.

\* \* \* \* \*

We have no doubt that many a prayer for Lord Headley will go up from humble Christian hearts that he may return to the way of truth; and unquestionably that is the proper attitude of mind towards a profoundly regrettable incident. We need not characterise it in severer terms. For various reasons we are no longer in the old ferocious mood of belief which so early crept into the Church—despite the emphatic warning of the Master—and wrought such lasting and terrible mischief. So, even when a Christian turns Mussulman, we do not care to hurl at him the sort of names which would have come naturally to our fathers. Perhaps, too, in days when the spirit of indifference is felt to be the deadliest enemy of faith, we incline to think that any serious consideration of religious questions, even when it leads to lamentable error, has value of a kind.

—*Guardian*, November 21, 1913.

\* \* \* \* \*

#### MOHAMMADAN MOSQUES IN ENGLAND.

The recent conversion of an English peer to Mohammedanism is a reminder that the Mohammedans in this country are sufficiently numerous and influential to support several places of worship. Three splendid mosques are in existence in England. Those at Liverpool and Woking have long been noted for their exquisite appointments. Of more recent date is the one situated in Bayswater. The doors are gilded in a similar way to those of the world-famous Taj Mahal at Agra, built by Shah-Jehan. In the East End there is a sacred temple of Al Ahmed, where the faithful meet once a year to go through a curious ceremony in honour of the Prophet.

—*Westminster Gazette*, November 21, 1913.

\* \* \* \* \*

#### A CHANCE THAT HAS BEEN MISSED.

We have missed a chance of a really fine spectacle in London, all through being two or three hundred years too late in time. I have been looking up the authorities to see what would have been done to Lord Headley by our fiercer and certainly more Christian forefathers. Lord Headley, you may have noticed, has become a convert to the Moslem faith, though he declares that he is still a Christian just the same. Opinions amongst the learned seem to differ as to whether his lordship ought to be burned alive at the stake, hanged, drawn and quartered, or

merely beheaded. Whatever the penalty, it would, of course, have been paid in public. What a magnificent show that would have been! A real live peer on his way to be executed in public! Seats would have sold for a fortune, and Mr. Larkin, whose arrival in London would have been just in time, would have had the treat of his life.

—*Leeds Mercury*, November 20, 1913.

\* \* \* \* \*

### THE EMPIRE OF MANY CREEDS.

But, as one paper truly points out, there is, in view of the large Oriental interests of the Empire, a certain fitness in having the Faith of Islam represented in the House of Lords. For ourselves, we only wish it were well and strongly represented in the House of Commons too. There is a very widespread tendency in these "tight little islands"—as the Aliens Act and the spirit which inspired it prove—to forget that England is not the British Empire, and that while the home population is comparatively homogeneous in race and creed this does not apply to the Empire at large. The British Empire is a conglomerate of many faiths and peoples; and if the presence of Mussulman peers in Parliament keeps that fact before some of our insularly-minded fellow-countrymen it will be a point gained.

—*Jewish World*, November 19, 1913.

\* \* \* \* \*

### A PEER'S CONVERSION TO MOHAMMADANISM.

Lord Headley's conversion may give an impetus to the movement for the establishment in London of a worthy Mohammedan place of worship. At present the services of the large Islamic community have been held in restaurants, and the need for a mosque has been intensified of late by the continued influx of Mohammedans, principally young Indians, who come to London to study.

Mussulmans of the British Empire are numbered by the million, and hundreds of Englishmen worship under the banner of the Prophet. Yet there is no place in the capital of the British Empire where proper facilities are provided for Muslims to observe the duties of their religion.

—*Manchester Dispatch*, November 17, 1913.

\* \* \* \* \*

### ENGLISH MOHAMMADANS.

Lord Headley's conversion to Mahommedanism recalls the fact that there are already two mosques in England—one in Liverpool and the other at Woking. The former is, perhaps, the better known. For some years past there has been a scheme on foot, which may eventually materialise, for the erection of a third in Central London. It would appear that converts in the British Isles are more numerous than is generally known, and they are to be found in all walks in life.

—*Globe*, November 18, 1913.

\* \* \* \* \*

### MOSLEM MISSIONARIES.

A gathering of Indian Mahometans, arranged by the Islamic Society, was held yesterday afternoon at Frascati's Restaurant, to induce the two or three hundred young Moslems resident in London to continue the ceremonial observance of their religion, and to refuse to drink wine. Most of those who attended were, of course, Indians, but there was a sprinkling of Egyptians and one or two Turks. The event of the afternoon was the announcement of the conversion of Lord Headley, an Irish peer. Mr. Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din, a barrister, who is understood to have left a lucrative practice at Lahore to act as an Islamic missionary in this

country, complained that his work was greatly hindered by the slackness of his professing co-religionists, and upon the proposition of Mr. Shel-drake, a young English convert, the tables and chairs were cleared away, handkerchiefs were spread on the floor instead of praying mats, and Mr. ud-Din led the assembly in the Jumma, or evening prayer. Mr. Zafar Ali Khan, the host, was prevented from being present owing to a sudden chill, but it was announced on his behalf that he would make himself financially responsible for rooms wherein all Moslems should be invited to meet every Friday for prayers, and it was hoped that this would be the beginning of a mosque for London. It was also announced that the establishment of a London Mahometan weekly paper was under consideration.

—*Manchester Guardian*, November 17, 1913.

\* \* \* \* \*

### TIDAL WAVE OF MOHAMMADANISM.

Lord Headley's conversion to Mohammedanism reminds one that there are quite a surprising number of English Moslems. Other famous English converts have been the late Lord Stanley of Alderley and the late Sir Ellis Ashmead-Bartlett, but there is a Moslem rank and file with mosques at Liverpool and Woking. A movement is on foot to put up a great mosque in London. The Liverpool mosque is the best known, and has, or used to have, an English sheikh who was the religious representative of the Sultan in this country. Lord Headley points out that his Mohammedanism is not inconsistent with his Christianity. Mohammedans recognise the teaching of Christ and Judaism as earlier dispensations in much the same way that Christians look upon Judaism. Mohammedanism, however, is losing ground in Europe. In Africa and Asia it is carrying everything before it. A generation or so ago the Sahara desert was the southern limit of African Mohammedanism. Now it has penetrated throughout the Soudan and into Central Africa, and is advancing rapidly southwards. In Asia it has swept through Turkestan into Western Mongolia. Mr. Carruthers, in his book just published, "Unknown Mongolia," bears testimony to the amazing success of the Mohammedan propaganda. In the Western Provinces of China, which are largely Moslem, the religion is also gaining ground.

—*Yorkshire Observer*, November 19, 1913.

\* \* \* \* \*

### ISLAM IN ENGLAND.

There can be no question that the cult of Islam in England will receive a small impetus by the conversion of Lord Headley. The last peer to join the Moslem faith, the late Lord Stanley of Alderley, was regarded as a great capture, but Lord Headley's long association with India, where sixty million British subjects call upon Mohammed's name daily, will cause his conversion to be regarded with unusual sympathy by Indian and, indeed, all Asiatic Moslems.

The fact is that Islam is at present in the midst of a great missionary and propaganda work. The "faithful" are increasing at the rate of a million a year. It is the only serious rival Christianity has to face. The two faiths are contending with each other for the mastery of nearly a quarter of the globe, and the measure of Islam's earnestness in the work may be shown by this sentence—that for every Christian missionary sent by Europe into Africa nearly a score of Moslem preachers are sent thither from the schools and colleges of Cairo and Stamboul.

I used to attend at intervals the Moslem mosque in Liverpool, where a Manx solicitor had changed himself into the Sheik Abdullah, and was working like a Salvation Army captain to spread the faith. What interested me most was not the attitude of the converted Liverpool people

—and they were not a few—but that of the educated Moslems from India and Persia and Cairo who came to Liverpool on business.

It was very nice to have a mosque in the heart of a Christian land, and they appreciated the peace and quietude in which they could make their prostrations, turn their faces towards Mecca, and say their daily prayers to Allah.

*Not one single nation that ever adopted Mohammedanism has renounced it!* There is no parallel to this in the world's history. And still the tide of conquest flowed—through Spain to the walls of Vienna, through the Balkans, and even into France, and if it had not been for the battle of Tours we might have been a race of British Moslems, and our pulpits been occupied with mullahs expounding the words of the Prophet.

They are proud of their success in Africa, and as even a bad Moslem nigger is better than a so-called Christian who has failed to catch the spiritual, but has imbibed the spirituous, they have no cause to be ashamed of the results of their teaching.

Just one word as to Islam itself. It is not an ideal religion, though it has many good points. Even bishops and peers may misunderstand it. The Bishop of London recently said that the faith of Mohammed was antagonistic to Christ. Does he not know that Moslems speak of Jesus Christ as "Sidna Issa," or "Our Lord Jesus," and that in one sacred mosque, where Mohammed lies buried at Medina, there is a vacant tomb to await the day when Christ shall end His second coming? No, Moslemism is not antagonistic to Christ, though it rejects Him as Diety and places Him only among the great prophets.

—*Daily Dispatch* (Manchester), November 20, 1913.

\* \* \* \* \*

## GROWTH OF MODERN CHRISTIANITY, BY LORD HEADLEY.

Without the slightest desire to attack any particular branch of the Christian religion—and there are many such branches—one may safely point to the beauty and simplicity of the Moslem faith by way of contrast. We cannot close our eyes to the fact that the religion of St. Paul is not quite the original religion as laid down by Christ. Sacredotal influences have been brought to bear upon Christianity at every turn, and bids for the temporal power have been apparent on all sides.

There can be but little doubt that much of the religion of the West is the outcome of the superstitions of mediæval times—a relic, indeed, of the Dark Ages, and not much in sympathy with the teachings of Moses or Christ.

In those cloudy and troublesome times—say between the third and fifth centuries and later—when Europe was the vast arena over which hordes of wild and warlike races vied with each other and spread terror and desolation on all sides, the great rulers of States, like the warlike barons or lords in England, were often men more conspicuous for their prowess with sword or battle-axe, wielded in defence of their estates, their hearths and homes, than they were for any book learning and culture. In order to keep things going at home they had to employ clerks or clerics who were able, by means of their superior learning, to maintain a sort of stewardship over the establishments, to keep records of current events, &c., &c.

These clerics in time became necessary adjuncts to large establishments, and exercised great power, and had great influence. Opportunities then often occurred for increasing this influence by using the mysteries of the unknown as a fulcrum against which to place those astonishingly long levers—dread of hell and terrors of future punishment. Skillful handling of these terrors produced in the minds of the credulous a feeling not far removed from panic, which was, however, soothed and smoothed down by the assurance that, on embracing a cer-

tain form of religion and swallowing some craftily evolved dogmas, salvation might be gained. But it was somehow contrived that absolute security as regards a safe and high place in the next world could not be obtained unless by very handsome gifts to "the Church," and these gifts took the form of large grants of land, palaces, cathedrals, and rich endowments. Here we saw the birth of sacerdotalism, and the determined bids for temporal authority have been very noticeable ever since, and right up to the present date.

The advent of Mahomet, some six hundred years after Christ, exposed the unreality of all such ideas as atonements, priestly interventions, supplications to the saints, and those other cumbersome and involved methods of approaching the Almighty. However grand the Mosaic laws, however beautiful the gentle and forgiving precepts of the Holy Prophet of Nazareth, it must be admitted that the Mahommedan teaching contained the most sublime message, overriding by its very simplicity all obstacles in the way of the believer on his path to God.

In Chapter IX. of the Koran lines occur which leave no doubt as to their meaning and applicability to all who are under sacerdotal influence and insist on taking human beings for their guides:—

"They take their priests and their monks for their lords, besides God, and Christ the Son of Mary, although they are commanded to worship one God only; there is no God but He; far be that from Him which they associate with Him." . . . "O true believers, verily many of the priests and monks *devour the substance of men in vanity, and obstruct the way of God.*" [The italic is the writer's.]

There is, in fact, not much uniformity in so-called Christianity, but we find in Islam that which should satisfy the longings of the created to be at one with and return to the Creator—the ever-present and omnipotent protector of all creatures, and according to Islam there is only one God we may worship and follow. He is before all, above all, and no other, however holy and pure, may be named in the same breath. Indeed, "it is surprising that human beings with brains and intelligence should have been so foolish as to allow dogmas and the tricks of sacerdotalism to obscure their view of Heaven and their Almighty Father, who is always approachable by each one of His creatures, whether human or saintly (i.e., Divinely inspired).

"The key to Heaven is always there, and can be turned by the humblest or most miserable human being without any help from prophet, priest, or king. It is like the blessed air we breathe, free to all God's creatures, and those who try to make mankind think otherwise are probably guided by interested motives—e.g., salaries and stipends—which keep professions going, or some other worldly advantages."

Only the other day I received two letters, both from devout Christians. One writer, whilst complaining of my leaning towards Islam, pointed out that the Mahommedanism was the religion of sensuality, and that Mahomet had a great many wives! The other letter informed me in emphatic terms that if I did not believe in the Divinity of Christ I could not be saved.

In England we pride ourselves on our love of fair play, and it does seem to me as unfair to condemn the tenets of any particular religion without knowing anything about them as it would be to condemn an accused man without hearing his defence.

There is a story told of a young and inexperienced Eastern ruler before whom an alleged criminal was being tried for his life. The evidence against the man seemed very strong; so, immediately at its conclusion, the youthful potentate said, "All right, take him away and hang him."

"But, your majesty," said the defending counsel, "will you be pleased to hear the witnesses for the defence?"

"Not I!" said the young ruler; "I might change my mind; take him away and hang him."

I wrote and explained to the first-named writer that Islam was not a religion of sensuality, but one of submission to God and beneficence to all His creatures, and that Mahomet's life was singularly blameless, and that his numerous wives were really married in order to provide them with homes, as they were the widows of those of his supporters who were slain in battle. I pointed out to the second writer that the Divinity of Christ never worried me one way or the other, and that the important point was whether Christ delivered God's messages to mankind.

Having shaken off the shackles of bigotry and superstition I feel myself like a man emerging from a tunnel, charged with mephitic and sulphurous gases, into the fresh clean air, and, to conclude this article, which has, I fear, exceeded its limits, I will quote from a little book I wrote a year or so ago—the same work previously quoted from: "The dogmas of the Christian Church—I care not whether Roman Catholic or Protestant—have repelled me ever since earliest childhood, and I do not know whether my boyish distrust of the Creed as laid down by St. Athanasius was less strong than is my contempt to-day for the man who lays down the law from a pulpit and consigns millions of his fellow men to everlasting perdition because they do not agree with him. It has always seemed to me very remarkable that educated gentlemen should be found who, in order to get into the Church, will cheerfully subscribe to the Thirty-nine Articles and that horrible Creed, well knowing in their hearts that they do not and cannot believe one-half they put their names to. After forty years of thought and prayerful effort to arrive at a correct view, the dominant idea in my mind is that the whole fabric of so-called religion is of man and not of God. I must also confess that visits to the East have filled me with a very deep respect for the simple faith of the Mahomedans, who really do worship God all the time, and not only on Sunday, like so many Christians."

Islam is the religion of grand simplicity; it satisfies the noblest longings of the soul, and in no way contravenes the teachings of Moses or Christ.

I hope on a future occasion to be able to give your readers an extension of this article.

HEADLEY.

—*London Budget.*

## WHY I BECAME A MOHAMMEDAN.

### THE FAITH OF ISLAM.

By LORD HEADLEY.

IN several newspapers notices have appeared commenting on my religious belief, and it is highly gratifying to me to find that so far all criticism has been of a most kindly nature. It is not to be expected that any decided step can be taken out of the beaten track of every-day custom without attracting attention.

I am very glad that such is the case. I am fond of my profession, and certain forms of athletics and sport have ever been my hobbies, but there has never been any desire for notoriety or publicity on my part; but in this case, if my action is the means of making people tolerant and broad-minded, I am quite prepared to put up with every kind of ridicule and abuse.



The other day a letter reached me from a devout Christian, informing me that the Mohammedan religion was one of sensuality, and that the Prophet had a great many wives! What an idea of Islam! But it is the idea in the mind of ninety-nine out of one hundred Britishers, who will not take the trouble to inquire into the plain facts as to the religious beliefs of over 100 million of their fellow-subjects. The Holy Prophet of Arabia was particularly self-restrained and chaste. He was true to his one wife Khadijah, who was fifteen years older than himself. She was the first to believe in the Divine messages. After her death he married Ayesha. He also married a great many of the widows of those of his adherents who had fallen in battle, not because he had the slightest desire for them, but in order to provide them with a home and give them a position they could not otherwise enjoy. This was quite in keeping with his unselfish and noble life. He gave away so much of his worldly belongings that he hardly ever had quite enough to live on.

We Britishers are wont to pride ourselves on our love for fair play and justice, yet what can be more unfair than condemning, as so many of us do, the Mohammedan faith without first attempting to find out even so much as an outline of its tenets or the meaning of the word Islam?

It is possible that some of my friends may imagine that I have been influenced by Mohammedans; but this is not the case, for my present convictions are solely the outcome of many years of thought. My actual conversations with educated Muslims on the subject of religion only commenced a few weeks ago, and need I say that I am overjoyed to find that all my theories and conclusions are entirely in accord with Islam? Even my friend, Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din, has never tried to influence me in the slightest degree. He has been a veritable living concordance, and has patiently explained and translated portions of the Koran which did not appear quite clear to me, and in this respect he showed the true spirit of the Muslim missionary, which is never to force or even persuade. Conversion, according to the Koran, should come out of free choice and spontaneous judgment, and never be attained by means of compulsion. Jesus meant the same thing when He said to His disciples: "And whosoever shall not receive you nor hear you, when ye depart thence. . . ." (St. Mark vi. 2.)

I have known very many instances of zealous Protestants who have thought it their duty to visit Roman Catholic homes in order to make "converts" of the inmates. Such irritating and unneighbourly conduct is, of course, very obnoxious, and has invariably led to much illfeeling—stirring up strife and tending to bring religion into contempt. I am sorry to think that Christian missionaries have also tried these methods with their Muslim brethren, though why they should try to convert those who are already better Christians than they are themselves

I am at a loss to conceive. I say "better Christians" advisedly, because the charity, tolerance and broad-mindedness in the Muslim faith come nearer to what Christ Himself taught than do the somewhat narrow tenets of the various Christian churches. To take one example of this narrowness—the Athanasian Creed, which treats of the Trinity in a very confusing manner. In this Creed, which is very important and deals conclusively with one of the fundamental tenets of the "Churches," it is laid down most clearly that it represents the Catholic faith, and that if we do not believe it we shall perish everlastingly; then we are told that we *must thus think of the Trinity* if we want to be saved—in other words, that a God we in one breath hail as merciful and almighty in the next breath we accuse of injustice and cruelty which we would not attribute to the most bloodthirsty human tyrant. As if God, Who is before all and above all, would be in any way influenced by what a poor mortal "thinks of the Trinity." I have never thought very much about the Trinity, as it is so confusing and does no good, but the other day an idea did flash into my mind, and I thought a little. It seems possible that St. Athanasias composed the most involved and puzzling Creed he could think of, and so arranged the wording that no layman could possibly unravel its tangles without applying to himself or some priest for the solution. I do not advance this idea very seriously, and there is probably nothing in it—it was merely a fugitive thought, which I was just quick enough to catch before it vanished. Here is another instance of want of charity. I received a letter—it was apropos of my leaning towards Islam—in which the writer told me that if I did not believe in the Divinity of Christ *I could not be saved*. The question of the Divinity of Christ never seemed to me nearly so important as that other question: Did He give God's message to mankind? Now, if I had any doubt about this latter point it would worry me a great deal; but, thank God, I have no doubt, and I hope that my faith in Christ and His inspired teachings is as firm as that of any other Muslim or Christian. As I have often said before, Islam and Christianity *as taught by Christ Himself* are sister religions, only held apart by dogmas and technicalities which might very well be dispensed with.

In the present day men are prone to become atheists when asked to subscribe to dogmatic and intolerant beliefs, and there is doubtless a craving for a religion appealing to the intelligence as well as the sentiments. Who ever heard of a Muslim turning atheist? There may have been cases, but I very much doubt it. There are thousands of men—and women too, I believe—who are at heart Muslims, but convention, fear of adverse comments and a desire to avoid any worry or change conspire to keep them from openly admitting the fact. I have taken the step, though I am quite aware that many friends and relations now look upon me as a lost soul and past praying for. And yet I

am just the same in my beliefs as I was twenty years ago ; it is the outspoken utterance which has lost me their good opinion. Fear is responsible for a vast amount of misery and crime in this world ; if people would be more outspoken there would be less misunderstanding and far more respect. Borrowing Mr. Balfour's aphorism, "There is but one counsellor worse than panic, and that counsellor is despair," I would say in this case there is an adviser worse and more dangerous than either doubt or disbelief, and that adviser is fear. Having briefly given some of my reasons for adopting the teachings of Islam, and having explained that I consider myself by that very act a far better Christian than I was before, I can only hope that others will follow the example—which I honestly believe is a good one—which will bring happiness to anyone looking upon the step as one in advance rather than one in any way hostile to true Christianity.—*The Observer* (London), November 23, 1913.

---

*To the Editor "MUSLIM INDIA."*

DEAR SIR,—Interest in *Muslim India* is largely attributable to the intellectual perception and expression of its writers, and to the accuracy with which they refer to leaders of philosophic and religious thought. Shaikh Feroz-ud-Din Khan, when dealing with "The Lords of the Easts and the Wests"—see issue for October 1913—has unhappily allowed himself to fall into an error which, equally unhappily, has been too often adopted by other literary folk. He has torn two lines of Rudyard Kipling's from the verse to which they belong and used those lines as a text to show that the author's desire was to "pamper selfishness" and "deceive their fellow-beings," teaching the latter to differentiate "the Eastern from the so-called Western nations." The poem was intended to convey an exactly opposite meaning, and the extraction and employment of the two lines only results in extracting the very soul and beauty of the poem, since those two lines refer alone to the geographical position as generally understood:—

"For East is East and West is West,  
And never the twain may meet ;  
But there's neither East nor West  
Border, nor breed, nor birth,  
When two strong men stand face to face,  
Though they come from the ends of the earth."

In other words, Shaikh Feroz-ud-Din Khan and Mr. Kipling stand on the same fine platform. "The East and the West are only the illusions of short-sighted eyes." Has the former, for a little time, been affected by short-sight.—Believe me, dear Sir,  
very faithfully yours,

ERIC HAMMOND.

30 Park Road, Wimbledon, S.W.,  
November 4, 1913.

## SACRIFICES AND ATONEMENT.

### THE FEAST OF SACRIFICES.

It was on the tenth of last month that the London Muslims met at Caxton Hall to celebrate the great Muslim Festival—the Feast of Sacrifices. The gathering was remarkable for its representative character, as well as for its numbers: English, Indian, Egyptian, Turkish, Persian, Muslims, and those from other countries met each other in true fraternal spirit to embrace and shake hands, and the spirit of peace, love and amity pervaded the hall. After the usual prayers, the following sermon was delivered by Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din, of the *Islamic Review*. He was followed by Mr. Mohamad Ali, the editor of *The Comrade* (India), and Mr. Zaffar Ali Khan, the editor of *The Zamindar* (India). The former gentleman in an eloquent speech explained the necessity of establishing Anjaman Khuddam-i-Kaaba, and succeeded in enlisting the sympathy and fellowship of his hearers to the cause of the Said Anjaman. The young Nawab of Bahawalpoor, with his Muslim guardian and officials, was also among those present.

#### THE FEAST OF SACRIFICES.

“And they who respect the rites of God perform an action which proceedeth from *piety of heart*. And to every people have we appointed rites that they may commemorate the name of God, over the brute beasts which He hath provided for them. And your God is the One God. To Him therefore *surrender yourselves*, and have thou good tidings to those who humble them.”

“Whose hearts, when mention is made of God, thrill with awe and to those who remain steadfast under all that befall them, and observe prayer and give alms of that which we have supported them.”

“And the camels have we appointed you for the sacrifice to God: much good have ye in them; make mention, therefore, of the name of God over them when ye slay them as they stand in a row; and when they are fallen over on their sides, eat of them and feed him who is content and asketh not, and him who asketh. Thus have we subjected them to you, to the intent you should be grateful.”

“*By no means can their flesh reach unto God, neither, their blood, but piety on your part reacheth Him.* Thus hath He subjected them to you that

ye might magnify God for His guidance. Moreover, announce to those who do good deeds : That God will ward off mischief from believers, for God loveth not the false and the ungrateful."—  
The Quran.

In these verses the last Book of God deals with the subject of sacrifice. This human institution has its genesis as well as its evolution. It is as old as man himself, and obtains in all classes of men. It has been believed that sacrifices ward off mischief befalling mankind, and the Quran in the verses quoted above seems to support the current view. From time immemorial man has offered sacrifices to propitiate offended Deity for his misdeeds, which as it is believed incur evil. This caused confusion of ideas and generated false notions ; it led people to believe that slaughter of animal life only could appease Divine wrath excited on account of sin. Nothing could please Divine nostrils more than the sacrificial smoke saturated with animal gore. It weakened the sense of righteousness, and ultimately dispensed with the keeping and teaching of the Commandments. Thus

#### SACRIFICE BECAME ATONEMENT

for sin. To appease God through "blood and flesh" became a popular idea, and it began to evolve. Sin in every particular form demanded a particular kind of sacrifice. One has simply to refer to the ancient mythology to find how varieties of sacrifices were provided to meet varieties of sins. Great calamities coming in consequence of great sins called for slaughter of big animals. At length the category of lower animals available became exhausted, and human ingenuity had to propose human sacrifice. To ward off evil from the whole nation India, Greece and Rome sanctified manslaughter at the altar of the Deity.

It was under these circumstances that Christianity made its appearance. The "teaching and doing of the Commandment," as taught and enjoined by Jesus, could not appeal to pagan Europe. The doctrine of Atonement, already known to and believed in by her, could alone befit her temperament. Adam committed sin, and God was just enough to condemn his whole race eternally. How to propitiate the incensed Almighty was a serious question. The whole animal life with all its species could not offer anything commensurate with the magnitude of this eternal human perdition. But God was the God of Mercy and Compassion. He loved man so much that, in order to save him from His own wrathful hands, He offered Himself for sacrifice. He sent His only begotten Son to pay the wages of sin. Great was the sin and great was the sacrifice. What an entertaining theology to suit the pagan disposition ! There is nothing to wonder at if the Greco-Romanised Christianity made progress by leaps and bounds in Europe. The 1,600-years-removed-Westerner had simply to make a

change in name and place. He had already heard of many a "God in man" in Greece and Rome, who used to participate in human affairs. Jupiter and Zeus now become antiquated, and some new god was naturally more appealing. Thus the old traditions were repeated, and they found their realisation again in the Holy Person of Jesus. Belief in

#### SACRIFICE AS AN ATONEMENT

was an old idea, and the Grace of the Blood was a palatable theory. And in my opinion, if sacrifices *ipso facto* do atone for sin, I am afraid Christianity is built upon a very strong basis. Sacrifices do obtain in all religions, and we Muslims also perform them, and to-day is the day reserved for the Feast of Sacrifices. The Quran also, while dealing with the subject, says that evils are thus warded off. But what a hideous, sickening idea that "Blood and Flesh" only can propitiate the Most Merciful God! Is it not a contradiction in terms? We do need enlightenment before we can swallow this bitter pill of theology. Was it not necessary that some Divine messenger should come to enlighten us as to the real object and utility of sacrifices? It ought to be so, yet it is in vain to turn the pages of old scriptures to find any rational exposition. Christ, perhaps, had a mind to teach something, but the low intellectual growth of His disciples could not afford Him an occasion to do so, and He had only to refer to the Coming \*Spirit of Truth. Christians do admit that *Jesus left His teachings imperfect*, and the deficiency was to be made up by the Church when filled with the Holy Ghost, which descended on the day of Pentecost. But the Church theology hardly improves upon what was already in currency in pagan Europe on the question of sacrifice. No, the teachings of the Church do not and cannot fulfil the prophecy narrated by St. John, and I challenge all the Church dignitaries in the West to refer to any improvement made upon the teachings of Christ concerning various questions troubling the human mind; and one of them is sacrifice. The Spirit of God as prophesied by Jesus descended upon Mohammad, and brought the Quran, which in the following words refers to the prophecy in question:—

"The (Spirit of) Truth has come and the false has fled away."

The Quran came to explain on rational bases all the difficult questions in theology; and the verses cited (quoted above) by me explain the utility and object of sacrificial rites. That "the Blood and the Flesh" were not *essential elements of sacrifices*, nor that they in themselves could propitiate God, was clearly taught in the Quran when it said:—

"By no means can their flesh reach unto God,  
neither their blood, but *piety on your part reacheth Him.*"

The beginning verse brings out the same idea. A Muslim with such clear teaching cannot prefer the new Dispensation of Blood to the old dispensation of "doing and teaching the Commandment" so laid special stress upon by Christ Himself. It is your righteousness and piety which reaches God, and is acceptable to Him. It is a lesson of piety which is imparted to you through your sacrifices. You are shown the way to become righteous. I cannot enter into the subject at length to show how sacrificial actions create piety in us within the short space of time at my disposal.\* Here I would simply show what righteousness is, and what are its aims and objects. To be at one with God and to be nearer to Him is the ultimate object of the righteousness which man has to achieve. Does not everyone anxiously aspire to reach what is higher? In fact, there is a universal move towards progress in the whole universe. Everything in nature desires to be converted into a higher order. And who is higher than man—the lord of the universe—excepting God? It is quite natural, therefore, that we crave after God. But how to reach this, our highest goal? Let us see various kingdoms of God's creation lower than mankind, and observe the process under which things pass from one lower order to the higher. There is only one, and one only, universal rule of this evolution. Self-effacement and self-annihilation is the only course through which one must pass before reaching a higher stage. Can the elements of earth pass into the vegetable kingdom without losing their former identity? The animal kingdom is higher than the vegetable, and no blade of grass or weed can reach near animal life or become part and parcel of an animal body unless it sacrifices itself and becomes food of an herbivorous being. Whatever we eat when assimilated becomes man. Has not the lower order been ennobled thus? A corn, a vegetable, a sheep, a fowl, all become man, but at the expense of self-immolation. A sort of death should prevail over everything, and it should lose its individuality before it aspires to reach a higher order. To be nearer to the higher being comes only through sacrifice and immolation; and it is interesting to find that the Arabic word for it is very suggestive, and explains the whole thing in itself. The word for sacrifice in Arabic is "Qurbani," which has *Qurb* for its root. *Qurb* literally means nearness. No *Qurb* *Ilahiah* (nearness to God) but through *Qurbani* (sacrifice). This is the real object of sacrifice as taught in the verses I read (quoted above):—

"And to every people have we appointed rites that they may commemorate the name of God, over the brute beasts which he hath provided for them. And your God is the One, to Him therefore *surrender*."

---

\* In our next we will fully discuss this question.

If you make sacrifices and commemorate the name of God, it is to remind you that as the animals surrender to you and through this surrender become of you, you have to surrender yourselves to God if you wish to be of God and near to Him. So show the following words of God :—

“When ye slay them (camels) as they stand in a row and when they are fallen on their side eat of them. . . . Thus have we subjected them to you, to the intent you should be grateful. . . . Thus hath He subjected them to you that ye might magnify Him.”

God has subjected animals to you, and you have to subject yourself to Him. Through surrender to you they magnify you, and through similar surrender to Him you have to magnify God, and God will ward off all mischief from you.

It is not “*the blood and flesh*” which propitiate God, and He in compensation wards off evils befalling you. It is a heinous idea, an insult to the Muslim conception of Godhead. To think so is blasphemy. It can only satisfy ignorance and credulity to think so of the Most Compassionate God. The animal, by his self-immolation, has shown to you how one can achieve dignity and salvation. To be more explicit, I may refer again to the lower animals which, by becoming our food, are ennobled to humanity. Everything in Nature is beset with dangers peculiar to it, and so it is with the animal. He has mischief to befall him, but he becomes safe from further trouble when converted into our body. No wolf will run after a sheep when it has become man. By self annihilation the sheep has got a better and safer life, and is saved from all danger.

This was meant by Lord Budha when he preached that salvation can be attained only through *Nirvana*. Man has his own dangers, and he wishes to be saved. If members of the vegetable kingdom can enter into the kingdom of animal life through self-annihilation, and those of the latter class into the human kingdom, and through this process they attain aggrandisement and salvation from their respective dangers, is it impossible for us to be promoted through the same course to the Divine order and secure immunity from all sorts of evils and dangers? Evil cannot enter even unto the precinct of the Kingdom of God, and if through self-immolation we enter into it, the Divine element in us will thrive and will ward off all evils. Then you will be held by God as His beloved, and will become begotten of Him. Then your hands will be the hands of God; your sight, the sight of God; and your feet, the feet of God. This I say on the authority of no less a personage than your own Prophet. You possess attributes of God within the limitation of humanity. This he meant when the Prophet said: “*Equip yourself with the attributes of God.*” Ennobled to that high state, you begin to share even with God what is solely reserved for



the Most High. For instance, is not all glory and praise due to God? and yet glory follows self-sacrifice. You become idolised through self-abnegation. One who loses his own individuality in God is sure to share Divine glory with Him. And the world has seen many supermen of the type. Perhaps Jesus and Iman Husain, the grandson of our Prophet, are apt illustrations. Mohammad surpassed all others in his self-sacrificing spirit, and had it not been for the masterly, clear teaching of the Holy Prophet of Islam, which killed almost all polytheistic tendencies in Muslims, the world was sure to do him the worship due only to the Father. Notwithstanding this, Husain in a very limited circle of Islam is worshipped like Jesus. Look to the sacrifice of these personages. Do you wonder if they are taken as God? If Jesus is believed to save His followers through His blood, Husain is also believed by a very limited number to save them through his unique martyrdom. My object is not to deal with this question here. My sole object here is to establish this one truth: that through self-sacrifice in the way of God one becomes of God and wields Divine powers. And can you refer me to any moral attribute other than the sacrificial spirit in man which can command glory and respect to such an extent from our fellow-man? No, you cannot.

Look to Mr. Mohammad Ali, Wazeer-Hassan and Zaffar Ali Khan—humble, insignificant atoms in God's creation, and yet their brethren idolise them. God knows what lies in their heart of hearts, but apparently they have made sacrifice of time, money and comfort in the interest of the community according to their best intent, and they become idols of the community; and if, God forbid! some personal motive actuates them to do all this, very soon God will expose them, and they will be no more. Jesus preached self-sacrifice on the Cross and Husain in the sands of Kerballa. Jesus was not God by birth, but He became a Son of God through self-sacrifice. Budha, Ramchandra and Krishna did the same, and were worshipped like Jesus. They made sacrifices not for ATONEMENT to but AT-ONE-MENT with God. But the door is not closed, it is as open to-day as it was before. Jesus was a Son of Man, as He called Himself, and you are also sons of man. What is true of one is true of another. Bear your own cross like Jesus, and share with Him the glory He enjoys through self-renunciation. He became a Son of God, and you can be the same. If such a Divine blessing was an impossibility, there would have been no Feast of Sacrifices in Islam, and we could not have met to-day in the Caxton Hall to magnify God. And let us magnify Him :—

“God is great, God is great,  
There is no other Deity but God.  
God is great, God is great,  
And to Him all praises are due.

## THE PEACE OF ISLAM.

---

I WOULD not, *could* not, as a loyal supporter of the Crown and Constitution, put my hand to the plough with such confidence if I had the slightest fear that the increase in the number of those who profess Islam, which I hope to live to see, would be likely to make the subjects of His Majesty anything but loyal and law-abiding. The true believer puts his love for God, and his earnest desire to benefit every one of God's creatures, so far above any thoughts of worldly advancement that he is the last person in the world to advocate rebellion against properly constituted authority. "Let there be no violence in religion" are words of deep significance in the Koran, and they come immediately after one of the most sublime passages in that holy book, and they are followed by: "Now is the right direction, manifestly distinguished from deceit: whoever therefore shall deny Tagut,\* and believe in God, he shall surely take hold on a strong handle, which shall not be broken; God is He who heareth and seeth."

The genuine follower of Islam places the delight of obeying God's slightest behest in the foremost citadel of his heart and soul: to him obedience to his Father in Heaven means a foretaste of Paradise—that Paradise which is a *reality* to him. Whether his worldly possessions be small or great, the happiness coming from this inward knowledge of God's mercy and love puts him in a position of absolute fearlessness. How can it be otherwise? His whole being is permeated by a desire that the Holy Spirit shall instruct him and keep him true to his anxiety to be at one with God. A near approach to this highest aspiration may be found in that beautiful Collect in the Christian Prayer Book: "O God, forasmuch as without Thee we are not able to please Thee, mercifully grant that Thy Holy Spirit may in all things direct and rule our hearts." Truly a worthy and becoming supplication from the created to the Creator, and breathing the same spirit as the preface, or opening chapter, of the Koran, which has been called "the Muslims' Lord's Prayer."

I care not what a man's colour may be—yellow, black, olive or white—or what his worldly position or environment—sunny south or wintry north—there is comfort in Islam, the religion of gratitude, praise and love; the religion of charity and peace.

There are not wanting indications that the time is not far distant when passive submission may become not only dangerous, but actually wicked. In dealing with devils, and

---

\* Literally "an idol"—anything whatever worshipped besides God, particularly the idols of the Meccans, Allat and Uzza. Also the devil or any seducer from the path to God, or any recognition of forms of religion leading to idolatry in any shape or form.

those emissaries of the evil one who are to be met with in every walk of life, it does not answer to be lenient. Compassion and "turning the other cheek" are quite thrown away upon the prince of darkness and his legions. Nothing short of annihilation should be aimed at. This is a point which may be fairly advanced and pressed forward by those who believe in the *continuity* of God's revelation to mankind. What we know has happened may happen again, for God is Almighty, and may yet instruct us, as He did in the old days of former prophets. There would be the similarity in the illuminating emanation from the Divine Presence, though the methods might be very different and difficult for mankind to comprehend.

For instance, it is conceivable that the recipient of a Divine message exhorting to a departure from or advance on the mild teachings of the gentle Jesus might be regarded as the anti-Christ or enemy of Christianity, whereas he would be merely another instrument chosen for the purpose of giving God's messages, just as Moses, Christ, and Mahomet gave them. He would be but a link in the chain of prophets maintaining the continuous stream of Divine revelation. There is no stagnation in Nature—no single event, or set of conditions and circumstances, can ever be *exactly* repeated; and it would seem unlikely that the future Revelation—whenever it pleases God to send it to us—will be anything more than *similar* to those which have preceded it, and of which we have tangible and convincing proofs.

The history of past ages shows how cruelly misunderstood have been the Holy Prophets, and how their plain statements of what God told them were regarded as ravings or insane imaginings. Every kind of indignity and torture has over and over again been the reward of those who have given out the messages, and, as a rule, it has taken centuries before men could or would recognise the Divine character of those inspired messages. Imagine for a moment the reception which would be accorded to a gentleman addressing a large mixed audience in the Albert Hall and declaring that he had himself experienced anything like the happenings described by St. John the Divine in the Book of Revelation! There is but very little doubt in my mind that "brain specialists" would be called in, and the gentleman would be politely but firmly removed to Hanwell. And yet his words would be *true*, and he would be made to suffer because sceptics were incapable of realising the fact that the power of God is infinite, and that He can suspend, alter, or adapt any of the laws of Nature, and, for the purposes of revelation, give power to any of His creatures to see into other worlds of beauty, and to receive impressions and messages which would be impossible but for His direct and special provisions.

## LORD HEADLEY

AND

## THE ISLAMIC SOCIETY DINNER.

---

LORD HEADLEY, to whom had been allotted the toast of the Islamic Society, was pleased to see such a large gathering of his Muslim brethren, and felt proud of the honour of being an invited guest on such an occasion. The Society, numbering about three hundred members in London, a few distinguished honorary members and twenty-five associates, was one which deserved the support of all good citizens, because it was of so much use to Mohammadans either permanently or temporarily resident in this country. It was also useful as an auxiliary in such matters as the publication of literature, an example being found in the bringing out of Dr. Stubbs' "Rise and Progress of Mohammadanism," which was published under the auspices of the Society.

Established in 1886 under the name of the "Aujuman-i-Islam," it continued to be so known until 1903, when it was resolved to change the name to the "Pan-Islamic" Society. This new name seemed to arouse a certain amount of suspicion, and it was felt that, had it been retained, a false impression might get abroad as to the real intention of Muslims generally towards their Christian fellow-subjects, so that yet a further alteration was effected in 1907, when the name as it now stands was decided upon. Whilst on this question of names, his lordship wished to quote from a recent lecture which his dear and respected friend and brother Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din delivered to a large gathering of his countrymen in Lahore, and he did so to show how loyal the educated Mohammadan is to the British Empire, under which our Aryan brothers enjoy more freedom than they would under any other country of the West :—

"If Pan-Islamism is understood to mean that all Muslims living in different parts of the earth under different non-Muslim Governments are unanimously planning to overthrow the Christian Empires, and thus to renew afresh the glory of Islam, it is a falsehood which has been made up by mischief-mongers. . . . Religion is nothing but obedience to certain Commandments; it is therefore obligatory on me as a follower of this religion to abide by, among other things, the order relating to unquestioning submission to the Government and real enmity with the enemies of the Government. It an odd inconsistency that in endeavouring to live in the service of my religion I should wantonly allow myself to go against the express Commandments of it. . . . Consequently, it must be said with

all emphasis in the interests of the truth that anybody who takes Pan-Islamism in the sense which some European churchmen are giving it, is not a Muslim in the true meaning of the term. But if Pan-Islamism means that a Muslim should wish that all human souls living on earth may become Muslims, and accept the truth of the Arabian Prophet, then I shall be the first to be proud of my love for Pan-Islamism, and for this I am prepared to undergo all punishment, for love for Islam and dissemination of Islam has sunk into my blood. I don't wish for any Islamic Government, nor desire any Islamic Empire. What I do long for is this—that, whoever be the ruler, the whole world may turn Muslim. When my ancestors under Usman were able by dint of noble example and force of unsullied character to convert a Christian ruler to Islam, there is no reason why I should not pray to God for a high degree of piety and godliness and righteousness, coupled with perfect obedience and submission to the Government, so that the force of my and my brethren's electrifying example may win over for Islam, if not his Majesty King George, any of his descendants. May God protect King George and his mighty Empire! Really, we Muslims who belong to different sects have enjoyed such comfort as we could not enjoy under any other Government. Here (in India) we have religious freedom to an extent unknown in Afghanistan, Persia, Turkey, Syria and Arabia. It is the blessing of this very Government that I am freely unfolding my ideas, otherwise in Afghanistan, if a Hindu make bold to say even by way of prayer that his Majesty the Amir may turn Hindu, he is sure to be stoned to death. In short, the significance which the European clergy put upon the term 'Pan-Islamism' is absolutely humbug for us Indians."

His lordship felt very strongly that we should look to men of broadminded intelligence like Kamal-ud-Din to assist in bringing the East and West to a more harmonious position. The question had often presented itself to him in this form: "How can the Muslim faith—so beautiful in its touching simplicity and grace—be 'Westernised' so as to be brought into practical touch with Western ideas?" Or, in other words, how can we Westerns apply ourselves so as to gain a better and truer comprehension of what Islam really means? It is futile to say that the West cannot tolerate the religious beliefs of the East, because for the past 2,000 years the nations of Europe have been professedly following the teachings of Moses and Christ—both Asiatics.

So that that "monstrum horrendum" Pan-Islamic might quite well have been retained so far as any serious damage might have been anticipated from its use, but it was good policy to change it for the simpler but very excellent reason that it might mislead those who are at present unacquainted with the true aspirations of all good Muslims.

Then the Society is useful in that on the death of any Mohammadan in this country the obsequies are carefully

attended to by the members, who see that the last rites are decently and properly carried out.

Now we may hope that with the spread of Islamic teaching there may be soon added to the list of members of the Society the names of many who, though in sympathy with the movement, are at present afraid of the outcry which might be raised on their publicly adopting the faith. He hoped that they would allow him to come up for election either as an honorary or ordinary member, and he would even be pleased to be an associate member, if so desired. He also wished it to be known that he will make it his very sacred and delightful duty to explain to all his friends what, according to his lights and intelligence, he believes constitutes the faith of Islam. Whatever a man's colour may be, whatever his position or environment, there is comfort in Islam—the religion of gratitude, praise, and love; the religion of charity and peace. It may be possibly argued that we get along very well with the religion we have; it was good enough for our ancestors for many generations past and ought to be good enough for us. As well might it be argued that we have no need of Atlantic liners, because our ancestors contented themselves with dug-out canoes and coracles. Surely we should look for what is best and most simple and appealing to intelligence in religion as well as in other things? It is often forced upon one that the dogmatic teachings of many of the churches we find in the West are conducive to ill feeling and acrimonious discussion, and we know that, not so very long ago in this enlightened country, Christian men not only freely consigned the souls of other Christian men to everlasting perdition, but put their bodies on to the rack and into the fire. Torture and barbarities have been committed in Christian England in the name of gentle Jesus which could find no favour with the One God of Mercy we now adore.

Why should we be held in subjection by sacerdotalism? Has not the age passed when we can reasonably be expected to worry about shibboleths and the dogmas of churches, when we can, if we choose, worship God at all times and without restraint? In this fast moving age religion is looked upon as rather a bore, and men are either atheists or blind followers of some dogmatic line of teaching which their reason rebels against, but which they outwardly profess because they think it looks well and *pays*. So much has been thought, spoken and written on the all-important, all-absorbing subject of religion that it may well be that there is nothing fresh to be obtained from any human quarter. That there is good in *all* religions must be admitted, but it almost follows that some forms are better than others. If it were possible to get a sound "non-professional" opinion in the selection of our religion, it would be a grand step in the right direction. If we go to priests or monks or others whose business it is to supply a particular kind of article of which they approve, we cannot get much assistance

because the various tenets or dogmas are so diametrically opposed to one another. Take the Christian Church alone; we should have such bewilderingly different directions to heaven from the Church of England, the Church of Rome, and the Nonconformists that we should gain nothing at all. What we want is an unbiassed opinion. Very probably if a number of intelligent and well-informed men were invited to put their heads together and examine carefully the different systems of religion with the view of determining the best and purest form, the decision would be in favour of Islam.

He thought the age had altogether passed when it would be sought to establish any religion by force of arms, and even if they had the power to do so the Muslims would never attempt to establish Islam by violent methods. Sedition and rebellion were absolutely forbidden in the Koran: "Let there be no violence in religion," being one of the maxims of the Muslim faith.

His lordship wished it to be clearly understood that as a loyal subject of his Majesty he felt himself at home amongst other loyal subjects, and he trusted that the day might not be far distant when he himself, a Western Muslim, might be but one amongst tens of thousands of those who will follow Islam from the conviction that it is the simplest and purest form of religion, and it would be a pleasing thought to find himself in the majority, for, as his hearers were aware, the majority of the King's subjects in the British Empire are Muslims.

In conclusion, he expressed the hope that fear of ridicule or the adverse opinions of friends or enemies would not prevent sensible men from adopting a religion which strongly appeals to the reason as well as to the mystic side of their nature. In thanking the Society for the hospitality shown that night, he expressed the hope that they might all be spared to meet again on a similar happy occasion, and he looked forward to a large increase in the membership of the Society during the coming year.

---

## A BEAUTIFUL PARABLE.

---

### LORD MOHAMMAD SAYS:

My religion is like rainy clouds. Some of them fall on pure, favourable soil, and cause fresh grass to grow. Some of them, falling in hollows, benefit mankind. Some fall on high lands, from which no benefit is derived. The two first are like the persons who acquaint themselves with the religion of God and instruct others, and the last like the person who neither regards it, nor accepts the right path.

## MUSLIM-HINDU RELATIONS.

*A Paper read by SAYYAD WAZEER HASSAN, B.A., LL.B.,  
Secretary All-India Muslim League, under the auspices of  
London Indian Association, at Caxton Hall.*

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,—

I feel highly honoured by the invitation which the London Indian Association has so kindly extended to me to address you this evening on a subject which is so near and dear to my heart, and I am sure must be near and dear to your hearts also. Ladies and gentlemen, the subject on which I have to address you this evening is of very great significance and importance to the inhabitants of a country which contains about one-fifth of the whole human race, and it is of no less importance to Great Britain, of which India, in the words of Lord Morley, is practically the only Empire. Upon the right solution of this great problem depends the future of our Motherland, and also to a great extent the future of the great Empire to which we belong. Of course, as you all know, India is neither wholly Moslem nor wholly Hindu; nor, indeed, is India synonymous with a combination of Hindus and Mussulmans. But I mean no disrespect to other communities in India when I say that the Hindus and the Mussulmans form the two main communities of India, and its future depends far more on the establishment of proper relations between them and the adjustment of those relations to the position of India in the British Empire than on the relations and position of other communities inhabiting India. In our own country we are familiar with the number of people inhabiting it and with the vast area of the country, but even in the short space of time that I have been in England I have not failed to note how colossal is the ignorance here about the country which constitutes practically England's only Empire. You will, therefore, forgive me if I repeat what is only too well known to you that in India there are almost twice as many Mohammedans as there are Christians in Great Britain, and that the number of Hindus is about two hundred and twenty millions, and together these communities form about 92 per cent. of the total population of India. It would be obvious to any but the wholly insane that it is neither possible for the seventy millions of Mussulmans to exterminate in any manner or way the two hundred and twenty millions of Hindus, nor is it possible for the two hundred and twenty millions of Hindus to get rid of the seventy millions of Mussulmans. Moreover, their relationship is not a question of to-day only, but in one way or another the Mussulmans and the Hindus have been in more or less close contact with each other for twelve centuries. Out



of this long period in their histories the two communities have been most intimately related to each other during the last seven hundred years and more. If there had been any possibility of the extermination of one by the other, I presume all these centuries were a sufficiently long period for any reasonable trial of such inhuman experiments. We should, therefore, begin an examination of this problem with the idea of extermination of one community by the other left out of the catalogue of future possibilities, and, in presuming this, I hope I shall not be considered guilty of taking too much for granted. Ladies and gentlemen, we should not, I think, go back too far into the remote past and rake up old rivalries, nor are we likely to get at the truth in histories often read by the educated Indians of to-day, for it is only too often that the honest and laborious chronicler's hand is invisible therein, while we see the shadow of the politician looming only too large. But you will permit me to say that about sixty years ago, when a new educational policy came to be pursued in India, the positions of the two communities were not exactly the same. The Mohammadans had practically lost their Indian Empire, but, like all proud fallen people, they disdained at the time to learn anything from their new teachers. However natural may have been this spirit of defiance and this habit of sulking, no Mussulman can look back upon it except to lament the criminal neglect of opportunities which were provided for Mussulmans as well as the Hindus in India by a generation of Englishmen whose names are now blessed in all educated and cultured Indian households, and will continue to be so blessed by coming generations educated on the lines chalked out by those illustrious and benevolent Englishmen. The Hindu-Moslem problem, as it exists to-day, did not exist at the time ; but I fear we have no reason to contemplate that position with any great satisfaction, for it does not argue that because it was not then, so to speak, a living issue, it would not become one at a later stage of the growth of the two communities. The absence of any manifestations of antagonism is not the same thing as the existence of unity and perfect harmony ; and, in tracing back from the present to that not very remote past, I am inclined to find the causes of present-day antagonism to the extent that it exists in the difference of tempers of the two communities when education on modern lines was first introduced into India. Wisely enough, and quite naturally, the Hindu community began from the very first to take full advantage of the new education, and its present evolution is due to the foresight and adaptability of its leaders sixty years ago. Unfortunately for the Mussulmans, they remained for a long time in the stupor that followed upon their decline and the disappearance of their dominion, and it seemed very unlikely that they could be roused from that condition by any individuals or forces working at the time. But fortunately for them, just at the time that the Hindus began to attend in

every day increasing numbers the schools and colleges established by Government and missionary societies in India, there lived amongst the Mohammadans one who, although the product of the ancient Eastern education, and surrounded by the environments of a period of decline, had a sufficiently clear vision and a far-sightedness that made him realise the importance of a change in the form and the content of education. Of course, I refer to Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, the greatest Mussulman of the last century, and one of the greatest Indians of that period.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am not unaware of the fact that some sincere well-wishers of India have occasionally criticised Sir Syed Ahmed Khan on account of his political views, but let me assure you that no one in India has worked harder or on sounder lines for the unity of India than Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, because it is due to him that Indian Mussulmans took to English education ; and when once the two communities share the same temper as regards Western education, and the educational disparity between them is removed, national unity would be assured.

Those rash generalisers who show in their actions even more than in their words that evolution is an abstruse expression only to be found in books on science, but never in real life, have not hesitated to accuse Sir Syed Ahmed Khan of having been opposed for all time to Moslem participation in the politics of their country ; but we who knew him more intimately, if I may say so, we who sat at his feet in Aligurh, and imbibed his own ideas about the future of India and Indian Mussulmans, do not hold that these accusations are correct and just, and apart from his intimate relations with many Hindus, and his writings and speeches where the ideal of unity is clearly defined, we maintain that the result of his educational policy justifies our interpretation of his views and character. The Calcutta University was founded in 1857, and thirty years after that memorable event India witnessed the establishment of the Indian National Congress. Students of sociology allot a period of thirty years to each generation, and it is not a mere fancy of mine that the establishment of the Indian National Congress was inevitably thirty years after the foundation of the Calcutta University. In this interval a new generation of men had come into prominence and was beginning to guide the destinies of their fellow-countrymen. The teachings of Western poets and political philosophers had now begun to bear fruit, and the first manifestation of the effect of the training which India received at the hands of its rulers now became visible in an organised form in the Indian National Congress. The Congress was, therefore, the result of the ordinary process of evolution working during the preceding thirty years, and was, as such, an embodiment of Indian political consciousness. As I have already suggested, these thirty years were unfortunately not utilised by Indian Mussulmans in the

same manner as by their Hindu fellow-countrymen. It will take me too far from my theme to analyse the causes under the dead-weight of which the Mussulmans had laboured, and which effectively prevented them from adapting themselves to the new situation. It is more to the point to mention that the cogitations of Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, for whom the downfall of Mussulman and the cataclysm of the Mutiny of 1857 were a rude awakening, resulted in the foundation of the Mohamadan Anglo-Oriental College at Aligurh in 1877, and it is no mere coincidence that it took the Mussulmans also exactly the same period of thirty years after this epoch-making event to establish their first political organisation. For the Mussulmans, the year 1877 and the foundation of the Aligurh College have the same significance as the year 1857 and the foundation of the Calcutta University have for their Hindu fellow-countrymen. In the space of these thirty years intervening between the foundation of the Aligurh College and the establishment of the Moslem League in 1906 a new generation of Mussulmans had come into prominence and had begun to shape the destinies of their co-religionists. The foundation of the League was therefore the first manifestation of the dawn of political consciousness on the Moslem horizon in India. The study of the poets and philosophers of the West, which had brought about a new political consciousness to the Hindus twenty years ago, brought about the same consciousness to the Mussulmans twenty years later, and he who would quarrel with Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, for keeping the Mussulmans back from a participation in the politics of their country twenty years before it came about seems to me to be one who would quarrel with the laws of Nature and the scientifically established process of evolution. In 1886 the Mussulmans could have taken no useful part in Indian politics, and, in fact, I feel certain that with their ignorance at that time, and in the temper in which they then happened to be, their participation in Indian politics would have reacted unfavourably on their Hindu fellow-countrymen also. He who plucks an unripe fruit must expect to find it sour.

It may be asked that if the Mohammadans became conscious of their political entity twenty years later than the Hindus, why did they not join an already existing political organisation instead of forming, as they have done, a separate organisation of their own. My reply to this question, which I admit to be pertinent and natural, is two-fold. In the first place, as I have already shown, the growth and evolution of the two communities, although similar in character, was not the same in point of time, and much as we may desire as Mussulmans to remove the distance of twenty years that separated the educational advancement of the two communities, we must confess we are powerless to do so. Those who commence their journey late in the day cannot hope to catch up those who commence theirs with the dawn. But it is possible for Mussulmans to learn a

great deal from the lessons which experience has taught to the Hindus, and either by discovering short-cuts or making forced marches to catch up their fellow-wayfarers on the road of progress. And here let me make an appeal to my Hindu fellow-countrymen. I appeal to them to lend every assistance they can to the Moslem laggards, for if they are to work together with the Hindus the two must march shoulder to shoulder. Even in politics magnanimity is not un-often the best policy, and in appealing to my Hindu fellow-countrymen to be magnanimous I am not appealing only to their magnanimity, but also to their political sagacity. The continuance of educational disparity between Hindus and Mussulmans will retard the growth of a common nationality, as the existence of such a disparity retarded common action in the past. Political unity can only be established between those who are equally well educated, and if Moslem co-operation appears at all necessary, it is the duty of my fellow-countrymen to assist in removing the existing disparity, and any help offered to the Mussulmans in education is one more stone put on top of the others in the construction of the national edifice.

In the second place, I would request you, ladies and gentlemen, to bear with me awhile, because I should like to develop before you an idea which, although far from original, is one with which, perhaps, you are not very familiar. Considering that so many things and institutions which are common to-day in India are the results of a study of English people and their institutions, and of a conscious or unconscious imitation of them, it is not to be wondered at if, in gazing into the future of our country, we are liable to think a little too often that it would be similar to that of the country which brought to us our newly-found political consciousness. But, trite as it may seem, it is only too true that India is in a hundred and one things unlike England, and we shall once more be quarrelling with the laws of Nature if we anticipate a political future for India exactly the same as the present conditions of England. Any student of sociology would tell you that no two countries or people can find their salvation in exactly the same manner; but it is salvation that we need, and we can leave the manner of securing it to itself. The history of our country for many, many centuries and the temperament of our people in the East have to be taken into account, and it appears to me that we shall be failing in our duty as nation-builders if, in deciding upon the method of attaining salvation, we attach the same value and significance to differences of religion in India as we do in England. In the East our religion is something more than a matter of ritual, something more than a set of spiritual conceptions. It often provides for us a social polity, and gives a distinct colour and shape to our culture. I do not intend to discuss here the merits or demerits of Islam and Hinduism, nor is it necessary for me to establish the superiority of one faith

over the other. But you will permit me to say that I am not prepared to believe that there is no difference between the two, or that that difference does not matter in politics. By politics I do not mean merely political tactics adopted for gaining particular political ends. Politics, to my mind, comprise all the public activities of civilised beings ; and, as I understand religion to teach the devotee how to live and how to die, I cannot dissociate religion from politics, nor can I regard them as two garments which can be put on and put off in turn. Holding these views as I do, I find when I scan the skies the vision of the future to be one of an united India ; but the union appears to be one not of individuals, but of communities—a political entity on federal lines as unique in constitution as our circumstances ; a federation of faiths no less strong than a federation of states in America or of kingdoms in Germany ; a union of people “not like to like, but like in difference, self-reverent each and reverencing each.” Ladies and gentlemen, whether you consider the question of separate political organisations or of communal representation, the main thing to consider is not whether two people enter the same house from two different doors or from one door, but whether they enter the same house or not, and whether they come to it animated with the same desires and cherishing the same ideals. If I may be permitted to say so, we have spent too much time in discussing the question of different doors, and in the heat of discussion have forgotten that we have to live in the same house ; and if we wish to live together, it is better to live in concord and harmony than in conflict and hostility. I will not attempt to apportion praise or blame between the two communities, but you will permit me to say that often and often enough the political organisations of the two communities have worked on the same lines in recent years, and the representatives of the two communities in the various legislative bodies of India have fought shoulder to shoulder against despotic measures and policies. The most recent manifestation of the desire to work together has been the series of meetings which have been held in Allahabad, Calcutta, Madras and Bombay, the last of which took place at Cawnpore. An account of this has come to hand by to-day's mail, and we find that Mr. Mazhar-ul-Haque, that distinguished champion of Indian unity, made a remarkable speech. In this meeting, I may add, more than two thousand Mussulmans participated. Please do not mistake these signs for an ebullition of Moslem temper which would subside as quickly as it has arisen. These are symptoms of the effect that education on similar lines has produced on two communities living side by side and recognising a common destiny above the existence of separate entities and the din of communal claims. The new ideals which are being cherished by the present generation of the Mussulmans could not but open new vistas before their vision. They see—and see with a steady gaze—

that the progress of our common Motherland must depend on a hearty co-operation among all her sons. Side by side with the recognition of their peculiar conditions, the Mussulmans, too, have begun to form conceptions of broader obligations and wider responsibilities to their country as a whole; and it appears to me that, while not quarrelling with the existence of separate communities as separate political entities, we can yet progress towards the formation of a nation in India evolved out of a gradual process of eliminating and minimising the points of difference, and developing and increasing the points of concord between the two great communities.

I must not be too exacting in my demands upon you this evening, and I will not quarrel with you if you are not convinced that the lines of evolution of nationhood which I have roughly sketched to-day are the right ones. But may I not appeal to you, and to a larger audience in India, for the exercise of a little charity in believing that even if I differ from some of my fellow-countrymen in my solution of the problem of nationhood, I am not any the less sincere and ardent in my desire to achieve the goal which they have in view? The glaring monotony of Indian public life is the result of forcing the awakening mind of the people into a cast-iron mould that may break, but would not bend. It is a shallow philosophy that seeks to find unity of effort through a uniformity of opinion. A fully developed national life is a rich texture of many hues into which is woven an infinite variety of aim, motive, and desire. It would, therefore, be idle to expect public men to respond to fresh inspiration, and to initiate fresh forms of public endeavour, so long as freedom of thought is suppressed by those who control the only efficient instruments that democracy has evolved for the organisation of public will and intelligence.

You will pardon me, I hope, if in this discussion I place before you certain recent developments in the organisation, of which I am the chief executive officer. I refer to the new creed of the All-India Moslem League.

We felt that there must be a political ideal for a political organisation. In April 1912 there was issued a circular letter from the office of the All-India Moslem League to all its members and other leading Mussulmans inviting their opinions on the subject. The correspondence which passed between the office and the members of the Moslem community in this behalf is a voluminous record. It was a matter of extreme satisfaction to me personally that the views of a large majority pointed to one and only one end, and it was that we must place on our programme as our ideal "a system of self-government suitable to India under the *ægis* of the British Crown." To appraise the true value of these opinions I made a tour in October 1912 almost throughout the country, and my conviction as regards the political consciousness of my community was more than confirmed. This ideal was, therefore, placed before

a meeting of the council of the All-India Moslem League held on December 31, 1912, under the presidentship of his Highness the Aga Khan. The council adopted the ideal placed before it, which was again laid for confirmation before the annual meeting of the All-India Moslem League held on March 22 and 23, 1913, in the city of Lucknow. The League gave its confirmation to that ideal. It runs as follows :—

“The objects of the League shall be *inter alia* attainment under the *ægis* of the British Crown of a system of self-government suitable to India through constitutional means by bringing about amongst others a steady reform of the existing system of administration, by promoting national unity, by fostering a public spirit among the people of India, and by co-operation with other communities for the said purposes.”

This clause, taken from the constitution of the All-India Moslem League, deserves, ladies and gentlemen, your best consideration. You will observe that it indicates not only the ideal towards which we should be steadily marching, but it also attempts, to a limited extent, of course, to point out the steps by which we may approach nearer to the goal in view. Let me now analyse the clause :—

“By a steady reform of the existing system of administration.”

This indicates that although no revolutionary reforms are contemplated, nevertheless the Mussulman mind is not unconscious of the defects in the administration of the country at present. It is obvious that the machinery, with the help of which India is governed, is more or less a century old. It is preposterous to contend that the India of to-day may well be governed with the help of the same machinery.

The second portion of the clause stands thus :—

“By promoting national unity.”

Howsoever we may wish for a speedy formation of an Indian nationality, it seems clear that it must evolve out of the circumstances which arise under our political activities in different directions. It cannot be “let there be a nation, and there is a nation.” The Indian nationality must, I presume, be founded upon the bedrock of a unity of ideals. The methods of working for the attainment of those ideals may differ. I maintain, therefore, that the ideal of self-government which the All-India Moslem League has placed on its programme is an important step towards the formation of that great nationality for the building of which we are all aspiring.

The last portion of the clause runs as follows :—

“By co-operating with other communities for the said purposes.”

In pursuance of the policy laid thereby, I had the honour to address a circular letter to my Hindu brethren inviting them to meet the Mussulmans in a conference in which we could discuss the preliminaries to our concerted action. My absence from India at this juncture has necessarily delayed the desired conference being convened, but if Providence spares me the strength and determination with which I have taken up this pleasant task, the conference shall be convened.

I now crave your indulgence for quoting a short passage from a message which my friend Mr. Mohamed Ali and myself left behind us for our fellow-countrymen when leaving the shores of India :—

“ But the object of our journey is by no means sectarian or exclusively communal. We firmly believe that the progress and well-being of the Mussulmans are bound up with the progress and well-being of the country in which they live. The present carries in its womb the hopes and fears common to every community in India, and we shall be failing in our duties, not only as Indians but as Mussulmans also, if we do not strive during our sojourn in England to convert our fears into hopes, and to materialise the hopes which we share with all our fellow-countrymen.”

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I trust you will accept this as a true index of the Moslem heart. I appeal to my fellow-countrymen for patience, toleration and goodwill. We assure them that we are fully conscious of the great responsibility that lies on the shoulders of the Indian Moslems in shaping the future destiny of our common motherland. We fully know that united we are sure to rise to the height aimed at, and divided we fall into abysmal depths.

Ladies and gentlemen, the discussion of the Hindu-Moslem problem in India is necessarily a sketch of the gradual development of the Moslem mind. I have tried to place before you the Moslem point of view of the present day, and I have no doubt you share with me the hopes of a brighter future.

I cannot, however, conclude this address without a passing reference to chimerical dangers pointed out and needless warnings indulged in by a certain section of the Anglo-Indian press, which have found an echo in the correspondence columns of an important English journal ; but it is not only to these people that I address myself when I say that the unity of Hindus and Mussulmans is not to be a unity in opposition to the British Government. I must warn you that often and often in the history of political organisations a unity in opposition has subsequently proved to be very ephemeral and weak. It is true that we wish to unite in attacking from two different sides the citadel of bureaucratic, and, in fact, despotic rule and all the abuses which it inevitably brings in its train ; but I am astonished to find that the unity between Hindus and Moham-



madans, which every British administrator in India has so long preached, is giving rise in the official mind to considerable embarrassment and uneasiness when it is at last going to be practised. I will not insult these illustrious administrators by accusing them of hypocrisy, but I am sure they would realise that the education which we Indians have received makes us somewhat critical, and unless they dissociate themselves from all ideas of being hostile to Hindu and Mussulman unity everyone in our country will not be equally disposed to give them credit for perfect sincerity. We are not so foolish as to believe that self-government can be achieved in a day. It will only follow the growth and development of a common nationality, and I would be deceiving you if I did not make it clear before I sit down to-night that I believe the evolution of a nation to be the work of many years and decades of patient labour and sincere and sustained effort. If we are to believe these journals to which I have referred, the Mohammadans seem to be very much like the child in the nursery rhyme: "When he is good he is very, very good, but when he is bad he is horrid." Is it sane to imagine for a moment that Indian Mussulmans mean to exterminate the British and oust the British Government from India simply because, following slowly in the wake of the Government of India, they have now come to cherish the ideal of self-government, to which such a clear reference was made in the now memorable dispatch of that Government on August 25, 1911? I will not dwell long on this subject because, no matter with how much ignorance of India I may credit the people of England, I cannot believe that they would readily swallow all that is written about the ambitions of the true Moslems leaders of to-day. I will only ask them: Is it natural to expect that, in spite of years of Western education, which has guided other communities of India on the path of progress, Indian Mussulmans would be content to live, like the women of ancient Rome, in a state of perpetual tutelage? I would ask them: Is it wise, is it even in the interests of the continuance of the British connection with India to distort for the ultimate rulers of India the legitimate hopes and aspirations of educated Mussulmans into a movement of anarchical character? If we believe that a wise Providence could not neglect the growth and progress of a fifth of the whole human race, we must believe that British rule in India to-day is providential. The sheet-anchor of the Oriental mind is a faith in Providence. Let us all hold fast to that faith, but let us not forget those beautiful lines which may be addressed to unity:—

"Thou wilt come, join men, knit nation unto nation,  
But not for us who watch to-day and burn.  
Thou wilt come, but after what long years of trial,  
Weary watching, patient longing, dull denial."

**PIERRE LOTI'S Defence of the Turks (Turquie Agonisante).**

"Arson, massacres, pillage, rape, terrible and unspeakable mutilations of prisoners, nothing is wanting from the reckoning of these truly Christian armies."

# **"Turkey in Agony"**

By **PIERRE LOTI.**

*(Thirty-seven editions have appeared in French.)*

Translated by "Bedwin Sands."

**FROM ALL BOOKSELLERS.**

**3s. 6d. net.**

Published for the **OTTOMAN COMMITTEE**

BY

**The AFRICAN TIMES & ORIENT REVIEW, Ltd.,**  
**158 Fleet Street, London, E.C.**

## **DIRECTIONS.**

1. All remittances from India and all communications respecting advertisements from Indian advertisers and all matters in bargain to Sh. Rahmatullah, Esq., English warehouse, Lahore.
2. All correspondence with the Editor at The Mosque, Woking, England.
3. For any numbers not received in India, please write to the Manager, "Muslim India," English warehouse, Lahore.

## **IMPORTANT NOTICE.**

Such of our Subscribers as miss any back number of "MUSLIM INDIA," &c., or wish to complete their file, are urgently requested to inform us by the next mail, as we intend to arrange for reprinting back numbers.

SH. NOORAHMAD, Manager.

## **MOHAMMADANISM.**

Anyone desiring information and enlightenment regarding Mohammadanism can communicate or make an appointment with Kh. Kamal-ud-Din, or see him any afternoon, excepting Friday, at our office, THE MOSQUE, WOKING, SURREY.