THE MUSLIM CONCEPTION OF GOD.

ALLAH! There is no God but He, the Living and the Eternal; nor slumber seizeth Him, nor sleep;
His, whatever is in the heavens and whatsoever is in the earth.

Who is he that can intercede with Him but by His own permission? He knoweth what hath been before them, and what shall be after them; yet nought of His knowledge shall they grasp, save what He willeth.

His throne reacheth over the heavens and the earth, and the upholding of both burdeneth Him not, and He is the High, the Great.—The Quran 2: 256.

Say: He is God alone, God the Eternal. He begetteth not, and He is not begotten; and there is none like unto Him.—The Quran 112.

He knoweth things visible and invisible. He is the Compassionate without demanding compensation, the Merciful in rewarding our actions. . . . He is the King, the Holy, the Peaceful, the Faithful, the Guardian, the Mighty, the Strong, the Most High. Far be the glory of God from that which they unite with Him. He is God, the Producer, the Maker, the Fashioner. To Him are ascribed excellent titles. Whatever is in the heavens and in the earth praiseth Him. He is the Mighty, the Wise.—The Quran 59: 22, 23, 24.
ON LEARNING AND KNOWLEDGE.

1. He dieth not who giveth life to learning.
2. Whoso honoureth the learned honoureth me.
3. Learn to know thyself, O Ali.
4. Seek knowledge from the cradle to the grave.
5. Philosophy is the stray camel of the faithful (Muslim); take hold of it wherever ye come across it.
6. The calamity of knowledge is forgetfulness; and to lose knowledge is this, to speak of it to the unworthy.
   Who are the learned? Those who practice what they know.
7. One learned man is harder on the devil than a thousand ignorant worshippers.
8. The desire of knowledge is a divine commandment for every Muslim.
9. That person who shall pursue the path of knowledge, God will direct him to the path of paradise.
10. He who knoweth his own self knoweth God.
11. Acquire knowledge. It enableth its possessor to distinguish right from wrong, it lighteth the way to heaven; it is our friend in the desert, our society in solitude, our companion when friendless; it guideth us to happiness; it sustaineth us in misery; it is an ornament amongst friends, and an armour against enemies.
12. The knowledge from which no benefit is derived is like a treasure from which no charity is bestowed in the way of the Lord.

KNOWLEDGE LEAVING THE WORLD.

The Messenger of God repeated something of strife and said, "It will appear at the time of knowledge leaving the world." I said, "O Messenger of God, how will knowledge go from the world since we read the Quran, and teach it to our children, and our children to theirs, and so on till the last day?"
Then Lord Mohammad said, "O Zaid, I supposed you the most learned man of Medinah. Do the Jews and Christians who read the Bible and the Evangel act on them?"

WISH NOT FOR DEATH

any one of you—neither the doer of good works, for peradventure, he may increase them by an increase of life; nor the
offender, for perhaps he may obtain the forgiveness of God by repentance. Wish not nor supplicate for death before its time cometh, for verily, when you die, hopes out and the ambition for reward; and verily, the increase of a believer’s life increaseth his good works.

ETHICS OF THE QURAN.

THREE DEGREES OF VIRTUE AND THREE DEGREES OF EVIL.

"Verily God enjoineth justice, the doing of beneficence and the giving unto kin; and He forbiddest immorality, wrong and rebellion."—The Quran 16: 92.

As a book on ethics, the book of Islam has one peculiar beauty in its teachings. Instead of preaching abstract morality it deals with practical life. In few words it brings home lessons to be observed daily, and yet they are so laconic and terse that an average matter-of-fact man, as well as one with a philosophic turn of mind, will see in them his satisfaction. Brief as many injunctions of the Quran are, they encompass the whole ethical side of human society. By way of illustration, we take the verse quoted above. The Holy Prophet used to cite this verse always in the Friday sermon, and in following him it is rehearsed up to the present before the congregations of Muslims every Friday.

In this verse the believers are commanded to do three things and to abstain from three things. They are bidden, firstly, to deal by one another with justice; secondly, to show active kindness to others; and thirdly, to treat others as one treats those that are united to him by the close ties of blood. Corresponding to these three deeds of virtue there are three acts which a Muslim is commanded to refrain from. He is to shun all obscene and immoral deeds; he is not to infringe the rights of others, or wrong them in any other way. As in our dealings with one another, the best act is the bestowal of gifts upon our kindred; similarly the greatest evil is one mentioned in the last, to upset the order of an established society.

If the whole world could act upon this single verse, all troubles, immoralities and crimes would at once disappear; and one cannot admire too much the choice of this verse for recital during Friday service.

The first half of the verse under discussion inculcates virtues, the observance of which is sufficient to work out the millennium.

"Verily God enjoineth justice, the doing of beneficence and the giving unto kin."
Here, we are first of all required to be at least just; we must give every man at least his due, and must return the kindness which others do to us. Justice requires us faithfully to repay our obligations to others. It is fair, but it cannot be classed with morals of the highest type. It is, after all, a virtue of give and take, and the Holy Book requires us not to stop here, but to do more than justice. We should do Ihsan—viz., beneficence. The former requires us only to return good for good, while the latter includes all those acts of kindness which are performed gratuitously. A beneficent person does good to others spontaneously, not to repay any good done to him. But this second degree of virtue is, in a way, defective. Though the kindness done by the benefactor is gratuitous, yet he naturally expects from the recipient of his favours, at least, a moral reward in the form of gratitude. He wishes the person to whom he has done a good turn to feel thankful to him. He is liable to be displeased if the other party prove wanting in gratitude. Nay, he is even prone to remind the beneficiary of his good offices. Thus, if in the case of justice we reciprocate the kindness of others, in the case of Ihsan (beneficence) also we wish for a reward in the form of gratitude. But the Holy Quran requires us to rise above this. It wants us to banish from our minds all desire for reward or gratitude. It bids us to do good to others even when we expect no reward or gratitude from them. We should show kindness to others for kindness’s own sake. And it is not impossible to do so. Do not parents show such kindness to their children? Do not good men render truly magnanimous services to their parents and other members of their families? It is for this reason that the Holy Quran describes this highest form of kindness in the words Ectae zil-Qurba—“the giving unto the kindred.” Thus the Quran cites three degrees of virtue. It bids us not only to be just and beneficent to others, but also to love others as

ONE LOVES ONE’S KINSMEN.

It should also be borne in mind that in the exercise of these noble virtues we are strictly prohibited from making any distinction of creed or colour. The least of the virtues inculcated in the said verse is justice; and what God says of the lowest form of virtue is, according to the usage of the Holy Quran, more true of the higher forms. In connexion with justice God says, “Let not ill-will against any people induce you to act unjustly; act justly, next will this be to the fear of God. And fear ye God; verily God is apprised of what ye do” (V. 11). Here the Muslims are enjoined to deal justly even to those people that are inimical to them. No amount of enmity and discord is to bar us from dealing out justice to other people.

In short, the three stages of virtue described in the verse in question are not restricted by any limitations, and the Muslims are required to practice them in their dealings with all people
irrespective of caste or creed. We are called upon to follow the injunctions embodied in this verse in our dealings with every man that comes in contact with us, be he Muslim or non-Muslim.

The other half of the verse deals with the evil which a Muslim is forbidden to do in his dealings with his fellow man. Consult the criminal and penal code of any country and you will find that all the laws therein are classifiable under three heads. Firstly, there are the laws relating to morals that pertain to an individual personally. The object of these laws is to check individuals from committing such evil deeds as affect their own persons. Next come the laws which protect the rights of the members of a society in their relation to one another. These rights pertain to person, life and property. But these laws can never be enforced unless there are other laws to protect the rights and honour of the enforcers of those laws—i.e., laws safeguarding the authority and prestige of the government of the day. These are the three main heads which exhaust the whole law affecting criminal liability, and yet we find that the Quranic verse we are treating deals with the very three things.

The first thing is Fahsha, which signifies such evil deeds as pertain to the personal morals of a man. The next thing forbidden is Munkar—i.e., such acts as involve a wrong to our fellow creatures. Lastly, we are commanded not to resist and rebel against the established order of society.

Thus the Quran in a logical order mentions three evils which seriously affect our ethics. It first mentions that evil the effect of which is limited to the doer himself. Then it forbids one which affects other members of a society. Lastly comes the evil which upsets the peace and order of the whole community.

One has simply to read works on ethics by writers of great eminence, or to consult books of religious sanctity, to appreciate the uniqueness of the Quran as a book on ethics, and he will fail to find teachings so tersely expressed and precepts so admirably inculcated elsewhere.
FUTURE POLICY OF THE BRITISH RULE IN INDIA AND ABROAD.

I.
CAWNPOOR AFFAIRS AND THE MUSLIM PRESS.

That Muslims form the greatest number among the British subject races, and that the Empire is a Muslim State, is a thing admitting of no question. How to rule it demands immediate and serious consideration. That the policy hitherto pursued needs alteration one cannot deny. The Muslims in India may be taken as the type and index of the others elsewhere; and the events which have developed within the last decade in that country may be studied with great advantage. The country has seen a continuous unrest and discontent; Hindus as well as Muslims have evinced dissatisfaction. Anarchism, sedition and political riots have made their appearance, and the peace of the country has become disturbed. The terrible tragedy at Cawnpoor came to consummate all, and overshadowed all other events in its serious consequences. A careful consideration of events and a thorough sifting of facts in order to formulate a sound policy to guide future rule in India is the need of the time, and a masterly grasp of the whole situation is immediately wanted. To ascribe all the trouble to the influence of the local Press in India, and to find a remedy in its suppression, as some may suggest, is simply to betray a misconception of the real circumstances. Such a step would be very impolitic, and would not lead to any good result. We admit that the Press in untrained hands is a dangerous weapon, but India is not devoid of men cultured enough to be an honour to the Press in any advanced society. Some healthy measures may be adopted to safeguard against its abuse, but a wholesale stifling of the Press is more dangerous than its abuse. It acts as a safety valve, to close which would explode even a strong ironclad. Suppression of free opinion will generate hidden societies, with diabolical objects, and it is next to impossible to exaggerate the harm that is certain to result. Sad experience in Bengal should act as a lesson to the Government. The persecution of the Press there no doubt put some small check on seditious writings, but it tended to favour anarchical activities. Bomb accidents, political dacoities and official murders have become rife. We admit that the Press in India is not ideal in every case, but the Press here is not infallible; they are liable to commit blunders. Freedom of opinion will do more good than harm. It will strengthen the rule by making
the officials more careful of their duty. And has not ignorance, and nothing but ignorance, of the subordinate officials there been the chief cause of many difficulties that have hampered the smooth working of the Government machinery? And if this is the case, to bring such ignorance to light for rectification is one of the best qualities of a model citizenship. The affairs of the Cawnpoor tragedy are the best illustration. Not for a single moment do we doubt the bona fides of Mr. Tyler, the Collector of Cawnpoor. Whatever he did was done out of ignorance. He could not intentionally offend Muslim feelings; he never imagined, we believe, that the demolition of a Mosque amounted to sacrilege according to Muslim notions, nor did he appreciate rightly our deep attachment to our religious cause. He did all in ignorance, and not with any evil intention. But then he showed another human weakness so common in the subordinate official class. He would not allow his mistakes to be put right. It would lower his prestige by doing so, was perhaps his idea. What a misconception of prestige, and what an unreasonable fuss about its maintenance! The same idea could not permit Sir James Meston to do what might have improved affairs at Cawnpoor, when he was giving audience to the Muslim deputation. We do believe in the maintenance of Government prestige, and we are quite alive to its importance; a Government without it is a nonentity, and we would be the last persons to suggest anything to its real detriment. But is not the prestige of a just Government best served and maintained in undoing wrongs of the subordinate officials than in upholding them? Has not the noble and sagacious act of Lord Hardinge saved the most delicate situation? He really understood what constituted British prestige and in what consisted its maintenance; Sir James also came to the same conclusion after doing wrong of serious nature, and supported the act of the Viceroy by his telegraphic message. Is not the British nation famous for its strong sense of justice, and well-known for its impartial dealing? Try to preserve this name and fame, and your Empire is secure.

Sir Dennis Fitzpatrick dismissed a Deputy Commissioner under him for the latter's rude treatment of an Indian gentleman, and thus strengthened the British Raj much more efficaciously in India than the pursuit of all those misconceived plans which are occupying less cultured English minds to keep up prestige. John Bull in these threadbare times must have something to occupy his idle mind. Miss Maud Allen must not go to India, lest the Indians may see in reality what they have every now and then seen in the illustrated periodicals. Matrimonial alliances between English girls and Indians should be discouraged. No watch between the coloured and white wrestlers or boxers. Indians should be given less chances to visit England; the English railway platform porter should not bow down to the ruled race. This all betrays lightness of heart, and,
hardly becomes the mighty nation which has been destined to rule such a vast Empire.

Are not Muslims a law-abiding race? Can anyone trace any rebellion of subjects in Muslim history against the established rule? Loyalty and submission to just rule is an article of faith with a Muslim. But what becomes of the prestige of a just rule when the wrong notion of prestige comes to deaden the very sense of justice? One can hardly understand that peculiar psychology of mind in an official which enables him to see many of his judgments as a District Magistrate set aside by the higher authorities without losing his balance of mind, but he becomes touchy when his steps as a Collector of the same district in his executive capacity are questioned. If to reverse the act or policy of a subordinate is likely to endanger the dignity of the rule, the sooner the High Courts and the lower Appellate Courts are removed from India the better. This all betrays incapacity to understand the situation, and we believe our rulers will very soon recognize the harm of such a course. This leads us to consider another aspect of the question. Sir James Meston could accede to all the demands of the Muslim deputation which waited on him about the affairs at Cawnpore, but he was approached unfortunately after the occurrence of such and such events, and he would not see his way to do what he wished to do some days before. How the new events could affect the already existing merits of the case is a mystery to a judicious mind, and it requires the ingenuity of Sir James' mind to solve it. On the other hand, it betrays weakness of human mind, and that irritability which, as the head of a Provincial Government, should have been concealed. But no one can exaggerate the masterly handling of the Viceroy. How His Excellency was found adamant against all foggy theories of prestige one can hardly admire too much. Had His Excellency been allowed to use his own judgment, and allowed to do what he so promptly did when Sir James Meston left India, it would have saved the Muslim community all the trouble.

We wonder how one can ascribe the development of the Cawnpore affairs to the Muslim press agitation. The action of Lord Hardinge is eloquent enough to expose the weakness of the charge. The act of the Collector of Cawnpore in acquiring the demolished portion of the mosque was on the very face of it illegal, as it did not fulfill all the requirements of the Land Acquisition Act. The land was not an acquired land in the eye of the law, and a Muslim property. Again, one has simply to see the file of the Committing Magistrate. The record hardly shows a tittle of proof to support the action of Mr. Tyler in ordering firing against the unarmed assembly. The anxiety of the magistrate, and the willingness of the Public Prosecutor to give up the serious charge under Section 333 J.P. Code, showed that there was no good ground for the extreme step taken by Mr. Tyler. That the murdered men were the martyrs, and
their survivors deserved every sympathy, has, in a way, been admitted by the Viceroy himself in his encouraging the charity funds in their help. It is sheer stupidity to say that his Government has bowed down before force; on the other hand, he has shown a competency which characterises a worthy statesman. His Excellency has proved that to do justice, even at the expense of the misconceived prestige, is the best policy to rule a foreign nation. But with all this we cannot understand the attitude of the Government towards the Press. What Lord Hardinge has done was, in other words, advocated by the Press. The tone of the Press in certain quarters may be undesirable, but may be rectified by wise measures. But crushing the Press will not lead to any fruition; it may not be free from harmful results. If the Press in certain quarters creates wrong impressions, similar measures may be adopted to militate against it. Government wants some medium between the ruler and the ruled, and the Press, if properly conducted, is the best agency. Those who receive private audience in the bungalows of the high officials are always looked upon with suspicion. They have no influence with the people. The meeting of October 1 at Delhi, under the presidency of the Nawab of Rampoor, was an utter failure for all practical purposes. It simply strengthens our views on the subject. There is an Hindustani proverb which perhaps will better explain our meaning: "Evil effects of intoxication," it goes on to say, "can only be cured by intoxicating liquors." Use the Press as an antidote against the poisonous germs of the Press. To buy opinion would be another serious mistake. We Muslims as a nation do believe in the existence of British rule in India to our benefit. We cannot afford to lose it, and the community does not lack men of moderate and sound views who of their own accord can be of much more help to the Government than so many titled men. The latter class could have been of real service at the present juncture, but unfortunately their hold on the community has become weakened. The Press is the educator of the people and the recorder of actualities. To crush it would lead to considerable discontent.

The affairs of Cawnpoor are, however, very instructive, and can be studied with great advantage to solve the problem which we have given in the heading of this article, and in our next issue we will take the opportunity to do so.
METHOD OF PREACHING RELIGION
AS GIVEN IN THE QURAN.

How to preach Islam to others is another question which requires elucidation in the light of the Quran, especially after what we have written about "Preaching and Conversion" in our last. A missionary under Islam, as we showed, does not concern himself with proselytisation, his sole business being to preach. Conversion, as our Book says, should come out of free choice and spontaneous judgment, and never be attained by means of compulsion, or even persuasion. Jesus meant the same thing when He said to His disciples: "And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear you, when ye depart thence" (St. Mark vi. 11). We wish He had been more explicit in giving these directions, and the world would have been saved the misfortune of suffering from the variegated pious jobbery practised in His Holy Name by the modern missionary. But perhaps the intellectual inadequacy of those immediately around Him did not invite further knowledge to be imparted by Him, and He had simply to defer it to the coming Prophet.* The Book of Islam was, however, revealed, and it laid down the following golden rule to act as guide for every honest missionary without distinction of creed or persuasion:—

"Call unto the way of Thy Lord with wisdom and godly warnings, and dispute with them in the kindest way."—The Quran 16: 26.

The holy verse refers to three stages of preaching. First, to invite others to the religion of God with all wisdom and caution. Secondly, to impart "godly warnings" to them. It may lead to some controversy, which should not be conducted but "in the kindest way." "Do not dispute with the people of the Book but in the kindest way." (ch. 29: 45), is another injunction in the Quran which a Muslim missionary has to observe when he enters into discussion with the followers of any revealed religion—Christianity, Hinduism or Judaism—in religious polemics. We have to argue with the people of the Book in the kindest possible way, but if they do not listen to us, we should not be offended, nor lose temper, but act in a more submissive way, as the Quran says:—

"If they turn back, say, bear witness, we are resigned."

A true Muslim spirit. We invoke their testimony to the fact that we have done our duty in conveying the message of God to them; we leave everything in the hand of God, and we are resigned to His will.

* St. John xiii. 35.
All these verses clearly show that we are bidden to preach Islam with the utmost kindness and wisdom, showing the excellence of Islam by means of arguments, and to abstain from the use of harsh language. Nay, we are restrained from everything which is calculated to offend or to exasperate the non-Muslims.

"DO NOT ABUSE THOSE WHO CALL ON OTHERS THAN GOD" (Ch. vi.)

is another wholesome injunction in the Quran. Are these injunctions consistent with a forceful propagation of Islam? Yet the same noble book is blamed for demanding conversion at the point of the sword. What a calumny of an unpardonable nature. We challenge these Zwemers, Margoliouths and other deliberate slanderers of our religion to come forward and lay their finger on one solitary verse in the whole Quran which teaches preaching of Islam by the sword. These so-called students of the Arabic language simply show their ignorance when they harp on such Quranic verses as allowed the Muslims of Medina to raise their arms against those who came to invade their city, life and property.

Islam spread in the world like fire in the wilderness. The world gave up its old creed and welcomed the new religion, but can any scholar of history assert with accuracy when and where any use of the sword was made in the spread of Islam when it went outside of Arabia? We are tired of the vague assertions and unscrupulous statements so rife in missionary and quasi-missionary literature in the West. On the other hand, if we say that Europeanised

CHRISTIANITY IS THE RELIGION OF THE SWORD,
we at a moment's notice can refer to reliable Western authorities to substantiate our statements. Were not the Pagan, the Saxon, the Scandinavian, the Briton, the Gaul, and the Iberian driven to the baptismal font like cattle at the point of the sword under the edict of Christian kings? Time, no doubt, is a great gulf of oblivion, and the last eighty years came to obliterate all the black deeds of the Church. Rationalism and the noble movement of Liberal Christians began to look with disfavour on the sanguinary spirit of the three-generation-removed Military Missionary, and his modern successor in the trade of religion began to accuse others of what was only true of himself. But the new trick could not continue for long, and new events exposed him in his true colours. He sang anthems and offered Te Deums at the massacre of those who, he thought, impeded his so-called work of evangelisation. Nay, he would not suffer his own brethren in religion but of different persuasion to live on the earth. Accounts of the murder of Palice, published a few months ago in Vienna, recall mediaeval martyrs, as well as the way in which Church Christianity was spread in Europe. "Palice and three hundred others were
bound with cords. An orthodox priest, pointing at the soldiers' rifles, then said:—

'Either sign this document showing that you have embraced the only true faith, or these Military Missionaries will send your souls to hell.'

All signed except Palice, whereupon the soldiers tore off his habit and beat him with their rifles till he fell with limbs and ribs broken. He still refused to apostatise, and a bayonet through his lungs ended his sufferings.*

One can only imagine the intensity and magnitude of the brutality which these people can show, and have shown, against others when their own co-religionists receive such treatment for a slight difference of opinion. We welcome the day when the noble spirit of Liberal Christianity will prevail over the whole Continent, and stamp out these inhuman and unchristian tendencies from the West.

WHY CONTENTION BETWEEN SISTER RELIGIONS?

(IN THE NAME OF THE MOST MERCIFUL GOD.)

"The Mahomedans have the advantage of us, for the idea of a heaven without women is unthinkable to them. They know that as God has provided this most precious gift on earth, so He will continue to provide that priceless gift in heaven. After all, it seems but reasonable that a man should be more happy living for ever in paradise with his dear wife and the women he loves than sitting for ever on a cloud in the company of uncharitable persons of more than questionable morals and intolerant religious convictions and fanatical dogmas."

These lines were written several years ago by one who, though brought up in an atmosphere of somewhat constricted Christianity of the Protestant school, always felt that in the Mahomedan religion might be found charity and simplicity, and freedom from the dogmatic tenets of the Romanists and Protestants. Subsequent visits to the East and study of the Holy Koran have confirmed him in this opinion. As regards the rewards after this life, it must be admitted that the majority of Christian teachers hold out the hope of a rather dreary and untangible set of future enjoyments. Not so the Mahomedan faith, which tells us of pleasures we can understand, which appeal to our intelligence and the senses given us by God.

What pleasure is equal to that which we enjoy when in the company of the greatest and most wonderful gift of God? Can any moments of earthly joy be compared with those we are given when mind and soul and body are joined in gratitude to the Most Merciful for sending us our most cherished possession—Woman?

"Of all the gifts God's mercy sends
To man, there's none that ever lends
A millionth part of the great good
Of pure and noble womanhood."

We are told to believe that our Father in heaven will reward us with great pleasures in the world to come; we know that our greatest and purest pleasures in this world have been connected with women—our mothers and our wives—so that it seems reasonable to believe that the heavenly pleasures will follow on, in intensified form, those with which we are already acquainted, and which we acknowledge are the most wonderful we can experience in the flesh. It is not sensuality, as some unworthy traducers endeavour to make out, but a grateful acknowledgment and acceptance by truly devout minds, souls, and bodies, of exquisite joys, which in our future state will develop, in ways known only to God, into those still greater delights which pass man's understanding.

Very many Christian writings discourage the toiler after truth by their persistent denial of man's right to enjoy himself, either in this world or the next. Nearly all the most pleasant things of the world are spoken of as sinful, whereas the reverse should be the case, since it is surely sinful to neglect or refuse to enjoy that which God's mercy has provided for our delectation? If our faculties and perception remain at all the same after that change which we, in our ignorance, often call "death," we shall reasonably look for an extension in glorified form of joys we already know something about.

The unknown is shrouded in obscurity, and we see through a glass very darkly at present. It would appear that instead of clearing up mysteries, the dogmas of the Christian churches have greatly complicated matters, and helped to block up the path towards intelligent belief. It may be difficult for our limited intelligences to form any but the vaguest idea of the infinite power of the All-Mighty, the All-Merciful, the All-Being, but the true Spirit of Islam enables men to approach their Maker without any mediation or intervention, since the followers of the Holy Prophet Mahomet do everything in the name of the Most Merciful God, who is ever ready in every place to hearken to His children's voices.

"Oh that men would praise the Lord for His goodness, and for His wonderful works to the children of men!"—Psalms civ. 8, 15, 21, 31.
"The world and all things in it are valuable, but
the most valuable thing in the world is a virtuous
woman."—Sayings of Holy Prophet Mohammed.

"When prostrate at Thy feet I fall,
Fresh wisdom to acquire,
All Thy past favours I recall:
Nor do I now desire
To ask from Thee what Thou must know,
In Thy omniscient mind,
Is really best for us below
And infinitely kind." A. W.

MOHAMMAD IN TRIALS
AND
MOHAMMAD IN POWER.

Trial gives man a character, but success brings forth his
nobility of mind, if he possess it. In fact, humanity is not solely
softness of heart. It consists of various morals—tender as well
as stern. They need variety of conditions for their development. If some find their manifestation only when one is in
penury, others demand affluence for perfection. One who
could not experience change in the circumstances of his life
cannot afford to be a perfect model for others' imitation. How
can you teach lessons of patience and meekness, if you never
happened to face the hardest trials of life, as Jesus did? You
may read homilies of forgiveness to others; but lip-sermons are
no proof of its possession by you. Words converted into action
only can justify our claims. Study ethical conditions. No
virtue is without its phase and character. It demands circum-
stances peculiar to it for its revelation. Possession of forgive-
ness, for instance, can be shown and claimed only by one who
has undergone three stages of life: Firstly, he has been in
affliction and helplessly persecuted by his enemies. Secondly,
he has come to full power and his enemies are reduced to his
mercy. Lastly, they come to receive judgment for their tyranny
at his hand, but they are forgiven and not punished. How

CAN ONE BE ACCREDITED WITH MERCY WHO
NEVER HAD ANYONE AT HIS MERCY?

Forgiveness is a noblest character in man. In vain we turn the
pages of sacred annals to find its full illustration in any other
person than the last of the blessed race of the prophets, who
could combine these three requisites of forgiveness in him.

From orphanage to kingship, Mohammad passed through
different stages of life. Events of diverse nature arose in his
life which demanded expression of various characters. At
every step he was weighed, but was never found wanting. We
need a perfect model up to our needs in several walks of life, and the life of the Sacred Prophet eloquently promises it in itself. That it is so, it will be our happiest duty to show to our readers, and we intend to do so from time to time; but how can we look to the other great personages of the world when their life presents no different aspects, leave alone that the authority of the narratives is not unquestionable? But we need not impeach their historiography. The persons they speak of are not historic; they are enshrouded in obscurity. Few words reported to have escaped from their blessed lips can hardly enable us to have an insight into their character. The Holy Prophet, on the other hand, is more historic than Caesar or Alexander the Great. His life is just like a mirror before us, where different characters of highmindedness, generosity, bravery, patience, meekness, forgiveness, and other essential constituents of humanity reflect in most brilliant colours. Take any phase of morality and you are sure to find it illustrated in some incident in his eventful life. Jesus meekly bore the hardest hour of His life, and how noble of Him to say while at the Cross: “Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.” The Sacred Prophet had to repeat the same thing on many a time, though with slight change, as his life was full of hard trials. For full thirteen years he remains subject to a long series of persecution of variegated nature. He is tortured physically and mentally; but he is alwaysprayful for the welfare of his persecutor. He once went to Taif, a place at some distance from Mecca, and preached against idolatry. The idolators drove him out of the city. The rabble and the slaves followed, hooting and pelting him with stones until the evening. Wounded and bleeding, footsore and weary, he betook himself to prayer. And the following words found utterance in a moment of deep distress:—

“O Lord, I make my complaint unto Thee. Out of my feebleness and the vanity of my wishes I am insignificant in the sight of men, O Thou Most Merciful! Lord of the weak, Thou art my Lord. Forsake me not. Leave me not a prey to strangers nor to mine enemies. If Thou art not offended, I am safe. I seek refuge in the light of Thy countenance by which all darkness is dispelled and peace cometh in the near and hereafter. Solve Thou my difficulties as it pleaseth Thee. There is no power, no strength, save in Thee. Guide them to right path, as they do not know what they do.”

Noble words and worthy of the noble speaker. Conscious of the insignificance he has been reduced to, and yet such splendid reliance on God. “If you are not offended, I am safe.” How hopeful, not the slightest tinge of despondency, no complaint, no doubt as to his being forsaken by God. “Solve Thou my
difficulties as it pleaseth Thee," is another beautiful expression, eloquent enough to enlighten a narrow-minded Church missionary who ignorantly harps on the uniqueness of "Thy will, and not mine."

A propagandist, however, fails to see one thing. He finds similarity of expression and loses his balance of mind. He has only one silly explanation to suggest. With him it is a sort of plagiarism; and Mohammad, being after Jesus, must be condemned for his literary purloining. If this is the logic which he advances, so much the worse for him; he is the loser in the long run. The Jews have been able to trace almost all the expressions and teachings of Jesus to their own literature. Besides, many parables narrated in the New Testament existed in Buddhist literature long before the advent of Christ. Is the whole Gospel record a theft? It is on such stupid reasoning that Sale had the audacity to call the Quran "a manifest forgery." But the explanation is not far to seek. All these prophets came from one God, they drank from one Divine fountain, and learnt one and the same lesson from one Great Teacher—the Creator of the Universe—and hence this similarity. They speak under Divine inspiration, and their words sometimes convey meanings which speak of future events in their life. To illustrate it we need only refer to the noble words spoken by Jesus, and compare them with the concluding portion of the prayer by the Prophet:

"Forgive them, for they know not what they do."—Jesus.

"Guide them in the right path, for they know not what they do."—Mohammad.

Words suiting the circumstances of the speakers respectively, and coming events proved their truth. One had no chance of gaining that power over his enemies in His lifetime, which could enable Him to show His magnanimity of soul in the form of forgiveness. He therefore implores God to do so. The other had to reach that climax. He had to forgive them himself. It was so within the knowledge of God. Besides, the words inspired on the lips of the Prophet are more comprehensive. They go further and include forgiveness in them. Forgiveness is only for the things past. Guidance to righteousness is for the past as well as for the future, because no one can tread the path of righteousness with his past sins unforgiven. So the Holy Prophet not only implores for the forgiveness of past deeds, but for their future righteousness as well. The words were prophetic, and proved to be so. Mohammad came to his full power. His oppressors came to him and received such kind treatment as was unparalleled. This led to their conversion and purity of life. *Elsewhere our readers will find what noble treatment a certain Christian lady received when, with other women, she came as a war prisoner before Mohammad.

* See page 385.
SIMPLICITY IN RELIGION.

By LORD HEADLEY.

The Governments of this country have often been sadly harassed by having to accede to the demands of religious bodies. The Church of England, the Roman Catholic Church, the Nonconformists, and many others all have to be considered, for they all have power, and all want more.

There is, as far as one can see, no class in the Mahomedan religion or Church which bids for the temporal power. The grandeur of Islam is uninfluenced by any such sordid considerations. Every true follower of the Holy Prophet looks to a reward which is as far above mere mundane advantages and riches as the light of the sun is above that of the ignis fatuus. There are no popes, no bishops, and no ministers requiring large endowments and emoluments, for God Himself is the head of this Church of the Spirit. History tells us of Christian Churches making heavy bids for the temporal power, and we can point to the sale of indulgences and the not always impartial distribution of fat livings to show how terribly matters which should only be connected with the highest aspirations of the soul have been mixed up with sordid considerations of purely worldly profit. It is not going too far to say that the vast majority of so-called Christians regard "religion" as a good, respectable, Sunday institution, which offers exceptional opportunities for showing off their best clothes and talking about their neighbours. This curious religion is also going to take them to some heaven—the position in that heaven depending in many cases to the amount paid, just as certain coins admit to the boxes and stalls, and others to the pit and gallery of a theatre.

Much of the religion of the West is the outcome of the superstitions of mediaeval times—a relic, indeed, of the Dark Ages, and not much in sympathy with the teachings of Moses or Christ. In those cloudy and troublesome times—say between the third and fifth centuries and later—when Europe was the vast arena over which hordes of wild and warlike races vied with each other and spread terror and desolation on all sides, the great rulers of States, like the warlike barons or lords in England, were often men more conspicuous for their prowess with sword or battle-axe, wielded in defence of their estates, their hearths and homes, than they were for any book learning and culture. In order to keep things going at home they had to employ clerks or clerics, who were able, by means of their superior learning, to maintain a sort of stewardship over the establishments, to keep records of current events, &c., &c.
These clerics in time became necessary adjuncts to large establishments, and exercised great power, and had great influence. Opportunities then often occurred for increasing this influence by using the mysteries of the unknown as a fulcrum against which to place those astonishingly long levers—dread of hell and terrors of future punishment. Skilful handling of these terrors produced in the minds of the credulous a feeling not far removed from panic, which was, however, soothed and smoothed down by the assurance that, on embracing a certain form of religion and swallowing some craftily evolved dogmas, salvation might be gained. But it was somehow contrived that absolute security as regards a safe and high place in the next world could not be obtained unless by very handsome gifts to "the Church," and these gifts took the form of large grants of land, palaces, cathedrals, and rich endowments. Here we saw the birth of sacerdotalism, and the determined bids for temporal authority have been very noticeable ever since, and right up to the present date. The advent of Mahomet, some six hundred years after Christ, exposed the unreality of all such ideas as atonements, priestly interventions, supplications to the saints, and those other cumbersome and involved methods of approaching the Almighty. However grand the Mosaic laws, however beautiful the gentle and forgiving precepts of the Holy Prophet of Nazareth, it must be admitted that the Mahomedan teaching contained the most sublime message, overriding by its very simplicity all obstacles in the way of the believer on his path to God.

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

"They take their priests and their monks for their lords, besides God, and Christ the son of Mary:* although they are commanded to worship one God only: there is no God but He; far be that from Him which they associate with Him." . . .

"O true believers, verily many of the priests and monks devour the substance of men in vanity, and obstruct the way of God." [The italic is the writer's.]

The religion of Christ is not quite the religion of St. Paul, who seems to have added to it and altered it very considerably, and various authorities have interpreted these later teachings and varied them from time to time. There is, in fact, not much uniformity in so-called Christianity, but we find in Islam that which should satisfy the longings of the created to be at one with and return to the Creator—the ever-present and omnipotent protector of all creatures. According to Islam there is

* Jesus said to the young man who asked what he could do to inherit eternal life: "Why callest thou me good? There is none good but one, that is God."
only one God we may worship and follow. He is before all, above all, and no other, however holy and pure, may be named in the same breath. Indeed, "it is surprising that human beings with brains and intelligence should have been so foolish as to allow dogmas and the tricks of sacerdotalism to obscure their view of Heaven and their Almighty Father, who is always approachable by each one of His creatures, whether human or saintly (i.e., Divinely inspired). The key to heaven is always there, and can be turned by the humblest or most miserable human being without any help from prophet, priest, or king. It is like the blessed air we breathe, free to all God's creatures, and those who try to make mankind think otherwise are probably guided by interested motives, e.g., salaries and stipends, which keep professions going, or some other worldly advantages."†

The main object of this short article is not so much to attack any particular branch of the Christian religion as to point out the beauty and simplicity of the Muslim faith, which, in the writer's humble opinion, is free from the objections so apparent in many other religions. Granting, for the sake of argument, that Islam is free from sacerdotalism with its attendant dogmas and greed for power, we must concede that the government of a nation or empire would go on more smoothly if such a peaceful religion were universally adopted. It seems impossible even to imagine the government of, say, the British Empire under such conditions, though 'tis "a consummation devoutly to be wished."

It is, indeed, a much to be deplored fact that "religion" has been responsible for more bitterness, cruelty, and shedding of blood than any other cause we know of. Is it possible, then, that a religion can be found which can ever bring all mankind to be unanimous in the simple worship of the One God who is above all and before all? Imagine for a moment if everyone in the British Empire became a true Mahomedan in heart and spirit—an Utopian idea, indeed! Government would be much easier, because men would be actuated by true religion and there would be no Church parties to consider, no dissenters to conciliate, and no heavy bills to pay the tolls on the path to heaven. There is some simplicity in religion as taught by Moses, Christ, and Mahomet, but the confusion which has been brought about by others who have tried to improve on God's Holy Revelations is inextricable and hopelessly bewildering to the single minded and earnest inquirer for truth.

One form of religion incites the Crusades, in which our ancestors sacrificed tens of thousands of human lives—for what? An unseemly quarrel over a sepulchre in which it is believed Christ laid for a short time. Was it worth while? Another

† "Thoughts for the Future." By A. W. (Walter Scott Publishing Co. Ltd., Felling-on-Tyne, Durham.)
form of religion taught us to burn alive and otherwise torture those who did not agree with us on quite minor points of religion. Was it worth while? Another very common form is that of those whose intolerance is so great that they consign all their fellow-creatures to everlasting perdition if they will not swallow certain dogmatic ideas. Is it worth while? Is it desirable to show a want of charity which must be hateful to the God of Mercy; and which either Christ or Mahomet would condemn in no measured terms? General Gordon said: "I do not see the sect of Pharisees among the Mussulmans. Whatever they may think they never assume, as our Pharisees do, that A and B are doomed to be burned; and you never see the un-amiable features which are shown by our Pharisees." Gordon had lived long amongst the Mahomedans in the East and the beauties of Islamic teachings had not escaped his notice, and there seems to be no doubt that in writing the above he truly felt that there was more true Christian charity in Islam than there was at home. In much the same spirit, he wrote: "No comfort is equal to that which he has who has God for his stay, who believes not in words but in facts, that all things are ordained to happen and must happen. He who has this belief has already died, and is free from the annoyance of this life."

In reply to the above it will probably be advanced that Eastern ideas do not blend with Western ideas, and there can be no "fusion," so to speak, and that to attempt to govern the nations of the West whilst an Eastern religion was recognised and influenced men's minds and actions would be quite incongruous and out of the question. Well, in reply, the writer wishes to point out that for nearly two thousand years every country in Europe has been governed under the religions of the East—i.e., Jewish and Christian.

The spirit of Islam soars far above petty jealousies and the racial distractions of East and West, and if Eastern Christianity led by the great Prophet of Nazareth has gone so far towards enlightening mankind, there seems to be no valid reason why the more extended and simpler Islamic faith expounded by the great Prophet of Arabia should not continue the good work. There is a great similarity between the characters of the leaders, as anyone will find out on inquiring into Mahomet's life. Also a study of the Koran will reveal the fact that there is nothing antagonistic to previous revelations—Mahomet's instructions, as laid down in the book completely back up the Bible teachings, extending them to suit the requirements of the time. On the principle that it is unfair to condemn a man unheard, so it is unfair to do what 99 out of every 100 Christians do—i.e., condemn the Mahomedan faith without even finding out the meaning of the word Islam. The 
laisser faire
principle is often applied by those who do not want to be enlightened; being enlightened means being worried, and they would rather remain in darkness than stretch out a hand to open the door
letting in light. "What I've got is good enough for me, I don't want to look at anything else," they say in effect, thus refusing to make an effort to advance even in the knowledge of God and His messages to mankind.

The foregoing remarks touch but lightly on several all-important subjects, and the writer will be glad if he finds in future issues of this magazine a continuation of the line of thought he has endeavoured to indicate.

THE RELIGION OF THE FUTURE.

SIR,—On reading Ali Fahmy Mohamed's very able and convincing letter in your current issue my first thought was: How can the Muslim faith be "Westernised" so as to bring it into practical touch with the nations of Europe? Or, in other words, How can we Westerns apply ourselves so as to gain a better comprehension of what Islam really means? Then followed a second thought: How is it that we do not complain about the nationality of Christ, who we must believe was a swarth Asiatic? His mother, the Virgin Mary, was an Asiatic, and Moses and nearly all the inspired Prophets were Easterns. The Holy Prophet Mahomet was, like the others, an Eastern, and was given his instructions from on high: the Holy Koran contains the Word of God like the Bible and other inspired works, and confirms the Bible and previous revelations. The Koran gives additional teachings, emphasising the importance of those teachings, and above all insists on the abandonment of all that savours of idolatry; the spirit of the revelation being that no other name should be even mentioned along with the holy name of Allah our All-Mighty Father—the All-Seeing, the All-Merciful.

"Then Mahomet, Thy chosen son,*
Inspired by fire Divine,
Laid down the law, the greatest one,
Which must for ever shine.

That Thou alone most merciful,
Our Father dear dost reign,
And that we must all time throughout
From other gods refrain.

No other must approach to Thee,
However great and pure,
No savour of idolatry
Can Thy dear heart endure.

* The word son is not here used as the Christians use it when alluding to Christ. Mahomet claimed Divine inspiration, but never claimed Divinity. He was a man and, as such, a son of God—God's creation.
Thy ways are not our ways, O God,
Tho' near Thy mercy seat
Are many souls of purity
Thy loving eye to greet.”

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

“For Moses, Christ, and Mahomet
Did each Thy love proclaim,
And we must not their words forget,
Or judge them not the same:

For though their words have twisted been
By those who Thee profess,
Their revelations can be seen
In simple blessedness.

Of human birth they all proclaim,
In happy language clear,
Thy one eternal glorious name,
Which is to us so dear.

Contention should not rise between
The followers of these,
The greatest prophets ever seen
Who lived but Thee to please.

They gave in all humility
Thy messages of love,
That all mankind might clearly see,
Nor from Thy precepts rove.”

The above quoted simple lines were written many years ago by one who was always at heart a follower of Mahomet, though at the time of writing he was almost entirely ignorant of the main features of Islam.

Having definitely decided that no comfort could possibly be obtained from dogmatic teaching, the thought came to me that God certainly watches and controls every desire and every action. He has always done so, no doubt, but the teaching gleaned from the pages of the Koran have enabled me to grasp
that wonderfully comforting thought in a way previously impossible. If every move in life is directed by the Almighty, there may be true comfort for those who are not only sore let and hindered in running the race of life, but are heavily weighed down by sorrow for their many foolish and evil actions. All such may have hope that God will—in His infinite wisdom and goodness—use them as an example for others, showing them what to avoid. It is a rather terrible thought, but the true believer will face any trial, any disgrace, or any degradation in God’s service. His ways are not our ways. The spirit of Islam points to salvation for the unfortunate, the unhappy, and the wicked when there appears repentance, and obedience, and resignation, and desire to assist our fellow-creatures to the greatest possible extent. Even through the greatest suffering we should feel happy in having been allowed to be the instruments to carry out Divine instructions.

Bigotry and fanaticism have wrought havoc in the contending Christian Churches, but this cannot be said of Mohamedism, which is an united church, save only for some minor disputes as to the descendants of Mahomet. How much better, then, would it be if we in the West made up our minds to abandon the complicated forms of religion at present obtaining, and to adopt Islam?

Some years ago the rulers of a very enlightened nation in the Far East had serious doubts as to whether their form of religion was the right one or not, so they appointed certain wise men to examine all the leading religions of the world and report thereon. The wise men deliberated and came to the conclusion that their own religion was as good as any of the others, and they therefore declined to advise any changes. Following up this idea I firmly believe that if all the best intellects of Europe could be brought into play in a search for a religion which should be based on worldly reason or common sense, no less than on the inspired writings of Divinely inspired prophets, the unanimous selection would be in favour of Islam, the simplicity and grandeur of which is quite without question. Is it not a blessing to be very grateful for to have the chance of embracing a religion which appeals to the reason as well as to the heart and inward longings of mankind, and is at the same time free from sacerdotalism and other complications?

There are those at present living on this earth, both in the East and in the West, to whom revelations establishing the truth of Islamic teaching have been made in the clearest manner, and it is possible that the time may not be far distant when God will allow these revelations to be made clear to all His children on earth; but this is a matter for Divine guidance, for no man knows the appointed time of God.

In an age of scepticism like the present, if one of the divinely inspired Prophets were to now reappear in the person of any ordinary individual and repeat the statements or utter
truths at all similar to those he uttered when on earth hundreds of years ago, he would be immediately regarded as insane, and be either imprisoned or placed in an asylum.

The many "Churches" of Christianity are so much at variance one with the other, and their "Divines" have made such an inextricable tangle of Christian teaching, and the dogmas are so hopelessly bewildering, that the clear reasoning mind and open ingenuous heart of man both crave for a religion which is tangible and convincing, as well as simple.

"The dogmas of the Christian Church—I care not whether Roman Catholic or Protestant—have repelled me ever since earliest childhood, and I do not know whether my boyish distrust of the Creed as laid down by St. Athanasius was less strong than is my contempt to-day for the man who lays down the law from a pulpit and consigns millions of his fellow-men to everlasting perdition because they do not agree with him. It has always seemed to me very remarkable that educated gentlemen should be found who, in order to get into the Church, will cheerfully subscribe to the Thirty-nine Articles and that horrible Creed, well knowing in their hearts that they do not and cannot believe one half they put their names to. After forty years of thought and prayerful effort to arrive at a correct view, the dominant idea in my mind is that the whole fabric of so-called religion is of man and not of God. I must also confess that visits to the East have filled me with a very deep respect for the simple faith of the Mahommedans, who really do worship God all the time, and not only on Sunday, like so many Christians."

The above extract from a little book entitled "Thoughts for the Future"† probably finds an echo in the more inward feelings of many who consider the question of religion and the future state.

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

I should be glad to write more, but, having often praised you for your concise letters and articles, I must not take away the effect by myself falling into the error of being prolix and long-winded.—Fraternally yours,

HEADLEY.

† "Thoughts for the Future." By "A. W." (Walter Scott Publishing Co., Felling-on-Tyne, Durham, 1913.)
A CAPTIVE CHRISTIAN LADY
BEFORE
THE LORD OF ARABIA.

His amazingly untiring zeal to stamp out idolatry from his country roused terrible opposition against the founder of Islam. No Arab tribe was without its idol, and to vindicate and protect the honour of their image-god every clan rose in war. This occurred when the Prophet was at Medina. In fact he had to pass here harder days than those at Mecca. Invaded on all sides by his enemies, he had every now and then to take the field, or to send men to meet aggression. Sometimes victorious, sometimes defeated, every incident created an appropriate occasion for the noble Prophet to manifest different phases of his grand character. One has simply to digest and codify them and the world will find in them laws and rules of war more humane and appropriate than could ever be imagined by the promoters of the Hague Conference. Never a sword was drawn but as a last resort to defend human life. Islam may be slandered for the use of the sword in propagating religion, but even its most hostile critics have absolutely failed to lay their finger even on one instance where war resulted in individual or tribal conversion to Islam. These battles no doubt, in one way, proved useful in this direction. They caused the revelation of that nobility of character in Mohamad which won the hearts of his countrymen, and was more effectual in proselytisation than any form of compulsion. That noble treatment which the defeated received at the hands of the Prophet worked wonders. Never a supplicant came but he got more than he deserved or desired. The following incident occurred after the defeat of the clan of Tay, which went a long way to bring the whole tribe to Islam within a short time. Among the prisoners who came before the Prophet was a band of respectable Christian women, led by the daughter of a widely-famed Christian philanthropist, whose generosity even now is proverbial in the East, and who is known as Hatim, the generous. When the Lord of the Faithful came to know of her lineage, he showed her every respect. He addressed her courteously, and informed her that the generosity of her father called for the tender treatment of his daughter. “God loves those that are kind to His creatures.” Islam, said the Prophet, aims at inculcating the higher virtues, and consequently it must recognise them wherever they exist. A world of joy and ecstasy dawned upon the lady when thus addressed courteously. She found the conqueror free from arrogance, extremely kind and affable, who immediately ordered her release. Emboldened by the saintly appearance and kind treatment of her liberator, her self-sacrificing spirit came to the rescue of her fellow-prisoners; she refused to accept the favour
if the women of her community, with whom she had shared captivity, should continue to be State prisoners. The daughter was worthy her noble descent from Hatim, and her self-abnegation could not go unwarded, especially at the hand of Mohamad, who always proved more than a match for the nobleness shown by others. She felt transported with joy, and invoked a long prayer upon the head of her noble deliverer, who, at her intercession, liberated all her companions. The whole company was given leave very soon, and they were despatched to their town under a trustworthy escort.

The lady, who went by the name of Safana, sent for her fugitive brother Uddi, and related the whole story to him and advised him to visit her benefactor, the Prophet. Uddi came to see Mohamad, and found him more than a worldly prince. He studied Islam, and found it a science of theology to all appearance. In it he found a succinct treatment of all spiritual problems which used to trouble him before. The book of Islam provided him with a host of illustrations for inductions and deductions, and furnished everything that had any bearing on the edification of the soul. He embraced Islam after some months, and with him his clan.

The life of the Prophet is full of such events. If the sword was drawn to force others to conversion, why were the prisoners released at the end of each war and allowed to go to their home without being converted to Islam? Can any person refer to a single conversion which was secured through compulsion? To wage war in defence of life and property was a duty, and cannot be treated as a crusade.  

SADAR UD DIN.

THE CALIPH OMAR AT THE CHURCH OF THE RESURRECTION.

The entry of Caliph Omar, the second successor of the Holy Prophet, into Jerusalem after it was conquered by the Muslims is one of the most memorable events in the history of the world. The siege of Jerusalem lasted for four months, and though the inclemency of the winter, with daily actions, sallies and assaults from the besieged, proved more destructive to the Arabs, the Christians had to give way to the Muslim perseverance at last. A conference took place between the parties, and a fair capitulation was proposed by the Patriarch Sophronius in the name of his people. He, however, demanded that the articles of security should be ratified by the authority and presence of the Caliph himself, who was in Medina at that time. The sanctity of the place induced Omar to accede to the wishes of the Christians, and he went to Jerusalem from the seat of the Caliphate. “The sublimity of his journey,” says the historian Gibbon, “is more illustrious than the royal pageants of vanity
and oppression. The conqueror of Persia and Syria was mounted on a red camel, which carried besides his person a bag of corn, a bag of dates, a wooden dish, and a leather bottle of water. Wherever he halted the company, without distinction, was invited to partake in his homely fare, and the repast was consecrated by the prayers and exhortation of the commander of the faithful." The Caliph had only one personal attendant with him to look to his needs in the journey, who was a political prisoner. But the law of Islam about keeping State prisoners as slaves had some stringent conditions about it. In matters of eating and drinking, as well as in having other necessaries of life, it demanded equality between the master and slave, and no one was more scrupulous in observing the law than the Caliph himself. He had only one camel to ride on, and he could not do so without sharing the camel with the slave. They both rode and walked by turn. And it came to pass that the city of Jerusalem was reached when it was the turn of the slave to ride. Though entreated by all his companions, as well as by the slave himself, to change the position, the Caliph preferred to obey the commandment of his Lord, the Holy Prophet, in his treatment of slaves to all the outward dignity which the occasion required; and, to the great surprise of the besieged Christians who came to the walls of the holy city to welcome him, the conqueror of the world was found with the string of a camel in his hand, leading it, ridden by his own slave! But their admiration for their victor, as well as the wise and humane laws of Islam, knew no bounds when they came to understand that the humble position adopted by Omar was only in compliance with the letter of the law. Pitching his tent of coarse hair, Omar seated himself calmly on the ground. The treaty was signed, and the great general entered the city without fear and precaution. He discoursed courteously with Sophronius, the Patriarch, concerning the antiquities of the city. It was in the Church of the Resurrection where they both stood when the hour of prayer came. The Caliph was asked by the holy father to perform his devotion there, but the former refused to do so, and said his prayers on the steps of the Church of Constantine. After concluding his devotion, "he disclosed his prudent and honourable motive" to the Patriarch in these words:—

HAD I YIELDED TO YOUR REQUEST, THE MUSLIMS OF A FUTURE AGE WOULD INFRINGE THE TREATY UNDER COLOUR OF IMITATING MY EXAMPLE.

Omar was wise in his prudent step. A mosque was in his time raised by the steps of the church on the spot where Omar said his prayers.

These are the first fruits of a religion which, it is said, has nothing to teach men of advanced culture. Of course, it can bring no lesson to those whose self-assertiveness has brought
them to violate all bounds of humanity; but one with whom true civilisation and service to humanity, without distinction of creed and colour, are one and the same thing, can learn many lessons from Islam and its followers. The foresight and the scrupulous care of the Caliph not only saved the Church of the Resurrection from being converted into a mosque, but made its position secure and its inviolability sacred for ever and ever.

With all his false promises, the savage Bulgars could not restrain himself from seeing the mosque of Salim converted into a church even within the very first week of his entry into Adrianople.

AN EPISODE TO THE MUSLIMS IN INDIA AND ABROAD.

II.

BRETHREN in Islam. Peace be on you and grace and blessing from God! Yours are the days of hardest trials, but remember the holy words of your Prophet, who says that the days of trials are the days of purification and blessings. Your difficulties are great, but they are not unsurmountable. Your affictions are bitter, but they are not without remedy. You have lost a great heritage, but, God be glorified! you are awakened and have become alive to the loss, and nothing is lost if the loser cares to recover what he has lost. If our misdeeds have brought our mishap, our return to righteousness can bring us back to the glory which was ours in days gone by, and so says the Book of God:

"And who shall present himself with good works shall receive a tenfold reward, but he who shall present himself with evil works shall receive none other than a like requital, and they shall not be treated unjustly."—The Quran 6: 161.

God is not unjust and Islam does not believe in fatalism.* Our present calamity is just a like punishment of our own evil work, but the reward will also be tenfold if we change our course for the better. We have realised our misfortune; we do upbraid our conduct; we are not satisfied with the present conditions; it is a happy sign; it is a turning point in our national life; we are at the threshold of a new order. Are we not in need of a guide? Yes, we are. One who is just awakened of a heavy swoon—and such is our condition—needs a guide. Various courses are suggested; but have we not already one, free of errors, free of doubt, free of suspicion? I believe we have. The Book of God claims the same for itself at the very beginning, and says:

* See page 395.
Zalekal-Kitabu; la-reba feeh hadun il-Muttaqeen.
(The Quran is the book free of doubts and errors, it is guidance to the God-fearing.)
—The Quran 2: 1.

We have been anything but God-fearing till now, and we have reaped the fruits bitterly; we have to be otherwise, and the Book of God becomes our true guide in attaining what we aim at, and we have our strength in the following words:

"And it is He who hath made you the successor of others on the earth, and hath raised some of you above others by various grades."
—The Quran 6: 165.

Everyone wishes to be successful beyond others in power, in wealth, in culture, and so do we. God has made some of you above others by various grades, and this we observe daily. He is the Lord of all things—He is the Creator, the Sustainer and the Bestower of power, wealth and culture. Is He indiscreet in the distribution of these blessings? God forbid if we even imagine so. The verses I have cited say something quite contrary. Evil comes out of evil and good out of good, with extra tenfold good as God’s gift. These words are unchangeable, and will be true in our case as well. We at present are destitute of everything desirable—no power, no wealth, no culture. We need not go into detailing the cause of our mishap; it is not worth the while. To find out means to gain what we have lost is the crying need of the hour. We want power, we want culture; we want wealth. There are those who do possess these things, and God is the source of all things. Should we worship the former or the latter? This is the question which the Book of God itself proposes:

"Shall I seek any other Lord than God, the Lord of all things."
—Ibid 6: 164.

The next verse comes to its reply:

"No soul shall labour but for itself, and no burdened one shall bear another’s burden."
—Ibid.

Simple words but pregnant with truth. Self interest is the chief incentive. It is wrong to say that we are ruled for our benefit. Everyone tries to aggrandise himself at the expense of the other. One is in power because he won’t allow it to another; one is wealthy because others are without wealth. Greatness and lowness are co-relative; how can one be great unless the other is reduced to nothing. The Romans used to feed their slaves well, not because they wanted to benefit the serfs, but to enable them to work harder. It is absurd, therefore, to worship those who chance to possess wealth, power and culture for the time being. What a truth, and how beautifully put:

"Shall I seek any other Lord but God, when He is the Lord of all things?"
—Ibid.
One who creates and sustains, who is the real owner and distributor of gifts, is the only Being who deserves all our adoration, all our worship, and all our obedience. And He promises to give tenfold reward for all our good deeds. To retrieve my losses, to gain what I want, I cannot do better than to worship Him. But how to do so? The following words put into the holy mouth of the Lord of Islam is the proper reply:

“My Lord hath guided me into a straight path, a true course and creed, that of Abraham, which is to be of God and of no other.”—Ibid.

Yes, Mohamad was exclusively of God and of no other. This was his only course of life, and he succeeded. Can you refer to any other character in the history of the whole world, secular or sacred, that is parallel to the Lord of the Faithful? We need not go into the details of his life. I need not defend or advocate him on various particulars of his life in the spirit of a propagandist. I take him as a character in history, one who comes with a mission in history, one who comes to raise his people from one state of life to another, one who comes to introduce a new order of things. It is useless to refer to sacred history for any other character. None of the Sacred Blessed there is historic; a cloud of obscurity envelops them. Even take them as they are; no one succeeded in the mission he had to fulfil in his own lifetime. But in the case of my Lord, he finds his mission completely fulfilled before he leaves this world, and the word of God comes to his testimony.

† “When the help of God and the victory are at hand, and thou seest men entering the religion of God by troops.”—The Quran 100: 1, 2.

He finds his nation in the most degenerate condition, and brings them to the height of evolution. His people were enthralled under the worst type of idolatry, and he came to their emancipation. His country was full of vices, and he succeeds in stamping every evil out of his land before his departure. The Arabs were unknown to the history of the world, and he brings them to the front. They were the sons of the desert, but through him and in his lifetime they became the coming ruler of human destinies. In short, they were strange to wealth, power and culture, and through him and in his lifetime it was at their feet. Leave aside his religious character; leave alone what he did for humanity; take him as a benefactor of his own people, and from every point of view he is a unique character. Name to me any other personage, if you will, who could thus change the destiny of his people for the better in his lifetime, and, with them, that of the whole world. The

† This chapter was revealed only about one year before the death of the Prophet, and warned him of his coming death, because the work of his life was near accomplishment.—ED.
Holy Prophet stands on the highest pedestal in this respect, with Caesars, Alexanders, and Napoleons at his sacred feet. This is not a matter of belief, opinion, or a pre-possession, but a simple, bare fact in history.

Is it not worth your while to study the causes which brought him all this success? I say yes. Why do you study history? Only for one thing: To learn the ways and modes of great men which brought them to greatness. Let us study Mohammad: let us find out the guiding principle of his life, not because he is our Lord, and we should follow him, but because he is the most successful man. And if we aspire after success he is the best model for imitation. And it is not a difficult task to find it out. The principle has been summed up in the following verse:—

"(Mohammad) say (to people) my prayers and my worship, my life and my death are for God, Lord of the worlds, He hath no associate. This I am commanded, and I am the first of the Muslims."

Mohammad is the foremost among men. Why? Because he is the first of the Muslims. To be Muslim—i.e., to be faithful and obedient to God is the secret to be foremost amongst the creatures of God. Be Muslim, and you are the master of the situation. Be Muslim, and you are the owner of wealth, power and culture. Be Muslim, and you will in no time gain what you have lost. And God be with you!

Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din.

The Mosque, Oct. 20, 1913.

SURSUM.

It is a far cry to the days of youth; days that never return. Days of morning breezes and of sunshine and evenings glorious with golden stars. Days of happiness and gladness when the heart was young and everything was bright with light and love and radiant with hope. Hope for the future, for the blossom, and the fruit. Days when castles in the air were built that in after years were destined to crumble and decay, and to ultimately vanish into nothingness. What days and nights of dreams, dreams, all dreams, created and destroyed, gorgeous visions, mostly unfulfilled, dissolved away by the wand of destiny or ground into powder by the wheels of fate! Ah! well! when you come to think of it, if all our hopes were realised and all our ideals gained, life would be “a sorry scheme of things entire.” After all, it is this eternal seeking for a goal we never reach, for the fulfilment of aims and aspirations that are never accomplished, that makes life worth living, that keeps the hands at the plough, doles out our triumphs and our failures, our joys and our sorrows, and in the long run leads us ever upwards to
higher thoughts and a nobler plane of actions. Yet the pathway along which mankind labours on the road to progress is strewn with broken lives and wrecked ideals with our Chattertons and Poes and Alastors, while amid the ever drifting flotsam and jetsam of humanity voices as inspiring, as ennobling, and enthusiastic still shout for the life-line the heedless voyagers decline to throw. But what is a life, or even lives, to great surging multitudes where races and nations and creeds and philosophies battle continuously for the mastery? If they are canaille, let them sink in the vortex, they are not worth the saving; if they are geniuses, let them save themselves or perish. Where cunning, hypocrisy, and selfishness are the watchwords of success, the sovereign guides leading unto fortune, righteousness, honesty and virtue become attributes that lead only to ruin, poverty and despair. Is it to be wondered at that the still small voice of Reason keeps asking and repeating, “Is our so-called civilisation a mockery and a lie?”

It is good for us to follow the steps where Truth walks.

Al Kader night the scroll of gold beheld,
From Hira Mount the words of light outwelled,
And chivalry arose with pennons spread,
And Arabey awoke: the darkness fled;
The star of morning cast a lustre bright,
The Western Isles were flushed with Eastern light;
Mecca beheld the rising of the sun,
Three continents proclaimed the victories won;
From Indus banks to Andalus the blest
The lamp of knowledge burned in East and West;
Alone in Muslim school and mosque and hall
The voice of Reason answered to the call;
Where science, art, to sovereign power attain,
Prosperity will follow in the train.

It is almost incredible the amount of fiction consumed by the reading public at the present day; in fact I have wandered through a good deal of it myself. No doubt fiction has its uses, just as other literature. If it be good fiction, well-written, either exposing iniquities of the social system, teaching ideals or morals, delineating character or dealing with periods of the past, it is valuable. We all vary in our tastes and therefore vary in our reading, and our tastes vary at different periods of our lives. In the days of my adolescence tales of derring-do and chivalry were my favourite reading, even as they are of all healthy boys. Tales much as those written by the late A. R. Phillips—“Kairoon, the Young Charioteer”; “Desdichado,” or the “Disinherited”; “Thundersleigh,” or the “Knight’s Quest”; “Ralph, the Mysterious,” and “Don Zalva the Brave.” Phillips, of course, is practically unknown to the young generation of the present, their parents and fashion have driven them to other authors.
No story made a greater impression on my youthful mind than "Don Zalva." It was my first introduction to the enchanted realms of Moorish chivalry, to Eastern habits and manners, to the magnificence and glory of that vanished empire of the past. To Granada's beauteous maidens and gentle knights.

"Caballeros Granadinos
Aunque Moros hishof d'algo."

To Soxa, with its fairy bowers and flowery gardens, and the wonderful palaces and gorgeous halls of the Islamite.

The splendours of the Red Castle of Al Hamar, the pleasures of the Albaçin, Malaga's entrancing courts and Almeria's bowers of love. What a land of romance was pictured by the novelist where the hero always overcame the deceitful artifices of his enemies, and the villain always came to grief. Where chivalry and courtesy dwelt and love and passion ruled, and where amid it all the shadow of the Inquisition cast a baleful, sickly glare. Torquemada stood out grim and terrible in his bloodthirsty earnestness to advance the cause he believed was that of God and truth, yet withal true to his principles, and kindly and gentle to the children of his own faith.

I was grateful to the novelist for introducing me to that world of past life, with its lights and shadows, sunshine and darkness, joy and sorrow, with its gentle deeds and dastard acts, where virtue and purity flourished and triumphed in the end, and hypocrisy and villainy was defeated and debased.

The light, the life has gone out, and Granada now is but a shadow of its former glory. The silent halls, stately columns, and gorgeous porticos still remain. The crumbling walls and half or wholly ruined courts that in the days of en-Nasir throbbed with life, yet proclaim in silent and with voiceless majesty the glory that has departed, the worth that is buried with the past; the splendour and power that once was Islam's.

The grass grows green and the trees wave their branches over the unknown graves where lies the dust of the men who made history when Granada and Cordova were the tilting lists of Europe, when the one was "Queen of the West," and the other "the Glory of the World;" when Andalusia sang and laughed and was happy, when the day was bright and the night was fair, and the cavaliers of the Beni Omeyya and the Beni Nasir walked in the paths of science and poetry and literature, or when duty called gathered to the trump of war.

Shall the Muslim ever again be able to write of his lands and their children, as his fathers wrote of old, with justice and truth? Shall he ever again attain those paths? Yes, if the Muslims remember that Islam as a civilisation is as they make her, their learning and attainments will be the measure of her power and position, and their achievements the measure of her strength.
The past materially is behind us, spiritually it is with us and before us, its example pointing the way if we will be guided by it. Its example leads us on. They achieved; can we not do so also? They conquered; can we not do so?

If the spirit abide and enthusiasm never flag.

There is music amid the hills, there is shouting in the valleys. The light shall flash again and the glory be revived. What they planted shall we not reap? The grain is ripe and ready for the mowers. Their deeds our guiding stars to lead us on to nobler and grander things. On their work we shall rise to higher realms and soar to greater heights of thought. Imbued with their enthusiasm, we can make the future far surpass the past, enrich it with the labours of a later and a wider experience. We are the moulders of the future generations of our race, on our work and our worth depends the greater part of their success, let us see that we are worthy of it, worthy of our heritage and to be called the Faithful, the followers of Islam.

Up, ye worthy sons of Islam, once again our flag unfurled, Shall be foremost in the conflict, in the vanguard of the world. Once again in fields of learning and in fields of thought engage; From your fathers, sons of Islam, you received a heritage: One of honour and of glory, one of worth and fair renown; Will ye cast aside your kingdom, throw the olden laurels down? Will ye let the stranger conquer, rule in realms were once your own?

Draw the secrets from the heavens and usurp the poet's throne? Were your fathers sluggards, think ye, lingering in the haunts of sloth?

Have you heard how Ibn Zeyad swept aside the battled Goth? Have you heard of great Omeya and the sturdy race he bore? And how Khalid ibn Walid victory from the Roman tore?

How the scions of Alabas at Baghdad enchanted towers, Patronised the haunts of learning, spent in study leisure hours? Fountains flashed the wine of knowledge; poets tuned their noblest lays; Streams of learning poured unceasing; science knew those halcyon days.

Hark! Jellal-ed-din-er-Rumi and the "Bird of Paradise," Dear old Hafiz and Nizami and wise Saadi bid you rise; Bid you rise, ye sons of Islam, put your mantle on again; Prove yourselves their trusty scions, prove the world your worthy men,

In the lands of Afric, Asia, set the hills of thought ablaze, With the thunder of your calling wake the mighty Himalayas. In the front of thought and culture plant again your Royal flag; With the glowing fire of knowledge light the plain and mountain crag.

Know ye not the ranks of learning, voice and pen are stronger far
Than the files your fathers marshalled white with lance and scimitar?
Still the Prophets' language rolling like a sea in tidal flood:
Hark! "The ink of scribe is nobler even than the martyr's blood."

YEHYA-EN-NASR PARKINSON.

FATALISM CONDEMNED BY ISLAM.

Though the doctrine that all things are subject to fate, and take place by inevitable necessity, finds no place in Islam, yet it has been fathered upon the Quran, the whole spirit of which goes against this enervating tenet. It existed long before Islam; it, in fact, is as old as ignorance in the human world. It came to serve as a source of consolation to those victimised, in most cases, through their own folly and inordinancy. Erring as human beings are, they are ever prone to ascribe their faults to others. To find oneself to be the cause of one's own sufferings is a terrible consciousness. It is a mental torture of immense magnitude and intensity, which few can afford to face; it makes one extremely miserable. He shirks it, and finds a genuine relief in ascribing his misery to others. He sometimes fails to find the cause of his troubles, and fate is his final prop. This is the genesis of fatalism, and the doctrine must find favour with races who at one time occupied an important position among nations, but are now sinking into impotence through their own doings. It is only natural if a Muslim, hard pressed by adversity, tries to lighten his heart by ventilating thoughts which seemingly support the view of fatality. But such expressions are no proof that Islam gives countenance to the doctrine. Nay, it condemns it on its very face.

How the doctrine crept into some Muslim writings is not difficult to explain. It has often been confused with the doctrine of pre-ordination. The Quran had to distinguish between the two, and some of the verses on the subject received a wrong interpretation from minds labouring under misconceptions concerning the doctrine of the first Motion. Before quoting the Quranic text, however, we deem it necessary to make some observations to explain Islamic teachings in this respect. They are absolutely antagonistic to fatalism when examined analytically. Fatalism makes evil an inevitable necessity, but the Quran declares it to be an accident following human action, and may be averted. Misery is a destiny under fatalism, but it results from our ignorance, or breach of the law under Islam. A fatalist must believe good and evil as already designed by God, but a Muslim is taught to believe that good, and only good, comes from God, and evil is a human acquisition. Again, belief in fatalism must deny the capability of unlimited progress to man, and obviate the
necessity of the law and its observance. Islam admits of such capability, and promulgates rules and regulations for human evolution. Fatalism leaves no choice between right and wrong. Islam teaches that man has been given an instinct to distinguish and choose between the two, and is therefore responsible for the use of his discretion. For this very reason the doctrine of causation became an article of the faith in Islam. It was taught, to intensify human sense to do good and to shun evil, that good must produce good and evil must lead to evil under laws unchangeable, and it was pre-ordained, and therefore causality was a Divine law—call it Pre-ordination or Fatalism, what you will. This is what has been taught in the Book of Islam. It goes directly against the popular conception of fatalism. The following from the Quran and the saying of the Holy Prophet substantiates the above:—

"Praise the name of thy Lord the Most High, who hath created and balanced all things, who hath fixed their measures and guideth them.* All measures of good and evil are from God† (i.e., He has made the law under which certain things when combined or separated by man inevitably result either in good or evil, he, being given the knowledge and discretion, may shun what leads to evil, and adopt what brings forth good). He (God) equipped man with highest capabilities,‡ but he is capable of degeneration. If he believes in and observes the laws he will be blessed with unlimited reward. The soul of man is balanced and inspired with instinct to make distinction between evil and good.§ Whatever good betideth thee is from God and whatever betideth thee of evil is from thee.|| Nor happeneth to you any mishap, but it is for your own handiwork, and yet God forgiveth many good things.¶ And whosoever shall have wrought an atom’s weight of good shall behold it, and whosoever shall have wrought an atom’s weight of evil shall behold it.**

This is the religion of Islam which condemns the doctrine in question in its every aspect. We wonder how it can be fathered on the Book the very first verse of which is sufficient to kill all fatalistic tendencies:—

Allhamdu lillahi Rubbiladameen Er-Rahman, Er-Raheem, Maliki-Yammiddeen.

All praises are due to ALLAH, Who creates, sustains, and develops all the faculties latent in the universe, Who created

---

* The Quran 87: 1, 2, 3. † From the definition of the Faith.
** Ibid 99: 7, 8.
things necessary to meet the need of man in his development and evolution, Who gives manifold rewards when we utilise His created material to our advantage, Who punishes our misdeeds and rewards good actions. These four attributes mentioned in the opening verse of the Quran jointly and severally go against fatalism. If fatalism is true, the way of progress cannot be open to every one; but the words Rubb and Rahman mean that God intends individual human development. He is ever ready to help and further progress in every individual case, and the material created by Him to do so is open to all, and not confined to the few blessed ones. Again, under fatalism we are a sort of mechanism and our actions spontaneous, we therefore deserve no reward. We merit no punishment. But Raheem and Malik, Yamniddin show that our good actions will receive ample reward and our misdeeds will incur punishment. In fact, a religion which to a considerable extent bases human felicity and success, in this life and in the life to come, solely on the observance of ordinances under good beliefs, and which teaches that all perdition and adversity here, as well as hereafter, are acquired, cannot be identified with fatalism in any sense of the word. That Islam is so, and is a religion of faith combined with actions, is as clear as day. On the other hand, any persuasion or belief which makes faith in certain dogmas to be the only passport of salvation is the religion most favourable to fatalism. Believe in certain dogmas and you are saved, disbelieve and you with all your good actions are eternally condemned. “Saved” and “unsaved” are thus accidents. Thus salvation in the case of millions is a birthright and eternal death comes similarly to others, because conversion finds little favour with the people in general, and few care or have occasion to give even a second thought to the religion or creed forced on them by their environments. They come and die in the same faith. If they chanced to accept the favoured dogma, they are saved; if not, they are condemned. This is fatalism, and therefore Churchianity and fatalism are really identical. Open the Common Prayer Book and you will find the following:

“Whosoever will be saved: before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic faith. Which faith except every one do keep whole and undefiled: without doubt he shall perish everlastingly.”

And the Catholic faith is this: “That we worship one God in Trinity and Trinity in Unity.”

Why should millions of those who never in their life cared for righteousness, but being born in Christian houses mechanically accepted what they picked up in their infancy, be saved; and why should other millions who died without faith in Christ, because the circumstances around them were not favourable to the acceptance of the doctrine of salvation, be lost? Why should
eternal condemnation also enshroud those who lived, and do now live, in regions beyond missionary activities? They never heard the name of Christ, nor had any occasion to appreciate the mysterious beauties of the Church doctrine. And what about that huge number of infant souls claimed by premature death, who, born in the unsaved families, could not come under the grace of that Church conventionality which has created the institution of Godfathers and Godmothers? All these different classes of souls meet eternal condemnation on account of circumstances beyond their control. This is fatalism pure and simple. All these remarks apply mutatis mutandis to the theory of Karma, or transmigration of soul, which makes our present felicity or adversity a shade of our actions in the life past. The subject, however, is of special interest in the West, and we propose to write on it some time later.

"THE MALAYSIA MESSAGE."

The *Malaysia Message* is a monthly periodical—the official organ, I think, of the Methodist Mission in the Malay Peninsula. The number for June has just reached me, rather belated, but welcome all the same. One likes to know what people are doing and thinking in other parts of the globe—at least when they are interested in the progress of humanity. Page 76 of the number contains a report of "A Muslim Boycott" in Java. After reading it there is a desire for more positive knowledge on the subject; perhaps some reader can give it. Evidence is a thing that some writers never seem to look for; they make assertions against members of other creeds without bothering themselves about details of proofs. The more vague the statement can be made the better it appears. It is then, if incorrect and made on purpose, the more difficult to refute. The majority of readers in such a case are not likely even to attempt it. Concerning this "boycott," or "supposed" boycott, we are informed that—

"A Mohammedan association has been formed in Java under the title of *Sharikat Dagang Islam* . . . which appears to be causing some anxiety to the Dutch Government and to the European community. At the outset it appears to have been simply a trading society for the purpose of getting the trade of the Javanese people away from the Chinese and into the hands of the Mohammedans. The movement has, however, assumed the character of a boycott against Christians as well as Chinese, and has gradually taken on more and more of a religious aspect. . . . An association of native
Christians has been formed to defend themselves against the *Sharikat Islam*.

The above reads like a news item in an ordinary newspaper; one of the paragraphs a reader glances over and laughs, then forgets in a few minutes. How can they boycott the Christians, especially if the latter are so numerous as the missionaries claim, and if, as they proudly proclaim, that they have arrested the progress of Islam in that part of the world? Can a people whose progress has been arrested boycott anyone, least of all the community who have been instrumental in arresting their progress?

Again we read:

"The *Sharikat Islam* publishes a newspaper, which, we believe, is a daily, called the *Octvesan Hindia*, or 'Indian Messenger.' This paper is stated to have already fully ten thousand readers, and it is expected that this number will be doubled in a few months. It urges its readers to attendance at the mosques, and the observance of Friday as a day of rest, and undoubtedly has a strong religious influence."

It seems evident from the wording of the above that the writer has no first-hand information on the matter. He says "we believe," and "it is stated." It will be well to note that point. I hope that the paper, no matter whether its circulation is ten thousand or not, will not only be doubled but trebled in the time mentioned, and that it will continue to impress upon its readers the fundamental principles of Islam; that it will observe faithfully those principles in its own pages and in its propaganda work, making them not only ideals to be taught, but laws to be put into practice daily. Doing so, may it be fruitful even unto abundance. Again, we read:

"A good deal of fanaticism is being stirred up, and the Dutch papers report that there have been 'excesses,' which we take to mean attacks on Christians or Chinese, for we have it on good authority that in one place a motor-car was held up, and the chauffeur left for dead, and that the owner, a European, had some difficulty in beating off his assailants."

Some time ago Sir Hiram Maxim published a terrible exposure of missionary work and methods in China; the above seems to be another of the same kind. Here we have an accusation of fanaticism, simply because a religious association has been formed—no one, seemingly, is to be allowed to form a religious association save Christians—or that Christians are the only people who are capable of forming a religious association.
without the members becoming fanatical. All the time he gives no reference to enable anyone to investigate the matter. An outrage also occurs; or is assumed to have occurred, and it is at once labelled as an instance of Muslim fanaticism, and attributed to the influence or teaching of the Muslim association without a single fact being produced to prove the association had anything to do with it, or that even a single Muslim took part therein. "Excesses," he says, "which we take to mean." I think readers will agree with me that such statements are mere insinuations, and such conceptions a gross abuse of justice. The writer's ethic is wrong. I would be as justified in assuming that the outrage was due to the teaching or influence of the above mentioned "defence association," or that all outrages committed in Europe were due to Christian influence or teachings; but Islam teaches better ethics. The facts appear to be that, Islam is spreading so rapidly in that quarter that the Christian leaders are alarmed, and the above paragraph is a deliberate attempt to stop its progress, to obtain Government interference, and to increase the subscriptions to the Methodist missionary fund, which, if we remember by the last report from England, had fallen off to an alarming extent, the membership also having undergone a decrease. I have also a statement from the East denying the charges. In such a case I have no hesitation in asking the editor of The Malaysia Message to substantiate his charges and produce his evidence. If he refuses to do this—well I will leave others to form their own opinion of his conduct.

Perhaps this editor is one of those referred to by Dr. Zwemer in the Moslem World, when he says:—

"Those who best know the situation in Malaysia are already able to speak of the arrest of Islam in Sumatra."

If so, he is to be congratulated on his authorities; perhaps some of them will inform us what is actually meant by the statement. In place of attempting to arrest the progress of Islam, or any other religions, in Africa or Asia, it would be advisable for those men to stay at home and try their hands at arresting the progress of Rationalism in Europe. While they are spending in foreign lands the donations of other people, wrung by sweat and hard labour from the workers of Europe, such men as J. M. Robertson, Prof. Drews and Prof. Smith are in England, Germany and America undermining by their teachings the whole superstructure of Christianity, and placing it on a level with the mythologies of the past—of Babylonia, Egypt, Greece, Rome, and Teutonic heathendom. Before their keen scholarship and vast erudition the feeble bulwarks of Christian apologetics wilt and wither away.

YEHYA-EN-NASR PARKINSON.