

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ
نَحْمَدُهُ وَنُصَلِّي عَلَى رَسُولِهِ الْكَرِيمِ

ISLAMIC REVIEW

AND

MUSLIM INDIA.

VOL. II.]

DECEMBER 1914.

[NOS. 11—12.]

NOTES.

WE issue a double number this time in order to effect an adjustment between the months of the calendar and the numbers of the Magazine. The first month of the next year will be in agreement with the first number of the third volume of the organ. We are also looking forward to an improvement. The new number will bring to you a sketch of our Mosque.

It is very propitious to note that this organ of Islamic literature, which undertakes to represent Islam from the Islamic Scripture particularly, and the precepts of the Great Apostle of God, has met with incredible success in England and abroad. Its warmth and light has not only lifted the mist of misrepresentation that had obscured Islam, but also animated many a benumbed English person who was almost dead to religion. The results have been very flattering indeed.

We are taking this opportunity of informing the English public that many English ladies and gentlemen have embraced Islam, and there are innumerable people in England who are Muslims without knowing that they are such. This inference is based upon a stream of letters that is pouring in every week, and personal interviews in which people affirm that Islam is in unison with human requirements and instincts.

شريف
The method of initiation is very simple. Either a person sends a letter to avow that he or she will believe in the Unity of God and the universal brotherhood of man, as preached by all the prophets from Adam and Abraham down to Moses, Jesus, and Mohammad; or a person calls to make a declaration at the Mosque, Woking, or at Lindsey Hall, Notting Hill Gate, London, at which places we are regularly delivering free public lectures on Sundays (3 p.m.) and Fridays (12.45 p.m.) respectively. These lectures are providing excellent occasions to the students of religion.

The Mosque at Woking is open to all throughout the week. We are receiving calls nearly every day for interviews, which can do in a short time what cannot be done by many lectures or books. Some seekers after truth stop with us as guests, and thus have a thorough peep into what we are. This is a very useful and cautious way of going in for a thing.

We have noted that many have embraced Islam, so much so that they are able to hold their own now. They have accordingly incorporated themselves into a fraternity called "The British Muslim Society," with Lord Headley as its President.

What is *Islam*? This is a question which is often put with a view to gain a rudimentary knowledge of Islam. Islam consists in believing primarily in the Unity of God, the Creator, the Cherisher of the Worlds, the Most Beneficent and Most Loving, the Forgiver of errors that are not committed deliberately. It demands belief in the mission of all the prophets—Abraham, Noah, Jacob, Isaac, Ishmael, Moses, Jesus, and Mohammad. It emphasises that there is no Deity but God, Who should form the only object of worship. No prophet should be adored. We adore neither Jesus nor Mohammad, though we hold them and other Apostles of Allah in the highest veneration and esteem.

The Divine Book in which Islam is expounded is the Quran, the doctrines of which are characterised by reason and practicability. It does not demand blind belief in untenable dogmas; it is entirely free from such things. It offers a system that recognises the powers and capacities with which man is fitted out before he is ushered into this world. It aims at the education and evolution of instincts ingrained in the nature of man. It furnishes a consummate code of moral, theological, social, civil, commercial, military, and judicial laws. It provides rules bearing on any and every form of intercourse and dealings. The object of all these details is that man may not lack guidance as to his connections with God and connections with His creatures. In the words of the Great Expositor of this system, "Profoundest veneration to the Divine Commandments and love to His creatures constitute Islam." In conformity with

it a Muslim is devotional, and a palpable form of sympathy is an absolutely necessary feature of his life. There is no priesthood in this religion; it has dispensed with intermediaries between Allah and His creatures. It does not believe in the sinfulness of man, but it accords freedom to man from such a thing, which is so depressing and a constant source of pessimism, which results in multiplying charlatans who take shelter behind this dogma of sinfulness of man, for which God is held responsible. The salvation of man lies in conducting himself in perfect accord with his nature, which is the object of his life, and which embodies the Divine Will. Allah equipped man with his nature with a certain purpose and design, the execution of which is the carrying out the Divine Will.

We may also mention for the benefit of our English readers that such contributors to our Magazine as the Rt. Hon. Lord Headley Farooq, Haroon Mustafa H. Leon, Ph.D., LL.D., F.S.P., Ameen Neville J. Whymant, Ph.D., Mr. Yehya Parkinson, F.G.S., Mr. Khalid Sheldrake, Mr. Omar Flight, Ameena, Mubarkah Alice Welch, Jameela Ettridge, Mr. Shamsuddin Sims, Mr. Ahmad Wetch, and Mr. Noor-ud-Din Harris are Muslims.

THE TEACHING OF ISLAM.

MUCH has been said, much has been done,
 To fan the flame of dear Islam,
 The faith we shield above all else.
 We need no summons from the bells,
 The brotherhood can oft be found
 Where sacred incense does abound,
 And none is master save "Allah,"
 Who rules the sun and moon and star.
 Repulse the war cry from our door,
 Lord sanction peace for evermore,
 The Holy Quran bids us cease
 From evil thought and wicked deed.
 Oh, guide our brethren in the East—
 Thou art our hope and our high priest,
 Let prayers and alms richly abound,
 Thy converts listen to that sound.
 Five times a day, the prophet prayed
 His doctrines pure on thee were stayed,
 We follow him, the young, the old,
 Take us for ever into thy fold.
 Our mosques we honour East and West,
 Let near their balm our bodies rest.

The crescent is the lasting sign
 That leads us to this holy shrine.
 We take our shoes from off our feet,
 And pray Thee "Allah" be our lead,
 No sting of death our blood turns cold,
 We calmly wait for our repose.
 No devil, hell, or gnashing teeth
 Consigns our souls at death's release,
 We know that He will shape our fate,
 The orders come through heaven's gate.
 Our penitential tears arise
 To Thy vast realm, the boundless skies.
 Forgive our sins so manifold,
 Inscribe our names in books of gold.
 Till time and tide have ceased to be,
 We still remain a part of "Thee."

London, November 9.

MARIE PERKINS.

CURRENT EVENTS.

THE Maulvie Sadr-ud-Din, of the Woking Mosque, was invited by Colonel Lucas, C.B., to the Victoria Royal Hospital, Netley, to approve of a site for opening an Islamic cemetery in the grounds of the hospital, where Indian wounded soldiers are being nursed. The Maulvie did not like the idea of opening a cemetery there, and suggested that it should be set up at Woking, which is the centre of the Muslim community, and where obsequies can be performed satisfactorily in his presence. The Colonel agreed, and asked Colonel Sharaman to accompany the Maulvie to the War Office and India Office, where the question could be discussed and finally settled. Gen. Sir A. Keogh and Gen. Sir Edmund Barrow received the Maulvie Sadr-ud-Din, and discussed the question with him, and decided finally to follow the suggestion offered. Accordingly officers from the War Office called three times at the Mosque, Woking, to prosecute the project. A site along the bank of a canal, some five hundred yards from the Mosque, has been pointed out, where it is hoped that the contemplated Islamic cemetery will be opened.

Further suggestions were submitted to the War Office, which elicited the following reply:—

From THE SECRETARY, War Office, London, S.W., November 12, 1914.

To THE MAULVIE SADR-UD-DIN, B.A., B.T., The Mosque, Woking.

Sir,—I am commanded by the Army Council to thank you for your letter of the 9th inst., relative to the proposed cemetery for Muslim soldiers at Woking, and to inform you that the question of selecting a site on the land north of the railway and canal, which you inspected with Captain H. C. Cole on the 8th inst., is receiving urgent

consideration of the Department. The owner has been approached in the matter, and his reply is awaited.

I am to add that you will be kept informed of the action taken, and will be further consulted when the actual site is decided upon.—I have the honour to be, Sir, your most obedient servant,

(Signed) B. B. CUBITT.

THE PROPOSED MUSLIM CEMETERY.

THE POWER OF THE GOVERNMENT.

(Reproduced from the *Woking Herald*.)

The proposed opening of a Mohammedan Cemetery at Woking, more particularly for the burial of Indian soldiers who die in this country as a result of having been in action at the front, was mentioned at a meeting of the Urban Council on Tuesday.

The Chairman (Mr. A. H. Godfrey) announced (as exclusively reported in the *Herald* last week) that the War Office were taking steps to provide a burial ground for Indian troops, and it was considered it should be within a reasonable distance of the Mosque. It was possible that a part of Horsell Common on the northern side of the canal, and on the eastern boundary of the urban area, might be acquired for the purpose. There was nothing official at present before the Council, but a War Office representative had seen some of the Council officials, although the War Office had full powers to do exactly what they liked without consulting the Council. The reason for providing the cemetery was because very grievous lies and false reports were being spread by the Germans amongst the Indian troops as to the manner in which we were dealing with the Mohammedan wounded and dead; it was of the utmost importance that the conscientious scruples of Indian troops should be carefully observed and every consideration given to them. He was sure they would agree that it was almost an honour to have men who fell as a result of the war buried in the district. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. J. B. Walker said that the Necropolis Company were asked to sell a piece of ground in Maybury opposite the Mosque for the purpose of a burial ground, but as it was in the midst of a residential district the company would not consider the proposal under any consideration. He might further tell them that there was already a special burial ground where Mohammedans had been buried in the past in the orthodox manner. He told the War Office that was a most suitable place; every facility was offered, and it was not a question of cost, and he still thought that instead of having a separate burial ground on a common it would have been wiser and more convenient to use the ground at Brookwood.

The Chairman said he understood that the head of the community at the Mosque had absolute power in the matter, and it rested with him; it seemed he preferred this particular spot rather than going to Brookwood. He had been informed that Indian princes were to assemble at Woking one day during the week and view the site.

The matter then dropped.

INDIAN SOLDIER BURIED AT WOKING.

The first burial in this country of an Indian soldier who has died as a result of wounds received while serving with the Indian Expeditionary Force at the front took place in the Mohammedan Cemetery at Brookwood on Monday afternoon. He was Ahmad Khan, of the 3rd Sappers & Miners, and he died on board a transport while on the way from France to Netley Hospital, on November 4. On Saturday the body was conveyed to the Woking Mosque in a motor hearse, the coffin being enshrouded in a Union Jack. The community of Muslims at the Mosque made arrangements with the Necropolis Company for the interment, which was not largely attended, chiefly on account of the fact not being generally known, but most of the Mohammedans at Woking were present, amongst them being an Arab from Medina, the burial place of the Prophet Mahomet. The brief and simple ceremony, which was conducted by Maulvie Sadr-ud-Din, consisted chiefly of silent prayer, interspersed with recitals of the glory of God. The coffin was first placed on the ground by the side of the grave, the Muslims facing towards Mecca during the prayer. After interment, and when the grave had been enclosed, silent prayer was again engaged in. On the coffin were placed several floral tributes from Woking friends—viz., Mrs. R. H. Howell, Mrs. Walters, Mrs. Chambers, and Mrs. Welch.

MUSLIM GREETINGS FROM WOKING TO THE FRONT.

It will be recalled that on September 20, at an "At Home" at The Mosque, Woking, the following resolution by the British Muslim Society was passed: "We desire to offer our wholehearted congratulations to our Eastern brethren now at the front, and to express our delight to find that our co-religionists in Islam are fighting on the side of honour, truth, and justice, and are carrying into effect the principles of Islam as inculcated by the Holy Prophet Mohammed."

The following letter has now been received by Lord Headley, President of the Society, from Colonel W. W. Leary, Assistant Adjutant-General of the Indian Army Corps: "I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of copies of the translation of the resolution passed by the British Muslim Society, and to inform you that by direction of General Sir James Willcocks, Commander of the Indian Army Corps, they have been distributed among the Mohammedan troops of the Army Corps under his command."

THE QURAN AND WAR.

THE religion which the Quran undertakes to advance and discuss is known as Islam. It is, indeed, a very significant name. Its radical and primary import is *making peace*. The very name strikes the most important chord and harmonises with the innermost wish of man, who instinctively endeavours to attain an entirely peaceful condition, and abhors even the idea of strife and turmoil. One who follows Islam is styled Muslim (not Mohammadan, as is used by ignorant Christian writers), because *he makes peace with Allah* and extends peace to Allah's creatures. The greeting—*i.e.*, Assalamo-Alaikum (peace be upon you!)—which he constantly makes use of indicates his motives and attitudes towards others. The Lord Muhammad announced that he had come to preach Islam, or the religion of peace. What a fascinating gospel for the warring tribes of Arabia! What a solid historical proof of its unifying powers! The disintegrating elements which were represented by the sands of Arabia were united, and a democratic brotherhood effected by virtue of the peaceful doctrines of Islam. The following verse of the Quran will remind those that are acquainted with the pre-Islamic history of Arabia of the violent blood feuds to which were given up the innumerable clans and factions of that warlike race. The verse does also immortalise the effect of the teachings of the Quran, which has historically been borne out:—

"And hold ye fast by the cord of God, all of you, and break not loose from it; and remember God's goodness towards you: how that when ye were enemies He united your hearts, and by His favour ye became brethren." "And when ye were on the brink of the pit of fire, He drew you back from it. Thus God clearly showeth you His signs that ye may be guided."—Quran III: 98, 99.

To bring these discordant tunes in harmony was a task bristling over with inconceivable difficulties. The detractors went beyond all bounds in tormenting the Apostle of Allah and inflicting wanton violence on his followers. Various cruel measures were devised to secure recantation. Bayonets were shamelessly used to pierce women, children were butchered in cold blood, and sometimes the initiates were fastened on intensely hot stones and exposed to the scorching rays of the sun which converts the Arabian sands into a veritable furnace. One of the adherents was subjected to a torment which surpasses all cruel ingenuity. He was placed between the hind legs of two strong camels, his legs tied one to each camel, and they were lashed to run in opposite directions. You can picture the shocking death which he met with. He was torn in two with a crash. In short, ingenious designs were contemplated and put into execution to compel apostacy. The Quran vividly sketches the agonies of men, women, and children:—

"Why should ye not fight on the path of Allah, and for the weak among men, women, and children, who say, O, our Lord, bring us forth from this city whose inhabitants are oppressors; give

us a champion from Thy presence; and give us from Thy presence a defender?"—IV: 77.

The Prophet himself was attacked by the miscreants, who were bent on extinguishing his life. The Quran depicts the bitterness of the Apostle's enemies in the following words:—

"And call to mind when the unbelievers plotted against thee, to detain thee prisoner, or to kill thee, or to banish thee."

He sent a party of his followers to Abyssinia, and himself had to fly for his life and take shelter in Medina. The stone-hearted ruffians would not content themselves with anything but the life of Muhammad. Concerted attacks were made on Medina itself with the invidious object of wiping out the man and his followers. This called forth defensive measures on the part of the Muslims, who were dragged into active engagements. The one object which compelled the Muslims to have recourse to active operations was self-defence and securing of peace, as we find very clearly given in the Quran:—

"Oppression and civil discord is worse than carnage." "Fight therefore against them until there be no more civil discord and oppression."

Wars are bound to dog nations. Even such peaceable measures as the Hague Conference adopted have failed to secure their desired effect. Do we not stand in need of laws that should regulate war in case such a thing should occur? Human laws cannot carry conviction to the degree to which Divine Laws do. But only Divine Laws of such a nature will be effectual as are tenable and fall in with human instincts. They should not aim at strangling human sentiments and susceptibilities. Injunctions of that character are involuntarily cast away into the lumber-room. Such has been the fate which the Bible has met with at the hands of statesmen in the present crisis. The actual following of the Bible meant the utter annihilation of the British Empire. The Holy Bible may pardon statesmen and military officers and those stirring speakers who have been taxing their eloquence to rouse the masses to the situation for the task of defending the Empire. The Bible does not recognise that its followers will be affluent or in possession of States which they will ever be called upon to safeguard against the aggressive foe. And it is not only the present juncture that reveals the inefficient doctrines of the Bible. The European nations have been alive to it prior to the outbreak of this huge war. The institution of the Hague Conference bears ample testimony to the intelligence of the European mind. It plainly points to two things that the Bible lacks: (1) In providing laws that touch the most important affairs of civilised nations; the other (2) is that injunctions conducive to peace and bearing on topics of war, and entering into the details of the various sides of war, are badly wanted. When people could not draw upon the Bible they had to depend upon human resources. But the Quran provides elaborate guidance on such and all other problems of moment.

The Quran undertakes to discuss everything that concerns human affairs—*i.e.*, politics, sociology, morality, and spiritual affairs. It sets forth doctrines, and invariably offers arguments in support of them.

One may judge for oneself whether the Quran comes up to this standard by taking its discussions on war by way of an illustration.

Below we shall reproduce from the Quran some of the verses that incorporate the object and the motives that should impel a nation to make war. To what extent people should cherish fear of God when they are involved in such a disaster? How they should avoid exultations and vaunting when they are arranging for actual engagements, and how far they should curb their evil propensities and control their brutal appetites? How they should remember God, say their prayers, and entertain charitable motives, and display the true spirit of chivalry? How they should stand to covenants; and which class they should side with and uphold? What treatment should be meted out to the vanquished foe, the war prisoners, and those that ask for quarter? How far one should exercise patience and resignation, and to what extent one should display a spirit of self-denial and self-sacrifice? These points have been dealt with in the Islamic Scripture.

THE NECESSITY, THE MOTIVES, AND THE OBJECT.

"Why should ye not fight on the path of Allah, and for the weak among men, women, and children, who say, O, our Lord, bring us forth from this city whose inhabitants are oppressors; give us a champion from Thy presence; and give us from Thy presence a defender?"

"And call to mind when the unbelievers plotted against thee (i.e., the Prophet), to detain thee prisoner, or to kill thee, or to banish thee. They plotted; but God designed to punish their plot, and God is the most charitable in His designs."

—The Quran VIII: 30.

"They will ask thee concerning war in the sacred month. Say: To war therein is bad, but to turn aside from the cause of God and the Sacred House, and to have no faith in Him, is worse than bloodshed. They will not cease to war against you until they turn you (i.e., Muslims) from your religion, if they be able."—The Quran II: 214.

"A sanction is given to those who, because they have suffered outrages, have taken up arms; and verily God is well able to succour them." "Those who have been driven forth from their homes wrongfully, only because they say 'Our Cherisher is Allah.'" "And if God had not repelled some men by others, cloisters and churches, and oratories and mosques, wherein the name of God is ever commemorated, would surely have been destroyed." "And him who helpeth God's cause will God surely help: for God is right, strong, mighty." Those who, if we establish them in this land, will observe prayer, and pay the alms, and enjoin what is right, and forbid what is evil: and the final issue of all things is unto God."—The

Quran XXII: 39-43.

"But in this law of retaliation is your security for life, O men of understanding, to the intent that ye may fear God."—The Quran II : 176.

"And fight for the cause of God against those who fight against you: But commit not the injustice of attacking them; God loveth not aggressors."

"And kill them wherever ye shall find them, and eject them from whatever place they have ejected you; for oppression is worse than carnage; yet attack them not at the sacred Mosque, unless they attack you therein; but if they attack, slay them: such is the reward of thankless people." "But if they desist, then verily God is gracious, merciful."

"Fight, therefore, against them until there be no more civil discord and oppression, and sincerity in religious views should be established; but if they desist, then let there be no hostility, save against the wicked." "The sacred month and the sacred precincts are under the safeguard of reprisals; whoever offereth violence to you, offer ye the like violence to him, and fear God, and know that God is with those who fear Him."—The Quran II: 186–191.

These texts are too clear to need any elucidation. They not only justify the motives and measures adopted by Lord Muhammad and his hosts, but also serve as guiding principles for nations that have to go to war. Can any mortal conference make laws more reasonable, more humane, and better based on true fear of God? The verses enlighten us on the grounds on which war can be waged. Oppression was raging on all sides when the expositor of Islam had to take the field. Cruelties were inflicted on the Muslims; they were subjected to virulent persecutions; "they suffered outrages"; they were wrongfully driven forth from their homes, and attempts were actually made on the valuable life of the great Apostle of God. He did what should have been done, and he did what people should do in the present crisis. The example he set to the people has been unconsciously followed by thoughtful men to-day. They have all broken away from the Bishops and the clergy, who have denounced the behaviour of the English as much as that of the Germans. For they appear to think that the Bible accords no sanction to such an aggressive career as has been displayed by the Germans, nor to the defensive measures that have been adopted by the English. The teachings of the Bible are themselves responsible for thus being set aside, for they cannot safely be acted upon. The injunctions of the Quran are, on the other hand, unconsciously put in force, for the sound teachings of the Quran are in perfect accord with human nature. The Quran aims at evolving those instincts and sentiments that have been implanted in man's bosom. This is, indeed, a religion that recognises man and his qualities, and lays down rules and regulations that are in perfect unison with what has been engrafted in human heart.

Islam is a religion of peace and lends itself to the establishment of peace. It stands to uphold all the prophets, confirms all the

revealed books, and protects synagogues, churches, oratories, and mosques in which God's name is ever commemorated. What better measures can be conceived to guide nations aright and to effect their amelioration? The reader may have perused in the verses given above that Islam is for peace and condemns discord and oppression; that God does not love aggressors; and that He is with those who cherish His fear in warfare too. Peace should be secured, and humane administration set up. The Quran depicts the characteristics of people that find favour with him.

“Those, if we establish them in this land, will observe prayer, and pay alms, and enjoin what is right, and forbid what is evil: and the final issue of all things is unto God.”

Lord Muhammad's personal example in all affairs, and the stupendous change that he effected, and unique success that crowned his endeavours: the marvellous redemption of people that were sunk in iniquities, the singular civilisation that they attained to, the remarkable diffusion of light up to Spain on one side and China on the other, are facts that have been affirmed and recorded by friend and foe equally. These are the precepts, and these are the actual practices, together with their results. People may think for themselves and come to a conclusion.

Next we shall reproduce texts to show with which party Muslims should side if they have to do so. ISLAM DOES NOT LOSE SIGHT OF THE QUESTION OF ALLIANCES:—

“And let not ill-will at those who kept you from the sacred mosque, bid you to transgress; rather be helpful for goodness and piety, but be not helpful for evil and oppression: and fear God. Verily God is severe in punishing.”—The Quran V: 3.

“O believers! stand up witnesses for God by righteousness, and let not ill-will at any induce you not to act uprightly. Act uprightly. Next will this be to the fear of God. And fear ye God: verily Allah is apprised of what ye do.”—The Quran V: 11.

“O ye who believe! stand fast to justice when ye bear witness before God, though it be against yourselves, or your parents, or your kindred, whether the party be rich or poor. God is nearer than you both. Therefore follow not passion, lest ye swerve from the truth. And if ye wrest your testimony or stand aloof, God verily is well aware of what ye do.”—The Quran IV: 134.

“In most of their secret conferences is nothing good; but only in his who enjoineth almsgiving, or that which is right, or concord among men. Whoso doth this out of desire to please God, we will give him at the last a great reward.”—The Quran IV: 115.

NOW AS TO COVENANTS:—

"Be faithful in the covenant of God when ye have covenanted, and break not your oaths after ye have pledged them; for now ye made God to stand surety for you. Verily God hath knowledge of what ye do."—The Quran XVI: 93.

"But those who, after having contracted it, break their covenant with God, and cut asunder what God hath bidden to be united, and commit misdeeds on the earth, these, a curse awaiteth them and an ill abode."—The Quran XIII: 24.

"The worst beasts truly in the sight of God are the thankless who will not believe. They with whom thou hast leagued, and who are ever breaking their league, and who fear not God." . . .

"Or if thou fear treachery from other people, throw back their treaty to them, as thou fairly mayest, for God loveth not the treacherous."—The Quran LXIV: 57-60.

"But this (i.e., declaration of war) concerneth not those Polytheists with whom ye are in league, and who shall have afterwards in no way failed you, nor aided anyone against you. Observe, therefore, engagement with them through the whole time of their treaty, for God loveth those who fear Him."—The Quran IX: 5.

"O Believers! be faithful to your engagements."
—The Quran V: 1.

The Prophet of Islam was very particular as to the keeping of appointments and covenants. He had, indeed, earned the title of Al-Ameen (*i.e.*, the Faithful) before he entered upon preaching the Unity of God. The breaker of promises is identical with the hypocrite in the Muslim eye. Duplicity and double-dealing is bitterly condemned in Islam. In the present age of so-called civilisation covenants are entered into with a view to break them as soon as convenience suggests. But such a perfidious act puts a Muslim away from the category of the Faithful. Consider the edifying effect of Islamic doctrines, which always aim at inculcating spiritual lessons of great utility. What would be the attitude of the Indian Muslims now when Turkey has been involved in war? They will, as Muslims, feel for any and every Muslim of the world. They cannot help feeling for Turkey. But they will at the same time be helping their own Government, though the Government may be professing a religion other than Islam. The British Press is committing serious error in having recourse to remarks that injure the susceptibilities of the Muslims of the world. Some have gone the whole length of absurdity to style the Kaiser "Haji Muhammad William." This is an unfortunate attitude to take up, and it reveals great lack of wisdom. Islam has been practical. Lord Muhammad led an exemplary life for as many as thirteen trying years under a rule which showed itself relentlessly antagonistic; yet he would not countenance any conspiracy or insurrection against the Government. He urged his followers to prove peaceable under all

circumstances. The Muslims follow his behests to-day; but it would be sheer folly to compel such a straightforward and sincere race to put on duplicity of character by requiring them not to feel for their brother Muslims. This salutary attitude can be well maintained in alliance with the fraternal feelings that the Muslim world will cherish. But the ruler and the ruled cannot be too cautious and prudent in handling the problem skilfully and with a very great measure of wisdom.

THE MANNER OF GOING TO WAR.

"And do not behave like those who came out of their houses vauntingly and ostentatiously to be seen of men, and who turn others from the way of God: God is round about their actions, even when the devil prepared their works for them, and said, 'No man shall conquer you this day.'"

This is a lesson which the Christian civilised nations who are now fighting should lay to heart and refrain from giving vent to boasts and expressions calculated to cast an unwarranted slur on the opponent. This impairs our mental qualities and tells very seriously on "the conduct of understanding." True culture is discovered when individuals or nations are put to a test. To maintain an unbiassed attitude is productive of many good results. It implies a very fine culture and argues a very scrupulous upbringing. Do not be deluded by the bubbles of pride and exaggeration, and do not impute falsehood to others. Do not the terms "Tory" and "Whig" "Roundheads" and "Puritans" give us an idea of perverted views and prevent us from behaving likewise. The Quran again guides us in regard to this:—

"O Believers! let not men laugh men to scorn who haply may be better than themselves; neither let women laugh women to scorn who may haply be better than themselves! Neither defame one another, nor call one another nicknames."—

XLIX: 11.

"O Believers! if any bad man come to you with news, clear it up at once, lest through ignorance ye harm others, and speedily have to be ashamed of what ye have done."—XLIX: 6.

The language that the parties are now employing, and the ingenuity they are displaying in inventing words, will be recorded permanently for the philologists to gauge the extent to which the nations can claim refinement. See that you are not leaving a bad record by contributing your quota to the language.

DEVOTIONAL SPIRIT IN THE MIDST OF ACTIVE OPERATIONS.

"Observe strictly the prayers, and the middle prayer and stand up full of devotion towards God." "And if you have any alarm, then pray on foot or riding; but when you are safe, then remember God, how He hath made you to know what ye knew not."—The Quran II: 239, 240.

"And when ye go forth to war in the land, it shall be no crime in you to cut short your prayers, if ye

fear lest the disbelievers come upon you. Verily the disbelievers are your undoubted enemies."

"And when thou, O Apostle, shalt be among them, and shalt pray with them, then let a party of them rise up with thee, but let them take their arms; and when they shall have made their prostrations, let them retire to your rear: then let another party that hath not prayed come forward, and let them pray with you, but let them take their precautions and their arms."—IV: 102, 103.

These injunctions to which the Prophet and his followers conformed, and up to which the Muslims are living now, provide a topic for the consideration of every student of Islam. It shows the ideal of Islam: a system of practical doctrines which demands devoutness of heart even in the midst of actual engagements! What influence is it designed to exert on the heart? Humble postures, which the Islamic prayer requires, coupled with the eulogies of the sublime powers of the King of kings, affect the hearts to an inconceivable degree. The Muslim is humane, in the field of hostilities even.

It also shows that the Islamic prayer enjoys freedom from rituals. It recognises the fact that body and soul go, as it were, hand in hand, and one affects the other. A Muslim holds his church wherever he goes; aisles and buildings of particular design are not absolutely indispensable.

There is another inference that you can draw. The strict observance of prayers is the one characteristic of a Muslim's life. He is not exempted from it under such trying circumstances as active operations. He is not, therefore, supposed to abandon it in the repose of ease and felicities.

Such a difficult but useful injunction speaks eloquently in favour of the Divine claimant. An impostor cannot impose upon himself such duties as may hazard his life. The Prophet must be endowed with a wonderful equanimity of heart to take upon himself such a duty. In such disconcerting conditions one cannot help being nervous and falling a prey to distracting thoughts. The heart of an impostor will involuntarily and constantly run upon personal safety. But the Prophet's heart and belief were too strong to be overcome by apprehensions of this nature. His personal example lent itself to carry conviction and inspire his comrades with the sincerity of his precepts and example. This accounts for the devotional spirit of his adherents, who always vied with one another to die for the great Prophet.

We fail to observe a similar self-sacrificing tendency among the disciples of Jesus Christ, who was betrayed by his disciples, one of whom contented himself with the insignificant sum of thirty silver coins in preference to his Master's safety, while another cursed his Master to obviate his own arrest.

OTHER RULES OF CONDUCT TO BE OBSERVED IN THE FIELD.

"O ye who believe! interdict not the healthful viands which God hath allowed you; go not beyond this limit. God loveth not those who out-

step it." "And eat of what God hath provided for you as food, that which is lawful and wholesome, and fear God, in whom ye believe." "God will not punish you for a mistaken word in your oaths; but He will punish you in regard to an oath taken seriously." "O Believers! surely wine and games of chance, and idols, and the divining arrows are an abomination of Satan's work! Avoid them that ye may prosper."—The Quran V : 89–92.

TREATMENT TO BE METED OUT TO THE ENEMY.

"Moreover, good and evil shall not be held equal. Turn away evil with what is good, and behold! he between whom and thyself was enmity shall be as though he were the warmest friend. But none attain to this perfection except they who are steadfast in patience, and none attain to it save the possessor of a very large heart."—The Quran XLI : 35.

"Yet let the recompense of evil be only a like evil—but he who forgiveth and is reconciled shall be rewarded by Allah Himself; for He loveth not those who act unjustly. And there shall be no way open against those who, after being wronged, avenge themselves. But there shall be a way open against those who unjustly wrong others, and act insolently on the earth in disregard of justice. These, a grievous punishment doth await them. And whoso beareth wrongs with patience and forgiveth: this, verily, is the noblest and hardest task."—The Quran XLII : 39.

"O Prophet, say to the captives who are in your hands, 'If God shall know good to be in your hearts, He will give you good beyond all that hath been taken from you, and will forgive you: for God is forgiving, merciful.'"—The Quran VIII : 71.

"If anyone of those who set up gods with Allah ask an asylum of thee, grant him an asylum, that he may hear the Word of God, and then let him reach his place of safety. This, for that they are people devoid of knowledge."

These are the teachings laid down in the Quran concerning war. The reader may consider the Islamic Scriptures for himself, and decide how far it can answer the purpose of individuals and nations. He will also come to realise that war was never waged by Muslims with the object of driving non-believers into Islam. Their devotional spirit refutes the baseless charge. Such a firm grip of the system on the hearts of the Muslims argues the soundness, practicability, and fascinations of their religion. Who is wielding the sword in England now? Is Islam being administered at the point of the sword here? Why are civilised people, such as the English, gradually embracing Islam? Who could compel such literary people as the Rt. Hon. Lord Headley Farooq, Mustafa Leon, Ph.D., LL.D.,

F.S.P., Yahya Parkinson, F.G.S., Ameen Neville J. Whyman, Ph.D., to accept the doctrines expounded in the Quran? I need not give an elaborate list of many English gentlemen and ladies that have joined our brotherhood. The fact that such enlightened people owe allegiance to the standard of Muhammad affords ample testimony to the truth of Islam. It also evidences that Islam is too rational to stand in need of the sword. Compulsion breeds hypocrisy. Islam condemns compulsion in religion, and very strongly interdicts double-dealers.

THE EXCELLENCE OF THE HOLY QURAN.

THE TESTIMONY OF CHRISTIAN WRITERS.

THE Holy Quran needs no champion—its excellence is apparent to the reader; but in these days, when vituperation is often poured upon Islam and its sacred Book, it is refreshing to turn to the pages of scholars, men who have had the opportunity of studying the Great Book, of delving into its doctrines, and pronouncing their verdict. The vapourings of ignorant persons with an interested motive can be passed over in the face of the following quotations.

The Holy Book itself takes its name "Kuran" or "Quran" from the verb "keera," to read, and literally signifies "the reading," or "that which ought to be read." It is divided into 114 portions of unequal length, which are termed "Suras" or Chapters." Each of these are sub-divided into verses. Each Sura is known by a distinctive title, sometimes taken from a name appearing therein. After the title, at the head of every chapter, except only the ninth, is prefixed the word "Bismillah"—"In the name of God, the merciful, the compassionate."

G. Sale, in the Preliminary Discourse to his translation, says: "The Quran is universally allowed to be written with the utmost elegance and purity of language, . . . It is confessedly the standard of the Arabic tongue." Thus we have the words of George Sale, who praises the Quran from the literary point of view, and he admits that it forms the standard of the Arabic language. Is this not a great testimony to the fact that, as it was delivered in the time of the Prophet Muhammad himself, so it remains to-day—uncorrupted, unchanged; and whilst other sacred books are relegated to the background in point of literary criticism, yet the Holy Quran leads the Muslim world to day, its style unimpeachable.

Carlyle says: "When once you get this Quran fairly off, the essential type of it begins to disclose itself, and in this there is a merit quite other than the literary one. If a book come from the heart, it will contrive to reach all other hearts; all art and authorcraft are of small amount to that. One would say the primary character of the Quran is that of its *genuineness*, of its being a *bonâ-fide* book. Sincerity, in all senses, seems to me the merit of the Quran; it is, after all, the first and last merit in a book; gives rise to merits of all kinds—nay, at bottom, it alone can give rise to merit of any kind."

Thus Carlyle looks at the Holy Book from another standpoint, and finds that it speaks straight to the heart; he admires the sincerity in all its pages; its "genuineness" makes a strong appeal to him.

Then we have the testimony of Sir William Muir: "The Quran abounds with arguments drawn from Nature and Providence: with a view to prove the existence of God, as the Supreme Ruler, and to enforce His sovereign claim on the obedience and gratitude of mankind. The retribution of good and evil in the life to come, the obligation to follow virtue and eschew vice, the duty and happiness of the creature in worshipping and serving the Creator, and such-like topics, are set forth in language of beauty and vigour, abounding often with real poetry. Thus, also, the reasonableness of the Resurrection is taught by many forcible considerations, and especially by the analogy, so striking in southern climes, of the earth, long dry and dead, quickened suddenly into exuberant life by the copious rain from heaven."

Washington Irving, in "The Life of Mohammed," says: "The Quran contains pure, elevated, and benignant precepts."

Davenport ("Mahomet and the Quran") writes: "The Quran is the general code of the Moslem world: a social, civil, commercial, military, judicial, criminal, penal, and yet religious code. By it everything is regulated—from the ceremonies of religion to those of daily life, from the salvation of the soul to the health of the body, from the rights of the general community to those of each individual, from the interests of man to those of society, from morality to crime, from punishment here to that of the life to come."

Edmund Burke ("Impeachment of Warren Hastings") pays a very high tribute to its excellence: "The Mahomedan law is binding upon all, from the crowned head to the meanest subject; it is a law interwoven with a system of the wisest, the most learned, and the most enlightened jurisprudence that ever existed in the world."

Davenport writes also: "Among the many excellencies of the Quran are two eminently conspicuous—one being the tone of awe and reverence which it always observes when speaking or referring to the Deity, to whom it never attributes either human frailties or passions; the other, the total absence throughout it of all impure, immoral, and indecent ideas, expressions, narratives, &c., blemishes which, it is much to be regretted, are of frequent occurrence in what Christians style the "Old Testament." So exempt, indeed, is the Quran from these undeniable defects that it needs not the slightest castration, and may be read, from beginning to end, without causing a blush to suffuse the cheek of modesty itself."

Bosworth Smith, in "The Life of Mohammed," expresses the following: "By a fortune absolutely unique in history, Mohammed is the threefold founder of a nation, of an empire, and of a religion. Illiterate himself, scarcely able to read or write, he was yet the author of a book which is a poem, a code of laws, a book of common prayer, and a bible in one, and is revered to this day by a sixth of the whole human race as a miracle of purity of style, of wisdom, and of truth. It is the one miracle claimed by Mohammed—'his standing miracle,' he called it—and a miracle, indeed, it is."

In the "Pouplar Encyclopædia," Division VIII., p. 326, we read: "The language of the Quran is considered the purest Arabic, and

contains such charms of style and poetic beauties that it remains inimitable. Its moral precepts are pure. A man who should observe them strictly would lead a virtuous life."

In the Herbert Lectures the following passage appears: "The Law of Islam contains admirable moral precepts, and, what is more, succeeds in bringing them into practice and powerfully supporting their observance."

Dean Stanley, the eminent Christian cleric, in his "Eastern Church," page 279, writes: "The code of the Quran makes, doubtless, a deeper impression than has been made on Christianity by the code of the Bible."

David Urquhart, in the introduction to Vol. I. of his clever book, "The Spirit of the East," gives a brief description of Islam which cannot fail to appeal: "Islam, as a religion, teaches no new dogmas, establishes no new revelation, no new precepts; has no priesthood, and no church government. It gives a code to the people and a constitution to the State, enforced by the sanction of religion."

Let these suffice. They are the opinions of learned scholars, of deep thinkers, and we think that the impartial reader will be able to pass judgment. How many people condemn what they have never read, and are so biased that their sane and natural reason is warped into antagonism to Islam. Let them investigate fully for themselves; let them read the Holy Quran; let them try to understand, and they may find that "Peace" which all are seeking. Let all remember that weighty saying of Lord Bacon: "A little philosophy inclineth men's minds to atheism, but depth in philosophy bringeth men's minds about to religion."

ACRIMU-AL-HIRRAH!—RESPECT THE CAT.

(By our esteemed brother H. MUSTAFA HENRI M. LEON,
Ph.D, LL.D., F.S.P.)

HAST heard the story, how one summer's day,
Within a mosque, a cat once hap'd to stray,
Just at the time God's prophet had gone there,
To make, as was his wont, the Zuhar prayer?
With measured tread, it step'd with noiseless feet,
And, 'fore God's prophet, calmly took its seat,
And purring gently, sat there calm and still,
Afraid of nought, suspicious of no ill,
When lo! by Allah's will, e'er wise and good,
The cat was seized with pains of motherhood,
And 'twixt its pangs, common to all of earth,
There in the mosque, to kittens three gave birth.
"Remove the brute," then loudly one did cry,
"To thus pollute the mosque, sure it should die."

"Say not such words," God's prophet then did say,
 "Remove it not, in peace let it here stay,
 Do not a thing its feelings now to jar,
 Respect the cat, *Acrimû-al-hirrah!*
 This cat hath only done that which it should,
 And hath performed its work of motherhood,
 What Allah hath decreed for all the race,
 As Nature's law, sure can be no disgrace;
 And Muslims learn from this the lesson, that
 Allah doth teach to all, Respect the cat!
 Thy father honour, and thy brother love,
 Protect thy sister, but of all above,
 Respect thy mother, she it was who bare
 Thee in her womb, and lavished on thee care
 Known but to Allah; Muslims think of that,
 This cat a mother is, Respect the cat!"

16 Shaaban, 1332.

July 9, 1914.

THE ETHICS OF THE WAR.

II.

IT is a common claim that all aggressive wars are unethical or immoral, and that, on the other hand, war waged in defence is ethical or moral. That is the full extent of the reasoning attempted in trying to put war on an ethical basis. It is the general opinion in educated Europe, and we may leave it there. The Muslim has no need to trouble about the controversy on that point: as demonstrated in my first article, the laws of the Holy Quran are quite clear on the subject, and are sufficient guidance for him. As both sides generally claim to be the defenders, and maintain that their opponents are the transgressors, the details of the campaign become the principal data on which at the time an ethical criticism of the war may be stated.

In a time of war the moral and immoral are woven together like the threads of a spider's web, or an intricate fabric of cloth; you have both in such mass that it would not only be difficult to disentangle them, but almost impossible to arrive at a clear judgment as to whether the good or the bad predominated.

I have already expressed my regret at the general tone of the British Press so far as actual ethics are concerned in literature, especially criticism. Yet it is noteworthy that a number of the leading papers, and many of the provincial, still maintain a high moral tone, and uphold to the best of their ability the highest standard of British journalism, and the noblest traditions of British literature. I am afraid the same

thing cannot be said of the German Press. It is just as well to state here that I have not seen any German papers, and have only the extracts appearing in our own papers to go upon, supported by articles written in reply to German articles from the pens of men on the other side. Even from those we obtain a good idea of the trend of German criticism and reasoning, and a general outline of the German standpoint. We are able, therefore, to gauge the moral atmosphere.

A few months ago we were all but unanimous in crediting the leading German philosophers, theologians, historians, and scientists with keenness of logic, rational method, judicial judgment, extraordinary erudition, and moral sanity; but now, entering the atmosphere of war literature, pouring from the German Press, and backed by the occupants of the professional chairs, one is compelled to adopt the conclusion that all those things have been thrown overboard, like an outward-bound dropping the pilot: thrown into the melting pot and dissolved into nothingness. The worst of the matter is that one finds it exceedingly difficult to argue with them. There is no common basis on which we can meet. Men like Eucken and Harnack and Haeckel seemed to us, at times at least, to arrive at correct and rational decisions on philosophy, history, and science. Eucken and Harnack are specialists in one branch of classical scholarship, and imagine that all culture is bound up with a knowledge of Greek. Outside of their one sphere their knowledge was of no consequence, and their position now discredits both on the moral side. Yet they did good work in the special field each had taken up, and we would have preferred better reasoning and nobler moral judgment from them. From Haeckel we ought to have received something higher than Rationalism reduced to sentimentality. He is not only one of the greatest biologists the world has produced, and our leading embryologist, but possessed of knowledge far beyond the confines of the science he has ennobled and enriched by a life spent in observation and research. It is the more regrettable that he too has fallen by the wayside. In the defence of the position and action of their country, rationality seems to have got buried in what is a mere mass of irrational argument, while sentimentality has emerged as the guiding star and ruling planet of the greatest minds in Germany.

Still, I should be loth to accuse those men and their compeers of insincerity. In the past, whether agreeing or disagreeing with the opinions expressed by them, I have always looked on them as sincere, and I am fain to do so in the present case. The conclusion left, therefore, is that the militant party has so gained the upper hand, so ruled the Press, so poisoned the minds of the people by the dissemination either of false news or the manipulation of the facts, that not only the average German mind, but the leading German minds, are unable to see the truth amid the welter of misrepresentation and misstatement

—the whole thing is in a fog. To a certain extent we can recognise why such a thing is so. As Britishers or British subjects we are proud of the freedom of the British Press. It is one of the grandest and noblest features of our civilisation, and proclaims in no uncertain voice the superiority of our culture to that of every other Power, great or otherwise. America has inherited that tradition, that freedom, and if she inherited nothing else from us it would be something to thank us for.

In Germany no such freedom exists, the Press there has been ruled and controlled by the iron hand of militarism, the mailed fist has dominated the written opinion and the spoken opinion, as well as all other aspects of German social life, for decades. A nobler thought and a higher ideal has existed and struggled eternally for expansion and for universal expression, but it has been curbed and stultified by the ever increasing burden and ever growing strength of the military despotism. That voice and that thought I hope still lives, although lost in the general war clamour that now rages; and when the final issue comes and defeat puts an end to despotic militarism, the Federated States will, I trust, emerge again into being and into action, and its sphere will be wider and more expressive and more dominating than it has been. It is not Prussian, it is South German, and will one day prove the greatest glory of those Teutonic peoples, eternal in its more humane manifestations, and rich with hope for the salvation and emancipation of a greater and more abiding Fatherland than that of blood and iron.

Meantime we have to recognise that whatever the future may hold in store, at present that voice is silent or so feeble that it is unheard in the clangour: stifled by the so-called "patriotism" that in war time colours all thoughts and actions and rules and controls every aspect of mental and material expression and activity.

I have in my veins two centuries of Irish blood, and previous to that centuries of English, with all the traditions of those old fighting border clansmen of the foray and the blood-feud; yet I was born in Scotland and brought up there, and Scottish custom and habit and thought and history and language have been dominant in the formation of my character, of making me what I am, and I love the place of my birth and the scenes of my youthful days and manhood's sojourn: the plains and valleys and hills of Ayrshire, glorified by the history and traditions of centuries of stern blood-feud, of natural and religious struggle, of virile manhood in every realm of literature and every aspect of peace and war. I am, therefore, not in a position to criticise the German who in what he considers the hour of national peril follows without a murmur his country's standard to the field.

While that love of country colours and controls the thoughts and actions of every one of us, it has its aspects ethical and

unethical. A man may so love his country that he will follow wherever she leads, be the path chosen right or wrong, and the action just or unjust. But if a man loves his country he should never forget it is his duty to direct her into what he considers the right path, and if he thinks she is wrong he ought to tell her so. I am not one who holds the opinion that British statesmen have never acted wrongly or that my country always acts right. I recognise that we are all fallible, and I have reserved to myself the right to criticise the foreign policy of my country, just as I would criticise the home policy of any Government if I differed from it. I hold that such is the correct position for every man worthy of the name. When I have thought British action wrong I have said so in the past, and I hope to continue the same method in the future.

In the present case, independent of a few minor details that may be seized on, I consider the action of Britain justified: the only path which as a matter of duty and honour she could have taken. I have already said so, and in spite of what has taken place since, that belief remains as strong as ever. That result makes it the more incomprehensible how, working on the same data, the leading minds in Germany should come to an entirely different opinion or conclusion. Their national feelings may bias them so that no other result is possible; if that is so, my national feelings may bias me on the opposite side. Such being the case, the matter must rest there; argument would be useless; there is no common standpoint on which to form a judgment. Metaphorically both sides would be tilting at windmills; when you hit one blade another turns up, perhaps striking the tilter, and so on eternally, while the resistance to every thrust would be infinitesimal, a waste of energy. There is nothing after all to be gained in the controversy if either I or any other person asserts that the German position is not one of morals and rational method, but one of moral insanity and irrational thought. The German would probably retort by a similar accusation against us. It is apparent that between us, all we can hope for is that when the war is finished a more satisfactory method will be found, so that we may at least seem unbiased, let us say on both sides, and a common standing-ground obtainable on which to form judgments, either on details, or on the whole. Taking it for granted that it is impossible to convert me to the German view, and that it is equally impossible to convert the German to mine, the only action that can be of value is an appeal to others. My appeal is especially to Muslims, both inside and outside the Empire: an attempt to convert them to my view by an appeal on some of the leading factors in bringing about the war, from a moral or ethical point of view.

All the German writings I know approve of the Austrian attack on Servia as justifiable. I am not an advocate of Servian methods or tactics, and as one who desires the progress of all

humanity, I hope Serbia will continue to advance in knowledge, especially in morals. Yet from an ethical standpoint I do not see how anyone can maintain that the Austrian ultimatum was justified, or that the murder of the Archduke and his wife was a sufficient reason why Europe should be plunged into war and thousands of lives sacrificed. The murderers and accomplices ought to have been punished, but the Austrian action was not a justifiable or an ethical method of obtaining that end. The case of Germany was that Austria had a wrong to avenge and should not be interfered with ; it was not, according to her, a matter for mediation, so Germany declined the conference proposed by Sir Edward Grey. We know now that Austria herself was willing to accept arbitration and that Germany stood in the way. So much is plainly evident from the report of Sir M. de Bunsen :—

“From now onwards the tension between Russia and Germany was much greater than between Russia and Austria. As between the latter an arrangement seemed almost in sight, and on August 1 I was informed by M. Schebeko that Count Szapary had at last conceded the main point at issue by announcing to M. Sazonof that Austria would consent to submit to mediation the points in the Note to Serbia which seemed incompatible with the maintenance of Servian independence.”

It is clear that Germany stood all along in the position of a stumbling-block to a peaceful solution, and on her the onus lies. Independent of all diplomatic scheming or subterfuge or honesty of purpose, the question was not one on which nations should have gone to war, the innocent would then be the greatest sufferers.

Again, practically the united controversialists on the German side approve of the invasion of Belgium as a point of vital strategy. The argument of those against Britain interfering on that issue may be summed up as follows: A treaty is an agreement between two or more nations to do or not to do certain things stated in the agreement. When one or more of the parties to the agreement withdraw it is not compulsory on the other or others to hold to the agreement. The partnership is dissolved. General Bernhardi has himself answered the question for the other side. He says :—

“By a collective guarantee is understood the *duty* of the contracting powers to take steps to protect this neutrality when all agree that it is menaced. Each individual power has the *right* to interfere if it considers the neutrality menaced.”

Here an apostle of German militarism justifies the action of Britain legally, without taking into consideration the further moral right of a great Power to succour a small and weak nation when threatened or overrun by another great Power.

One may assert without any hesitation that had, say, Britain or France gone to war against Russia, Germany would have refused either side permission to pass over her territory or to use her railways for the transportation of troops. She would certainly not permit any other Power to violate her neutrality. That is the final argument in her condemnation from a legal and a moral standpoint. She has done to others what she would not allow others to do unto her.

Yet I would have the Muslims look at the matter as from a higher and noble plane. The military system of Germany threatens the whole world—would the Muslims like to be placed under it? Do not mistake, brethren, Britain may have made mistakes, many mistakes, but under Germany there would be no such freedom of speech, freedom of action, and, above all, such religious freedom as pertains under the rule of the British Sovereign; it would be good-bye to progress for centuries, farewell to all those benefits that the East is beginning to appreciate as she draws closer to the heart of the Empire and gets more and more into touch with the thoughts and aspirations and lives of the British.

J. PARKINSON.

WESTERN IDEAS OF ISLAM.

It is very curious and amusing for a Muslim in the West on hearing people say quite seriously what he believes. Really, if one listens to all the various stories which are so readily circulated, one comes to the conclusion that the people who have *never studied* Islam and its teachings *seem* to know far more about these matters than the Muslim himself. First of all, they assure us that we worship the sun. This is quite a current belief in the West. Then that we worship Muhammad himself. Also that we worship idols; that we perform many mysterious rites and ceremonies.

Let us take the first contention. We *cannot* worship the sun or any other heavenly body, however glorious they may be. In the sixteenth chapter of the Holy Quran we read:—

“And He hath subjected the day and night to your service: and the sun, the moon, and the stars, which are compelled to serve by His command. Verily herein are signs unto people of understanding.”

“And among His signs are the night and the day, and the sun and the moon. Bend not in adoration to the sun or the moon, but bend in adoration before God who created them, if ye would serve Him (xl.: 37).”

How, therefore, can we possibly worship the sun, when God Himself tells us that it is *subject to us*; that it has been created for our service; that all the heavenly bodies minister to our needs. Can we worship anything which is below us? Can we revere and give adoration to an inanimate thing which is an effect from the Great Cause. God shows us most plainly that the sun, moon, and stars

are "compelled to serve by His command"; that they are not to be worshipped, not to be revered, but are natural phenomena. The following verse:—

"Verily herein are signs unto people of understanding,"

directs us to ponder well all these force of Nature, to examine them, to utilise them, and derive all the benefits from them that we are able. If we are thus told to investigate these things for ourselves, could we dare analyse the Sun, Moon, or Stars if they were our gods? If we were created by them, and hold our life from them, dare we try to understand them? To utilise them would be subjecting our own Deity to our own personal service. Truly the Holy Quran says:—

"Your God is one God."

We must worship God alone—He who created all these planets, who controls the whole solar system, which obeys His divine law. We must not worship any thing or any person except God. We *cannot* worship Muhammad; it would be *idolatry* to do so. He was a man, as we are, but was blessed with the last revelation to mankind, and to worship him would be *sin*. The Jews and Christians were commanded to worship the "One God, the Eternal God, who begetteth not neither is He begotten," thus dissociating every other created thing from the Creator of the Universe. Let us quote a few texts from the Bible itself to this effect:—

Deut. vi. 4: "Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God *is* one Lord."

Isaiah xlv. 5: "*I am* the Lord, and *there is* none else, *there is* no God beside Me."

Mark xii. 29 and 32: "And Jesus answered him, The first of all the commandments *is*, Hear, O Israel; The Lord our God *is* one Lord." "And the scribe said unto him, Well, Master, thou hast said the truth: for there is one God; and there is none other but He."

We can thus see that these Prophets taught the same doctrine that was preached in Arabia by our Holy Prophet over thirteen hundred years ago. Moses was the great Prophet of the Israelites, yet they loyally remained monotheists, and never worshipped Moses as God. Christians *alone* erred in this respect by attributing divinity to the Prophet Jesus. Muhammad restored this great fundamental truth, which all the Prophets, including Jesus, so strongly insisted upon, that there was *ONE* God. Therefore Muslims never have, neither will they, worship anyone but God alone. How far less, then, could we worship something which our hands had made? How could we bow and prostrate before something which we had fashioned ourselves, of which we were the creator? If we had worshipped a man, at least there would have been some small excuse, for tribes and empires have before ascribed divinity to their rulers; but there is no excuse for those who cry for assistance to the thing made with their own hands. The Holy Quran points this out in Sura 16:—

"But the idols which ye invoke, besides God, create nothing, but are themselves created. They are dead and not living."

The futility of asking help from idols is expressed in the Holy Quran, Sura 13, in a striking manner:—

“It is He who ought of right to be invoked; and the idols which they invoke besides Him shall not hear them at all; otherwise than as he is heard, who stretcheth forth his hands to the water, that it may ascend to his mouth, when it cannot ascend thither.”

Thus it is folly to place any deity beside “the Creator and Sustainer of the whole of the Universe.”

We are told that we have mysterious rites and ceremonies. It is very curious, but I have been Muslim for nearly eleven years, but have not yet been able to discover these ceremonials. Islam is divine simplicity, and the only “mysteries” are those created in the minds of the person who has never studied its teachings.

Let us turn to Chapter 98 of the Holy Quran:—

“And they were commanded no other in the Scriptures than to worship God, exhibiting unto Him the pure religion, and being orthodox; and to be constant at prayer, and to give alms, and this is the right religion.”

Again we read what religion is. It is not a mass of mysterious ceremonials; it is not a collection of mystical dogmas. But in the words of the Holy Quran, Sura 2, we read its definition:—

“It is not righteousness that ye turn your faces in prayer towards the east and west, but righteousness is of him who believeth in God, and the last day, and the angels, and the Scriptures, and the prophets; who giveth money for God's sake unto his kindred, and unto orphans, and the needy, and the stranger, and those who ask, and for redemption of captives; who is constant at prayer, and giveth alms; and of those who perform their covenant when they have covenanted, and who behave themselves patiently in adversity, and hardships, and in time of violence: these are they who are true, and these are they who fear God.”

Formalism, ceremony, mysticism, narrow-mindedness, meanness are all forbidden; whilst we are urged to investigate the teachings of the Prophets, to give alms, to be charitable to mankind, to free captives, to help others, to be always faithful to our word, to resign ourselves patiently to Him, and follow His Law. This is Islam.

"THE DEAD ARE RAISED UP."

By the MAULVIE MUHAMMAD ALI, M.A., LL.B.

THE text which I have chosen for the heading of this paper is part of Jesus' answer to an inquiry from John the Baptist, who was then in prison, as to whether he was the one "who should come, or do we look for another?" (Matt. xi. 3). The answer was simple: neither had Jesus any doubt in his mind as to what the words conveyed, nor could the Baptist misconstrue the words. And if anything was needed to make the significance clearer, Jesus' answer did not fail to supply it, for he immediately adds the words: "And the poor have the gospel preached to them" (Matt. xi. 5). It was, therefore, through the preaching of the Gospel that Jesus raised the dead to life. And this, indeed, was the object of his life. He had not come to show the strange sights of skeletons walking out of their graves and casting terror into the hearts of the populace by the ghostly scene. On the other hand, he had come to give life to the spiritually dead. And if any doubt exists in the mind of any of his admirers as to the truth of this statement, let him read and ponder over the Master's own words: "I am the resurrection, and the life: he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live: And whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die" (John xi. 25, 26). These words should leave no doubt in the mind of any reader of the Gospels as to what Jesus meant when he sent word to John the Baptist saying that "the dead are raised up."

Yet human credulity always gains the upper hand. The simple words of Jesus, so clearly explained by himself, have become the nucleus of many superstitious stories, and tradition has supplied marvels to give an unnatural interpretation to them. The Gospel of Matthew is not satisfied by giving place in its pages to the stray instances of a dead person being raised up here and there, but also gives circulation to a very strange story, of which none of the other inspired writers has any trace. This story is introduced into the circumstances connected with the crucifixion of Jesus Christ. Credulous people are not satisfied unless some marvellous incident is connected with the death of a great person, and while the other synoptics considered the marvel of "the veil of the temple being rent in twain" as sufficient for the purpose, Matthew's demand on the credulity of his readers is too heavy for the more sane among his perusers, and the effect is thus destroyed by over-doing on his part. He seems to have forgotten for a moment that he was writing a book with the serious purpose of giving spiritual truth, and not a fairy-tale to amuse children, and adds: "And the graves were opened; and many bodies of the saints which slept arose, And came out of the graves after his resurrection, and went into the holy city, and appeared unto many" (Matt. xxvii. 52, 53). The concluding words do, indeed, betray that it was originally probably nothing more than a vision, and by and by gained credence as a fact, for the skeletons of saints rising out of their graves after hundreds, and perhaps thousands of years, and then walking into the city, was a sight which

should have impressed the whole populace and not simply *appeared unto many*. Anyhow, the story is in itself sufficient to show how tradition has sought to give a ludicrous interpretation to the simple words of Jesus: *The dead are raised up*.

The significance of these words is, however, made clear beyond the shadow of a doubt by the Holy Quran. One of the numerous distinctions which the Holy Quran enjoys above the sacred Scriptures of other religions is that the growth of tradition has not in the least affected the purity of its text, and hence we have incalculable facilities in finding out the correct interpretation of its words. Our path is not beset with the insurmountable difficulties met with in the case of the Gospels of sifting the truth from the falsehood, and of separating the marvellous stories of a later growth from the simple, original truths. The Holy Quran puts into Jesus' mouth almost the very words which form part of his reply to John the Baptist in the Gospel of Matthew: *And I raise the dead to life*. In order to show what the Holy Book means when it puts these words into Jesus' mouth, it makes similar statements repeatedly regarding the Holy Prophet. For instance, speaking of the transformation which was to be brought about by the Holy Prophet in Arabia, and through Arabia in the whole world, it says: *Know that Allah will give life to the earth after its death* (57: 17). Again, comparing the faithful and the ignorant, it says: "What! is he who was dead, then we raised him to life and gave him a light with which he walks among the people, like him who is in the darkness from which he cannot go forth" (6: 123). Still, again speaking of the Prophet's message, it says: "O you who believe, be obedient to Allah and the Apostle when he invites you to that which gives you life" (8: 24). Similar statements abound in the Holy Quran, but the few quotations given above would suffice for my purpose. These quotations make it clear that Jesus' statement, that he gave life to the dead, must convey the same significance as the statements regarding the Holy Prophet, which show that he was raised to give life to the dead, and that those who followed the truth which he had brought, had received that life. Hence it is also that the Holy Quran is called "*ruh*," which ordinarily signifies the spirit of life.

It is a noteworthy fact that tradition in Islam has not recorded any such marvel about the doings of the Holy Prophet as should have cast the veil of doubt over the plain significance of the simple words of the Holy Quran quoted above, as the Christian tradition has done in the case of the Gospels. On the other hand, it has faithfully preserved to us a pithy saying of the Holy Prophet casting additional light on the above subject. Thus he is reported to have said: "I am the resurrection, at whose feet the people are raised to life." The spiritual resurrection brought about by the Holy Prophet was not limited to the companions, nor, indeed, to any one people or any one generation. Hence the Prophet calls himself a resurrection for all people.

The spiritual resurrection brought about by the Holy Prophet is the most remarkable in the history of the world. It was not a reformation in the ordinary sense of the word; it was a thorough transformation of a whole nation, a transformation which raised a people from the depth of degradation to the height of civilisation.

A whole people—men, women, and children—had been raised from the depth of fetishism, idolatry, and superstition to the purest and simplest monotheism; a nation of drunkards had been not only made sober but an absolute hater of all intoxicating liquors; a nation divided into tribes and sub-tribes at constant warfare presented a united front, the like of which is not known to history; a nation among whom ignorance was a pride, and who did not know reading and writing, was made the torch-bearer of knowledge and sciences to other people; and this wonderful resurrection of a dead nation was brought about within the short span of twenty-three years. A similar resurrection again awaits the world, and shall be brought about through the same agency.

MUHAMMAD ALI.

MUSLIM FESTIVAL AT THE WOKING MOSQUE.

THE greatest festival of the Muslim year was celebrated at the Woking Mosque on Friday last. The festival was in commemoration of the sacrifice made by Abraham, the common father of the three great Creeds—Judaism, Christianity and Islam. Thus the followers of these great faiths can join together in its observance. The Mosque was crowded by an assembly of all nations, and among those present were His Highness the Ruler of Bahawalpur, Princess Saliah Jerukovitch, and many high officials and others. No preference is shown to rank, but all stand shoulder to shoulder. The service was conducted in the Arabic language, and recitals of the glory, power and praise of God intertwined the prayers. The sermon was preached by the Maulvie Sadr-ud-Din, B.A., the Imam of the Mosque, who took as his text the Sacrifice of Abraham. At the conclusion an English gentleman declared his Islam. The ordinary Friday service with the sermon followed. A noticeable feature was the presence of Hindoos, Catholics, Jewesses, Church and Chapel people; probably no sacred building other than the Mosque would have these elements united in the service. The gathering then proceeded to partake of lunch, consisting of Indian dishes, at the Memorial House, and the day was occupied according to the wish of the visitor. The multi-coloured garments of the worshippers provided a pleasing spectacle. Owing to the inclemency of the weather, the proposed procession which is usual on the occasion of these gatherings had to be abandoned. The day was a very happy one, and all vied with each other in helping towards the success of the day.—*Woking Herald*, Nov. 5.

THE FESTIVAL OF THE SACRIFICE.*

THE Festival of the Sacrifice is one of those institutions which delivered man from the grip of a tormenting doctrine, and dispelled the darkness that had enveloped a section of mankind. With a view to expiate sins and appease the wrath of God, people began to subject themselves to all forms of self-imposed torture, which reached a climax in human sacrifice. The ecclesiastical history of the world presents horrible records of such practices. If the Africans displayed their conception of a relentless god by offering human sacrifices, the Babylonians, in the midst of culture and advancement, cannot present a clean bill. The former used to offer up the most beautiful man, while the latter would dispose of one from among their prisoners. If Dahomey, in West Africa, witnesses the slaughter of two thousand men at the demise of its king, China also used to display the head of a victim borne aloft to herald the procession of the king through its streets. If we attribute human sacrifices in America to lack of civilisation on the part of its inhabitants, we accredit the Druids of Britain with "the putting to death of men, women, and children, to please their gods." If the people of Canaan were given to this ritual of a very dear price, so were also the Indians exhibiting their indulgence. The old palaces of Jaipur still preserve the altar which used to be the scene of human slaughter, which has now been replaced by animal sacrifice. In short, this inhuman practice had found its way through every continent. The erroneous conception of God must be responsible for it. The Quran goes to the very root of the evil, and elevates the very conception of God so as to eradicate the vice, which gives Him the character of an implacable monster:—

"By no means can their flesh reach unto God, neither their blood; but piety on your part reacheth Him."—The Quran, xxii : 38.

The first step calculated to put a stop to human sacrifice was taken by the Prophet Abraham. This was expounded and confirmed by the great Apostle of Islam. Abraham saw in a vision that he had slaughtered his only son as a sacrifice to God. He gave out what he saw, and people were painfully looking forward to the day that would evidence the slaughter of his son Ishmael. Neither the Prophet nor the people had any idea that the vision was going to result in a veritable blessing to them all. Now Abraham was held in the highest esteem and reverence. He still enjoys that unique distinction of commanding the common veneration of the Jews, the Christians, and the Muslims. He has been, indeed, recognised as the father of nations. It required the unquestionable authority of such a mighty personality to entirely do away with a propitiation which had been in practice for a long time. The day came, and Abraham made preparations for carrying out literally what he had seen in his vision. Just when he was going to manipulate his knife in the eye of the public, the interpretation of the dream was revealed to him. He

* A sermon delivered by the Maulvie Sadr-ud-Din at the Mosque, Woking.

made it known to the people in attendance, slaughtered a ram in place of his son, and thus abolished the cruel form of sacrifice. In the course of time, nations forgot the lesson taught by their common father. The Christians converted the crucifixion of Jesus Christ into a sacrifice and revived the old idea, and quite unconsciously lapsed into the erroneous dogma which had been rectified by the father of Nations. Muhammad, who was proud of Abraham's blood running in his veins, and who would invariably uphold what was taught by the prophets that went before him, and who would vindicate their honour, stood up for Abraham, and explained the doctrine of sacrifice, and retrieved the honour of Jesus Christ, to whom had been imputed the revival of the doctrine of human sacrifice which was abolished by Abraham. He has thus proved to be a blessing to mankind and a champion for the prophets anterior to him. I do not see why a reasonable Christian should see the honour of Jesus Christ tarnished, and the useful example set by Abraham disregarded. Do they like this cannibalism of the ceremony of the Sacrament, in which they imagine themselves to be partaking of the blood and flesh of our Prophet Jesus? Do they forget that they are innocently ascribing heinous cruelty to the Great God of love and genuine tenderness and true affection? Even an earthly father would not suffer his son to be slaughtered and disgraced. Jesus Christ does not countenance such an erroneous method of pleasing God. He curses Judas Iscariot, who was the instrument of his betrayal. He implores the Almighty overnight to avert the disaster. He curses the nation that subjected him to such a shocking persecution and disgrace. He was never expected to go counter to his father Abraham. He lays down the right way to salvation:—

"And he said unto him, Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is, God; but if thou wilt enter into life, *keep the commandments*" (Matthew xix. 17).

And, again, he observes:—

"Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven."
 . . . "For I say unto you, that except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and pharisees, *ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven.*"

Lord Muhammad vindicated the cause of Jesus Christ, and so will every Muslim.

Misdirected ability in the interpretation of parables is responsible for such mistakes. How much does Christendom owe to Luther, who pointed out that "to carry a string round the waist" and "to keep the light burning" were typical of something spiritual. The Crucifixion is evidently an invaluable lesson of self-sacrifice for the cause of truth. But it is a pity that the repeated cry of the disciples expressive of their inability to understand the parables used by Jesus should become emblematical of the understanding of so cultured and advanced a time as ours is. The Quran takes cognisance of man's liability to err in this direction, and guides thus:—

"He it is Who hath sent down to thee 'The Book.' Some of the texts are of themselves perspicuous; these are the basis

of the book, and others are figurative. But they whose hearts are given to err, follow its figures, craving discord, craving a false interpretation; yet none knoweth its interpretation but God and the stable in knowledge. They say: 'We believe in it; it is all from our Lord.' But none will bear in mind save men endowed with understanding" (iii: 5).

In view of such considerations as these, it seems absolutely indispensable to offer animal sacrifices to commemorate the redemption of man, initiated by Abraham and established by his rightful heir and descendant Muhammad. It is designed to inculcate another moral lesson of very great utility. Self-denial and self-sacrifice are sustaining forces of this world. This universal law and practice is too obvious to demand an exposition. The growth of the vegetable kingdom involves the sacrifice of insects, birds, and animals, together with innumerable metals that are annihilated in order that vegetation may thrive. Likewise, the development of insects, birds, lower animals, and rational beings implies the consumption of air, water, and the outturn of the mineral, vegetable, and animal kingdoms. All explorations, all researches, all scientific experiments, call for sacrifice. The building up of an empire stands in need of sacrifice, and so does the preservation of it. Look at the wonderful response that the Indians have made. The Princes and their subjects have offered personal services and sacrificed their economic resources to maintain the prestige of their King and defend the Empire. All of us should lay to heart this useful lesson, which contributes happiness and lends itself to the development of the world. Practise it at the Mosque, in seeing to the comfort of another, at the table, in the train, in the street, and you go for a cultured gentleman. The lack of it will stigmatise you as selfish pigs. Similarly self-abnegation, which seeks to hold in check inordinate appetites and exorbitant ambitions, is appraised in the sight of God. Indulgence of brutal cravings encumbers like weeds the growth of higher virtues, multiplies troubles, and extends its baneful influence beyond the individual to the community. Embezzlement, misappropriation, dishonesty, and wicked plans resorted to by royalties for supersession, are nothing but expressions of selfishness. Slay this morbid lust, and you become a veritable boon. Spend energy so that it may be redoubled; empty your coffers in order they may be replenished; exercise self-denial and self-sacrifice, so that you may be repaid with happiness and eternal life.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF LIFE.

By AMEEN NEVILLE J. WHYMANT, Ph.D.

MANY hundreds of years ago the moon searched the garden of the world and found Ispahan. This jewel pleased her, and continuing her quest she found another jewel by the silver Tigris, which was called Baghdad. Relentlessly pursuing her unquenched desire, she discovered the flourishing bloom of Cairo; yet, still unsatisfied, she sought out with a silver-white, slender finger, Istamboul. She pondered long and deeply over the heaps which denoted the monumental cities of Babylonia, Akkadia, Sumeria, Assyria and China, while the night breeze stirred softly the palms which sprang out of the graves of the greatest scholars, rulers and priests of ancient Egypt. But no sound arises from the dead past, and so, gathering together her quartette of jewels, she retreated to her own domain as the Muezzin made the call to morning prayer.

"Ispahan is half the world" was a living truth at the time of which I write, and the scholars of the day acknowledged that Ispahan was the seat of wisdom, and the home of the hope of the future. For was not this city the domain of philosophy, and the moon which illumined the darkened garden of the world, which gave the white roses their silver glory, and the red roses their passionate, burning radiance? Yes, Ispahan was the hub of the Cosmos—the soul of the world.

Cæsar—Imperial Cæsar—was becoming accustomed to the long sleep with his forefathers; the voice of immortal Socrates was becoming more and more faint; the eloquence of Demosthenes had become a matter for blind wonder and worship, and was no longer a living reality. Rome, the magnet of the Mediæval world, was almost devoid of power, and Greece had lost her youthful beauty, and now betrayed an unashamed imperfection which her earlier cult denied. The colleges and temples of Ancient Egypt were still and silent. Their books had been put aside, and her libraries were buried in the decay of the palaces which had contained them. Truly the Persian philosopher wrote: "No voice shall answer from the dead again," for mighty, wise, incomparable Egypt was silent in death. The East that had been all, was nought; it was a flower devoid of petals and perfume but beset with thorns. The West was trying with its shaking infant hand to write its alphabet and lisp its numerals, but was without a teacher, untaught and unknown. And Ispahan was half the world, as the Muezzin called to morning prayer.

There were some who lived on the hills and in the wide, silent deserts of Iran who did not heed the call. They knew not—for they would not know—the Commander of the Faithful and his Prophet. They held as their Teacher the Prophet of

the hillside rose garden, Zoroaster, and to them he was all-sufficient. But Zoroaster used a language which had flourished before Socrates taught, and before the mathematicians of Ancient Egypt had learned to count. How, then, should any but the sons of learned Ispahan understand the letters which were so strange? Also, how should they understand the principles so lofty even when they knew his tongue? For they were not professors, but children to be taught—sons of ignorance and not sons of learning. Philosophy was a dazzling term, they could not comprehend, but wished to know; who, then, should teach them? And those who were not sons of Ispahan obeyed the summons of the Muezzin from his turret high up in the morning air.

Far away over the hills, which reached nearly to heaven, lived other men, children of the great colleges of Ancient China and India, to whose ears came the living words, "Ispahan is half the world." And they, too, came to Ispahan, but in twos and threes; for how many were sons of wisdom? They also heeded not the clear call of the Muezzin, for they had obeyed a call from far down the avenue of Time: the call of Prince Gautama, the Buddha, all-knowing, wise. They thought they needed nought else—nor perhaps did *they*, for they were wise; but how few they were! They thought not of their countless brothers who must remain without a teacher, because the only one they had they could not understand. They themselves had wisdom, but had they also peace? Of old it was written, so that Socrates quoted it: "Wisdom hath many thorns in her girdle, and whoso takes her into his house hath no rest. She is the queen of power, but also of pain; of love, but also of anguish." Had they wisdom without pain, and love without anguish? And, consumed by their lofty philosophy and learning, they heeded not the Muezzin's call. But they who were without philosophy and without a teacher entered the Mosque and found—Peace.

* * * * *

Evening had come, with her attendants, Quietude and Rest, and the Commander of the Faithful walked with a learned Sheikh in the city of Baghdad. The evening had brought Peace to their souls, for they were of the Faithful to whom "Allah is nearer than the vein in the neck." The Sheikh, turning to his exalted companion in lowly guise, said: "How our brothers enjoy the peace of the evening, when the arduous day has run its course." "Yes," replied the Caliph, "would that all men might know the Peace of the Faithful. For did not the learned Imam say that we should heed not worldly distinctions or honours, as these crumble to dust, but that we should follow the gleam in the darkness? Herein are all men equal, that prince or slave, learned or ignorant, rich or poor may all hold in common the Peace and Wisdom of Eternity. The throne is humbled to the dust, but the soul ever breathes the fragrance of the Eternal Garden." Allah-u-Akbar!

"THE CROSS AND THE CRESCENT."

THE following paragraph appeared in the *Christian Herald* of August 27 last, and is a remarkable tribute to the Muslims of Asia Minor:—

"Dr. J. H. Jowett, who has recently been paying a memorable visit to the East, sounded a challenge to the Christian peoples in an interview which he gave to a press representative at Birmingham. The famous Anglo-American divine has come from his travels profoundly impressed with Christendom's duty to concentrate on the battle between the Cross and the Crescent. 'One thing that struck me in the colleges in Asia Minor,' he proceeded, 'was the keen intellectual outlook of the Muslims. Judging by the questions which were submitted to me at Roberts College, the men are groping after a more satisfying interpretation of life and destiny, and it seems to me that the Muslim world is open to receive the Christian interpretation, if it be presented by men capable of appealing to their disciplined powers. I feel that one of the greatest needs of the hour is to send out to the Muslim world some of our finest equipped men. It is true what Drummond said of Japan, that one hundred-ton-gun man would probably be of more service than fifty twenty-ton-gun men. They are alert enough and keen enough to take the best we can give them, and they are out for the best they can get. On every hand I could see that they had every door and window open to the reception of what the West could bring, and in science and in general scholarship they were imbibing all the treasures of the West. In these days of general appropriation of the wealth of the Occident, the time is surely ripe for the presentation of the truths of the Christian religion.'"

Let us consider some of the phrases of Dr. Jowett. First of all he urges the Churches to concentrate upon a battle between Cross and Crescent. Often we have heard that it is the "fanatical" Muslim who is supposed to stir up his people against the Cross, but here we have a learned divine who urges Christians to make war, of course in the spiritual sense, upon the Muslim religion. In days such as these, when we are all striving for peace and brotherhood, these words are a pity, Jesus himself would not have endorsed these sentiments, but latter-day apostles of "Churchianity" have found that the old practice of sending warships and cannons to subdue a people has had no effect, and so they try to flood the "heathen" with an army of paid missionaries, in whom they have more faith.

The huge organisations, backed up with thousands of pounds and a veritable array of missions, form a striking contrast to the propagation of Islam, which is merely by personal effort. "Every Musulman is more or less of a missionary—that is, he intensely desires to secure converts from non-Musulman peoples," as one writer puts it. Each Muslim is ready if called upon to enunciate the doctrines of his faith, never in a bigoted manner, otherwise these efforts would be doomed to failure, as we find is the case with the majority of the Christian missions; but gradually the seed is sown and takes root. Africa is so rapidly becoming Muslim that the Church is alarmed, and the Kikuyu affair, which showed up so plainly to the world the lack of unity on the part of the Christian propaganda, was the result. To use the words of Dr. Martineau, "Christ came to bring fire upon earth, and His disciples after eighteen centuries are still discussing the best patent match to get it kindled." A returned missionary once remarked: "On furlough, one is overwhelmed by the complexity, and the labour, and the roar of the Church machinery. I suppose it is all needful, but one dreads that the means may loom so large that the end shall be forgotten." Here is a great mission for really true Christians; seek to unify the Christian peoples, root out those excrescences which have grown up and hide the true teachings of Jesus. We are told that Moses did not write the Pentateuch, that David did not write the Psalms, that Matthew, Mark, Luke and John were not the authors of those books which bear their names. Here is the real battle, not of Cross against Crescent, but of error against truth. Let the Bible be authenticated first of all, then present a true book to the world. Giving an anonymous work as the "Word of God" is immoral. Leave mission work alone and rectify those things which are of vital importance. First of all, find out which branch of Christianity holds the *true* doctrines, cease to quarrel and then think of others. Never talk about fighting against a well-equipped and alert army if your own forces are torn with internal strife. When one realises the hopeless task of Christian missions to the Muslim world, the words of Carlyle come uppermost in the mind: "What is better than itself, it cannot put away, but only what is worse. In this great duel, Nature herself is umpire, and can do no wrong; the thing which is deepest-rooted in Nature, what we call *truest*, that thing, and not the other, will be found growing at last." Dr. Jowett pays a tribute to the keen intellect of the Muslims. Is he surprised? does he think that culture is confined to the West alone? He forgets that whilst Europe was sunk in the deepest darkness, when the Church had absolute sway over the minds of the people, the East was the master of all science and education. The West imbibed its teaching from the Muslim races, and returned the compliment with war and bloodshed, and territorial acquisition. Years of struggling for independence against the material armaments of Europe has prevented many of the

Eastern countries from marching along in the van of progress as in the past, and thus Europe forgets the debt she owes to Islam, and poses as the teacher of humanity. He requires that the "finest equipped men" should be sent out to Muslim lands, thus we can see that the Church is alive to the superiority of the average Muslim over the average Christian. The teachings of Muhammad are such a strong bulwark against "interpretation" of other doctrines, that plain teaching is useless, and metaphysical juggling is the only weapon. We have been told that Muslims are "fanatical," and resent everything that is Western, but Dr. Jowett does us this service, that he denies most forcibly this canard. Here are Muslims studying and assimilating the material sciences of the West, which, after all, are only returned to them. "They are alert enough and keen enough to take the best we can give them, and they are out for the best they can get." Quite true, this is real progress, and if we turn to Japan we see there the full utilisation of Western knowledge. Japan has been received with open arms by Europe merely because she is able to take good care of herself, and has defeated Russia in such a masterly manner, proving herself quite capable of resenting interference from outside. She has assimilated all the positive sciences of Europe, but is she any nearer to accepting Christianity? Not at all: she is wise enough to understand that in the past it killed education, stifled knowledge, and crushed freedom of thought. She can see that the sway of the Church in Europe is only nominal, that the very nations which send out missionaries to the East have no longer a belief in those things which their paid agents teach. Missionaries have too often been the advance guard of a European army, and whilst giving the Bible with one hand, the sword has been presented with the other. Can we blame Japan for thus refusing? Christian effort in Japan has met with practically no success, whilst Muslim propaganda is succeeding in a wonderful manner. Thus we cannot agree with Dr. Jowett that the "time is surely ripe for the presentation of the truths of the Christian religion." These doctrines fell once before Islam, and determined efforts have been made since to convert Muslims, but ever unsuccessfully. To repeat Carlyle's words, "What is better than itself, it cannot put away, but only what is worse." Therefore, whilst Muslims are ready to learn all that Europe has to teach them, Christianity has no future in Muslim lands, as Islam is superior to it, and the remarkable success of Islamic effort in England itself is a tribute to that great teaching given to the world thirteen hundred years ago by the Prophet of Arabia. The Holy Quran is unimpeachable in its genuineness, and its doctrines are reasonable and logical, whilst at the same time the acme of spirituality, thus one can foresee a great future for Islam in Europe.

BERTRAND TADORNA.

WOMAN.

"Nor have the Swedes been altogether content with the heavy-handed art of Germany, or with the view of woman which Germans share with Mahommedans alone—the view that she can be no more than a domestic drudge or an instrument of pleasure."—*Daily Mail*, October 28.

THE above cutting from the *Daily Mail* only serves to betray the ignorance of the writer. How long will these foolish people write upon subjects with which they are unacquainted? It would be interesting to know from what fairy-tale book he gleaned his knowledge. One of the best replies to the vapourings of Mr. H. Hamilton Fyfe is the following from the *Daily Chronicle* of November 5. It speaks of the Bedouins, who are, of course, Muslim :—

"On one point, however, they need instruction in Kultur. They never make night attacks in case, by mistake, the women's quarters should be invaded, and to injure or offend the enemy's womenfolk is regarded as dishonourable."

Compare these two extracts side by side, you will find that they contradict each other. Thus we have two writers expressing totally opposite views. One compares the Muslims to the Germans; the other tells us that the unnamable atrocities in Belgium would not exist if the invaders were Bedouins instead of Germans. Yet, in spite of all this, people call the Germans "civilised" and the Bedouins "uncivilised"—we leave the rest to the imagination of our reader. However, it is well to quote from Islam upon this subject to show that the writer in the *Daily Mail* had better refrain from wearying the public with these fables until he studies the question before putting pen to paper and thus expose himself to ridicule.

In the Holy Quran, Sura 4, we read :—

"And respect women who have borne you."

In the sayings of the Holy Prophet Muhammad we find the following :—

"Women are the twin-halves of men."

"The rights of women are sacred, see that women are maintained in the rights attributed to them."

"The Prophet said, when asked by Moawujah about wife's right over her husband: Feed her when thou takest food; give her clothes to wear when thou wearest clothes; refrain from either giving a slap on her face or even abusing her; and separate not from thy wife, save within the house."

"That is the most perfect Muslim whose disposition is best ; and the best of you are they who behave best to their wives."

"The world and all things in it are valuable, but the most valuable thing in the world is a virtuous woman."

"God enjoins to treat women well, for they are your mothers, daughters and aunts."

"Fear God in regard to the treatment of your wives, for verily they are your helpers."

Let these few extracts suffice. It is as well to say that Islam does not condemn woman as the cause of all evil, it leaves that to the creed that boasts that it has produced civilisation. Islam has always allowed woman to hold her own property independently of her husband, a right which was only conceded in England in 1881 by a legislative Act. The religion which says that "Paradise lies at the feet of the mother" contrasts very favourably with that which says "Let the woman keep silent . . . for I suffer not a woman to teach" (St. Paul).

INSPIRATION: NATIONAL OR UNIVERSAL?

FOR many centuries the Western world has read and followed the sacred book of Christianity, and has derived all its teachings in this manner. When the word "prophet" is mentioned, the mind immediately flies to one of those godly men who were members of the human race, the final revelation being brought by Jesus himself. The question before us is : "Has God given His revelation to the Jewish people to the exclusion of the greater part of mankind?" Let us think for a moment. God created the world, and "saw that it was good." He made man, "male and female created He them," to use the words of Genesis. Therefore we can conceive that when the process of evolution brought about a being endued with all the reasoning faculties which raised him so far above the rest of the animal creation, naturally he looked to something superior to himself for guidance. God fashioned this and all other planets, He foresaw everything which man would need to sustain him, and provided the air we breath, the light which we so need, the heat which is so necessary, the rain to enable our efforts in the field to be successful. He made man in such manner that each organ of his body was ready to fulfil its proper function, and endowed him with the same powers, faculties, and ideals all the world over. Is man in one place less capable than another who is born in a different part of the earth? Has any man been given any superiority in any way racially? God has created us all with equal chances, we are all of the same family.

When we desire to speak to God, is He nearer if we go to Him in any particular way—through any certain form of ritual or dogma, through any certain priest or mediator? He is everywhere, and we can approach Him at any time and in any place. Look around in Nature, do you not see Him mirrored everywhere? Look to the sky, is He not before the eyes? Nay, look anywhere: God is ever-present. Let us come to understand that He speaks to mankind in every clime. The Bible is a history of the Jewish race, and we find that strain of national egotism running through its pages: that Jehovah is the tribal deity of the Hebrews, and commands them to dispossess and slay all other peoples. "Slay ye every one of them, take not one of them alive"; and why? because they worship the deity in another fashion; because they do not accept the formulas of Judaism. Let us read the maledictions poured out upon the unbelieving races who happen to exist round Palestine. All the prophets come to Israel, and other nations will be conquered by them only on condition that they hearken to the prophet. The other races seem merely raised by God as scourges for the Jews when they misbehave. Jesus, too, was a Jew of the Jews, and sends his disciples to the "lost sheep in Israel," and speaks of the Syro-phœnicians as "dogs"; still we find this national prejudice against people alien to the Israelites. Let us leave the Bible for the time. Look at the mighty Empires of China, of Persia, of Assyria, of Greece and Rome; are they outside the scope of God's family? Are they created merely as a whim? have they not their place in the Universe as God's children? Why then should the Jews be selected as a "chosen people," and all the others left in spiritual darkness? Is this the action of a loving and merciful deity? Let us be rational and read impartially. India had its guides, and we find prophets and great men who bring the people to the Light of Truth. We have Lords Buddha and Krishna. Their doctrines were revelations from God to these people of Hindustan, and millions have, and do still follow the grand truths which they enunciated. Persia produced such a grand man as Zoroaster or Zarathustra. His teachings are said to have been the cause of the enlightenment of the Biblical Prophet Daniel, and how can we say that he is not a Prophet? China, too, had it not its teachers? Are not the ethics of Confucius equal to any in the Testaments? Why then should we exclude the greater part of mankind to give inspiration only to such a petty nation as the Hebrews? Jesus felt, too, that his teachings were not acceptable to his own race, and threatened them. "Therefore, I say unto you, the Kingdom of God shall be taken from you and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof," clearly indicating that the Jews were not to have the final revelation, but that it should come to a race who would accept and bring the teachings into practice. Of what use is it to have a teacher if we do not pay heed to his words and act upon

them? Therefore, we can safely say that God has never left any portion of mankind without a guide, that He has distributed His favours equally to all men; and we can turn to the Holy Quran, where we read, "Say, we believe in God, and that which hath been sent down to us, and that which was sent down unto Abraham, and Ismael, and Isaac, and Jacob, and the tribes, and that which was delivered to Moses, and Jesus, and all prophets from their Lord; we make no distinction between any of them." Here is true catholicity, belief in all the revelations which have been made to man through the medium of all God's prophets. Again, too, we must not think for a moment that true inspiration has ceased, for we have the assurance of Muhammad, the voice of Allah, "Verily, God will send to this people, at the beginning of each age, him who shall renew its religion." Thus in Islam our vision is broadened, we not only look to the Semitic peoples for Prophethood, but Allah teaches us that He has neglected no nation, that all are His children, and that he leaves none to walk in darkness; He is not the God of a particular people, but the Father of mankind. If we picture a God that chooses one race, do we not make Him a narrow-minded, partial Being, who creates all and then elects a favourite? We detest favouritism in our everyday life; then should we attribute this to God? Let us turn to Islam and worship Allah, who is "Lord of the Universes," who cares for all, loves us, directs us wherever we may be, and still speaks to mankind, as he did from Sinai, Palestine, India, China, or when he shined forth His light from "Araby the blest."

SHAMSADDIN SIMS.

GOD : NOT BEGOTTEN.

Say, God is one, God is not dependent on anything, nor anything is independent of Him. He does not beget, nor is He begotten, and there is none like Him.—The Quran : 112.

How briefly, and yet beautifully and completely, the conception of God is summed up in these few words. This is the special characteristic of the Holy Quran that it avoids unnecessary verbiage, and expounds everything in such clear, succinct, and definite terms that the idea comes home to the mind. To begin with, the word Allah in the terminology of the Holy Quran is the name of a Being who is free from all defects and drawbacks, and possesses all powers and attributes. Such a Being is the God of Islam. As a further description of this Being the Holy Quran says, in the words quoted above, that He is absolutely single in His attributes, and is not dependent on anything for His purpose. His attributes are not at all shared by any other than Himself, and He can dispense with everything for

the execution of His purpose. Matter and soul need not co-exist with Him eternally for help in the exercise of His creative faculty.

Wherever there is anything, He is the sole creator of it.

Here it will not be out of place to deal with an objection or two. Sometimes it is heard alleged that it cannot be conceived how God created matter and soul out of nothingness.

Secondly, they say that when man has some attributes in common with God, as mercy and anger, why cannot God be a mere designer like man? If likeness is admissible in one case, it ought to be allowable in other cases also; if sameness in one respect does not interfere with His Godhead, there is no reason why it should interfere with it in other respects. The first objection is simply a reiteration of the theory that the creation of something out of nothing is a scientific impossibility. Man can conceive only what can be brought within the purview of his senses, the only avenues of knowledge. Whatever lies beyond the field of sensuous action is inconceivable to man. All the attributes of God are therefore inconceivable from the view point of human mode of action. Can man, with any stretch of mental faculty, conceive eternity and infinity? A finite and determinate being, hedged round by so many limitations on all sides, cannot form a clear, vivid conception of a being without beginning and end. Can man, again, form any explicit conception of seeing without the organ of sight? Yet he believes with all sincerity of purpose that God sees without eyes. Can he further conceive that knowledge can exist without mind? Yet he entertains not a vestige of doubt that God is the knower of all that happens in any form in the heavens above and the earth below, without the possession of anything like human mind. Instances can be multiplied in any number; all the working of God will be found to be perfectly inconceivable by human mind. It ought to be so in the fitness of things. Human mind seated as it is in a material body cannot conceive anything except what comes to it through the senses; the supernatural sphere, being totally a *terra incognita* for it, cannot fall within the scope of its comprehension.

The second point that man and God have some attributes in common needs to be met advisedly. The common element in man's and God's attributes has in each individual case a material difference, which holds true in the matter now before us. Mercy and anger are the common attributes of God and man, and so designing can also be a common attribute without detriment to the idea of Godhood.

True, God is merciful, but He is merciful without possessing a human heart. Equally true, He has anger, but His anger does not imply the possession of the human heart. He can display mercy and anger without standing in need of a human heart, whereas man can show mercy and anger only when his mind is in thorough working order. Here lies the difference. Mercy

and anger are present in both cases, but in one case are dependent on the previous existence of mind, whereas in the other case no such dependence is necessary. Independence of any working material is the distinguishing feature of the divine attributes. Taking the case of creation, man does make things like God, but the same difference must be allowed to characterise God's creation. Man cannot create anything independently of matter already existent, whereas God can do so with perfect independence of any previous existence. Next comes the point that God does neither beget nor is He begotten. Perfection demands singleness. The very idea of duality or plurality sets at nought the idea of perfection. Two separate existences cannot conceivably be found without a clear distinction between them.

If there is no difference the existences fall under the definition of oneness. Perfect sameness and complete identity are simply other names for oneness. If God begets another God, both cannot be perfect so long as they occur to us as two distinct beings. If one is imperfect, it is not begotten of a perfect being. In short, the power of begetting cannot square with the attribute of perfection.

The concluding portion of this short chapter completes the idea contained in the previous one: "There is none like Him." The existence of two or more perfect beings is an impossibility. We recognise beings as distinct and separate from one another only when each of them has peculiar features not found in others, hence each one is distinguished by a noticeable lack which goes to neutralise the idea of perfection. So for perfection entire and absolute, as should be the characteristic of God, oneness and self-sufficient singleness combined with perfect independence are indispensable requisites. To sum up, the Islamic conception of God is that He is the sole possessor of all perfect attributes, free from all defects and drawbacks. He is perfectly independent in the exercise of His attributes, and, as the perfection of His attributes consistently with reason demand, He is without a parallel in all of His attributes.

ABDUL HAQQ AHMADI.

—*The Review of Religions*, Qadian, India.

THE ARAB ADVANCES.

"EARTH trembled and the cities stared aghast,
As rank on rank the horseman galloped past,
With naked limb and breast, unkempt and wild,
On! on! to war, each fearless desert child.
From every eye flashing the battle-light,
On every cheek the Arab blood was bright;
Each warrior set, each horse at utmost speed,
They were as one, the rider and his steed."

* * * * *

"With blazing valour far beyond the rest,
Great Khalid into battle mêlée prest;
'The Sword of God' by Allah's Prophet named,
In conflict dread for peerless prowess famed."*

Muthanna, Prince of the Banu Bakr, was the first to advance on Irak (Boweib bridge and many another victory proclaim the renown gathered by this chief). It was soon necessary to reinforce the command of Muthanna, and the "Sword of God" was selected by the Khalif as commander-in-chief. Arriving on the borders of Persia, Khalid, with his usual imperiousness, sent the following haughty summons to his enemy:—

"Accept the Faith of Islam and thou art safe; or else
pay tribute, thou and thy people; if thou refusest, thou
shalt have thyself to blame, for a people is on thee loving
death even as thou lovest life."

The Persians scorned to reply, thinking probably to easily overcome the untrained warriors of the desert. Hormuz, the Persian general, was soon to find out his error in despising his foemen, despite his cunning. Khalid fell upon him with the usual fury, cutting the Persian army to pieces at the "Battle of the Chains." Time and again victory rested on the banner of Islam, and Khalid carried devastation on the armies of Iran throughout the valley. As he rode the general sang to his soldiers:—

"Behold the riches of the land:
Its paths drop fatness;
Food is as the stones of Arabia.
It were worth our while to fight
Here for worldly advantage only;
But in a holy war, how much more noble!
These fair fields and paradise."

Two great battles were fought—one known by the name of the "River of Blood," another at Firdah. One hundred thousand

* Sons of Islam." By J. Parkinson.

Persians are said to have fallen, although their armies far outnumbered the Muslims. When the spoil taken was sent to Medina, the Khalif is said to have exclaimed :—

“O ye Kurayish! verily your lion, the lion of Islam, hath leapt upon the lion of Persia, and spoiled him of his prey. Surely the womb is exhausted. Woman shall no more bear a second Khalid.”

Jyadh, who had been despatched northward with reinforcement, was surrounded at Duma. From there he sent a message to Khalid asking for help, as the numbers against him were far superior. Khalid's reply was characteristic of the man, of the soldier, and the poet. As the droning torrent dashes from the bowels of the mountains, as the rolling thunder crashes from the bosom of the cloud, so in martial music, speeding over the Syrian desert to the far-off field of Duma, sped the warrior's reply to his harrassed comrade-in-arms :—

“Wait, my friend, for but a moment, speedily shall help appear; Cohort after cohort follows, waving sword and glittering spear.”

So Khalid swept down on Duma. The terror of his name preceded him, and the majority of the tribes surrendered without striking a blow.

During the time those operations were going on other, but less successful, generals were pushing forward into the heart of Syria against the renowned legions of Imperial Rome, now acknowledging the sway of Constantinople. The Emperor Heraclius massed an army of about 240,000 men on the banks of the Yermuck. Week after week went by without anything beyond mere skirmishes occurring.

Both armies were evidently afraid of a general engagement—the Arab awed by the vast numbers of the Romans opposed to him, and the Romans by the impetuosity of the Arabs. The Khalif, impatient at the delay, recalled Khalid from Persia and ordered him to join the army in Syria with half his force, leaving Muthanna in supreme command in Iran with the remainder. Three ways were open to Khalid to march upon Syria—first, to return to Arabia and march north; second, to travel by the valley of the Euphrates; the third, and shortest route, to cross the desert, make for Tadmor and turn the Roman flank. The dangers were, shortness of water and of missing the way. As time was everything, Khalid chose the shortest and more dangerous path, the desert route. The great warrior, daunted by no obstacles, resolved to brave the dangers of the burning sands, and his conquering army was soon lost in its trackless waste. The Roman army, led by Theodoric (Gibbon gives the Roman general in Syria Werdan; Sir William Muir mentions only Theodoric—it is unlikely the former would be in supreme command if the latter was in the field), though outnumbering the Arabs six to one, still wasted time in desultory fighting and

brought about no decisive action. Two months were passed in this way when a commotion was observed far away to the north. Pillars of smoke like grimy serpents were climbing skyward, and a lurid light set the clouds on fire, and incarnadined the steel-blue of the sky. Borne on the northern wind the wail of the widow, the cry of the fatherless proclaimed that now the Roman moved too late. "The Sword of God" had fallen upon the Syrian, and Khalid, having crossed the desert in safety, was careering onward, on to the Yermuck, on to Wascusa, to drench in blood the Eagles of Imperial Rome: far in his rear the ruins of Tadmor (Palmyra) marked the path where his conquering veterans trod.

"Louder the roar of his coming,
 Oh! woe to the Grecian now.
 Khalid with nostrils dilated,
 The wind of the war on his brow;
 Strong in the madness of valour,
 As dark as the fury of night,
 Drinking the nectar of passion,
 Inhaling the air of the fight.
 Deep as the roll of the Yermuck,
 And wild as the Jordan in flood;
 Plunging through files of the foemen,
 He revels in oceans of blood.
 Glowing the spirit of danger
 The soul of the fight in his eyes;
 Black on the field of his banner
 An eagle, plutonian flies.
 Warfare to him is his birthright,
 The stour of the battle his breath;
 Born from the womb of the conflict,
 He laughs at the terrors of death."†

The Arabs were now in a slight predicament; three or four generals were in the field, but the Khalifa had nominated no one in particular to the supreme command. To bring matters to a crisis Khalid proposed they should command in turn day about, and also suggested his day be first. It was, of course, his object to force an engagement at once. His suggestion having been agreed to, Khalid marshalled his forces into squadrons of one thousand each, so as to extend his flanks, and make his army appear more numerous than it really was. He then gave orders to advance and began the battle destined to decide whether the Arab or the Roman was to be master in Asia.

All day long the battle raged, sometimes inclining to one side, sometimes the other. The carnage was frightful, but the result doubtful, until the quick eye of Khalid discerned that the Roman cavalry was declining from the infantry, and like a

† "Sons of Islam," by G. J. Parkinson.

wedge he drove his centre in between. To the rear of the cavalry lay a precipice, and to save themselves from destruction they charged straight at the Arab front. At the word of command the Muslim ranks swung open and the horsemen dashed through. The swords and spears encountered nothing but air. On they sped into the country not to reappear again on the fatal field. The instant the horsemen passed the Muslim ranks closed up. The Romans were now hemmed in—in the front the Arabs, in the rear a deep chasm, into which they were gradually being forced :—

“ Whirlwinds are roaring o'er Yermuck,
The vultures are croaking on high ;
Horses are writhing in anguish,
And men in an agony die.
Romans are food for the vultures,
The bodies stem Yermuck's red tide ;
Over the ruin of legions,
The son of Al-Walid doth ride.
Bright his brow with a glory
Illumined his eye with the glow ;
Gone the array of the Christians,
And broken the pride of the foe.
Dauntless the heart of the chieftain,
And never his deeds be outdone ;
Child of the desert and simoom,
Kurayish all hail to thy son ! ” †

Historians say that 100,000 alone perished in the gulf, without taking into account those killed in the struggle on the plain. The number may have been exaggerated, but the slaughter must have been enormous. The victory was decisive : Palestine, the roads to Egypt, and Asia Minor now lay open to the Arab invasion. That night Khalid and the other generals dined in the gorgeous pavilion of Theodoric, and each soldier in the Arab army received for his share of the spoil 1,500 pieces of gold, or the value. The power of Byzantium was curbed for a time, and the way cleared for the conquest of the nations. During the progress of the battle a messenger arrived from Medina bearing the news that Abu Bakr, Khalifa of Islam, was dead, and that Omar was elected to succeed him. The new ruler of the Muslims was opposed to Khalid, and in the days of Abu Bakr often advocated that he should be deprived of his command. Now Khalif, he was in a position to carry out his own wishes, and the messenger who brought the news of Abu Bakr's death and Omar's election also carried a letter depriving “ The Sword of God ” of his command, and putting Abu Obeida at the head of the forces of the Musulmans.

Abu Bakr, the first successor of the Prophet, reigned about two years, dying in the thirteenth year of the Hijra. He was

† Sons of Islam.

mild, but firm, in his rule. He was never known to degrade any of his officers. He was exceedingly lenient to the rebel tribes, treating them with a humanity and forbearance in advance of the age, and in striking contrast with the usual severity of the princes and rulers of the period. No case of tyrannical injustice can, I think, be brought against him even by the most drastic of critics. On one occasion, it is said, he did use harsh measures against a proselyte, an action which he afterwards regretted. On his accession nearly all the tribes were in revolt. By his own energy and firmness, and the activity of his generals, he had within a year brought all to subjection. By the time of his death his armies had overran Mesopotamia and part of Syria, enriching themselves with the spoils and laurels of many a hard-fought field, on which they broke the power of Persia and of Eastern Rome. His armies lay on the Euphrates, ready to advance on the heart of Iran, and in Syria the "Sword of God" was breaking the Roman at Wascura. Asia and Africa lay open to the inroads of the Arab.

BEAUMONT HILL.

MIA STUDADO DE LA BIBLIO.

De MAULVIE SADR-UD-DIN.

LA Kurano kaj nia Sankta Profeto Muhamad postulas ke ni havu liberecon de vido. Kiel Muslimoj ni devas rigardi la enspiratajn librojn kiel nian propran posedon, kaj tiel ni devas akcepti la Profetojn. La Kurano ni nur diras vortojn pri tiuci, sed ankau konsentas je kion predikis Musa (Moses), Isa (Jesus), kaj aliaj Profetoj de la Domo de Yakub (Jakobo) kaj aliaj sanktaj libroj, kaj fidas je ilia dia deveno. Plue la Islama skribo konfirmas aliajn Sanktajn Skribojn, kiuj venis antaue.

Lia Alteco Muhamad plenumas eldirojn en la Malnova kaj Nova Testamento; li ne neis tiujn ci sed diris ke ili antaudiris pri li kiel la Dia Instruisto, kiu venus por perfektigi teologian penson. La Kristana Evangelio nomas lin la "angulstono" de la Konstruado de Teologio. Estus tre bedaŭrinde ke la plenumon per la alveno de Muhamad ne studis la Kristanoj. Ili maluzis vortojn tradukis ilin malprave, kaj pro tio la homaro ne klare vidas la veron. Kiam ili rifuzas akcepti viron kiu konfirmas doktrinojn de Jesus Kristo kaj aliaj profetoj de Dio, kaj konsekvence ligas la popolojn en frateco, ili ne agas laŭ la volo de la Patro.

Vidu kian gravan aferon faris Nia Sankta Profeto. La Biblio parolas pri la alveno de Granda Misiisto; gi montras lian mision, liajn signojn, lian fortecon, lian lokon k.t.p. k.t.p. Cu tial ne estas devo de ciu Judo kaj Kristano atendi kaj

pripensi la personon kiu plenumos tiajn promesojn? Cu ili ne malgojigos se io restos ne plenumita? Cu ne estas malguste se ili intence kovras la okolojn kiam ni trovas viron en kies personeco cio promesata estas plenumita.

Readmons xxxiii. 2.—“Kaj li diris, La Sinjoro venis ce Sinai, kaj supreniris de Seir al ili; Li brilegis forte de Monto Paran, kaj Li venus kun dek miloj da Sanktuloj: de Lia dekstra mano iris fajra lego por ili.”

Isa. xxi. 7.—“Kaj li vidis carioton kun du viroj sur cevaloj, carioton de azenoj, kaj carioton de kameloj.”

Habb. iii. 3.—“Dio venis de Teman, kaj la Sanktulo de Monto Paran ‘Selah.’ Lia gloro kovris la cielon kaj la tero estis plena de Lia laŭdo.”

Apokalipso xix. 11 kaj 16.—“Kaj mi vidis la cielon malfermitan, kaj jen Blanka Cevalo kaj li sur sidis sur ĝi estis nomita ‘Fidela kaj Vera’ kaj laŭ lia justeco li jugas kaj faras batalon.”

Kaj li havis sur siaj vestaĵoj nomon skribitan “Rego de Regoj Sinjoro de Sinjoroj.”

Se la azeno estas simbolo de la lando kie Jesus Kristo aperis kaj se la valo de Jordano kaj la Monto Olive estis la sceno de lia tera misio, tiam tiuj ci antaŭdiroj devas esti forta vero en la menso de tiuj kiuj sin nomas Kristanoj, kaj ili devas ekkoni ilian plenumon en la lumo de historio. Cu ili ne prenas kelkajn eldirojn por kunmeti la agojn de Jesuo? Ni ne povas kompreni la logikon de nuntempa Kristaneco. Gis Jesuo ciu antaŭdiro estis pri ia PERSONO sed ili diras ke post li, tiuj ci nur estas plenumita lau spirita senco. Kia stranga ideo pri traduko. Se la eniro de Jesus sur azeno en Jerusalemon kaj la meto de vestaĵoj sur la azenon, kaj la branĉoj de arboj—tute ordinara aferoj en la vivo.—estas tiel gravaj, se ili diras ke tiuj ci plenumas la Malnovan Testamenton cu ne estis malsage, idiota, doni nur spiritan signifon al la aliaj antaŭdiroj, kiuj ne aplikas al Jesus Kristo?

En Apok. xix. (Antaŭdirita) ni legos pri “Blanka Cevalo,” kaj “li kiu sidis sur ĝi estas nomata” “Fidela kaj Vera, kaj la justeco li jugas kaj faras batalon” kaj lia noma estas “Rego de Regoj kaj Sinjoro de Sinjoroj.” La libro de Apok. estis Skribita A.D. 96 (eble multe pli malfrue) pro tio la rajdanto sur la blanka cevalo ne povas estis Jesuo Kristo. Cu la blanka cevalo ne estas Arabo kaj cu la vorto “Fidela” ne estas nomo de niu Sankta Profeto Muhamad donita al li de lia nacio pro liu vereco kaj honesteco? Cu la vortoj “Fideloj” kaj “Muslimoj” ne estas la samaj en ordinara parolado? Kiu alia krom Muhamad povas esti la plenumo de tiu ci antaŭdiro? Kiu post Jesuo Kristo venis kun dia religio kun enhavis Regojn kaj Grafojn en siaj vicoj? Li devas fari batalon per justeco. Kiu alia krom Muhamad venis post la skribado de tiuj ci por

plenumi ilin. Ni devas esti logikaj legante la Bibliion. Se vi legas vortojn tie kiujn vi supozas estas pri Jesuo ; legu ankau aliajn kiuj ne parolas pri li sed pri iu kiu venos post li.

Se la azena rajdo estas afero kiu okazis en Jerusalamo kaj tie ili uzio gin kiel ordinaran ilon por vojago, tiam por kameloj kaj cevaloj ni devas rigardi Arabujon.

En "Readmono" in legas "La Sinjoro venis ci Sinai, kaj supreniris de Seir al ili ; Li brilegis forte de Monto Paran, kaj Li venis kun dek miloj du Sanktuloj, de lia dekstra mano iris fajra lego por ili." "Se la veno de Dio ci Sinai kaj Seir estas Moseo kaj Jesuo, kion signifas Monto Paran ? Cula montoj de Meka (Mecca) ne estis nomitaj "Paran Montoj" de la komerco de tempo ? Se vi tradukos du, kial ne la trian ? Denove, li venis gis Paran kun dekmiloj da sanktuloj. Tiu ci ne povus esti Moseo au Jesuo : ili neniam alproksimigis Monton Paran, kaj ili ne havis dek mil sekvantojn. Cu la historia venko de Meka de Muhamad ne estas la granda plenumo de tiuj ci vortoj kiam li venis kun dek mil fidelejoj sekvantoj al Monto Paran de Medina ? Denove, ni legas "de Lia dekstra mano iris fajra lego por ili." Nur estis du Profetoj Kiuj donis legojn. Moseo kaj Muhamad : la unua de Sinai la lasta de Paran.

Ke estis necese ke iu devas veni por plenumi tiujn ci antaŭdirojn cu ne estas tute klare laŭ la vortoj de Jesuo Kristo mem, kiam li parolas pri la Helpanto :—

"Konvenas por vi ke mi ja foriru. Car se mi ne forirus la Helpanto ja ni ne venus al vi : sed se mi iros, mi senkos Lin al vi." Tiel diris Jesus. Liaj vortoj estas tuteklaraj—la Helpanto devas veni post li ; li ne ankoraŭ estis sur la tero, sed venos post la foriro de Jesuo. Se oni diras ke la "Unu" estas la Sankta Spirito estas blasfemo : gi necese dirus ke la Sankta Spirito ne estis sur la tero gis tiam, kaj Jesus ne posedis lin. Tiu ci kontraŭdiris tion kio estas skribita en Mateo iii. pri kio lau supozo okazis je la bapto de Jesus "kaj jen la cieloj malfermigis por li kaj li vidis la spiriton de Dio malsuprenirantan." La sankta Spirito vere jam estis sur la tero kaj estis ce Jesuo, kaj estis kun li dum lia vivo. Se la Helpanto estas la Sankta Spirito tiam la vortoj de Jesus senutilas kiam li diras "La Helpanto je ne venus al vi, sed se mi iros, mi sendos lin al vi."

٥
 اشرك جميع القبائل في حمل الحجر الاسود والى على تقاليد
 المباركة في وحدة القرية والمحبة فيما بينهم وايضا انه
 صلى الله عليه وسلم اطفاء نيران الجدال ونجاهم
 من الحروب المزعجة والقتل والقتال وبذل ريسهم في
 الحقيقة كالم اتفاق وذلك كله من مكارم اخلاقه والله
 قال (بعثت لاتيتم مكارم الاخلاق) وقال (انكم لم تسعوا
 للناس باموالكم فسعوهم باخلاقكم) وقال (لا عقل كالقدر
 زلا ورء كالكتف ولا حسب كحسب الخلق) وقال (خير
 الناس احسنهم خلقا) فسيدها محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم هو خير
 الناس اجمعين لانه فله ذلك صار اغزى لكل شخص
 يريد ان يعرف الرجل الذي يكون متسما ببذر الاتفاق والوحدة
 في قومه في اول وهلة وان لم يكن كذلك فهو ما قرب
 في تلك التعاليم المباركة لانه الرجل الذي يفرق جماعته
 عن اتفاقهم وتجعلهم فرقا فافانده ما متى من تعاليم
 سيدهنا ونبينا محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم خيرة ابد الاخلاصة
 لقول ان سيدنا ونبينا محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم قد اتفق
 اليه قومه جميعا قبل البعثة بانه امدحهم وناهيهم بالمشافهة
 ما يتبعها من مكارم الاخلاق وكل هذا الاخلاق العالية
 من مكرمة في فطرته غريزية فيه لم يد رسها في كتاب لانه امدح
 لذلك قال الله تعالى فيه (والله يعلم حيث تجعل رسالته) فان الله
 الى يتبع هذا الحق ثانيا بان سيدنا ونبينا محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم رحمة للعالمين بعد
 ١٤ ايضا وقد ثبت بانه هو الوارث لابييه ابراهيم ع في رضى الحجر الاسود
 صلى الله عليه وسلم وفرد وبارك عليه (المرجع محمد عبد الحى عرسودى فاضل)

ومبشراً ونذيراً ونبيّاً وسراً جاً منيراً وايضاً ان جميع العرب
 كانوا يعتقدون به قبل البعثة على الله رحيمٌ بجميع نفع بني الانس
 فلذلك فرحوا به لما دخل الى الحرم الشريف واعلم ان هذه
 المحاكمة لا تصد راي الا من انسان كامل عاقل يريد اصلاح
 الخلائق اجمعين والا لصدت من اناس يحب لنفسه
 ميالاً لقومه وعشيرته خاصة دون غيرهم لقامت الحرب
 على ساقها وفنت قبائل العرب على آخرها ولكن انما
 صدرت من ذلك الا انسان انسان عيني الزمان اعني
 سيدنا منبياً محمد خاتم النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم حيث انه
 صلى الله عليه وسلم وضع رداءه الشريف على الارض ثم بسط
 ثم اخذ الحجر الاسود بيده ووضعه في وسط الرداء ولا
 يستعين في احد من ابي قبيلة كان وايضاً ما اخذ رداء رجل
 قبيلة كان او من احد اقربائه الذينهم يخصونه وفي ذلك
 الفصل حكم راي حكيم لانه لو اخذ رداء من قبيلة دون قبيلة
 او استعان باحد دون احد فالاعتراضات باقية وتاراجيد
 تكون حامية ثم بعد ذلك انه صلى الله عليه وسلم امر ان يخذ
 بطرف الرداء الذي فيه الحجر الاسود من كل قبيلة رجل
 واحد فقط فلما صلوه وقرئ به من الترتي اخذ الحجر الاسود
 بيده الشريفة ووضعه هو بنفسه المقدسة في
 الموضع الذي وضعه ابراهيم خليل الرحمن عليه
 الصلاة والسلام وفي ذلك ايضاً حكم راي حكيم للذينهم يتفكرون
 ويعقلون ولا تخفى عليك فعله صلى الله عليه وسلم حيث انه

بالعزة والصيت في جميع العالم فلذلك قام بعضهم على بعض
واردوا الحرب المبيدة ولو كانت فكم وكمن مقتول ومضروب وكمن
وكمن مجروح ومسيء ولوكمن وكمن من ترمل الآيتمى وكمن من يتيم
اليتيم لان الحرب اذا قامت على ساقها بين قبائل العرب فلو
تختم الا بعد الهدنة الطويلة وفناء الرف الوف من الناس
لما شروا من حرب اليسوس وغيرها ولكن الله سلم بسبب
ذلك النبي الرؤف الرحيم عليه افضل الصلوة وافضل التليم
من ذلك الجدال العظيم المنتج للحروب المدهشة ثم قال بعضهم
لبعض ما هذا الجدال الذي ينتج الحرب والقتال وتيمم الاطفال
نما لنا لا يجتمع على امر واحد يكون فيصلا فقيلا وما هو ذلك
الا من الفضيل فقال لا بد من تقبل حكم اول داخل الحرم في
هذا الوقت فقالوا باجمعهم قد رضينا ذلك فبينما هم
ينتظرون واذا بسيدنا ونبينا محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم
هو اول داخل داخل الى الحرم الشريف في ذلك الوقت
الذي قرروه بينهم ولما رآته قريش فرحوا فرحا مفرطا
قالوا باجمعهم جاء الامين محمد فهو يفصل فيما بيننا والله
مبني فلا يشطط في الحكم ابدا وكانت جميع قبائل قريش يسمون
يلقبون سيدنا ونبينا محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم بالامين
: بانه ورعه وزهده وكما لعقله وعلو حمته وتقواه
مكارم اخلاقه وصدق لهجه فتقرر في هذه الشهادة
لعظمي الحضرة سيدنا والدين والاخرين صلى الله عليه وسلم
في جميع قومه قبل ان يبعثه الله تعالى الى الخلائق هاديا

اربعة اقدام من العذر وحان وضع الحجر الاسود في الموضع
الذي وضعه فيه ابراهيم خليل الرحمن عليه الصلاة
والسلام فعند ذلك تنازعت جميع قبائل قريشى وكل قبيلة
تقول نحن نضع الحجر الاسود في موضعه لاجل ان تكون
لنا العزة والصيت في العالم كله وايضا كل واحد واحد من كل قبيلة
يقول انا اضعه لاني انا عزيز قومي ثم سلت السيفوف من اغاها
وكل واحد منهم يبتغي حقوقة وعظمته وكانته حتى اشتبهت الظلم
بينهم وطال وقت المجادلة وكاد ان تقوم الحرب الشديدة والمهينة
العظيمة - فتفكر في هذه الدوام الذينهم رضوا ثلثي الحروب الظلمة
وقطعوا على الافتخار منذ سابق الزمنة كما يشهد لهم التاريخ
في حربهم المستطيلة ومقاتلتهم وقتالهم وقتلهم بعضهم بعضا في
شيء فكيف يكون في هذا الامر العظيم واعني به وضع الحجر
الاسود في الموضع الذي وضعه فيه ابراهيم عليه السلام
ثم لا تخفى عليك ان هذا الامراى الجدرال العظيم اذا اتفق
الحرب الشديدة لا تحصى قريشا وقبائلها بل ان الحرب
تقم جميع قبائل العرب لان العرب يكونون حلفاء بعضهم
بعضا فلا تبقى قبيلة من العرب سالمة من الحرب اذا قامت
على ساقها ولكن اطفالها سيدها ونينا محمد صلى الله عليه
وسلم بقوة الهية وعقل كامل ونفس قدسية وهما
عالية واعلم ان وضع الحجر الاسود في موضعه فيه عزة
عظيمة وتلك العزة لا ترجع الى مجاوري مكة المعظمة فقط
بل انها ترجع الى جميع القدم فعند ذلك يمتازون على غيرهم

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

الحمد لله ونصلي على رسوله الكريم

قد ثبت لبقينا ونبيينا محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم من حيث تعالى به
ومن حيث مكارم اخلاقه بانه رحمة للعالمين وهذه الرحمة
العامّة هي مركزه في جملة من حين ولادته صلى الله عليه
وسلم حتى ترقى ونمت بنمرة ومن ذلك انه جعل جميع العالم
تحت ظل تلك الرحمة العامّة كما هو ثابت له صلى الله عليه
وسلم - وان مكارم اخلاقه من قبل بعثته ومن بعدها
لا تعد ولا تحصى لان خلقه صلى الله عليه وسلم عظيم
وقد كتب الناس في سيرته ومكارم اخلاقه كتباً كثيرة وان
الآن اذكر واقعة واحدة من مكارم اخلاقه فقط وتلك الواقعة كانت
قيل بعثته صلى الله عليه وسلم وان ابين فيها استقلال سيدنا
ونبينا محمد وبعثته في ادوار حياته من التزام تعليماته المنورة
بعضها ببعض لا زدياد الايمان - اعلم ما بلغ النبي صلى الله عليه
وسلم الخمسة والثلاثين من عمره وذلك قبل ما وحى اليه الخمس
سنوات اتفق انه جاء سبيل شديد في مكة المعظمة زادها الله تعالى
شرفاً وتطيماً وانه قد اضر جدران بيت الله الكعبة المكرّمة
فاحزن قريشاً ذلك السيل لانه اضر جدران بيت الله تعالى
ان قريشاً قد اجتمع رأيهم بعد المشورة التامة بان يسمروا الجدران
وتادى من الحديد ويبسروا الكعبة المعظمة جديداً لانها بيت
لله المعظم والعلامة التي اقامها ابوهم خليل الرحمن عليه
صلواته والسلام فاخذوا بالبنا وحسب وصلت وبلغت