

# MUSLIM INDIA

AND

## ISLAMIC REVIEW.

---

VOL. I.]

FEBRUARY 1913.

[No. 1.

---

### FOREWORD.

---

DURING our sojourn in this country nothing could amaze us more than the striking contrast which, to our great surprise, we observed between the readiness of the English nation to do justice, and its misplacement for want of proper information. That John Bull would defend the weak and side with the aggrieved is as true of him to-day as it was in days gone by. But he is a human being, and is liable to make mistakes if misinformed. In a country like England, where the public voice acts as an effective agency to mould the trend of events, while in its turn itself receives its shape chiefly from the Press, it is a matter for regret if the latter is not a free and unbiased channel of enlightenment. That unfortunately it is not so in certain quarters is undeniable. The Press here, as it ought or used to be, is to an extent no index of genuine public opinion, nor is it a mirror of true facts. It plays in the hands of a party it belongs to and is a strong weapon to be wielded to further the latter's ends. It must support party-policy at any cost and conceal or distort and minimise everything which it thinks has got counteracting effects. That these are not our hasty impressions, but that our opinion is based also upon information we have received from, and views entertained by, some of those unbiased thinkers who have given their best consideration to the subject, will appear from a letter inserted elsewhere in these pages, which comes from the able pen of that literary luminary of Occidental and Oriental fame—we mean Professor Edward Browne, of Cambridge, who so kindly gives us a welcome, and a timely warning too, which we hope to utilise to our advantage. { The situation of the Press here, however, can better be explained by reference to Ottoman affairs in the near East. Seemingly, the foreign policy of the present Government has all through been adverse to Turkish interest, and favourable to the Allies. A

considerable portion of the Press comes to its help to uphold the said policy. No exaggeration is spared to blacken the Turks in English estimation, while all the inhuman atrocities of the savages of the Balkans, one-hundredth part of which was more than enough to arouse honest resentment and genuine horror, are concealed or explained away, and anything which may tend to direct the wave of English opinion to the right direction is not allowed to have its free course, and the honest nation is hoodwinked as to the real state of affairs.

It is now an open secret that the wrong policy of Sir Edward Grey in foreign affairs has done more damage to British prestige in India than any measure of Indian government, though most drastic in nature, could have done there. Indiscreet utterances of the Prime Minister and the Foreign Secretary during the past few weeks, in pronouncement of their oscillating policy concerning the Balkan affairs, are likely to create that attitude in Muslim India which the most strenuous efforts on behalf of the Indian National Congress failed to do in a quarter of a century. }

#### DANGER TO MANCHESTER AND SHEFFIELD.

Swadeshi movements, which mean boycotting the European goods in the Indian market, when successful, are sure to bring many factories in Manchester and Sheffield to difficulties sufficient to cause unmanageable strikes and revolutions in the labouring classes here. The said movement only wants Muslim co-operation to see its success, which we are afraid is forthcoming. Mass meetings, consisting of thousands of Muslims of every grade, are convened in support of the Turkish cause in every big town in India, and deliberations in them only confirm our apprehension; and yet the luminaries of the English Press still continue in their efforts to keep their nation in darkness, and advise that too much importance, as the *Pall Mall Gazette* says, should not be attached to the resolutions passed by Indian Muslims at Calcutta, Lahore, and elsewhere regarding the attitude of Great Britain towards the Balkan War, because they are the doings of the Young Muslim, like those of the Young Turks in Turkey. "One hardly needs an enemy," says an Indian proverb, "in the presence of such a wise friend." These people do not wish to be corrected, nor do they allow anything to appear in their columns which may disillusionise their readers. It is our own sad experience, and it is one of those reasons which actuate this our humble effort. We do believe that the present attitude of the English people will undergo a radical change if the nation is made cognisant of that 'deep-seated interest' which their fellow Muslim subjects do feel in the four corners of India for their brethren in Turkey.

The management of this paper has been entrusted to hands best known to the Punjab Local Government (India) for the

staunch support they gave to her from pulpit and press in the days of unrest in India. (We have always believed in the British Raj as a blessing to India. We do believe that our community is better off under the present regime, and we have spared neither pen nor tongue to preach loyalty and allegiance to her while there, and consequently no one feels more acutely than ourselves at finding our work of years undone through one stroke of wrong policy. But still there is ample time to amend, and we come forward in our own humble way to co-operate with the Government in this respect ; we do believe in the strong sense of justice of this great nation, and we ascribe its present attitude to her being unaware of the real state of things.

Muslims are the greatest sufferers of all other communities through misrepresentation in Europe. With all this deluge of literature which is daily pouring from the Press in this cosmopolitan town, an average Londoner is more ignorant of the Islamic world than many Englishmen are of the Arctic zone. It is not a clergyman only, but a politician of a particular type as well, who deem it necessary to calumniate us in all possible ways. In order to poison the honest English mind against Turkey and prepare it to act against the old traditions, the wire-pullers of anti-Turkish movements took more than two score years to circulate calumniations and fabricate stories against the Turk. His religion, his polity, his economics, his social and moral conditions were vilified, and with him all the Muslim world. To strengthen this campaign against Islam, and retard its marvellous progress in Africa, a pseudo-Muslim paper, under the name of the *Moslem World*, has been started here under missionary guidance. We were not unaware of some of these misrepresentations while in India, and we regarded them as a legacy of old missionary propaganda against Islam, but on our coming over to this land we came across many a shocking piece of ignorance. Islam was the only religion which preached unity of God to a perfection that killed all polytheistic tendencies of the human race and brought all other deities of the world to the dust, yet its votaries are represented in the London theatres to bow down before a lion's head, which is kept as a chief object of adoration in their mosques. The Prophet Mohamad, who only emancipated woman from the debasement to which the whole world had reduced her, and gave her almost equal rights with man, has been represented here to have taught that woman possessed no soul. A more abominable piece of misrepresentation cannot be imagined. It was at the Council of Macon towards the end of the sixth century, and not in any Mohammadan assembly, where a bishop raised the question whether woman really was a human being, and answered the question in the negative. It was the Holy Bible, and not Alkoran, the last word of God, which in the words of St. Paul, taught that Adam was not deceived, but that the woman being

deceived was in the transgression. If Tertullian maintained that a woman should go about in humble garb mourning and penitent in order to expiate that which she derives from Eve, he simply did what the book of Genesis taught him to do. In the light he received from the Gospel, Tertullian is quite justified if he brands woman as the 'devil's gateway,' 'the first deserter of the Divine law' and the cause of human perdition. This teaching of the book of Genesis is chiefly responsible for the female debasement in Christian Europe. It was Islam which absolved woman of the calumny.

A community which has been so deliberately misrepresented by her enemies, not properly understood by her ruler, cannot expect to have fair justice at the hands of those under whom God has been pleased to place her ; but the fault lies with her and with no one else, if she makes no attempt to clear her position and make herself understood by those who are directly concerned.

\* \* \* \* \*

It was Kipling who pronounced the famous dictum—

"East is East and West is West,  
And never the twain shall meet."

Several other publicists of the West have dogmatised in similar strain, so that a vast majority of the European public, for whom thinking is done by the Press, seem to be hopelessly confirmed in the conviction that Europe and Asia will always remain an enigma unto each other. Convictions like these are easy to mature, but once they have degenerated into a prejudice, as is at present the case, it becomes well nigh impossible to dispel them. If England, after a century of Imperialism, is yet unable to understand India it is not because India is incomprehensible as most of the Western writers would have us believe, but because Englishmen have failed to meet Indians half-way in an attempt to solve the "riddle." Islamism as a phase of Orientalism has equally puzzled the one-eyed Occidental philosophy, and Muslim India, to which a chance of the presentment of its case has hitherto been denied, has suffered more at the hands of those who preside over its destinies than Hindu India, which has had comparatively greater chances of interpreting itself, thanks to a well-organised and well-equipped indigenous press. The British Empire, as a healthy Imperial organism, depends for its vigour and stability upon a complete fusion of its various components. Such a fusion has been rendered exceedingly difficult but not impossible. It is imperative in the interest of Great Britain that this difficulty, enormous as it is, should be solved as soon as possible. Our only justification for inaugurating *Muslim India* lies in a feeble attempt at preparing the way for just such a solution. With the pick and the shovel we start the pioneer's work of removing the boulders from the way. The more graceful paving we leave for better hands.

## A WELCOME AND A WARNING TO THE ISLAMIC REVIEW.

From E. G. BROWNE, *Pembroke College, Cambridge.*

*To the Editor.*

SIR,—The other day you paid me a visit and we discussed at some length your project of inaugurating this *Islamic Review*, with the object of diffusing in this country more correct ideas than those which at present prevail as to the essential features of Islam and the characteristics of those who profess that religion, and of dispelling the many gross errors—sometimes due to malice, more often to mere ignorance—which are current in Europe as to its doctrines, ethics, and practice. While applauding the motives which impelled you to undertake this task, and wishing you all success in your endeavour, I did not disguise from you my doubts as to the likelihood of your achieving any great measure of success, unless, by obtaining and publishing ampler and more correct information about current events in the East, and the prevailing tendencies of thought—religious, political and social—in the Islamic world, you could succeed in making your Review indispensable to all students of these subjects. For it is not enough to publish correct information: it is necessary to induce people to read it—a much more difficult matter.

That entertaining and suggestive writer, Max Nordau, in his work entitled “Conventional Lies of our Modern Civilisation,” has some very trenchant remarks on the so-called Freedom of the Press in Western Europe. In a sense, of course, it is free, since within limits it can write what it pleases, so long as it avoids actual libel and blasphemy; but it must not be forgotten that part of its freedom consists in the liberty it enjoys of withholding information which is distasteful to it, or which conflicts with that view of affairs to which it desires to give currency—in a word, with its policy. Formerly, when the two great political parties in this country held widely divergent views on foreign affairs, and ere most of the leading organs of the Press had passed under the control of a few powerful and wealthy groups with definite aims which they desired to promote, this evil existed in a much less degree. Thirty-five years ago, for example, the Conservative Press was in the main Turcophile, and the Liberal Press Russophile; so that if the *Daily News* refused a letter which sought to prove that the Turks were more sinned against than sinning, and that the Slavs were not the angels of light imagined by their admirers, no great harm was done, for it would be readily accepted by

the *Daily Telegraph* or the *Pall Mall Gazette*. All this has been changed now; the Radical *Daily News* is only too Conservative in its Turcophobia, while the Conservative *Pall Mall Gazette* exhibits Russophile proclivities which would have delighted the heart of Mr. Gladstone, if he could have lived to see its conversion. The mass of English people are, on the one hand, so dazed by restless domestic legislation which affects their private affairs to a degree unprecedented in the last generation, and, on the other hand, so scantily supplied with unbiased information about foreign affairs, that their interest in the latter has naturally declined. Formerly interesting information as to what was happening in the East, for instance, was eagerly accepted for publication, provided its accuracy could be guaranteed. Now this is no longer the case, and if we cannot accuse the more respectable papers of "suggestio falsi," we can hardly acquit some of them of "suppressio veri." The question with several of the most influential appears now to be, not "Is this information correct?" but "Will this information be agreeable to France, Russia, or Italy?" or "Will it support the policy outlined in our leaders?" Whatever the reason, it is amply proved by experience that at the present time it is often impossible to secure the publication of important first-hand information about what is happening, for example, in Turkey and Persia, except in one or two of the few remaining really fair and independent papers, of which the *Manchester Guardian* deservedly ranks as the first.

How to remedy this unsatisfactory state of affairs is an urgent but difficult problem: the diagnosis is, as so often happens, much easier than the treatment. Perhaps it may to some extent cure itself by generating a widespread scepticism as to the value of the Press as it now exists, either as a record of actualities or as an educator, or even an indicator, of public opinion. As soon as it is generally realised that the solemn, consequential leaders of the great London daily papers are not inspired oracles of truth and wisdom, but are too often the *tendencienx* utterances of advocates employed to give currency and authority to opinions equally base and baseless; and that the dogmatist of Printing House Square is merely *iilun jasadun lahu khuwárun*—"a calf with a lowing noise"—then shall be verified those comforting words of the Qu'rán: "*Yurídun an yutfi á núra 'lláhi bi-afwáhihim, wa lákinna 'lláha mutimmu nárihi, wa law kariha 'l-káfirín*" ("They seek to extinguish God's Light with their mouths; but God will perfect His Light, though the unbelievers like it not!").

That your Review may help to "perfect the Light" by making known the truth in all matters connected with Islam and the nations which profess it is my sincere and earnest hope.

-I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

EDWARD G. BROWNE.

February 7, 1913.

## UNIQUENESS.

BY KHWAJA.

OURS is an age of uniqueness, and if we aspire after uniqueness we only go with the age. It is a laudable pursuit and a noble object ; but our zeal in this respect, sometimes misguided, carries us too far, and our ambition leads us astray. Under a fervent desire to claim uniqueness for our possessions, sentiment takes the better of reason, and we are prone to fall short of average judgment. We form an incorrect estimate of relevant facts, and sometimes labour under a wrong conception of the desired quality ; we presume to own it while really we lack it. We are duped by some of our exclusive and unequalled possessions, which, though not enviable, are supposed by us to accredit us with uniqueness. But a Negro is not regarded as a unique character in Europe, although he possesses matchless complexion and features. He never excited the envy of the fair West, and therefore cannot claim uniqueness.

Everything has its own sphere, and must be judged on its own merits within the legitimate limits of its own class. There are others of the same genus possessing certain characteristics in common, by which they are distinguished from other species. It is from the standpoint of this difference, and not from any other point of view, that *par excellence* is required for a claim to uniqueness.

### UNIQUENESS OF THE BIBLE.

The Holy Bible is a Word of God, and if it claims uniqueness it should do so as such, but, to our great surprise, whatever has as yet been advanced in support of this claim only betrays a misconception of the claimed attribute on the part of its advocates. The wide circulation of the Holy Scripture in the four corners of the world is one of the chief arguments stated to establish its uniqueness. One need not question the correctness of the statement, although it lacks facts and figures to support it. We may admit that the Sacred Book has received such publication, but whether this fact contributes towards its merits in any way as a Word of God is a question to be considered by the thoughtful theologian of the West. Besides, this achievement of the Bible owes its existence much more, perhaps, to its being an effective means to further the self-assertiveness of Europe for its worldly aggrandisement than to any genuine desire to disseminate Biblical lore among other nations. But if this wide circulation of the Gospel is to be taken as a good ground for the uniqueness of the Bible as the Word of God, other sacred books of various denominations can rest their claim to uniqueness on similar peculiarities which

undoubtedly are their exclusive possessions. For instance, I may refer to the Rigveda, which more than two hundred millions of Hindus in India believe to be the only book of God revealed to man. It is the most ancient record that has existed on the surface of the earth. It has another novel feature which is not observable in any other sacred book. It has continued to exist in a language which was the first to die out as a spoken language. It imparts its teachings in words most unintelligible to its readers, and in this way affords room for its various commentators to differ in their exposition of the holy text from each other to an extent which has not fallen to the lot of any other sacred book. Can the Holy Vedas base their claim to uniqueness on this matchless, but undesirable, feature? God, no doubt, is unique in all His ways and works, and His Word should also be unique, but in matters which advance the sacred cause for which it has been revealed to mankind. The Bible might have got the asserted circulation, but has the extent of publication in itself anything to do with the edification of one's soul and the regeneration of one's life? Does it prove or add anything to the intrinsic value of the Holy Writ.

#### ALKORAN, UNIQUE AS THE WORD OF GOD.

The followers of Islam also claim uniqueness for Alkoran, and advance more cogent and satisfactory reasons in support of their claim, which will find space in these pages later on. For the present, I confine myself to one thing which must be taken as the cardinal feature of the Word of God. If a book from the Almighty comes to remind us of one's Creator, and if its main object is to bring man in touch with God, it is Alkoran, and no other sacred book out of the whole mass of religious literature that the world has produced, which has so marvelously fulfilled this sublime object. It opens in the name of God, it concludes in the name of God, and every page in it makes mention of God. If revelation from the Most High comes down to reveal to us the Divine character, Alkoran does it at its very outset. It opens with a verse which gives a sublime conception of God in a nutshell. It enumerates certain Divine attributes which underlie all other attributes of God mentioned in other parts of this last Word of God. It may be safely asserted that Alkoran stands unique in this respect. Genesis, the first book of the Old Testament, opens with a chapter more befitting a book on geology than a book on theology. The New Testament hardly shows any improvement in this respect. The first two Evangelists seem to be interested more in narrating the genealogy of, and the fulfilment of certain prophecies concerning Christ respectively, than in enlightening their readers with what they learnt of the Divine attributes from the Master. If St. Luke commences his Gospel with an ordinary apology of an average author for writing "what many have taken in hand to set forth," St. John only re-echoes what he might have heard



about "Logos," i.e., the Word, in many an Alexandrian school of Greek philosophy. The revealed philosophy of the "Logos" to substantiate the doctrine of "Sonship" hardly made the world any the wiser. Zend Avesta, the sacred book of the Zoroastrians, did not fare better. The opening verse of the Rigveda gives countenance more to element worship than to theism, as at its very outset it gives us an uncomium of fire. But the final Word of God in its very first verse tells us of God, from whom it claims to have come. It begins with the following verse :—

Alhamdu lillahi Rabbilalameen Arrahman arrahim  
Maliki Yawmiddin.

"Praise be to God, Lord of the Worlds, Creator and Sustainer of the Whole Universe ; most Compassionate and Bountiful to all without their merits and deserts ; most merciful and kind in rewarding the actions and deeds of His creatures ; King on the Day of Reckoning and the Giver of rewards according to one's merits and demerits."

What a true and sublime picture of God to which every atom in the Universe bears testimony ! This is the opening verse of the Holy Book of Islam, and similarly the Book ends in verses befitting the Word of God. They run thus :—

Qul A'oozu berabbinnas Malikinnas Ilahinnas.

"Say I betake myself for refuge to the Creator and Sustainer of men, the King of men, the God of men." . . .

In keeping its readers always in the august presence of God, Alkoran is again unique. In this respect it possesses a beauty of its own kind. One may open it in the most fortuitous manner, and he is sure to find mention of God on the very pages opened thus haphazardly ; nay, you cannot pass over four or five lines at a time without coming across some reference to God. God thus pervades the whole Book and permeates almost all its verses. Can anyone claim such uniqueness par excellence for the book he believes in ? On the other hand, we know books, passed as Divine Scriptures by millions of men, in which you can count pages after pages dealing with human affairs without the slightest reference to God ; and if they can be accepted as the Word of God, Alkoran has a far stronger claim to the honour. . .

(To be continued.)

---

## THE SAYINGS OF THE HOLY PROPHET MUHAMAD.

---

Hope in God, but fasten the camel securely.

The grave is the first step towards eternity.

Pay the workman his wage before his sweat dries.

Hell is hidden behind pleasures, paradise behind work and privations.

God loves the men who earn their bread by labour.

None has ever tasted better drink than he who, in the name of God, swallows down an angry word.

An hour of meditation is better than a year of devotion.

The striving after knowledge is God's will for every believer.

Shall I tell you what is better than fasting, alms and prayer? A friend making peace with his friend. Enmity and hate rob man of every gift of God.

When thou seest one who is richer or more beautiful than thou, think of those who are less fortunate than thou art.

---

AS I sit writing I hear a church choir practising. Something diverts my attention, and my eye falls upon the columns of a newspaper some two weeks old, with the heading "Fifty Thousand Killed." The choir is singing a hymn in which the words "Meek," "Mild," "peace" and "goodwill" occur. Lovingly the choristers dwell on these as if they signified something real, something of which they had cognisance. Words, mere words, as Turk and Infidel can tell. Fifty thousand killed for "peace" and "goodwill"!—E. SCHAAP (*African Times*).

## KAISER ON RELIGION.

---

WE quote the following from a speech made on February 10th by the German Emperor at the Friedrich-Wilhelm University on the occasion of the celebration in memory of the rising of the German nations in 1813. Want of space compels us for the present to reserve our humble comments on this impromptu speech made opportunely by the Emperor, when the modern mind is too much imbued with materialistic ideas to think seriously of religion. A piece of right advice comes from a right man, who could not fail to observe the lack of religious fervour so prevalent in the whole continent. The Emperor, however, spontaneously gives expression to certain ideas which may come to reality very soon, and history may repeat itself in the coming events in the Near East. The Emperor said :—

“In the old Prussian town of Koenigsberg I called to the attention of East Prussia that the seed of that great period of upheaval was to be found in the fact that the Prussian people based its moral view of life on religion—in other words, it had recovered faith in its God.

“The present generation—which is inclined to believe principally in what can be seen, proved, or touched with the hands—shows less capacity for that which is transcendental, and puts difficulties in the way of the very word religion.

“This present generation may well learn how it may get back to the faith of its fathers. Shortly after the death of the great King, the Prussian people had lost this faith.

“Foreign ways gained ground among the people, and when there came the great endurance test of 1806 there was a collapse such as the world has hardly ever seen.

“Was that the work of man? That was the judgment of God, as was subsequently a change in the course of world-history, the re-birth of a whole nation. That is so stupendous a thing that it is worth while to take it to heart, and never forget that that also was not the work of man but of God.

“Thus, in the fear of God, an oppressed and dismembered nation rose and—a wonder such as had never occurred before—carried everything before it.

“Thus we have in the facts of the past sure proofs of the governance of God. We have visible proofs that He was with us, and is still with us. Learn from these lessons of the past that the whole of Germany's youth can forge for itself that shield of faith, proved in the fire, which must never be lacking in the armoury of Germans and Prussians. Armed with such weapons we will, untroubled from right or left, pursue our straight path, eyes upraised, hearts upraised, trusting in God.”

## CROSS versus CRESCENT.

---

### IMPRESSIONS OF THE PRESENT CRISIS ON THE MINDS OF INDIAN MUSLIMS.

---

By KWAJA KAMAL-ED-DIN (Ahmidi), B.A., LL.B.

---

#### II.\*

AFTER all the cat was out of the bag. Events developed and brought facts to light, which only confirmed what had already been believed in certain quarters. It was not the Allies, but almost all the continent that had conspired first to dismember and then to extirpate a Muslim Kingdom as an alien plant on Christian soil, and the semi-barbarians of the Balkan States were used only as a catspaw. Europe with all her culture and refinement, for which she was idolised in the East, could stoop to stratagem hardly worthy of civilised people, and was seen in her true colours unknown before. She could practise anything but truth and honesty, and with her these moral delinquencies passed as the ethics of politics. Ends, though in no way honourable, justified means ; and honesty was immolated to satisfy cravings of covetousness and self-assertiveness. If some five years ago she hailed the new regime in Turkey on constitutional bases, it was more with an outlook to find occasions for interference, and take unfair advantage of disturbance and disorder which the change was likely to create, than with a noble desire to see some betterment in Turkish affairs. Harassed by a thousand and one domestic troubles, Turkey was assured by the Great Powers, as Kamil Pasha was reported to have said in an interview with Dr. Hans Barrett of *The Berliner Tageblatt*, that no war would take place. She consequently dismissed all the reservists at the suggestion of Europe, but only to be surprised and handicapped by the uncivilised Montenegrins and inhuman Bulgars. Even after the announcement of hostilities, Turkey is again hoodwinked. She as a Muslim, honestly believed in the counsels of Powers which always posed as friends to her, and assured the maintenance of her territorial integrity. If Salonica is surrendered without much opposition, it is done at a friendly advice, as a stratagem of war to create a bone of contention between Greeks and Bulgars, who, Turkey is led to believe, were already hostile to each other, but to her great discomfiture the said advice proves to be anything but honest. Turkey thus victimised to European perfidy, is surprised and defeated before she can

---

\* The first of this series appeared in the Jan.-Dec. number of *The African Times & Orient Review*, which we produce elsewhere.

organise effectual resistance. She notwithstanding makes a stand worthy of a manly race. But no sooner does she manage to strengthen her sinews than the easy conscience of Europe cannot bear bloodshed, though the earth near the seat of war was flooded with innocent Muslims' blood only a few days before, without the slightest pang of remorse in the said easy mind. Peace negotiations ~~are~~ mooted, not to redress the aggrieved, but to divide the spoils thus robbed in the name of the cut-throat Allies. All the fuss—to maintain the *status quo*—made up at the outset of the war as a precautionary measure against a possible Turkish victory is hushed up. 'The hands of the clock cannot go back,' is what is vociferated in the European Press, and re-echoed by those who know how to eat their own words, expressed to the contrary only a few weeks before, though the great repairers of the said clock of events in Europe could easily have seen their way to bring the said hand back by saying that it had gone upward wrongly, if the incidence of the war had taken a turn more favourable to Turkey. It is not the conquered area which is demanded to be ceded, but the cession of territory still to be conquered is also forced. Homilies of peace are read to the Turkish representatives in St. James' Palace by some of the so-called followers of the Prince of Peace—i.e., the statesmen of Europe, who only two weeks before could not find their equanimity of mind disturbed at those unprecedented inhuman atrocities perpetrated by the savage Bulgars against innocent Muslims, men and women who admittedly were not belligerents. At this juncture, if the manly spirit of the young Turks revolts at the sordid suggestions of the European Concert, and aspires to do what an honest nation ought to do, and what the whole Muslim world, nay, anyone having the least sense of justice in him will expect them to do, Europe presents a collective note to the Porte. All neutrality goes to the wall, all justice and equity, conscience and honesty are set at nought, and the usual convenient pretext—to secure the safety of European and Christian life in danger, reserved for self-assertion and uncalled for interference—comes to help, and the sending of cruisers of war is contemplated.

The whole affair savours of jobbery, and lacks in honesty. But why this antipathy against Turkey? Are the Turks blood-thirsty and inhuman? Events in Tripoli and the Balkan War prove otherwise, where the sheep of Christ play the part of a wolf. Is Turkey incapable of ruling her subjects? She, one may say, has shown more tact and better abilities to govern and satisfy the foreign element under her rule for some 600 years than the wisest of nations could do for a far less period elsewhere. She has shown more leniency and favourable consideration to people of different races and diverse creeds under her than others have done abroad. She could trust men of other religions and persuasions to fill the highest posts under her

government—a thing absolutely unknown to Europe in the administration of her foreign territories. The enemies of the Turks, no doubt, took special pains for the last fifty years to circulate fictitious stories of their imaginary misrule and aggression through novels, theatres and newspapers, in order to poison European minds against them and prepare Western nations to approve the present catastrophe, which these evil schemers against Turkey brought into existence ; but still, St. Petersburg affords instances of misrule of the worst type, and the favoured Allies are a race of cut-throats and bandits, as appears from their sanguinary deeds in the war.

The Turks may be adept in all European ways and manners, and they are admittedly so, but their *faith* is their crime of blackest dye in the eyes of Europe. They believe in Islam—a religion which baffles Christianity everywhere. Europe wants to see the Crescent wane before the Cross, not under a religious fervour, but from motives which savour more of the flesh than of spirit.

The modern mind here, no doubt, is too serious to give even a second thought to religion, and in certain circles, advanced in refinement and taste, to talk of religion is rudeness and insult ; but Christianity has proved to Europe an efficacious means to further her worldly aggrandisement. Missionaries are sent to foreign lands to create occasions for European interference. Conversion to Christ is a hint to Europe to presume future subjugation to her sway. Evangelical campaigns may not further the Kingdom of Christ, but they have been understood, and are therefore helped, to facilitate and prove a way to widen the European realm. To retard Christianity is, therefore, to impede European acquisitions. Obstructions put in the way of the former are taken as a check of the latter's world-devouring ambition. But Christianity, with all her worldly advantages to make progress, has got a most formidable foe to defeat in the person of Islam. Her dogmatic doctrines do not stand before the rational tenets of Islam. Her Trinity is a refined form of polytheism with a Muslim, and her object of adoration the final evolution of nature worship, from fetish to man. Her modern civilisation, with all its 'selfishness and self-indulgence, its banquets, balls and masquerades,' cannot decidedly be preferred to the purity, simplicity and self-abnegation of Islamic life. The so-called "Religion of the Sword" could make strides with leaps and bounds without the use of force, in its humble and most unassuming ways, in realms explored by Western covetousness for Christian conquest.

Islam made progress in Central Africa which was marvellous enough to excite the anxieties of not less a personage than the Emperor of Germany. Workers in the world-evangelising campaigns met from time to time in various conferences and admitted their helplessness against the Faith of one God. The use of force was the only resort left to Christianity for its

supremacy over Islam, when she failed otherwise on the strength of morality, reason and spirituality. It was Zwemer, or perhaps some other member of this reverend fraternity, in one of the world-evangelising conferences some six or seven years ago, who desired to use all Christian sinews against Islam in the coming decade, and try to remove the only unsurmountable obstacle in their way. If evangelisation means subsequent subjugation from a European point of view, it was her first duty to take the pious hint, and the trend of events which occurred within the limited space of a few years past show that she has done so. Islam had entered Europe through the North of Africa, and continued to keep its hold tenaciously there, but the European Concert devised its dismemberment. It was apportioned amongst themselves on their own account, and operations began to accomplish it very soon. Persia met the same fate, and European Turkey is in her throes. Asia Minor, Messo-potamia and Southern Arabia wait the hour when the "delimitation of vested interests" will convert the sphere of interest into a protectorate or annexation.

We have reasons to believe that the insular position of England has always kept her aloof from the European jobbery till now. Her interests are undoubtedly identical with Islam. We believe that she will keep up her integrity of the past days and will ever be true to her tradition. No doubt a diplomatic error on the part of Sir Edward Grey in entering into the Triple Entente has created a mass of difficulties in her way, and England yields to the pressure of Russia and France even at the expense of her prestige and of her best consideration for her Muslim subjects, as she has done now in subscribing to the Collective Note to the Porte. But we hope that a more matured consideration will induce her to change her course. The British Nation should know that the problem in the Near East is not an exclusive Ottoman question, as shown by a portion of the Press here, but a vital question of universal Muslim interest. It is a folly of an unpardonable nature to minimise its importance and confine its far-reaching effects to Turkish shores. The *Pall Mall Gazette* is only misinformed if it thinks, as appeared in its issue of the 31st of January last, that "the anxiety professed by Indian Muhammadans regarding the future of Turkey is not in reality very deep seated." No graver misrepresentation can be imagined, and the Press here, to a certain extent, cannot be relied on as a mirror of true facts. It is not the "Young Moslem" in India as the *Pall Mall Gazette* states, but the whole Muslim community in India which is in stir and commotion, and evinces an "intense concern." A collection of two hundred thousand pounds sterling within a few weeks in aid of the Turkish Relief Fund, when its chief portion comes from the masses, cannot be the business of the Young Muslim members of the Indian Muslim League, especially when the community subscribed double the amount to the Muslim University Fund only

last year ; and the Arab Relief Fund in connection with the war in Tripoli was another drain on the Muslim purse in India. It is high time for the English Press to enlighten the nation on the true state of affairs in Muslim India. It will serve no good to hoodwink the man of businesslike nation simply to support party politics. Change of policy is the only check against the Muslim adopting a desperate attitude. The National Congress of India, hitherto a purely Hindu movement, may become a real national congress, and some elements of the "hitherto quiet community" may add its quota to the not as yet subsided 'unrest.' It is wrong on the part of the *Pall Mall Gazette*, to say that the Indian Muhammadan does not care very much about the fate of Turkey. That high officials like Deputy Commissioners in various districts in India have seen their way, and deemed it expedient, to preside over Muslim meetings held in support of the Turkish Relief Fund is a fact sufficiently palpable to disprove the statement of the said Gazette. It is to maintain cordial relations between England and Muslim India as the ruler and the ruled that a change of policy in foreign affairs is needed.

### IT MATTERS MUCH.

It matters little where I am born,  
 Or if my parents were rich or poor ;  
 Whether they shrank at the cold world's scorn,  
 Or walked in the pride of wealth secure,  
 But whether I live an honest man,  
 And hold my integrity firm in my clutch,  
 I tell you, brother, plain as I am,  
 It matters much.

It matters little how long I stay  
 In the world of sorrow, sin and care ;  
 Whether in youth I am called away,  
 Or live till my bones and pate are bare.  
 But whether I do the best I can  
 To soften the weight of adversity's touch,  
 On the faded cheek of my fellow-man,  
 It matters much.

It matters little where be my grave,  
 Or on the land or on the sea ;  
 By purling brook or 'neath stormy wave,  
 It matters little or naught to me.  
 But whether the Angel Death comes down  
 And marks my brow with his loving touch,  
 As one that shall wear the victor's crown,  
 It matters much.

—*The African Times.*



## JESUS, AN IDEAL OF GODHEAD AND HUMANITY.

---

LA ILAHA ILALLAH.

(There is no god but God.)

---

By KHWJA KAMAL-UD-DIN, B.A., LL.B

---

"THOU shalt have no gods before me," spoke the God of Israel to Moses, and imperative as the commandment was, it was honoured more in the breach than in the observance. In spite of the repeated warnings from God, the house of Israel went 'after other gods to serve them and worship them.' They could 'incur the wrath of a jealous God," but they could not give up the worship of the 'graven image.' But Israel was not the worst of his kind, there were others as well amongst the various tribes and nations of the human race, scattered on the surface of the earth, who could find edification of their soul only in bowing before an image made by their own hands. Indians and Egyptians, Persians and Syrians, Romans and Greeks, in their turn, with all their culture and advancement, were found incapable of appreciating that high notion of worshipping one God, which some 4,000 years ago was preached from the Mount of Sinia and re-echoed from the Mount of Olives. Even the Church of Christ in its early days could not keep its fold from falling into the old habit of bowing before images. Roman and Greek mythology crept into it, and the classical gods of ancient days found their place in its annals under Romish Canonisation, with change of name and place. Polytheism flourished in one garb or another, and kept its firm sway on the human mind till the advent of the last of the race of prophets, when it received its final death-blow in Arabia. It died to rise no more, and the unity of God was established for ever. The last word of God gave such a lucid exposition to Monotheism that since then, even those who are still victims to polytheistic tendencies perforce own their belief in the oneness of God, and come with a plausible apology for their doing the contrary.

What was the conception of the divinity of Christ in its primitive stage, and what gradual changes it underwent subsequently, is beyond the scope of this paper. Suffice it to say that the modern Christian mind has rejected all old theories, and has become too advanced to believe in a plurality of gods. In fact to speak now of Christians as believers in three gods, as they used to be in days past, is simply to betray one's ignorance of their belief in the light of modernised Western theology.

They, it is said, believe in One, and only One God, with the Lord Jesus as a Manifestation of that One and the same God.

### THE INFINITE BEING.

An Infinite Being to be comprehended by finite man is an impossibility, and all that the unaided research of man can establish is: that there is some Power and an 'Infinite and Eternal Energy' from which all things proceed—a fact which even science and an agnostic cannot deny. 'In our search for a cause we discover no resting place until we arrive at the hypothesis of a first cause, and we have no alternative but to regard the first cause as infinite and absolute.\* But is this First Cause unknowable? Is not Intelligence and Design observable in All His working? Is it unlikely for Him to reveal some of His Characters to His Creatures which they could not of themselves find out, or is it impossible for Him to do so. To think otherwise would be "not only unphilosophical but absurd," says a Christian writer. "I ask you to examine, with calm, unprejudiced inquiry," he continues, "those historical facts and that inner character of Christianity which make Christians believe that the great First Cause has spoken to mankind and revealed His character in Jesus Christ." If man is not a material product of purely material substance, and possesses, not only intellectual but moral forces, and if his morals are morals of a Personal God, whose image he is, is it not desirable that God should come in man as a prototype and perfect specimen for others' imitation, so that all our moral forces find their complete development? The unique figure of Christ, His spotless character, His life after death, the miracles He worked out, are some tangible points of God's character which, it is said, He has been pleased to reveal to mankind in the person of the blessed Son of the Holy Virgin.

This is what in our times has been apologetically advanced for Christian belief in the Godhead of Christ. I need not question the correctness of the premises given above, nor do I see the necessity of impeaching the genuineness of the Evangelical records they have been based upon. I accept them as they are, but do they lead to the conclusions arrived at? I am afraid I am constrained to remark that I do not see my way to answer in the affirmative.

### MIRACLES AND TEACHING OF JESUS.

With the miracles and teaching of the Nazarene Prophet, as well as with His spotless character, and certain Self-glorifying utterances as the basis of His claims to Divinity, I will deal later on. Besides, Jesus is not a unique character in this respect. History has not failed to see others as well, in the

---

\* Herbert Spencer.

person of some of the great men of the world, who can equally claim divinity on these basic lines. For the present I wish to meet the first ground, which appeals to me more than the other grounds, and, I must acknowledge, is not destitute of plausibility.

#### GOD AND JESUS.

Has God revealed His character in Jesus Christ? If to give full manifestation to His glory, God was pleased to take human birth and stooped to eat and drink like others, and suffered the consequences of His so doing, one cannot fail to find an apology if He betrays ordinary human weaknesses, and therefore I should not be so unreasonable as to expect 'God coming out of a woman's womb' to possess those transcendent superhuman attributes like Omniscience, Omnipresence and Omnipotence, which everywhere and in all times have been rightly considered as true essentials of Godhood. One must always bear in mind, it is argued, that the Son of Man was God, but in Man, and the glory of God and His attributes, therefore, had to receive their full epiphany within the four walls of humanity, and subject to the implacable tyrannies of Time and Space to which a helpless creature like man has been victimised. No wonder, therefore, if the God incarnate lacked knowledge of many a thing; His confessed ignorance of the exact time of the last day, of which only God the Father knew, and God the Son could and did not. His experience with a fig-tree (Mark xi. 12), perhaps, is the best illustration of His two natures. "He was hungry, and, seeing a fig-tree afar off having leaves, He came, if haply He might find anything thereon, and when He came to it, He found nothing but leaves." The event, no doubt, shows not only His want of omniscience, but seemingly His lack of average human observation, 'for the time of figs was not yet.' But He was a man, and He did what His fellow-men would have done when oppressed with hunger. Are we not prone to fall short of average human judgment when certain passions in us are aroused? And therefore His showing anger against an inanimate thing like a tree which did not supply Him with figs to satisfy His hunger was nothing short of what we usually do when baffled in our expectation. But were they not necessary preliminaries, a Christian apologist would say, for the working of Divine glory which found its manifestation when the Lord was heard to say, "Let no man eat fruit of thee hereafter for ever," and the tree withered for all time. We know that there are other events recorded of Jesus in the New Testament which to many appear to be absolutely inconsistent with the universal conception of God, but the Divinity of Christ perhaps stands on a different base. It consists, it is urged, in the development and manifestation of certain Divine morals, which, finding their revelation in Him, place Him on the throne of His Father, rather than in

the possession of those magnificent superhuman powers which befit the Almighty God.

#### GOD AND HIS IMAGE.

God is Impersonal, and man made after His image! The moral attributes of the Divine image can come to their realisation only in one who is man as well as God. But was Jesus a complete epiphany of such morals? If God is man's prototype, morals observable in the latter are those of the former. If moral forces are realities and can rule the whole universe, when properly balanced, did they meet their fullest development in the person of Jesus Christ? Modesty, Meekness, and Patience undoubtedly are noble qualities in man which partake of the Divine nature, but do these passive tender qualities exhaust the long list of human morals? Are there not other stern, active morals, noble as well, which are essential to constitute humanity? Bravery, Justice, Generosity and Trustworthiness among them; and did Jesus get the occasions necessary for the manifestations of these morals? Because, unless one gets a fitting opportunity for the exercise of a moral quality, a possible potentiality is no proof of actuality. God forbid that I stigmatise Jesus for being otherwise, but what I mean to say is that negative virtues are no virtues, especially in teachers of morality; they cost nothing, and are no help to one who needs a specimen in practice.

#### WORDS AND ACTIONS.

In judging the ethical side of one's character people make a serious mistake, which sometimes creeps imperceptibly even into the judgment of level-headed writers known otherwise for their impartial criticism. Words are accepted for actions, virtues preached to others in sermons and homilies are often believed to be actually owned by their teachers. But it is a mistake, and a serious one. No literature in any community is devoid of books on ethics. They contain golden rules of morality worthy of a prophet or a god in man; but, if whatever is contained in them is to be accepted as an index to the moral character of their writers, our judgment on the moral side of Lord Bacon's character should be otherwise than it is. A teacher, however highly divine his claims may be, should not be accredited with possessing all those moral attributes which he inculcates to others through his precepts, unless he, by his own example, has converted them into action. This truth was never so practically and lucidly hinted at as by the author of 'Anwar Suheli,' a famous book on morality in Persian literature, where all moral lessons which he intended to teach to his readers have been put into the mouths of birds and other dumb creatures. In fact, an ethical aphorism written on a wall is as good as in the mouth of a man if the latter has never been able to put it into practice. Besides, morals can be best

brought home to others only through actions, and an example is, therefore, deemed always better than a precept.

#### CONDITIONS OF ACTUALITY.

No one can deny that every potentiality requires certain conditions to become an actuality, and a moral preached, and perhaps potentially possessed by one cannot be claimed as owned by him unless he brings it into practical shape under given conditions. It is through the splendid meekness with which He bears all the derision of the Israelities and His marvellous patience in the face of the hardest trials of life which He suffered as a martyr to the truth, that meekness, forbearance and patience become enviable possessions of the Lord Jesus, otherwise He would have been a mere tale-teller of passive morality. It is a real misfortune of the highest magnitude that the ministry of the Lord was curtailed by circumstances which He could not control, and the world lost the chance of seeing a practical manifestation of various divine moral qualities which possibly He possessed. Even the much-praised morals in Christian literature, like forgiveness, could not see their complete development at His hands. The said moral quality also, like others, requires given conditions, and unless they are present one cannot be fairly accredited with it. Three essential conditions must be fulfilled before you can claim to possess this noble attribute. In the first place, you must be persecuted ruthlessly by your enemies. Secondly, your enemies must fall, and change of circumstances render them at your mercy, and, last of all, though not the least in importance, in spite of your possessing the means to give them the punishment they justly deserve, your noble nature gets the better of you and you forgive them. Mercy, like forgiveness, can only be shown by one who finds others at his mercy, and unless one attains that high position, the preachings of mercy are words which lack reality. Besides, it is our everyday experience that people in power generally regard forgiveness as an insult rather than as a kindness when it comes to them from a helpless victim of their persecution. It is deprecated and treated with contempt. Of course Jesus on the Cross prayed for forgiveness for His tormentors, and it shows that he was in that mood at the time, but sentiments and feelings expressed by Him while praying for His enemies on that occasion have also been given vent to by other great men under similar trials of life, and He is not unique in this respect. The moral quality of forgiveness, however, could not see its realisation in the lifetime of Jesus: one finds only the first of the three conditions precedent for the manifestation of forgiveness in His life, the other two are lacking. It remained in embryo for some six hundred years more, and found its right use and occasion at the hand of the Prophet in Arabia, when the 'Lord on high with His 10,000 Saints' reached the gates of the 'ancient House' in the person of Muham-

mad. The old writings were fulfilled, and Mecca was conquered, without a single drop of human blood being shed, an event unparalleled in the whole history of the world. The enemies of the prophet in Mecca had subjected him and his followers for thirteen years to a long course of trials and hardships, which surpassed in intensity and quantity the hardest trials in 'others' life. His enemies fell and found themselves at the absolute mercy of their persecuted victim. They deserved every imaginable punishment to be devised by human ingenuity, and to bring them to it was simply to meet the ends of Justice and Equity. Muhammad would have been quite justified if he had punished them as severely as Joshua, Ramchandra, and Krishna did when victorious over their enemies, but the great Divine moral attributes of Forgiveness which the Son of God Himself could not reveal in Himself, being hampered in His ministry by circumstances beyond His control, received its full revelation, which otherwise would have remained in abeyance, perhaps for ever. God raised various prophets from time to time, and His various characters were revealed in them. Muhammad was the last of the race, and all those divine moral attributes which were still undeveloped in man, and had had no occasion for proper manifestation in the lifetime of previous prophets, found their proper revelation in him. Forgiveness being one of them, had its own occasion as well as its use. It found no occasion in the lifetime of Jesus, and if others had it, they did not utilise it. But Muhammad had the rare opportunity and did not fail to use it. His enemies when utterly fallen entreated him to treat them as a noble-minded person would do. The appeal was most opportune and made to the right man, and was readily accepted.

#### TENDERNESS AND STRENGTH.

This is what can be fairly said about the tender passive moral qualities which are chiefly claimed for Jesus, but there are stern moral qualities besides which are also divine, but which, I am afraid, found no revelation in the Son of the Holy Virgin. These stern moral qualities when properly balanced secure happiness to human society. Anger, Hatred, and to them I may add Vengeance. They are all necessary to keep life and property secure. They cannot be branded as lower and bestial passions. They have their right use, and it is only through their degenerate use that they become so. Do we not observe them in the working of dumb nature, which, in my opinion, is the best index of Divine character? We read of them as attributes of God in the Biblical record. Besides, to say that they are undesirable is simply to find fault with the Supreme Wisdom who supplied man with these passions. Are not Hatred and Anger realities? Do they not affect the trend of human affairs? And if man is born after the image of God, and consequently all the moral qualities observable in him are those of God, all these stern and active moral qualities must be divine

moral attributes in man, and cannot be dispensed with. They no doubt require regulation and training, and it is in the life of a perfect man in whom God is claimed to have been revealed that we look for the right use of such passions. Is not a morality preached and taught in the Sermon on the Mount sufficient, if adopted, to destroy those stern moral qualities which I call, and are Divine, and to render our life and property insecure? The morality, I am afraid, is too sublime to be practised, and will, I believe, remain so till the day of Judgment. But can the teacher of the said Sermon under these conditions claim to be a perfect model of humanity and a complete representative of Divine character, and is His claim justified? I have purposely referred to these two passions, as they cannot exist if the said Sermon is brought into practice, though its Teacher Himself could not restrain Himself from making use of them sometimes; but there are innumerable moral attributes besides, human and divine, which, to take the most favourable view of the case, remained in abeyance and did not see their revelation in the Nazarene prophet; and I see no reason therefore to say in the words of Renan that "religion cannot be said to have made a bad choice in pitching on this Man (Jesus) as the ideal representative and guide of humanity." Renan, with all his rationalistic attainments, was not proof against his early predilections, otherwise he could not have deliberately made such a remark. He should have known that there were various walks of life most necessary for the superstructure of human society, and Christ could not be a guide there. A King on the throne, a Judge on the bench, a Statesman in his Cabinet, and a General in the field, are as necessary factors of human society as a teacher of morality, and God was also not unwise in raising patriarchs like David, Solomon, Joseph, and Joshua, who acted respectively as a King, a Judge, a Minister of State, and a General. They were human beings, and possibly committed errors, nay, sins, as Christians believe, in the performance of such duties. But if God had to come as the "ideal representative and guide to humanity," He would have been more useful to human society if He had appeared as a king or a statesman. He could have left better rules for the guidance of Christian kings and statesmen in Europe, and the world would have seen a millenium when relieved of their ambition and self-assertion. His Holiness the Pope of Rome and King Emmanuel badly wanted a God in the person of a General rather than in a "Prince of Peace" to guide them in their recent uncalled for campaigns. He could have taught them morals of war. Perhaps his precepts and actions in this respect might have proved a better check to Italian atrocities in Tripoli than the Ordinance of the Hague Conference.

#### THE SECOND ADVENT.

We are told that the Lord is to appear in the last days as King to do justice to the oppressed, and to set all iniquities

right, but if the world is to end at the time of His second advent, our need of an 'ideal representative and guide to humanity' will also come to an end. It may be said perhaps that His Kingdom was not the Kingdom of this world, nor did He allow 'His servants to fight,' that He 'should not be delivered to the Jews.' (St. John xviii, 36.) But if the civic and economic policy of the world necessitates the existence of some kind of kingdom, and the enforcement of mutual rights and obligations between man and man, which is the only basis of a commonwealth, and which renders some sort of rule indispensable; and if no sooner man emerges out of the primitive state of nature than at once knowledge of individual property rushes to his mind, and its security, together with the safety of his own life, brings home to him the necessity of some sovereign political authority, though in a rudimentary form; and, last of all, if the policy of England converted the old Witenagemot into the modern Parliament, should we look to the Mount of Olives for an "Ideal representative and Guide of humanity," as Renan says, or to the Mount of Faran to find a King, a Statesman, a Lawyer, and a General in the Person of the Prophet.

A calm and unprejudiced consideration of these facts given in these pages will, I am sure, convince a student of Renan that his remark was not free from shortsightedness. Christ, as He Himself confessed, is no example in the higher walks of life, but will He be of help to us in our ordinary life? Is not our domestic life an essential and important part of our programme in life? Are not many houses in these days of ours scenes of unpleasantness, misery and discord? And does not this deplorable plight result from the want of those sweet relations between husband and wife which make the matrimonial bond a heavenly tie? Is not the very word 'home' a treasure of dearest and happiest associations, which are becoming extinct day by day; was not woman created to be a 'help meet' to man, and are they not meant to be husband and wife, on the happy or unpleasant mutual relations between whom a home becomes a heaven or a hell? If these are realities, and to a great extent responsible for our happiness or misery, are we not in urgent need of a Guide to regulate our domestic daily life? It is a great misfortune that the divine element in Christ did not allow Him to have an earthly connection with some woman as husband and wife, and we are again constrained to turn our eyes to some other quarter for a "guide of humanity." Jesus, of course, had a mother, but His divinity again comes in the way, and a son in a Christian house has nothing to learn from Him in home morals. The Holy Virgin could with complacency of mind hear her Divine Son call her 'woman' because she saw something in Him different from her, but an ordinary English woman would like to see her son behave differently.



## IS THE MORALITY OF JESUS PRACTICAL?

The deeper we go into the question the more doubtful we become as to the correctness of Renan's remark concerning Jesus Christ which we have quoted above. The Morality taught by Him in His famous Sermon on the Mount never found favour even with His immediate followers. Even now they are taken as the best specimen of morality taught in the world ; but the world has become two thousand years older since then, and still cannot see the way to bring them into practice. Even the devout members of the Church and the most zealous workers in modern evangelical campaigns find themselves unfit for the task and unable to work out these high principles of ethics, and are looking for the second advent of the Lord when the Kingdom of Heaven shall come to restore peace, amity, and love, and man becoming circumcised of all stern but otherwise manly passions, he will be in a more suitable disposition to act upon them. Some old Rishi even now in the Hymalayan icebergs in the East may appreciate them, but certainly no one in the West.

The whole difficulty lies in realising His ministry and His real mission as a teacher of these rigid principles of morality. In my opinion, if Jesus be given His true position, it will be that which He Himself professes and claims, shorn of all the graceful Pauline coverings of Ecclesiastical dogma. He stands redeemed of His paradoxical situation, and the unpracticable nature of His teaching is explained. Here He seems to be in His right place. He was a prophet raised to reform the house of Israel, and to bring together its scattered sheep into one fold. He came to improve the morals of the Israelites and expose the hollowness of the knowledge of the Pharisees, who posed as the only expounders of Mosaic law. The law was the law of retribution and vengeance. It was abused, and He came to explain it. He shows its proper application, and thus to fulfil it and not to destroy it.

To make myself more explicit in establishing the true position of the Prophet Jesus, I must first refer to the circumstances which were responsible for bringing the Law of Moses into existence. The children of bondage required emancipation, physically as well as morally. Through the bondage of many generations they had lost all manly morals and had become mean, dejected, and cowardly. Crossing the Red Sea could liberate them from the yoke of Egyptian kings, but it could not free them from the thralldom of servile habits. The law of liberation, therefore, came to their rescue ; "an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth," was the only code of life suited to redeem their enervated spirits. The said law accordingly worked well, and succeeded in turning children of bondage into a race of rulers and conquerors. Then came abuse. They forgot the spirit and began to worship the letter. They left the kernel and went after the husk. They insisted scrupulously on the literal

observance of the Law of Vengeance, and in course of time they became a personification of vengeance. They had manifested slavish meekness once, but now they became anger incarnate. Their hatred when aroused knew no bounds. Thus they fell morally, and with it came their worldly downfall. They were again humbled under a foreign yoke, and began to pray for salvation. They needed a Redeemer, for whom they approached Jehovah through their patriarchs, and a Saviour was promised. The promised Messiah came, and brought them the true key of salvation, but they failed to understand His mission. Their previous history was a good lesson. They should have known that if their emancipation was in the law, the subsequent salvation should also follow the law. If the law of vengeance came to regenerate them when they were slaves to unmanly habits, and was a necessary preliminary to making them rulers and conquerors, the law of mercy was indispensable as well to redeem them from being victims of anger and hatred before they could be restored to their lost supremacy. The Redeemer of the house of Israel not only diagnosed the real disease which had contaminated their national fabric, but also came with a panacea when He said "Ye have heard that it hath been said 'an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth,' but I say unto you that ye resist not evil, but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek turn to him thy other also. And if any man will sue thee and take away thy coat let him have thy cloak, and if whosoever shall compel thee to go with him one mile, go with him twain."

#### A NEW GOSPEL.

It may be impracticable as the world thinks, it may not be consonant with its polity and commonweal, but it brought a new Gospel to, and could save, those who had been slaves to hatred and anger. This law of mercy which was evolved on the Mount of Olives was the New Dispensation and not what has been dogmatically preached afterwards. Strong faith in it, and its practical observance, were sure to bring salvation to the scattered house, and not the blood of the teacher who became a martyr for it. But 'to hate thine enemy' was the watchword, and one who taught them, "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you," could not be accepted by them as heir of the throne of David and restorer of their lost supremacy.

Jesus has been unfortunate in having foes as well as friends. No one could understand the Covenant He renewed. Both wanted a kingdom. The former when disappointed became His enemies and could not leave Him till they brought 'Him to the Cross'; the latter, more hopeful, looked to the last times for the moment when their sons shall have an exalted position with Him on the throne, but no one appreciated His teaching. He Himself was a great believer in law and its observance. He believed that the world and its kingdoms must go to those who

possessed high morals and knew how to control their passions. He knew that it lay much more by the cultivation and possession of certain characteristics that a nation can find supremacy over others than in the possession of military training and weapons of war. He knew that faith in and observance of certain laws only could create the character and morals desired. He knew the weak points of the Israelites, whom He came to raise, and the Law revealed to Him was the one evolved in His Sermon on the Mount. This was the New Dispensation, this was the New Covenant to redeem the lost house, to establish which He came to the Cross, and His martyrdom, as believed. In the renewed law lay their salvation. But His race rejected it, and fell, to rise no more.

#### CHRIST'S TEACHING.

Unfortunately, as I remarked before, the position of Christ and the nature of His teaching, though clear to one not subject to any predilection, has always been a mystery even to His followers. Take Him as a Prophet, a Teacher and a Holy Messenger of God raised to bring scattered sheep together and restore the house "under the wrath of God" to its lost supremacy, and therefore to teach them morals to meet the contingency of the time and place which He was in, the whole mystery is solved, and He commands all the respect and reverence which a human mind can feel for one of the greatest teachers of and martyrs to truth. But take Him as a God and you are beset with difficulties never to be surmounted. Read His teachings in the light of the facts explained above, and an Impracticability becomes a Possibility, or rather a Necessity suited to the requirements of the time and the people addressed. But to find in them some germs of Divinity simply because they cannot be practised by an average human being, and because the modern mind is too sordid to take them seriously, is simply to betray one's ignorance of an ordinary theory of legislation and its progress and evolution.

*(To be continued.)*

---

# THE STRUGGLE IN THE NEAR EAST

## AND THE

### MUSLIM FEELING IN INDIA.

---

AN APPEAL TO THE BRITISH PUBLIC.

---

By ZAFAR ALI KHAN,  
Editor of *The Zamindar*, Lahore, India.

---

AS a citizen of that mighty Empire which has the unique distinction of claiming the allegiance of four hundred million Orientals, of whom fully one quarter are Musalmans, and as a British Indian Muslim who has the proud privilege of looking upon the Empire not as a purely alien institution destined to perish with the decline of British prestige, but as a political structure in whose stability Musalmans are as much interested as Englishmen, I feel it is time that I should describe to the great British public the extent to which the feelings of Muslim India are being exercised as a result of the merciless campaign of extermination against Muslim lands that commenced with the descent of Italy upon the Tripolitan Coast, and has culminated in the sanguinary horrors of Balkania. My object in these lines is to remind the people of Great Britain of their obligations towards the seventy millions of Musalmans whose devoted attachment to the person and throne of the British monarch, and whose admitted claim to be regarded as an important factor in determining the course of British Imperialism, should entitle them to a voice in the councils of the Empire. The Musalmans of India feel that as a part of that great whole which is called the British Empire they have a right to be heard on problems affecting the destinies of their brethren-in-faith abroad.

An Indian Muslim looks upon the British Government as a divine dispensation, and as such it inspires him with a feeling bordering on reverence. He also regards it as a tolerably fair substitute for a Muslim Government, and as such he expects it to discharge the functions which in his mind are associated with Muslim rule. To reconcile himself to the notion of perpetual British supremacy, which has come to be regarded by him almost in the nature of things, all that he requires is this: That the British Government should cultivate friendly relations with the surviving independent Muslim states, which in his case—such is the constitution of Muslim mind—supply the void created by the absence of a free and unfettered Muslim sovereignty in India.

Such is the attitude of the average Indian Muslim towards British rule, and unless British statesmen are so short-sighted as to reverse the traditional policy of England and, regardless of the cherished susceptibilities of a hundred million loyal Muslims, embark on a course of open and reckless hostility against Islam, the attitude is sure to be indefinitely prolonged. An Anglo-Turkish *entente* would create for the Musalmans of India a political environment of ideal bliss. Even the neutrality of England shorn of its benevolence would still ensure the traditional loyalty of Muslims, whose good sense in making allowance for the exigences of Imperialism will feel that in dissociating herself from those who are bent upon the destruction of Islam, England is at any rate respecting the sentiments of her millions of Muslim subjects. For an England whom they regarded, if not as an active, at least as a passive ally of Muslim states, the Musalmans of India would continue to shed their life-blood. But the moment they felt that England, whom they regarded as the friend of Islam, was openly fraternising with the avowed enemies of their Faith a disillusion is bound to follow.

With infinite sorrow I am constrained to confess that as a result of the sanguinary events of the last two years, which have spread misery and desolation from the valleys of Morocco right up to the steppes of northern Persia, the Musalmans of India are just now in the throes of such a disillusion. The unfortunate conviction is dawning upon the minds of millions of British-Indian Muslims that England, who with her unlimited resources could have easily prevented this vandalistic scramble for Muslim territory, which is a disgrace to Christian civilisation and the law of nations, began with conniving at the misdeeds of the Italian Corsair, and ended with openly espousing the cause of the Balkan bandits. The frightful toll levied upon Muslim blood by the so-called champions of the Cross and the disgusting horrors perpetrated in the name of Christianity might have been neutralised by a single frown on the brow of Britain, and the Musalmans of India are struggling against the sickening sensation that "the Policeman of the World" permitted the butchery to go on under his very nose.

As a publicist having control of a Hindustani vernacular daily with the largest circulation in India, I am in touch with Muslim feeling in England's great Dependency, and accordingly I am in a position to declare with some authority that the policy of the present British Cabinet, in so far as it affects ultra-Indian Muslim interests, is giving rise to grave discontent. People here in England are not perhaps aware of what is going on in India as a direct consequence of England's strange participation in what, according to the "Saturday Review," may be called "the immolation of Turkey." The great living heart of Islam in India has been stirred to its innermost depths as it has never been stirred before. As day after day news reaches India of the

massacre of Muslims, irrespective of age and sex, with the silent approval, so it would appear, of a united Christendom, the mind of the Indian Muslims grows distraught and distracted. They are seized with an intense loathing for the atrocious cynicism which helps in raising hecatombs of their innocent co-religionists. In a paroxysm of anguish they appeal to their Government, in the name of humanity, to put a stop to all this wanton bloodshed. But their appeals go unheeded. They are told that the Government are unable to do anything as their hands are forced by the International Law of Neutrality. This very nearly drives them to the verge of desperation, and but for the tact and sympathy of Lord Hardinge, whose statesmanship, by permitting them to raise subscriptions for the aid of the sufferers from this twentieth century crusade against Islam, has created a safety valve for the desperate mood of Muslims, there is no knowing to what grave developments India might have been exposed. As it is, meetings are being held all over the country loudly protesting against the fanaticism of Europe, sympathising with Muslims in distress, and calling upon England to sever her connections with the tormentors of Turkey. The demonstration of sympathy has been universal, and its manifestations are so genuine, so multiform, and so practical as to furnish the far-sighted British Imperialist food for serious reflection. All sections of the Muslim community have rallied to the call of Islam in this dark hour, and loosened their purse-strings with unstinted liberality, although it is the poorer class which has chiefly replenished the Red Crescent coffers. It does one's heart good to see a poor widow, a helpless orphan, an indigent beggar, giving away their little all, in the pious hope that perchance their humble contributions will go just a little way towards alleviating the sufferings of those whom a kindred faith has made to them as dear as kinsmen. The conduct of a penniless Muslimah of the wild northern Frontier who, for lack of ready money, subscribed her nine months old babe to the Peshawar Red Crescent Fund and had the satisfaction of seeing it put up to auction for £60, gives an index to the feeling of Muslim India over the anti-Islamic campaign of Europe in the near East. Branches of the Red Crescent for raising funds in aid of the Turkish sufferers from war have been established all over the country, and within the last two months nearly £2,000 have been collected. Two medical missions have been equipped and sent out from India, and it was a member of one of these missions who is reported by the Constantinople correspondent of the "Daily Telegraph" to have harangued a street meeting on the day of the great *coup d'état* and assured them that India was heart and soul with Turkey. Thousands of Musalmans have been anxious to proceed to Turkey as volunteers, and only their imperfect knowledge of the Law of Neutrality has hitherto prevented them from leaving the shores of India and joining their Turkish brethren in the defence of Islam.

All this must be quite new to the British public, as the English Press, which alone could have enlightened the people of this country as regards happenings in India, has on the whole been strangely indifferent to the situation. It is a mistake to suppose, as the leading papers in this country seem to have supposed, that the Turkish question is a purely Ottoman question which can be solved by anathematising or suppressing Ottomanism. The question has a wider aspect. It is the question of Islam, and as such it is bound to react upon India, which has the largest Muslim population of any country in the world. Great Britain is therefore directly interested in its equitable solution, and politicians or publicists who advocate the dismemberment of Turkey ignore the stupendous stakes Great Britain has in India. The anti-Turkish and, on the whole, anti-Islamic policy of Sir Edward Grey has already done much harm. Discontent is fast spreading among Indian Muslims, and the latest move of the British Foreign Office in the matter of violating its plighted neutrality by subscribing to the Collective Note of Europe, which is openly partial to the Allies and floutingly hostile to Turkey, has only made matters worse. There is no such thing as International Morality. Of that the Musalmans are certain. Europe is adept in the art of eating its own words. It has torn its treatise at will. It has violated its plighted troth whenever it has suited its convenience to do so. But then we have been accustomed to regard England physically and morally as something distinct from Europe. Not only her insular position but her unique love of justice and fairplay has justified our belief in her exalted idiosyncracies. Sir Edward Grey, by jumping from neutrality to partiality, has given a rude shock to the implicit faith which Muslim India had for half a century reposed in the unchallenged probity of England.

But just as England is not Europe, so Sir Edward Grey or the party he represents is not England. On behalf of Muslim India, I appeal to the people of England in the name of the glorious traditions which have made the name of this small island, all the world over, synonymous with all that is good and just, to vindicate this fair name by rallying to the standard of justice and fairplay. England, if she means to remain a World Power, must set inflexible justice above every other consideration. It was moral ascendancy that made her great, and by virtue of the same attribute she will retain her greatness. This greatness just at present is jeopardised by a line of diplomatic conduct, which for fear of indulging in a harsher term I will simply describe as un-English.

John Bull, as we Indian Muslims understand the brawny old gentleman, has always been a protector of the weak, an emancipator of the oppressed, a redresser of wrongs, an impartial judge, and above all a stern and inflexible holder of the ring during a combat. But of late he seems to have fallen

into questionable company. His "splendid isolation" kept him unsophisticated, and therefore Nature's Western masterpiece. Now he has taken to alliances and ententes, and the foul environment is beginning to tell upon him. "A fair field and no favour" which used to be the guiding principle of his conduct is now being expunged from his moral code. His quondam friend and ally the Osmanli is in the grip of four assailants, but instead of holding the ring to which he was pledged by his oft-repeated protestations of neutrality, he makes common cause with a number of hooligans who show their cowardice by taking up cudgels on behalf of four sturdy Allies against the weak, solitary adversary. Will John Bull make one supreme effort to annul the unholy alliances that he has contracted, and become his pure self again?—*The Outlook*.

---

## THE ETHICS OF ISLAM.

By MOHAMADALI, B.A.(Oxon),  
Editor of *The Comrade*, Delhi, India.

---

THE opponents of Islam have often accused it of appealing to the senses. It permits polygamy and divorce, and its paradise is alleged to be sensual. They have seldom taken the trouble to explain on this theory the ban that Islam has laid on intoxicants, on indiscriminate intercourse of the sexes, and gambling. A faith with leanings towards sensuality would have sanctioned, if not the orgies of Imperial Rome, at least the milder sensations of the present day ball-room. It would have allowed a free use of alcohol, if not ordained it as part of its religious ceremonials. It would have permitted betting, if not recommended it as a stimulant in its festivals. When this is considered, its opponents also call it a puritanical faith. But it abhors asceticism just as much as it forbids some of the gaieties permitted or commanded by other faiths. Is it, then, a mass of contradictions? The enemy of Islam would say, "Yes." But what does Reason say? Is it not possible to discover in its ethics the *via media* for humanity? Its own boast is that "*La yukallifullaho nafsan illa wus' aha*" (God does not tax the appetite beyond its power). Appetites that are natural and God-given have nothing inherently bad in them, and "sensuality" is not in itself a stigma. And as Nature cannot be thwarted, natural appetites and natural feelings should only be regulated and not interdicted. Just as the natural feeling of revenge is the basis of criminal law and is only regulated in civilised states, in the same manner appetite is only



regulated in progressive religion by matrimonial laws and not banned by ascetic provisions. Monogamy can no more be a rigid, unalterable rule of life in all cases than the Commandment "Thou shalt not kill" can abolish capital punishment and make all war a sin. Nor can marriage be a sacrament in the sense that those who are once joined can under no circumstances be parted asunder. All human legislation recognises the need of elasticity and makes exceptions; and Divine law should not be credited with the imperfection of hide-bound rigidity, specially when it is believed to be subject to no amendment and no repeal. But exceptions should be clearly defined—as they have been in Islam—and should never be allowed to become the rule—as, unfortunately, they have to some extent become in the case of polygamy and divorce in Moslem lands to-day. In the case of intercourse between the sexes, while the conservative element, specially in Moslem India, adheres to an unwholesome rigidity dictated by local custom and recent usage, the radicals would rush in where at least angels do not love to tread. The intimate intercourse which Islam sanctions only between husband and wife or between those whose close relationship is sufficient security, if made general or indiscriminate, would create temptations which may thwart the regulation of a natural appetite through the institution of marriage, just as threats may lead to breach of the peace in a state in which private revenge is regulated by law. The absence of this regulation of social intercourse between the sexes would, according to Islam, lead to an "unnatural" excitement in the sense that Art is man's Nature, and, consequently, the institution of marriage is "natural." But drinking and gambling are more obviously unnatural excitements, and while Islam only regulates natural appetites, it bans them altogether as unnatural and unwholesome. This is the only theory on which the puritanism of Islam can be reconciled with its alleged "sensuality," and the reconciliation is not the least strained if two principles are kept in view—viz., that Nature must be regulated, not thwarted, and that for unnatural excitement total abstinence is the only effective temperance.



## CONCEPTION OF GOD IN ISLAM.

BY MOHAMAD ALI, M.A., LL.B.

Editor of the *Review of Religions*, Qadian, Punjab, India

OF the fundamental principles of belief in Islam, the first is a belief in God. The belief in a higher power than man, though not seen by him, can be traced back to remotest antiquity, to the earliest times to which history can take us, but different people in different ages and different countries have had different conceptions of the Divine Being. Islam in the first place preaches a God who is above all tribal deities and national gods. The God of Islam is not the god of a particular nation so that He should look after their needs only, but He is described in the opening words of the Holy Koran to be Rubbil Alameen, or the "Lord of the worlds," and thus while widening the conception of the Divine Being, it also enlarges the circle of the brotherhood of man so as to include all nations of the earth, and thus widens the outlook of human sympathy. The unity of God is the great theme on which the Holy Koran lays great stress. There is absolute unity in Divine nature; it admits of no participation or manifoldness. Unity is the keynote to the conception of the Divine Being in Islam. It denies all plurality of persons in Godhead, and any participation of any being in the affairs of the world. His are the sublimest and most perfect attributes, but the attribute of mercy reigns over all. It is with the names Ar-Rahman and Ar-Rahim that every chapter of the Holy Koran opens. Merciful and compassionate convey to the English reader of the Holy Koran only a very defective idea of the deep and all-encompassing love and mercy of God, which enfold all creation. "Wa Rahmati Wasiát Kulla Shaien"—i.e., "My mercy comprehendeth all conceivable things"—says the Holy Koran (vii. 155). Hence the messenger who preached this conception of the Divine Being is rightly called in the Holy Koran "Rahmat Lilalemeen," "A mercy to all the world" (xxx. 107). The great apostle of the unity of God could not conceive of a God who was not the author of all that existed. Such detracting from His power and knowledge would have given a death-blow to the very loftiness and sublimity of the conception of the Divine Being. Thus ends one of the shorter chapters of the Holy Koran:—

"Ho Wallah Ellazi Lá élahá illá ho Aálimul ghebe wasnadah errahiman errahim, ho wallah ellazi la éllahá éllahu Elmalik elquddoos esslám elemumin elmuhaimeen elazeez eljabbár elmuttakebbár, Subhánnullahi emma yeshrakoon, huwallah elkhaláq elbare elmussaver lahul esmá elhuona yusabbeho laho má fissamaiváte, walarde wa huwal azeez elhakeem."

"He is God beside whom there is none, who should be served, the knower of the unseen and the seen, He is the merciful and the compassionate. He is God beside whom there is no god, the King, the Holy, the author of peace, the granter of security, Guardian over all, the Mighty, the Restorer of every loss, the Possessor of every greatness; High is God above what they set up with Him. He is God the maker of all things, the Creator of all existence, the Fashioner of all images—His are the most excellent and beautiful attributes that man can imagine; every thing that exists in the heavens or in the earth sing His glory and His perfection, and He is the Mighty, the Wise" (lix. 22—24).

He is God the all-Hearing, the all-Seeing, the Deliverer from every affliction, the Generous, the Gracious, the Forgiving, the Near-at-hand, who loves good and hates evil, who will take account of all human actions. Thus, while Islam in common with other religions takes the existence of God for its basis, it differs from others in claiming absolute unity for the Divine person, and in not placing any such limitation upon His power and knowledge as is involved in the idea of His not being the creator of matter and soul, or in His assumption of the form of a mortal human being. If the idea of the existence of God finds general acceptance among mankind, there is no reason why such a perfect and sublime conception of the Divine Being as is met with in Islam should be repugnant to anybody.

---

## CROSS versus CRESCENT.

---

### I.

To the Indian arriving in England, a few days' residence in London effects a complete transformation in his views on the professed neutrality of this country in the recent contest between various Christian Powers and Muslims in the Near East. If the Press and Pulpit are fair representatives of the English nation, the hostile attitude evinced at present through these channels against a Muslim power is too palpable not to leave apprehension in the Muslim mind of the proclaimed neutrality. The Indian is led, by the variance between the proclamation of the Government and the tone of the organs of public opinion, to the conclusion that, either the ministry is out of touch with the people, or it does not trouble to acquaint itself with what is going on, even in London. At the outbreak of the war in Tripoli, the English Ministry, apparently, became aware of the trend of events only on the day of the ultimatum, though many days before the Post Office had received instructions not to accept parcels for Turkey via Italy. Policy appears to wait on the trend of events. Thus at the outbreak of the present

war in the Balkans it was declared that the territories of the belligerents would not be affected by the result of the war, following the precedent of the Greco-Turkish war. It was apprehended by many that this was merely a precautionary measure against a Turkish victory. But the unexpected turn of events has upset the equilibrium of the English mind.

It is not my object to discuss this development, but to endeavour to bring home to the English mind the impression likely to be produced on the minds of the millions of India and its North-Western Transborder provinces by the events of the past year, and by England's present attitude in regard to them.

It is the first duty of a loyal subject to warn his ruler against the consequences of a step which the latter is, at least, presumed to have taken, and the writer, who has never failed to preach in support of Government measures in India, is much more interested in doing so.

The present war, I venture to say, will not conclude with the expulsion of the Turks from Constantinople, but will affect the destinies of two continents by producing a universal though unifying disturbance. The position would not have been so serious if the war had not, unfortunately, been given a religious colouring by the King of Servia. His declaration might not have found favour amongst the sober-minded if it had not been for the advocacy of the Bishop of Oxford and some of his pious fraternity, who clothe fanaticism in the graceful covering of theological phraseology. The old fanaticism of the middle ages, which soaked the world in blood for differences of opinion, is again rampant, and proclaims this to be a Holy War of Cross against Crescent, and yearns to hear Christian hymns in the Mosque of St. Sophia, once again converted into a cathedral.

The business-like English public apparently fails to see that its own interest is being jeopardised. The religious war is being waged not merely on Turks, but on Muslims, of whom one hundred millions live under the flag of England, which, only last year, was proclaimed as the greatest Islamic power on earth. If this be the case, I am unable to understand the present policy of the British Government. Are the interests of the Muslims to be sacrificed on the altar of religious fanaticism? Because this is the impression being produced on the Muslim mind. Have the British people calculated the consequences of such a policy? Will they not rather desire to win the esteem and gratitude of their Muslim fellow-subjects by averting this fanatical war, which can be done by one stroke of British diplomacy? If the war is continued, I fear that it may produce results not to be foreseen, but nevertheless undesirable.

The Muslim world, whose dearest interests are at stake, is not so blind as not to see the trend of the events of the last two or three years, as arranged by the European Concert. First, a Muslim Kingdom is overthrown by French strategy

in Morocco. Next, an insignificant power like Italy is encouraged to make an uncalled for attack on another Muslim country, committing inhuman atrocities, and defying the rules of the Hague Conference, without calling forth a word of censure from Christian Europe. Constitutional reforms forced on non-Christian countries not prepared for them, with the sole object of creating confusion, and taking unfair advantage of the consequent disorder. An old Muslim Kingdom has been cut into pieces and partitioned under the convenient cloak of "spheres of influence." Italy was saved from deserved humiliation by a forced treaty of peace under pressure of Balkan unrest, concluded one day, and the next war was declared by Bulgaria and Montenegro, who having already completed their mobilisation in secret by permission of the Great Powers, surprised the handicapped Turks, and made them a prey to the ignoble policy of the European Concert.

I venture a few conjectures as to the probable course of events. The Turks having been driven out of Constantinople, there may follow an attack on Asia Minor, on the pretext of bringing the birthplace of Christianity under Christian rule, then annexation of Egypt, Southern Arabia, and the seizure of Mecca and Medina, under pretence of improving sanitation during the Pilgrimages, and the appointment of a new Khalif—perhaps the ambitious Khedive—as the courtesy of Christian Europe will not deny the Muslims a religious Head. Finally the Bagdad railway as a bone of contention, and the European Powers involved in a general conflict, filling the earth with human gore and corpses, polluting the atmosphere and producing a plague of such violence as to perforce put an end to European ambition.

With all its materialistic tendencies and ridicule of prophecies, it is stated that some Europeans are looking for the fulfilment of an old prediction of the restoration of the Byzantine dynasty to the throne of Constantinople, and have discovered a supposed scion of the said dynasty to occupy it. I think, therefore, that I may cite an old tradition of Islam, which has been in existence in writing for at least a thousand years. This tradition predicts the expulsion of the Turks from Constantinople by the Christians, to be followed by the destruction of the Christians, and the final supremacy of Islam.

Now, whatever may be the rationalistic view of the value of prophecies, there can be no doubt that belief in them has great influence in the East, as for instance at the time of the Indian Mutiny. Has not faith in prophecies worked wonders in rousing enervated peoples from lassitude to warlike deeds? Think what may be the effect of such a tradition on the Muhammadans, who have not lost their martial spirit. Whatever may be your opinion of it, or my own views, which, perhaps are not unknown to the Government of the Punjab, the important point is its effect on the minds of Muslims, among

whom even the most materialistic are beginning to believe in its truth. Current events are drawing attention to it, and arousing new hopes. Every Muslim mishap makes them look more eagerly for the fulfilment of the prophecy, and faith may bring them to bay. Europe itself is inviting the catastrophe, which may be averted by the English people, which now stands on the brink of the Rubicon.

Events in Europe are known in the Indian Trans-border, where suspicion has been aroused against the European Powers as the cause of Muslim evils. The Indian local governments can, and do, appreciate the importance of the prophecy which I am discussing. As a proof of its influence I need only translate a Persian poem, recently composed and given a wide circulation, referring to this prediction :—

“O Lord of the Times hasten thy appearance.  
The world is lost. Put thy feet to the stirrup.  
The world has become impure with infidelity, injustice  
and tyranny.  
Come and tear down the banners of infidelity.  
For what purpose is the Lord keeping thee back?  
Rise and work out a revolution in the world.  
Purify the surface of the earth from infidelity and  
darkness;  
Come and crown Islam with fresh victories.  
Islam is defiled, and thou art its guardian :  
Come and choose a Kingdom for thyself,  
O Chief of the leaders! Rise to our rescue!  
Do this sacred deed for the sake of God and thy noble  
ancestors.  
O God, listen to the prayer of the broken hearts!  
O Lord of the Times hasten thy appearance!”

The effect of these verses on the Muslim mind and the aspirations they give rise to can better be imagined than described.

But is the English nation going to gain anything out of the present imbroglio? Even if the Turks are burned to ashes, and St. Sophia converted into a Cathedral for His Holiness the Bishop of Oxford, is it not Russia which is going to gain? But the English nation has one thing to lose, the most precious gem in its Crown—Muslim confidence and love. Has not Professor Vambery told you that Muslims have proclaimed from Pulpit and Press that your rule is a divine blessing? Do you wish them to alter that opinion? If not, do not create occasions for estrangement. Rule based on the confidence of the ruled is a blessing to be preferred to government by Criminal Intelligence Departments.

Formerly the doctrine of Jihad (Religious war against the non-Muslim) had great influence on Indian Muslims, but those days are past. Thanks to the untiring efforts of Mirza

Ghulem Ahmad of Qadian, the great religious reformer of the age in India, and of Sir Sayyad Ahmad Khan of Aligarh and their coadjutors, the true exposition of Jihad has been accepted by Indian Muslims, who begin to disbelieve in war against non-Muslims for difference of religion, and thus are strengthening the British Raj.

Does the present statesmanship wish to see the old undesirable order restored? Jihad was never denounced or disbelieved by the prophet of Qadian and the same of Aligarh. They believed in it as an article of faith, as war in defence of religion. They taught us to defend Islam on the same ground which has been chosen against it by its assailants. I know for certain that the Muhammadans in India have no reason, or just occasion, to raise the standard of insurrection against the government, but it is their religious duty to help their brethren in Islam. Panislamism, in my opinion, is as yet a myth, and an invention of some ingenious priestly schemer against Islam, but circumstances brought into existence by the Christians in Europe may turn it into a reality.

In conclusion, I appeal again to the business-like instinct of the English nation. Do not allow yourselves to be carried away with the fanaticism of the clergy and fantastic political schemes of others. Do not harp on supposed Turkish atrocities and their misrule. St. Petersburg has worst instances of them.

You have most loyal subjects in the Muslims, with whom loyalty is an article of faith. But they are human beings, and they have their religious duties; they have got feelings which should be respected by a wise ruler. If the need of the day calls forth certain diplomatic remarks concerning events in Persia from the lips of no less a personage in India than the present Viceroy himself, in his last speech in Calcutta, it was simply out of regard for Muslim feelings. The matter has become much more serious, and requires immediate acts and not words. We do feel for our brethren, and it is our religious duty to come to their help and defend our religion. Sir Agha Khan has acted simply as a spokesman of our genuine feelings when he advises us to make every sacrifice in the interests of Islam.

Go and see the Muslims in India, and those especially in the Trans-border land on the North-Western side, where European events have not failed to create a life absolutely unknown to them before. Take advantage of it, and do not lose the chance. Think of your neighbours of the Land Frontier. They are reading these events in a light not favourable to you. You cannot admire too much your present Governor of the Frontier province in India for his special tact and abilities in converting an indomitable and ever turbulent race of Afreedi enemies into your friends, but I am afraid the events of these twelve months may undo Sir George Roos Keppel's work of twelve years.—*African Times*.

## THE GAEKWAR OF BARODA.

No worse specimens of bad taste can be seen than what have been evinced lately by some of the Press here in connection with the episode which occurred in the last Delhi Durbar. An apologetic explanation on behalf of the Gaekwar was sufficient to hush up the matter, and so it was done. But an imprudent instinct instigates a portion of the London Press to stir up the water, and the third prince of India, who is an idol of our sister community, is vilified in terms unworthy of an English nation. But it is simply stirring their own filthy water. The so-called unmannerly behaviour of the Gaekwar was one of his acquisitions while here. We are not unaware of the European attitude of mind towards their kings. Gaekwar was present at many a levee here; His Highness with his open eye must have seen what respect and reverence a great nation usually show to their kings. And if he did, say, by mistake what he learnt at great expense, the fault lies with the nation who taught him such manners! What a strange piece of inconsistency! We unmannerly Orientalists are taught to adopt Europe as our ideal, and when in actions and manners we imitate her we are taken to task.

Whatever may be the fault of the Gaekwar, the English Press had no business to injure others' feeling by making personal attacks on a prince who has succeeded in giving us a model rule amongst his class. He is loved by his subjects, and we Muslims are chiefly thankful to him for his impartial administration, without distinction of creed or race. In some quarters his many administrative measures are considered enviable, the introduction of compulsory primary education being one of them. The following is a most scurrilous slander, coming from an English pen, which appeared in the columns of the *London Mail* of February 8. Our only consolation is that it is not the expression of the nation in general:—

### THE GAEKWAR OF BARODA.

The powers that be in India have apparently not yet done with this highly objectionable person. The *Pall Mall Gazette* prints an account not only of the Gaekwar's action at the Durbar, but gives many details as to his general disloyalty. The plain truth is that the man should never have been selected as ruler of Baroda; while during the past few years his acts of disloyalty have been more than sufficient to warrant his deposition. He was not in the direct line of succession, while as a youth he was an ill-bred, unkempt individual, who ran about wild with the pariah dogs and the village boys. But on the deposition of the preceding Gaekwar, the authorities selected this insignificant outsider, whom they thought they could mould to their will. Never was a greater mistake made, and the selection was a gross injustice to the people of Baroda, who viewed the appointment with disgust, and their new ruler with contempt.

### A THOROUGH ROTTER.

A friend of mine, who is thoroughly acquainted with the Gaekwar, thus describes him: "A mean-looking man, whose pock-marked face displays more cunning and suspicion than strength or intelligence. As vain as the peacocks which abound in the State, and as tricky as the cheetahs which hunt his black buck. It is practically impossible for him to think straight; and even for an Oriental he has a singularly crooked mind. To say he is nervous, and that it was nervousness that caused him to act as he did at the Durbar, is absurd. He is the most self-satisfied man I have ever met, and his aggressive assurance is highly objectionable. His action at the Durbar was premeditated, and he meant to be as officious as possible. But he is a coward, and, when pulled up, tried to excuse his impertinence. As those who know him outside his political laches say, 'he is a thorough rotter!'"