

[Price 6d. each.]

Islamic Review

AND

MUSLIM INDIA.

A Monthly Journal devoted to the Interests of the Muslims.

Office: THE MOSQUE, WOKING.

Edited by { KIIWAJA KAMAL-UD-DIN, B.A., LL.B.
MAULVIE SADR-UD-DIN, B.A., B.T.

VOL. II.]

OCTOBER 1914.

[No. 9.

Contents.

	PAGE
The Present War: Civilisation and Religion - - -	417
A Resolution - - - - -	421
Comrades in Arms. By LORD HEADLEY - - -	421
The War and the Principles of Christ - - -	425
The Devotion of India - - - - -	428
Words of Wisdom. By H. W. LONGFELLOW - - -	431
Mazzini's Gospel for To-day - - - - -	432
The Mosque at Woking. By KHALID SHELDRAKE - - -	435
The War and the Muslims. By J. PARKINSON - - -	439
An Approach to Oriental Imagination. By TERESA HOOLEY - - -	446
Does Islam Favour the Seclusion of Women? By THE OCCIDENT - - -	447
Bible Problems: The Story of the "Fall" - - -	450
The Quran on the Evils of Drink - - - - -	452
Muslim Festival at Woking: The Eid-ul-Fitr - - -	453
If Only there had been Enough Christianity! - - -	455
A Striver After the Truth of Islam. By AMEENA - - -	458
Is Christianity Really Trinitarian? By MUHAMMAD AHMED - - -	458
An Outline of Christian Theology before Muhammed. By J. PARKINSON - - -	460
Birdperspektivo de la Vivo de la Sankta Profeto (<i>Esperanto</i>) - - -	466
Arabic - - - - -	469

Price Six Shillings per annum post free in advance; and in India Rs. 7.

*Single copies to be obtained from The Mosque, Woking,
and in India from Azeermanzal, Lahore.*

London:

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

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ
نُصَلِّي عَلَى رَسُولِ الْكَرِيمِ

ISLAMIC REVIEW

AND

MUSLIM INDIA.

VOL. II.]

OCTOBER 1914.

[No. 9.

THE PRESENT WAR.

CIVILISATION AND RELIGION.

"Is ghar ko aag lag gai ghar ke chragoe."

"Oh, the house took fire from the very lamp
burnt to light that house."

How appositely this verse from Hindustani, which I have also translated into English, explains the present situation. It hints as to those factors which have chiefly created these heart-rending conditions. The so-adored Civilisation, yes, and this very boast of the Western nations, inspired by Materialism, with no Divine Light to guide it, was sure to work out all that so grimly faces us to-day. Its seemingly rosy paths were leading us to this fiendish hell. They say that the German people have ignited this universal conflagration; but has not Germany for years stood head and shoulders above the other nations in the West in almost every branch of civilisation? Does not Europe owe a great debt to the people in Germany for all her recent advance in science, in art, and in philosophy? Yet the very home of material progress is to-day the hotbed of the most disastrous havoc that has ever visited humanity. What Europe took scores of years to build up under the propitious smiles of the so-called Civilisation is now going to be broken into pieces in days or even hours under the ominous grimaces of the same.

Religion, they say, creates fanaticism ; but we do not find in the red annals of religion any parallel to this civilised madness and refined frenzy, which is going to rend the very bowels of the earth. I readily admit that religion in the past has for full fifteen years been knee-deep in blood ; *Christian* Europe has seen ravines and rivulets of human gore in days past ; but has religion anything whatsoever to contribute to the struggling out of this unthinkable deluge of the crimson life-fluid, with which civilised Europe will inundate the world ? Wars have sometimes been waged in defence of religion, and have often been made a cloak to conceal political motives. But the present war is the greatest that the world has ever seen, while the belligerents claim to be foremost in civilisation, with no zeal for religion. Though this war was electric in its speed, yet the different stages at which the various nations responded to the death-clarion establish the same fact. By comparison, the lower in civilisation showed the greater reluctance to take any part in the fateful drama. Many hold that the English nation is behind the others in art and culture ; and that the Germans head the list ; and here we see that Germany was the first and England the last to participate in hostilities. Is that a mere coincidence ? Decidedly not. Material civilisation, devoid of those salubrious humanising influences which religion exerts on the human mind, bringing forth all that is noblest and best in man, could not fail to bring her votaries to this fatal pass. Are not these physical sciences, which one should rightly be proud to possess, chiefly responsible for making this war the most terrible, the most heinous, and the most devastating and bloodiest of all that have passed ? Are not these the demons of civilisation—I mean those engines of war the possession of which inspires Germany to regard her position as invulnerable, and induces her to defy all the other nations ? Calculate all that has been spent in the last quarter of a century on the manufacture of these weapons of war. Have not these instruments of human annihilation caused the heaviest drain on the exchequer of every nation in the West ? and this all to bring us nearer to destruction and devastation. We waged wars on the surface of the earth when we were ignorant and uncivilised : we became cultured and advanced in physical sciences, and airships and torpedoes came to add to our powers of destruction. These sciences, which, under the influence of a true religion from God, could be an immense blessing to mankind, have become a formidable curse to us, under the inspiration of a sordid materialistic philosophy. It is claimed that the present culture has equipped us with the best ideas of life : man has, after all, succeeded in these days of civilisation in finding out the true philosophy of human life, which guarantees prosperity, happiness, and felicity. The theory of “the survival of the fittest” is the pride of materialistic philosophy. We cannot deny its strength ; it is a truism and a useful theory of life. It

should act as an effectual incentive to individual exertion to shake off lassitude and lethargy; but it has proved a most pernicious factor in the devastation of humanity. It created modern sordidness and inspired self-assertion, and has killed all those high sentiments of self-abnegation and self-restraint which make human life a real millennium. But while thought comes from heaven and not from earth, modern philosophy has received her inspiration from dumb, dead nature, which has produced most demoralising effects. In the vegetable kingdom they found every parasite, creeper and bramble eking out its existence through self-assertiveness at the expense of others; in the animal kingdom they found the lower species killed by the higher to feed and sustain it, Thus self-assertiveness was taken as the rule of life, and destruction of the inferior by the superior is thereby justified. This explains the extirpation of the Red Indian, and the gradual disappearance of very many races from the surface of the earth. This alone justifies the treatment meted out to the natives of the Congo and other tribes in European colonies! (I must say in this connection that the treatment of the subject races by England has been much more humane and considerate than that of other nations; but perhaps they are, as thought by the Germans and the French, somewhat backward in culture and advancement, and have not reached that height of refinement that would stifle their blunt, strong sense of justice.) Their man-of-business disposition stands firm against these highflown ideas of philosophy. Yes, the theory of the survival of the fittest, misconceived and read in the light explained, could not fail to produce such dire results. It is solely responsible for the colour question, and to it racial differences owe their genesis. For more than fifty years past various nations in the West have claimed the right of the fittest against the rest of mankind; and is it to be wondered at if each of them in its turn tries to establish among themselves which is the fittest to survive, and uses the others as subservient to its own needs? That materialism had to create such conditions was a foregone conclusion: that material culture, with no Divine inspiration to bridle its activities, was to prove a dire curse to humanity, is after all an established fact.

Civilisation on modern lines, however, has been more injurious to humanity in general than even a perverted religion; and thus that old, old vexed question between religion and civilisation as to their respective utility to mankind is once for all settled.

Religion, if it came from the Creator of the Universe, could not but be of material help to work out the will of its Author. If God had some great design in the creation of man, religion from Him should enlighten us as to His will, and supply us with means to carry it out: otherwise religion is as bad as the much-boasted civilisation. Religion, therefore, does not mean the observance of meaningless rituals; it does not consist

in subscribing to some irrational dogmas ; it is not a collection of impracticable theories injurious to human society, or injunctions of sentimental morality. Religion is a true theory of life ; it should explain to us the will of God in creating our species, and lay down rules and regulations to have that will worked out. Jesus meant the same thing when he said, "Let Thy kingdom come ; Thy will be done on earth as it is heaven." Jesus anxiously looked for that kingdom, which meant nothing else but to see mankind after the heart of its Maker. The Son of Man, however, was somewhat over-sanguine about its immediate establishment, and so were his disciples—even the very thrones of the Kingdom were apportioned. With Jesus it was almost a matter of one generation : "But I tell you of a truth, There be some some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the kingdom of God," was the assurance given by him to the disciples so covetous of those thrones.

The Sermon on the Mount has become a stumbling-block to many who try to read the teaching given therein from a utilitarian point of view, especially when they see its preacher a practical man in all other respects : one who discarded all the theories of the Rabbis and the Pharisees, and preferred practice to rituals, could not presumably be responsible for that impracticable morality said to be promulgated from the Mount of Olives. But it is not difficult to penetrate Jesus psychologically. "I say unto you, This generation shall not pass till all these things are fulfilled," are the words of Jesus, and show how sure he was of the nearness of the said Kingdom. Yes, it was near at hand, a question of a few years more—he to sit on the throne of David, righteousness to rule everywhere, wickedness waning, meekness the only passport to that millennium. Is it then to be wondered at that he exhorted his disciples to be meek and humble, and forbear everything unpleasant ? He believed that the days of evil were numbered, and if wickedness was to be stamped out within a few years, through some miraculous operation, it was not worth his while to resist it. Keep in mind this mental condition of the teacher of the following vow, and it does not seem so impracticable : "Resist not evil, but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also ; and if any will sue thee at the law and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak ; and whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain. Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat or what ye shall drink, nor yet for your body what ye shall put on. . . ." It was most commendable teaching if the Kingdom was so near, as Jesus believed. One could bear the inclemency of the rigid winter weather here and remain indifferent to clothing if after only a few years one was to be clothed "with white raiment" and wear a "crown of gold" upon the head (Rev. iv. 4.) But, alas, two thousand years have passed, and the Kingdom of Heaven has not yet appeared.

Jesus gave us a code of life, which, however, was not workable. But that does not show us that religion from God has got no message to humanity. Even the religion of Christ, if followed, could not give countenance to what we see at present—no religion on earth would allow this. Religion, coming from the fountain-head of peace and happiness, could not teach otherwise. For illustration I will take Islam, and will try to show how this final form of religion from God tends to work out peace and love and amity to all mankind. It incites man to exertion, and suppresses wickedness, by allowing resort to necessary punishment wherever it is desirable.

(To be continued.)

A RESOLUTION.

At a meeting of the British Muslim Society held at the Mosque, Woking, on Sunday, September 20, the following resolution was proposed by its President, Lord Headley, seconded by Maulvi Sadr-ud-Din, and carried unanimously:—

“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 MOHAMMAD.”)

COMRADES IN ARMS.

By LORD HEADLEY
(Saifur-Rahwan Shaikh Rahmatullah Farooq).

WE are now putting together a glorious page of history, which countless generations of our descendants will read with honest and grateful pride. To feel that one actually belongs to a grand Empire, whose sons are freely pouring out their life blood in defence of honour and for the love of truth and justice, and to think that one is permitted to live and see heroism and

devotion on such a magnificent scale, thrills the soul to its very innermost recesses.

If the spontaneous support forthcoming from all the British Colonies has elicited admiration, the equally spontaneous and affectionate outburst of loyalty and devotion from all parts of the Indian Empire has called into being a new consciousness of brotherly love—the somewhat cold and phlegmatic temperament of the Briton being thoroughly warmed to enthusiastic delight by the wholehearted and noble offers of his Eastern brother. There has been no hanging back, and the spirit which hundreds of years ago animated the Holy Prophet Muhammad when he was compelled to draw the sword in the cause of freedom, truth, and justice, now dominates all Britishers and Muslims who are fighting shoulder to shoulder in this war righteously undertaken in defence of right against the might of arrogant oppression.

The Muslims of the West are naturally proud of the efforts now being made by their Eastern Muslim brethren, and those sentiments have been fittingly expressed at a recent meeting of the British Muslim Society, when a resolution was passed congratulating those followers of Islam who are privileged to assist in carrying into effect those principles which characterised the life and dealings of the Holy Prophet.

When we declared war against Germany I received letters from friends who appeared horror-struck that we, a Protestant nation, "should take up arms against another Protestant nation" in order to help "idolatrous Roman Catholic countries like France and Belgium." I wrote back, pointing out that this was in no sense a religious war, and that we were simply carrying out our promise, whilst Germany was deliberately breaking hers. The Germans might be of any religion or of no religion, it mattered not what they were; they were breaking a solemn and binding written promise, and placing a deep and never-to-be-forgotten insult on the British Empire by asking us to be a party to a great international crime. Were we to commit sin and break our word because the majority of Germans happened to be Protestants? Were we to lose our self-respect and do wrong, because the national religion of France and Belgium happens to be Roman Catholic? One cannot help feeling intense thankfulness that we followed the example of the Holy Prophet, who always administered justice impartially, whether those appearing before him were Jews, Muslims, Christians, or Idolaters. We did the right thing, quite irrespective of any religious leanings or beliefs, and took just the very course Muhammad would have taken had he been with us. In the end, when we have beaten the modern Huns, may the spirit of justice guide our hearts and keep us from blindly inflicting punishments in excess of what is required. The *lex talionis* cannot, of course, be applied; but do not let us lose sight of the necessity for so arranging matters that the whole civilised world

shall not again be kept in an incessant state of feverish anxiety because one nation insists upon armaments on an enormous scale, and strives at her aggrandisement at the expense of the rest of the world.

"Insāf kerna hoga"* has often been a watchword of talismanic power in the East, and, thank God, it has been, and will, I hope, be our motto all through this war, in which Muslims, Christians, Jews and Hindus are all showing the whole world that their moral sense of right and wrong is in no way warped or distorted by their particular religious views.

I now reproduce, without any apology, a few verses contributed to the *Islamic Review* in January of this present year, because the "brotherhood" and "fusion" of religious thought seem to have rapidly become realities, especially since the outbreak of the war.

THE BROTHERS IN ISLAM.

It had been said we could not meet
Or join in prayers for further grace—
Together reach Thy mercy seat—
Or mingle praise in the same place.

O Heavenly Father, Thou hast shown
To us, Thy loving faithful sons,
How brotherhood has quickly grown
Insep'able while time still runs.

In all the ages of the past,
In all the future years to come,
Thy name alone can bind us fast,
Whilst we can say, "Thy will be done."

Great Allah, Lord, our God, our King,
Who knowest what for us is best,
We praise Thy name and loudly sing
The fusion of the East and West.

In view of the terrible nature of the hostilities now going on all over the world, the following short prayer was added to those usually read at the Woking Mosque at the conclusion of the Sermon delivered by Maulvi Sadr-ud-Din on Sunday, September 20th:—

We beseech Thee, O God, to assist with Thy Almighty power, our brethren now engaged in a struggle in support of truth, justice, and honour. Do Thou help our soldiers, both Christian and Muslim, and be Thou a comfort to those who mourn the loss of relations and friends.

* "Justice shall be done."

We may not rejoice in ill-deeds because they appear to bring certain advantages, we cannot praise the Germans for their dishonourable conduct in starting the war, but there is no doubt at all that healthy and happy results are already becoming manifest as the outcome of one of the most outrageously unfair wars in the history of the world. Paradoxical as it may seem, we are, in a sense, great gainers through this scourge; but for the urgency of the case and the need for concerted action, we should never have known, as we now know, how deeply attached we of the British Empire really are to one another. It is not merely a case of "English speaking races," but a case of over three hundred millions of our Eastern brethren as well. Thus out of the jangling clash of arms and falling buildings there is one note of sweetness which will echo for ever down the aisles of futurity—it is the note of brotherly love established between peoples who delight not in war, but, with true Islamic sincerity, in upholding the *Right* at any cost.

PRAYER AND THE MUSLIM.

"MOST honour to the men of prayer
 Whose Mosque is in them everywhere,
 Who amid revel's wildest din,
 In war's severest discipline
 On rolling deck, in thronged bazaar
 In stranger land, however far,
 However different in their reach
 Of thought, in manners, dress or speech,
 Will quietly their carpet spread,
 To Mecca turn the humble head,
 And, as if blind to all around
 And deaf to each distracting sound,
 In simple language God adore,
 In spirit to His presence soar
 And in the pauses of the prayer,
 Rest as if wrapt in glory there."

MARCUS DODS, D.D.

MAGNANIMITY lies in forgetting any obligation thou hast done to others, and not mentioning it as "I have done this for you," nor even ascribing it thyself.

JUNAID.

THE WAR AND THE PRINCIPLES OF CHRIST.

TO THE EDITORS OF THE "ISLAMIC REVIEW."

DEAR SIRS,—In your current issue, on the War and the Principles of Christ, may I make a few comments on your remarks?

Tolstoy's interpretation of Christ's principles, as "Never be angry," "Never retaliate," "Love your enemies," &c., is quite right; only that Tolstoy did not show us how it can be done. It can be done if we have full faith in God. A man assaulted in our public streets should not assault back, but hand his assailant over to the keepers of the peace. So, a man who is fully aware of God's literal omnipresence, and is walking in harmony with God, and loving God supremely, will not, if he is assaulted, retaliate, but will hand over, or leave to God to deal with, his antagonist. God will assuredly in these conditions sooner or later undertake for His own, if his own exhibits the true spirit of Christ. God's resources and ways and means of delivering are infinite. Try this personally and in sincerity, for a time if you like, and you will find that it will work. But individuals and nations forget God more or less, and will not walk perfect with Him; so they begin to undertake for themselves and so suffer more or less in proportion. Although the so-called Christian peoples fall far short of the Christian principles, that does not bring down or lower the principles, it rather shows how high they are. I enclose you an article of mine on "The True Meaning of Some of the Things of Christ." If you care to publish this letter or the article, or extracts therefrom, you are welcome.—I am, yours sincerely,

J. J. BROWN, M.P.S.

300 Cathcart Road, Glasgow, September 17, 1914.

The learned gentleman believes that in the present crisis the Christian nations have fallen short of the Christian principles. He thinks that their incapacity to carry them out shows "how high they are." We, however, fail to agree with him. For the British subjects are fighting for the cause of truth and justice. Our men at the helm have done their level best to avert the war. They never took the initiative; they never meant to wage a war of aggression and spoliation. But when we are once dragged into it, when unprovoked invasions are threatened, and when Belgium, to whose covenant England should stand, is trampled, we will not listen to the pious untenable sermons that are preached from the pulpit. To defend our king, our nation, and our empire is religion. Does religion seriously teach us to suffer humiliation and retain a passive and callous

disposition when wanton violence is practised, when shameful outrages are committed on women, when sanctuaries are razed to the ground, when picture galleries and libraries are committed to devouring flames, and when barbarous and heinous atrocities are inflicted, when covenants are violated and laws infringed? We cannot relish such doctrines, and we cannot digest them consequently. We may be compelled to subscribe to such dogmas blindly, but we cannot carry them into effect with impunity. Such dogmas do not recognise the noblest susceptibilities in man. Devotion to the cause of truth and devotion to the cause of humanity is unquestionably more appreciable than "the blessed piety."

We would respectfully refer our correspondent to a familiar illustration: should a ruffian perpetrate violence on his household, would he stand an idle looker-on or defend the object of his honour? Can your chivalry survive in case you stick to your religious views? Can there remain a trace of self-sacrifice, devotion, and true chivalry by acting on such principles as are taught by the Christian fathers? If you spare the life of a murderer who butchers people in cold blood you are not kind; you are not exercising mercy; you are not extending forgiveness but you are abusing the Divine qualities of "honour" and "prudent retaliation" which have been implanted in us. You are rather countenancing the development of vice and evil ways and practices. God Himself purifies the earth of such wicked people by sending down visitations. Why should we not fulfil, as His vice-gerents, His Divine Will by administering punishment to those that rob mankind of their peace? The Quran enlightens us on the problem:—

"O believers! retaliation for bloodshedding is prescribed to you . . . but he to whom his brothers shall make any remission is to be dealt with equitably; and to him should he pay a fine with liberality. This is a relaxation from your Lord and a mercy. For him who after this shall transgress a sore punishment! But in this law of retaliation is your security for life, O men of understanding! to the intent that ye may fear God."

If a man commits fornication the offender must be chastised publicly, and no misplaced mercy should be shown:—

"The whore and the whoremonger, scourge each of them with a hundred stripes; and let not compassion keep you from carrying out the sentence of God, if ye believe in Allah and the last day: and let a party of the faithful witness their chastisement."

Islam lays down likewise that should an enemy make an invasion the country and the people must be defended. The

prophet of Islam put up with the maltreatment and violence of the detractors for no shorter a space of time than thirteen long winters. His devoted followers were always eager to follow his commands to the letter ; but his good nature would not inspire them with anything like agitation, much less revolt or insurrection. He despatched a party of about eighty men and women to Abyssinia, and himself fled to take shelter at Medina, into which he was hotly pursued. At last the warlike, relentless tribes conspired to make a concerted attack upon Medina and wipe out the man and his followers. Mohammad was an ideal man of true culture, a personality in whom one could study a beautifully-balanced disposition, and every sentiment and quality assigned a proper place. All qualities were called forth on their proper occasions : He was unanimously acknowledged as Al-ameen, the most trustworthy custodian and protector of trusts and rights ; he was an ideal philanthropist ; he was gifted with the most charitable and sympathetic heart ; he was very modest and free from conceit or arrogance ; he was humble, but marvellously brave. The vanquished foe always appreciated his magnanimity and forgiveness. The Quran describes him to this purpose :—

**“A noble model have ye in Allah's apostle, for all who
hope in Allah, and in the latter day, and oft remember
Allah.”**

So when he was hard pressed by the heavy odds of the united forces of Arabian tribes he came out of Medina armed with valour and intrepid courage which are denied to the impostor. Numbers could not prevail where truth and justice of cause were charged with indomitable spirit of bravery. The cause of truth, the cause of God, the cause of true sympathy and devotion got the better hand despite the overwhelming odds. We hope that we shall share the same Divine help, for we are following what is true and Divine, we are following the example of the prophet of God ; we have not gone to war for realising any selfish and sordid motives, we are defending the cause of truth and justice, and upholding and preserving the most sacred ties. We may be excused if we fail to appreciate the doctrines of the clergy. The Bible may condemn such a course as the British subjects have adopted, but our conscience, our heart, Islam, and the Quran approve of it. The Christian Church should not play the traitor in the time of the trouble of the British Empire. The pious Christian should refrain from serving Satan in the name of God. Shut the Bible during the war if you choose to be wise.

THE DEVOTION OF INDIA.

DESIRE TO BE FOREMOST IN THE CONFLICT.

THE King-Emperor has sent a message to the Princes and Peoples of India. The first part is in the same terms as the message to the Dominions, and it concludes as follows :—

To the Princes and Peoples of My Indian Empire :

Among the many incidents that have marked the unanimous uprising of the populations of My Empire in defence of its unity and integrity, nothing has moved me more than the passionate devotion to My Throne expressed both by My Indian subjects, and by the Feudatory Princes and the Ruling Chiefs of India, and their prodigal offers of their lives and their resources in the cause of the Realm. Their one-voiced demand to be foremost in the conflict has touched my heart, and has inspired to the highest issues the love and devotion which, as I well know, have ever linked My Indian subjects and Myself. I recall to mind India's gracious message to the British nation of good will and fellowship which greeted My return in February 1912, after the solemn ceremony of My Coronation Durbar at Delhi, and I find in this hour of trial a full harvest and a noble fulfilment of the assurance given by you that the destinies of Great Britain and India are indissolubly linked.

THE INDIAN ARMY.

SIMLA, September 9.

Lord Hardinge, in a speech in the Viceroy's Council, dealt with the despatch of troops from India to the seat of war. The following is the passage relating to this subject :—

It is no longer a secret that India has already despatched two splendid divisions of infantry to Europe and one cavalry brigade, while three more cavalry brigades will follow immediately. That we have been in a position to send over 70,000 combatants to fight for the Empire across the seas is a source of pride and satisfaction to India as a whole, and with the knowledge that practically all the Ruling Chiefs have placed their military forces and the resources of their States at the disposal of the Government it is clear that we are not at the end of our military resources.

Among the Chiefs selected to accompany the Expeditionary Force are the Maharajah Sir Pertab Singh, the Maharajahs of Bikanir, Patiala, Kishangarh, and Jodhpur, the Rajah of Ratlam, the Nawabs of Jaora, Sachin, and Bhopal, and also the Malik Umar Hayat.

CEMENTING THE EMPIRE.

The Press Bureau has issued a full summary of the proceedings in Council, which has been telegraphed to the Secretary for India. Speaking of the employment of the Indian Army in the War, the Viceroy said :—

It was, moreover, with confidence and pride that I was able to offer to his Majesty the first and largest military force of British and Indian troops for service in Europe that has ever left the shores of India. I am confident that the honour of this land and of the British Empire may be safely entrusted to our brave soldiers, and that they will acquit themselves nobly and ever maintain their high traditions of military chivalry and courage. To the people of India I would say at this time, let us display to the world an attitude of unity, of self-sacrifice, and of unswerving confidence under all circumstances in the justice of our cause and in the assurance that God will defend the right.

Speaking on the question of the emigration to British Colonies, his Excellency said : "The fact that in a few weeks' time our splendid Indian soldiers may be fighting side by side and shoulder to shoulder with our Colonial fellow-subjects against the common enemy is a guarantee of fair and generous treatment on both sides in a controversy of this nature."

The following passages occurred in an eloquent speech by Malabiya : India recognises her duty at this present moment and, God willing, will loyally and manfully discharge that duty, that no sacrifice of men or money will be grudged in order that the British arms should triumph, in order that the success of the British arms should establish the triumph of right over might, of civilisation over the military barbarism of Germany, of ordered freedom over military slavery.

In replying on the debate the Viceroy said there was nothing like comradeship in arms and joint participation in dangers and hardships of war to level distinctions, inspire mutual respect, and foster friendships. He added, "*I cannot help feeling that, as a consequence, better relations will be promoted amongst the component parts of the British Empire, many misunderstandings will be removed, and outstanding grievances will be settled in an amicable and generous manner. In this sense out of evil good may come to India, and this is the desire of us all.*"

THE INDIAN PRINCES.

The Secretary of State for India announces that in addition to the offers of service and assistance in connection with the war which have been made in India to the Viceroy, the following offers have been received from Chiefs and others residing in this country :—

The Maharajah and the Maharani Maji Sahiba of Bharatpur.—(1) The whole resources of their State ; (2) two motor-

cars and a chauffeur, with all expenses; (3) Rs. 2,000 to the Indian Relief Fund.

The Rajah of Akalkot.—Personal service in the field.

The Rajah of Pudukota.—“All I possess”: expresses his anxiety to serve in any capacity. Has placed his motor-car at the disposal of Government, and is returning to India to raise, subject to approval, a regiment of his subjects to release a Regular regiment.

The Gaekwar of Baroda.—All his troops and resources.

Mir Ghulam Ali Khan of Khairpur.—Personal service in the field.

On the reassembling of Parliament on September 9 both Houses were informed of the magnificent offers of service and money made in India to the Viceroy.

The outstanding features of an epoch-making recital were the selection of many Princes and nobles for active service, the acceptance of contingents from twelve States, the combination of various durbars to provide a hospital ship, gifts of horses, camels, and money for the purchase of machine-guns, and an offer by the Dalai Lama of 1,000 Tibetan troops for service.

THE GORGEOUS EAST IN FEE.

WESTMINSTER.

The House of Commons was aroused to a high pitch of grateful enthusiasm by the reading of the Viceroy of India's telegram. The story which Mr. Charles Roberts had to unfold to the House was unlike anything which had ever been heard in the Imperial Parliament. It fell on the ears like a romance from the East, with all its variety, movement, and colour. It was accepted as one of the finest tributes ever paid to the Imperial ideal.

Mr. Roberts told how the rulers of the Native States, numbering nearly seven hundred in all, have offered their personal services and the resources of their States for the war. The Viceroy has selected many Princes and nobles for active service. The veteran Sir Pertab Singh, Regent of Jodhpur, would not be denied his right to serve the King-Emperor in spite of his 70 years; his nephew, the Maharaja, who is but 16 years old, goes with him. Twenty-seven of the larger States in India maintain Imperial service troops, and the services of every corps were placed at the disposal of the Government.

Several specially notable instances of the generosity and eager loyalty of the Chiefs were warmly cheered as the gallant recital continued. There were 50 lakhs of rupees, a third of a million pounds sterling from the Maharaja of Mysore, the hospital ship Loyalty, the Chief of Gwalior's offer of large sums of money and of thousands of horses as remounts, and promises

of camels with drivers from the Punjab and Baluchistan. The Maharaja of Rewa has offered his troops, his treasury, and even his private jewellery for the service of the King-Emperor.

The House was profoundly moved by tidings of loyal messages and offers from Chitral and the Khyber tribes, and from the Nepal Durbar, beyond the borders of India. The most thrilling stroke came towards the end. The House heard with frank amazement, but with unbounded delight, that the Dalai Lama has offered 1,000 Tibetan troops for service under the British Government. The Viceroy added that lamas innumerable throughout the length and breadth of Tibet are offering prayers for the success of the British Army and for the happiness of the souls of all victims of the war. There was round upon round of cheers when an end was made of the reading of this unexampled document. Mr. Will Thorne supplied the most appropriate commentary. "Send a copy to the Kaiser," he suggested to the Prime Minister, amid general laughter.

Lord Crewe read the dispatch in the House of Lords, together with the King Emperor's stirring message to the Princes and peoples of India, with its grateful recognition of "their prodigal offers of their lives and their resources in the cause of the realm."—*The Times*.

WORDS OF WISDOM.

LISTEN to the words of wisdom,
Listen to the words of warning,
From the lips of the Great Spirit,
From the Master of Life Who made you ;

I am weary of your quarrels,
Weary of your wars and bloodshed,
Weary of your prayers for vengeance,
Of your wranglings and dissensions ;
All your strength is in your union,
All your danger is in discord ;
Therefore be at peace henceforward,
And as brothers live together.

I will send a Prophet to you,
A Deliverer of the Nations,
Who shall guide you and shall teach you,
Who shall toil and suffer with you.

If you listen to his counsels,
 You will multiply and prosper;
 If his warnings pass unheeded
 You will fade away and perish.

H. W. LONGFELLOW.

MAZZINI'S GOSPEL FOR TO-DAY.

**THE DESIGN OF GOD?—LOVE YOUR COUNTRY—
 RELIGION IS ETERNAL—THE NEW EPOCH
 —GATE TO A HIGHER LIFE.**

So beggared of earthly goods was the great Italian, Mazzini, when he was an exile in London, that he had to sell his very clothes for food.

"One Saturday," he says, "I found myself obliged to carry an old coat and a pair of boots to one of the pawnbrokers' shops, crowded on Saturday evenings by the poor and fallen, in order to obtain food for the Sunday."

And yet so spiritually rich was Mazzini that even to-day, being dead, he is able to scatter spiritual largesse to those who have not yet attained to the spiritual heights he reached over half a century ago when weary he trod our streets.

Here are some more of his messages for to-day. One cannot read his essays without being astonished at how appropriate they are to the present crisis.

GOD WILLS IT.

"The cry which has resounded in all great and noble revolutions, the 'God wills it, God wills it'! of the Crusades, will alone have power to rouse the inert to action, to give courage to the timid, the enthusiasm of sacrifice to the calculating, and faith to those who distrust or reject all merely human ideas.

"Prove to mankind that the work of progressive development to which you would call them is a part of the design of God, and none will rebel. Prove to them that the earthly duties to be fulfilled here below are an essential portion of their immortal life, and all the calculations of the present will vanish before the grandeur of the future. Without God you may compel, but not persuade; you may become tyrants in your turn; you cannot be educators or apostles."

LOVE YOUR COUNTRY.

"O my brothers, love your country! Our country is our Home, the House that God has given us, placing therein a numerous family that loves us, and whom we love; a family

with whom we sympathise more readily, and whom we understand more quickly, than we do others; and which, from its being centred round a given spot, and from the homogeneous nature of its elements, is adapted to a special branch of activity.

"Love your country. Your country is the land where your parents sleep, where is spoken that language in which the chosen of your heart blushing whispered the first word of love; it is the home that God has given you, that by striving to perfect yourselves therein, you may prepare to ascend to Him. It is your name, your glory, your sign among the people. Give it your thoughts, your counsels, your blood. Raise it up, great and beautiful, as it was foretold by our great men. And see that you leave it uncontaminated by any trace of falsehood or of servitude; unprofaned by dismemberment. Let it be one, as the thought of God."

ABHOR THE USURPING NATION.

"I abhor the usurping and monopolising nation, conceiving its own grandeur and force only in the inferiority and in the poverty of others; but who would not welcome with enthusiasm and love that people which, understanding its mission in the world, should find its security upon the progress of all surrounding it, and should be ready to sustain against the oppressor the cause of right and of eternal justice, violated in the oppressed?"

RELIGION IS ETERNAL.

"Religion is eternal. It will be the soul, the thought of the new world. Every man has in his own heart an altar, upon which, if he invoke it in earnestness, purity and love, the Spirit of God will descend. Conscience is sacred; it is free. But truth is one, and faith may anticipate the time when, from the free conscience of enlightened men, beneath the breath of God, shall be given forth a religious Harmony, more mighty, more potent in love and life, than any to which Humanity has yet lent ear."

PRESENTIMENT OF A NEW EPOCH.

"Whether as a real belief, or an enforced homage, the new epoch obtains its due acknowledgment from intellect, almost without exception. We all felt, both in heart and brain, the presentiment of a great epoch; and we have sought to make of the negations and analyses of the eighteenth century the banner of the faith of that epoch. Inspired by God to utter the sublime words—*regeneration, progress, new mission, the future*—we yet persist in striving to realise the material triumph of the programme contained in those words, with the instrument that served for the realisation of a mission now concluded."

YOU MAY KILL MEN, NOT IDEAS.

"When the Roman Senate ordained that the 'History of Cremutius Cordo' should be burnt, a Roman stood forth, saying:

Cast me also into the flames, for I know that history by heart! The day will come when Europe will give a like answer to your blind ferocity. You may kill men; you cannot kill a great idea."

DOCTRINE OF SOLIDARITY.

"Foremost and grandest amid the teachings of Christ were these two inseparable truths: *There is but one God; all men are the sons of God*; and the promulgation of these two truths changed the face of the world, and enlarged the moral circle to the confines of the inhabited globe. To the duties of men towards the Family and Country were added duties towards Humanity. Man then learned that wheresoever there existed a human being, there existed a brother: a brother with a soul immortal as his own, destined like himself to ascend towards the Creator, and on whom he was bound to bestow love, a knowledge of the faith, and help and counsel when needed."

NEVER DENY THE SISTER NATIONS.

"Never deny your sister nations. Be it yours to evolve the Life of your Country in loveliness and strength; free from all servile fears or sceptical doubts; maintaining as its basis the People; as its guide the consequences of its Religious Faith, logically and energetically applied; its strength, the united strength of all; its aims, the fulfilment of the mission given to it by God."

"War, like Death, is sacred; but only when, like Death, it opens the gates to a holier life, to a higher ideal. I hail the glorious emancipating battles of humanity, from Marathon down to our own Lignano, without which our municipal liberties would have been crushed in their bud; from those which won religious liberty for the half of Europe, down to those which, in our own time, summoned Greece from her grave of two thousand years to a second life; the blood-baptisms of mankind to a great mission, to be fulfilled only through martyrdom. But war, whenever not sanctified by a *principle* inscribed on its flag, is a crime—the foulest of crimes; soldiers, whenever they are not the armed apostles of progressive life and liberty, are nothing but wretched, irrational, hired cut-throats. And for *such* a war there may be momentary triumphs; never the beautiful rainbow of lasting heroic victory."

INTERNATIONAL POLICY.

"The ruling principle of international law will no longer be *to secure the weakness of others, but the amelioration of all through the work of all: the progress of each for the benefit of the others.*

"Reflect, then, seriously on the character of your international policy, for the honour and future of your land are entirely dependent on it. There are men who think they have accomplished their mission towards their country when they

have contracted a petty treaty of commerce with a Government that to-morrow may not see, or only put back for a few years, by base compliances, a situation of difficulty that must inevitably arise. These may be clever men for a time—influential party chiefs : but they are not statesmen.”—*Public Opinion*.

THE MOSQUE AT WOKING.

PASSING through the countryside in a swiftly-moving train one has little time to mark distinctive features of the landscape so that they remain fixed upon the memory, but to the passenger, as he nears the pretty little town of Woking, there appears something which seems so different from the general architecture—so splendid in its curtain of verdure, so apparent against the general background—that the attention is at once riveted to the spot. Standing out quite plainly is the outline of a Mosque, supreme sentinel of the One God in a land of Triune worship : the advance guard of Islam, portraying purity in its simplicity and whiteness. The dome, rising above the trees, seems to imply that there is something higher than ever-present Nature, and the Crescent at its highest pinnacle symbolises the acme of progress and perfection to which the human race can attain. Entering from the roadway by a path bounded by trees and shrubs, one immediately senses the feeling of peace which seems to pervade the atmosphere itself. The court-yard, bounded by a thick growth of bushes, leaves the picture to suddenly reveal itself to the visitor when he arrives at the gateway. Stand for a moment with me and gaze upon its lovely outlines. The great arched entrance, the lovely mosaic work entwining itself over the porch, the minarets rising at each angle, the lofty dome in the background, and immediately before us the fountain, throwing its jets of sparkling liquid, scintillating and glistening, kissed by the rays of the sun, set in a verdant carpet sprinkled with flowers, as the jewels in a beautiful garment. Surmounting the broad steps, let us enter. Removing the shoes, we immediately stand upon a carpet whose colour is only matched by the herbage outside. Above us is the high vaulted dome, set with several stars, which seem to represent the heavens above. Ahead we have the mihrab, with its beautiful decoration. “Allah,” that all-comprehensive Name, is written at its apex, and various chapters from the Holy Quran enhance its sides. To the right we see the mimbar with its carving, and ascending the steps we are confronted with a glorious piece of work which attracts at once. These are verses of the Holy Quran painted into one harmonious design, the whole being roofed with a golden dome. To the sight-seer alone it is unique, worth taking trouble to see even once in one’s life, but to those who go

deeper its significance is profound. Standing in its splendid isolation, it is a protest for Truth in a world of Falsehood, for Purity in a maze of Vice, for the proclamation of the Supreme Being in a universe of unbelief. Five times daily when the Azan, the significant call to prayer, breaks the silence, it is a reminder that God is ever present, that He exists, and that He alone is worthy of worship, that He will surely hear those who submit themselves to His Divine guidance and ask for His blessing. And of those who utilise this building? I will tell you. Unused, unoccupied it remained for years, its gardens never resounding with the muezzin's cry; its door only opened for the edification of a stray visitor. But suddenly a change is effected. Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din arrived in England and took up his quarters at the Memorial House. Henceforth the sacred building has been ever open to all. Each prayer has its quota of worshippers, Indian, Arab, and English, and visitors come daily to see its beauties and to learn something of Islam. The presence of the Mosque has been felt not only in the neighbouring townships, but in all the British Isles. Every Sunday it is crowded by those who feel that the prevailing faith in England can have no message, no code of life, no real benefit to the soul, and therefore the lectures which are delivered are the source of great profit to many. Several conversions have taken place in the town itself, and London sends its share of English Muslims who gather to praise God. Opposition has been aroused, but this we can realise is only the effect of the logic and reason which is promulgated from the Mosque; the clerics find that they must try to bail out their sinking ship before they are engulfed by the irresistible tide of Islam. On the gateway we have a board which states "The House of God is open to all." What a message. Not that you may pay for pews inside which will be your private property, not that if you belong to any other creed or denomination you should not tread the precincts, not that a certain kind of dogma is taught; the board does not state that it is "Church of England," "Baptist," "Wesleyan," or any of the four hundred different divisions of Christianity—no: one comprehensive word "all." Christian, Buddhist, Jew, Freethinker or Muslim are welcome to its portals to hear the Divine message of Islam. And what a contrast it makes to the petty squabbings of the fanatics of Europe who each take a different rendering of the same Book, and then proceed to condemn others who read it in a different light. Oh, how necessary it is to bring Islam to these benighted people, to make them realise that God is the Father of Humanity, that His revelations are not given to one chosen race, but that Humanity is the true Son of God. To teach that, instead of being so unworthy and putting the burden of sin upon another's shoulders, we must right ourselves, we must strive hard to conquer the evil in us, we must work

for the betterment of our fellow-creatures, we must obey the Will of Him that created us. A journal recently, speaking of life in London, which is typical of all English towns, says: "The individual church of the London populace still continues to be the public-house. In London the organisation of animalism seems complete. It has an enormous all-prevailing literature; the public-house at every street corner is its rendezvous; it has its code, its own public opinion, and is entirely satisfied with itself. One shudders in thinking of young lads sent up in their thousands year by year from country homes to join this mass of heathendom. . . . If drink is not at the bottom of all this vileness, it is at least its closest associate and ally. And with legislation there must be everywhere a renewed and better organised effort to penetrate this human jungle, to drain its morasses, to cut down its poison plants, to let in light and air—to make it, in short, a growing ground no longer for noxious weeds and loathsome creeping things, but for whatsoever things are lovely and of good report." Did the writer of these lines ever stop to think what a terrible picture he portrayed to the world, and that this is the outcome of what is termed "Christian Civilisation"? Jesus said that we should judge by the fruits, and this terrible picture is given by a Christian writer of London to-day after nearly 2,000 years of Christianity. What is his remedy? Does he call upon the Churches to stop this senseless drain upon the purses of people here, in order to send missionaries abroad to teach people who possess religions which are powerful for good, and which are heartily believed and acted upon? Does he ask for the return of these revered gentlemen to bring the light to the "heathendom" here? No: probably he would think this remedy even worse than the disease itself. Out in the mission field they are disunited and cannot quarrel frequently, but let them all be cramped into England, and probably the horrors of the Holy Inquisition would be as nothing to the devices they would find for despoiling and crushing each other. What, again, is his remedy? "Legislation." Where is the power of the Cross, of which we hear so much? Have people begun to realise that this dogma is a fraud and sham, and can be of no use in uplifting humanity? That he shows Christianity to be impotent is obvious: the Church having no remedy we must turn to legislation. What a sorry state of affairs. Here is the need for a religion which can and does uplift humanity, which is not a mere lip profession, which is not a field for displaying oratorical powers, which is not a faith of blind belief. The religion must be one that will appeal to man, that will make him realise that God exists and that He directs all things, that will teach him that mankind are brethren, that man is not a sinful, immoral, incapable being on a level with the four-footed beast, but that he has the highest potentialities which can raise him to the highest level, that he is the vice-regent of God Himself, and that by submitting to the will of the Supreme Being,

and by helping his fellow-creatures, he can open the gates of Paradise here upon this earth. Islam forbids drink and gambling ; thus the great curses of Christian lands disappear under the teaching of Muslim missionaries. It gives nobility to the soul, charity to mankind, and a code of life that regulates every moment of one's life. Uplifting all as it does, can we not say that the true remedy for all these curses, for the awful state of affairs that the above writer describes—again I repeat the only remedy is Islam. And so the Woking Mosque stands as the gateway of Islam in the West. Let us hope that the day is not far distant when our community here will be numbered by thousands, and that mosques will be opened in every city of the United Kingdom. Legislation must be faulty, but Islam is Perfection.

KHALID SHELDRAKE.

ISLAMIC REVIEW.—It cannot fail to arouse interest in many to read what we quote in the following in this connection from the introduction to that most remarkable book, "The Rise of Christendom," in which Edwin Johnson, M.A., the author of the book, traces most of the current Christian theology to a Muslim origin. His words, given below, have after all proved prophetic, and an occasion has arisen for a thinking Westerner to learn of a religion, so grossly misrepresented hitherto, which can exactly suit his matter-of-fact, businesslike temperament. We wish our readers in the West would ruminate on what the author puts before them in the following quotation :—

"I have looked with interest on the first mosque that has been built on English ground. Our Mohammaden friends may desire to learn something of us, but it is we who have to learn from them in respect to the great Mediæval tradition. They are the masters of it, they are of the orthodox Church : theirs is the sublime theology and the inflexible logic. We owe it to the common civility of the great Empire to which we belong to endeavour to correct the vulgar fables which have prevailed since the fourteenth century in respect to their religion, and to desist from affronting them with what they must ever regard as a corrupt version of their own sacred legends. We need no more controversy, but mutual intelligence. And should a genuine study of Oriental systems be destined to flourish in the West, it will be a means of promoting that truly catholic and all-tolerant sentiment which is suitable to the British no less than to the Roman Empire."

THE WAR AND THE MUSLIMS.

From the Standpoint of a British Muslim.

TO ALL WHOM IT MAY CONCERN, THESE—

Europe is now in the throes of awful conflict. The greatest war in the history of mankind is raging both on land and sea. No such mass of fighting men has been arrayed against each other since civilisation or humanity first left a record of its struggles. Men trained to arms, in scientific method, and supported by every mechanical invention and device of death-dealing weapons that the mightiest brains of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries have been able to construct. Guns belch their thunders and ranks roll on ranks, and the bravest and strongest of the people go down to destruction on the red-field of battle.

It may seem strange that such a state of things should be possible in this age of enlightenment, of culture, and morals, when art and science and literature has drawn the nations closer to each other than at any previous period of the world's history, when men are bound by ties unknown in olden times. Yet it is so; deep down in the innermost recesses of the physiological and the psychological structure of man, with all his high aspirations and intellectual attainments, resides those primal feelings and impulses which in certain circumstances rush to the surface, and he stands forth naked and unashamed the apotheosis of martial ardour and valour: the red-god incarnate in word and deed. Those at home, too old or too weak to be with him in the carnage, pray for his success, sing songs of the glories of his sires, and pour out pæans of praise when he triumphs. For the deeds that are doing just now on the continent are deeds that stir the blood, quicken the pulse, and raise throb after throb of emotion in sympathy.

The news has been flashed all over the Empire, aye! over the world, and proclaimed by numberless papers and voices that in this great struggle India has resolved to stand by us, and that she is now hurrying her sons to the front in their thousands. Men of every race and every religion under those bright skies of the East I remember so well: brilliant sapphire in the noonday and at night the darkest blue. They come, dauntless, daring, determined, and joyous, the flash of battle in their eyes and of valour on their brows. Gurka, Punjabi, Rajput, Pathan and Sikh, side by side, in life or in death to the end.

THE MUSLIMS ARE COMING.

Led by Muslim chiefs and princes—those swarthy “Followers of the Prophet,” whose fathers loved death better than

life in the cause of Islam, and with all the ancient valour for which the Islamite is famed.

ALLAHU ACKBAR.

Now that the Muslims of India are coming to join the firing line, now that the brethren left in India are putting forth every effort to support the Empire by other means, the question may be asked of us : What is the position of Islam in regard to the contest ?

What does the Holy Quran say about war ? Does it say anything ? Yes, the Quran says a great deal about the Muslim position in regard to war. It could not be otherwise. Islam was born amid strife and conflict, and the first Muslims were baptised in the lap of battle. *Islam in its early stages was forced to draw the sword in self-defence, and compelled to fight for its very existence.* It was, therefore, imperative that the Prophet should lay down rules of guidance for his followers so that they might know how to act on every occasion and in all circumstances. The Quran, therefore, contains many references, and lays down many rules of conduct. We do not require to go over the whole book. It will be sufficient for our purpose to take one Sura, that entitled "The Cow" (II). I here give the verses in full for reference :—

Verse 86—"And fight for the cause of God against those who fight against you : but commit not the injustice of attacking them first : God loveth not such injustice."

Verse 87—"And slay 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 in the sacred mosque, unless they attack you therein : but if they attack you slay them. Such is the reward of the *oppressors*."

Verse 88—"But if they desist then, verily, God is gracious, merciful.

Verse 89.—"Fight, therefore, against them until there be no more *oppression*, and the only worship be that of God : but if they desist, then let there be no hostility, save against the wicked."

Verse 212.—"War is prescribed to you : but to this ye have a repugnance."

Noldéke puts this Sura down as the earliest of those delivered at Medina. Rodwell is practically of the same opinion, although, apparently, thinking some of the verses earlier and others later. The exact date is not important for our purpose, but it is evident it was delivered when Medina was threatened and the Muslims were being harried by the Meccans and the Arab tribes in the vicinity ; and it is as well to remember that point. An examination of the above translation will show that I have made use of two words not usually adopted. I have placed them in italics

for reference. My reason is to make the meaning plain to English readers. Instead of the word "oppression" Rodwell has "civil discord," and in a footnote explains the phrase as meaning :—

"Their driving you out of Mecca, or *the temptation (to idolatry).*"

Muhammed Ali, of Qadian, says :—

"The word *fitnat-un* (original for seduction) indicated originally a burning with fire, and hence affliction, or a trial or civil war, or slaughter or seduction. As used in this, it means seduction, meaning the seduction of the Muslims from the true religion."

To a Britisher, therefore, the meaning is better conveyed by the word "oppression," meaning to oppress or persecute a person or persons so as to compel them to give up their religion. For the same reason I have made use of the word "oppressors," in preference to Rodwell's "infidels," as the verse plainly refers to those responsible for the oppression, and not to persons now designated infidels according to the common English use.

It seems to me the Muslims have here, in the verses quoted, a sure guidance how to act in any crisis such as the present. A clear, clean-cut path along which they may travel in safety, in conformity with the dictates of their religion, of their duty to humanity and God. There can be for them no middle path, no by-way into which they may turn so as to shun the issue. The message has been delivered, and the message is plain.

A true Muslim, acting according to the ordinances laid down to him, can go to war only on certain conditions, strict conditions, and when those conditions are in operation he is only fulfilling his duty in so doing. The conditions, speaking generally, are :—

First.—He is at liberty to make war on those who are in arms against him; namely, he is at liberty to defend himself against attack, and to retaliate if it is in his strength to do so.

He may if he so wills turn the other cheek to the smiter, but it is not compulsory for him to do so. Bravery and powers are as much ideals of the true Muslim as chivalry, justice, kindness, truth, goodness and mercy.

Secondly.—He is at liberty to make war on oppressors or persecutors; on those who create civil discord and who attempt to seduce him from the truth, so being that the oppressors are hostile to the State of which he is a member or with which his State is in alliance, as exemplified by the Prophet himself on numerous occasions.

Such are the general conditions under which the Muslims may go to war. It is our place now to see how far those con-

ditions exist in the present case. It might be asserted that the British Empire and the German Empire went to war, and that it was the duty of the Muslim members of the British Empire to stand by that Empire in its hour of need, and I am quite sure an appeal such as that would reach the heart and stir the soul of every Muslim. Yet to be quite sure of our ground and of the righteousness of our action we must go further. We must know the conditions and understand the principal reasons which made the British people throw down the gauge of battle and allow the sword to decide.

During the first stages of the imbroglio our interest was only of a secondary nature, our honour was not at stake neither was our position threatened. When Austria and Servia quarrelled over the murder of the Archduke our interests were not touched at any point, and we were quite willing to act the part of arbitrators, although it seemed to the most of us that the Austrian argument was only a means to an end long contemplated, and the murder of the Crown Prince only made an excuse for a long previously thought out course of action. When Russia and Germany began to mobilise it was clear even to those not versed in the diplomacy of those nations that the position was serious and war almost inevitable. Yet Britain, having nothing to gain nor anything to lose up to that point, attempted, through her statesmen, to bring the Powers involved to terms, doing her utmost in the cause of humanity to bring about an understanding, delay warlike preparation, and insure peace.

BRITAIN'S STRENUOUS EFFORTS IN THE CAUSE OF PEACE WERE IN VAIN.

As Mr. Asquith put it in his great speech at Edinburgh :—

“Through the efforts of my right hon. friend and colleague, Sir Edward Grey, the conditions of a peaceful settlement of the actual controversy were already within sight, when on July 31 Germany, by her own deliberate act, made war a certainty.”

Germany actually rushed matters before the efforts of our Government had time to mature. Her ill-tempered and overbearing demands of the intentions of the Russian and French Governments, especially the latter, and her sudden declaration of a state of war, hastened the outbreak of actual hostilities. Britain was left with no option but to discontinue the attempt to arrive at a peaceful understanding.

Now the effective line for a French invasion of Germany or for a German invasion of France lies through southern Belgium. Belgium is a small nation and was not at all concerned in the quarrel between those great Powers on her eastern and western borders. But she was concerned about her own neutrality and integrity, both of which had been guaranteed by the Powers

involved and Britain. As a signatory to the agreement, Britain at once asked the French Government if they intended to respect the neutrality of Belgium; the answer was in the affirmative—Yes. The same question was put to the German authorities.

THE REPLY OF GERMANY WAS EVASIVE.

She could not promise, but she would be willing to guarantee that Belgian integrity would be restored after the war. Such a reply was not satisfactory. It was not good enough for Britain, and on receiving an appeal from the people of Belgium and reports of the violation of her territory, our Government at once sent an ultimatum to Germany demanding that she respect the neutrality of Belgium. Failing a reply to our demand in the time allowed, Britain declared war.

OUR HONOUR WAS AT STAKE.

We gave our word, our bond, to maintain the neutrality and the integrity of Belgium, and we could not stand by and see her territory violated. To have looked on unmoved would have been to break our moral obligations, our solemn promise, would have besmirched our honour and placed us in such a position of shame that no nation on earth would henceforth have trusted the word or the signature of Britain. That was the principal on which we declared war. By her haste in bringing about the outbreak of hostilities, her pushing matters while we were doing our best to find a peaceful solution, it is plain that Germany all along desired war.

There were other reasons, indirect, why we should have embarked in the conflict, some active at the time, others which might have forced our hands and brought about our interference sooner or later. Those reasons were not and could not have been part of the actual controversy, yet they are weighty. For years we as a nation have been on terms of friendship with France, and in the face of that friendship we could not have looked on and seen France humiliated. The complete defeat and devastation of that country would have necessitated action on our part. The next indirect point is of the utmost importance, especially to an understanding of the whole affair. Germany was a vast military camp—a fighting machine built on the most scientific methods. Within certain limits no one can blame her; every nation has a right to safeguard its own interests. But the limit is reached and militarism of a nation becomes a danger when it has reached the point that it threatens the freedom and liberties of other independent States. Within the last few decades Germany has been piling up armaments at an enormous speed, extending them both on land and sea on such a scale that her financial resources have been strained to the uttermost. There can be no doubt of the fact that she was doing so with the purpose of making war on some

nation or nations. Her navy could only mean that a stroke was meant at Britain, and must have been intended for our overthrow. We should not judge her hastily. As proof of the contention we only point to the facts. She refused to come to any terms with us when we suggested an agreement with her on lines of restriction of both navies, to keep them within bounds. We were willing to meet her, but she declined. One may surmise that our willingness to make such an agreement, and our endeavour to preserve peace at the beginning of the present crisis, may have led her to the conclusion that we were afraid and did not wish to oppose her in battle. Then we have the

TESTIMONY OF HER OWN WRITERS.

She aimed at the domination of Europe, and the principal item on her programme was the overthrow and disintegration of the British Empire. Germany was in the hands of the military party of the State, and its militants, with the Kaiser at the head, wanted to dominate and dictate laws to the world. When we consider how the Germans have treated the natives of Togoland and other colonies in Africa by a barbarous method of systematic cruelty, our Eastern brethren can imagine what it would be like to change the British Raj for a German Raj, and they may thank Allah the British arm is still strong enough to maintain the honour of the Empire and uphold the glory of the island race.

We do not go to war lightly at any time. On no previous occasion have we done more to avoid a conflict. We acknowledge the debt science and art and literature owes to German intellectualism, but we recognise that for a generation that that intellect has been mainly utilised for the purpose of perfecting the machinery of destruction, and in the raising of a military power great enough to dominate all others. We have, in conclusion, gone to war for three outstanding reasons, summed up in the words of Mr. Asquith in the speech referred to :—

First.—“To vindicate the sanctity of treaty obligations, and of what is called the public law of Europe.”

Second.—“To assert and to enforce the independence of free States, relatively small and weak, against the encroachments and the violence of the strong.”

Third.—“To withstand, as we believe in the best interests not only of our own Empire but of civilisation at large, the arrogant claim of a single Power to dominate the development of the destinies of Europe.”

That is my case, ye Muslims. It is for you now to decide if the conditions which forced Britain to go to war are parallel with the conditions laid down in the Holy Quran under which a Muslim is justified in so doing, and whether or not the Muslims are justified in supporting the British Empire and

the Home Government on this great issue. My opinion is, *they are*. The Muslims are only doing their duty and acting in accordance with Quranic law in helping Britain by every means in their power ; by assisting her morally and materially in breaking for ever this horrible system of militarism which for decades has been crushing civilisation, ruining the resources of the nations, stifling economic and mental development, retarding moral advancement and impoverishing and draining the very life-blood of the people.

Ethically, this war on our part is for the rights of neutrals, for justice to the weak, for mental and social freedom. It is against oppression and civil discord and the tyranny of one nation to dictate to all others. It is being waged to throw off some of the great moral evils against which Islam wages war continually, and against which the Prophet invoked and his followers fought. At least, that is how it appears to me.

"War is prescribed to you, but to this ye have a repugnance." The words were spoken by the Prophet to the Exiles and Helpers who at Medina were struggling in self-defence to save themselves from extermination. As Muslims they were averse to war, but war had been forced upon them ; such is the meaning to be drawn from the circumstances and the text. We were averse to war ; war is at no time part of our programme ; we tried our best to bring about peace and to save Europe from the horrors of military strife. We were unsuccessful in those endeavours.

WAR HAS BEEN FORCED UPON US.

We are now going to see it to a finish, and that the finish is in our favour. No effort shall be spared to bring it to a satisfactory conclusion, to enable the world to breathe again, and to free it from the degrading and crushing burden it has been suffering from for years. Even at the end we shall have to remember the words of the Prophet : "But if they desist, then let there be no hostility." This does not mean that we are to cease fighting immediately the foe desire to do so, but that we are to cease fighting when the enemy ask for peace and at the same time agree to right the wrong, promising to desist from oppression, civil discord, and those conditions which brought about the war. That is the duty before us, that is the end for which we must aim, on which all our strength must be concentrated. Yet we have also to remember : "But if they desist, then, verily, God is gracious, merciful." When Mecca and paganism lay prostrate before the Prophet on that January day of 630 A.D., in spite of all he and his followers suffered at their hands, he freely forgave them—the finest example of clemency and mercy in history. It behoves us, therefore, to study his words in connection with his acts, and to read the verse in the light of his example. So we, too, in the hour of success will require to be gracious and merciful. Justice we shall have to

demand, and justice we shall have to get, for the sake of the widows and the orphans, and the towns and fields of Belgium and France wantonly and senselessly destroyed, for the raped women and the burned homes and murdered men. But in doing justice we shall require to see that the innocent do not suffer through our action. We shall require to overthrow oppression and make the oppressors pay, but our justice must be tempered with mercy, and take care that we do not in turn become ourselves oppressors and act unjustly. Never in any circumstances must we blame or condemn a whole nation for the attitude, policy, and actions of a few. That is the law of Islam, and the noblest aspiration of humanity.

The Muslims of India are now in the fighting line. We are certain that the honour of Islam is safe in their keeping. They will remember the gentle deeds and matchless magnanimity of Abd-el-Kader ; the mercy and goodness of Salah-ud-din ; and the justice and nobility of Akbar, India's grandest Emperor. Those ideals of chivalry, courtesy and prowess, which in the palmy days of Islamic civilisation were the aim of every Muslim knight and made their fathers respected in the East and West, will be the guiding stars to lead them on to victory. We trust them and shall watch with pride their actions. They shall weave still brighter laurels for the Muslim brow and add new glories to the Muslim name.

J. PARKINSON.

AN APPROACH TO ORIENTAL IMAGINATION.

"NO FLOWERS."

BRING me no flowers when I am dead,
Lay thou no lilies on my bier,
And for a reason be it said :
"She loved them so when she was here."

"They were her friends. How could she bear
That they should wither in the cold,
Or, buried with her body, share
The dark corruption of the mould?"

No flowers at all when I am dead,
Lest my wayfaring spirit come,
By scent of dying blossoms led,
To grieve in pity o'er my tomb.

TERESA HOOLEY.

DOES ISLAM FAVOUR THE SECLUSION OF WOMEN?

A MUSLIM lady relates that her sister's husband was with the Holy Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him!) in twelve expeditions, and her sister was *with her husband in six of them*. She says: "*We used to attend the sick and nurse the wounded.*"

A woman asked the Holy Prophet whether a woman who had no sheet to cover herself might stay at home. The Holy Prophet said that her neighbour should share her sheet with her, and they should attend what is good and *be present in the gatherings of the believers*. The Holy Prophet said to his wives "God permits you to go out for your wants."

OFTEN it is stated by those who are ignorant of the true facts that Islam condemns women to be shut up in the house, and that they must not be seen abroad. I would recommend these people to read the above passages, and think a little for themselves. So many times it has been said, that it is almost a common belief that Christianity raised the status of women, whereas Islam degrades women to the level of a household slave. If we take the first paragraph alone the absolute lie is given to these pernicious ideas, and Muslim women in days gone by went even to war with their men-folk, encouraging them and acting as nurses during the campaigns. If a woman is to be shut up in a house, how then could she accompany the troops? Again, we read that a woman, being poor, asked that she might be allowed to stay at home because she had no clothes to present herself in the company of the Muslims. The Holy Prophet's reply gave an opportunity for charity on the part of the neighbour, and at the same time he clearly stated that women must *attend all the gatherings of the people*. How, then, could one say that women must be confined to their own homes? Also, there is the question of the many wants of ladies. Could a man purchase articles which are peculiarly feminine? Certainly not; and Muhammad told his wives that they should go out to make their purchases. Let us examine why there was any necessity for any statement on this subject. The conditions and customs prevailing in Europe are certainly changed from those of days gone by, and the veil which is worn by ladies here is a relic of those days when no decent woman uncovered her face in the company of strangers. In the West nudity is regarded as the perfection of art, and so we can see the classic sculptures and studies in the nude in the various galleries and houses of Europe. Women go to the

opera with dresses cut very low round the shoulders, and which are gauzy, showing the contour of the form beneath. This is regarded as quite proper. Women have absolute freedom of will to come and go as they please, and to meet men and women where they choose. In fact, there is complete social intercourse. If we analyse the results, we find that this is a very doubtful blessing. We find that passion is aroused by the exhibition of an arm or shoulder, and unconsciously evil thoughts obtrude themselves. We find that women are betrayed every day, and that misconduct is exceedingly rife. If we look upon the enormous number of divorces which have been granted during the past few months alone, it serves to show that this freedom has had results which are far from beneficial. It is common knowledge that morality is very low in Europe at the present day, and vice is prevalent quite openly in all our cities. Prostitution is largely on the increase, and that dread disease which it spreads is the subject of much anxiety on the part of the medical fraternity. On the other hand, Islam does not allow this *unlimited* intercourse, but encourages women to conduct themselves in such a way that *morality* may be *strengthened by their presence*. Islam *never* forbids a woman to attend the Mosque or public gatherings, or to go shopping or to visit friends; but it *does* require that she shall clothe herself decently, and that her conduct shall be above blame. Women often spoke with and complained to the Holy Prophet, who was himself a pattern of conduct for mankind in their relations with the fair sex; they mingled with the believers, and had freedom within proper limits; but a Muslim woman would be horrified at some of the actions and dresses of Western women, which appear to the latter as quite proper. If we find a certain seclusion in certain Eastern countries, it is *not* the result of the teaching of Islam, it is *not* the result of the practice of the Holy Prophet and his followers, it is *not* Islamic law, but it is the *force of circumstances* which has rendered this limited seclusion necessary. It obtained in Greece, in Persia and India *before* the advent of Islam; and as a social custom it continued, regulated and restrained from excess by the example of our Holy Prophet and his followers. Let us take one reason: If a country is peopled by different races whose religious customs differ, so much so that what to one would be vice would be merit and virtue to the other, whose ways are strange to each other, some who respect women and others who look upon her merely as an instrument to gratify desire, is this not a potent reason why women should be carefully protected? Women by nature are less capable of defending themselves than men, and the honour of a woman should therefore be a foremost thought. Again, we have countries in which are soldiers of an alien Power of the ruling race, and we know that the military, cut off from home ties, seek satisfaction. Here comes the danger that a pure woman must face

if she goes about in a promiscuous fashion, as in the West. Where the people are of one race, and the military are of that race, we often hear of rape and criminal assault. Then realise what a woman of a conquered race would expose herself to, should she take absolute freedom of movement. Whilst I know and state that purdah is *not* a teaching of Islam, that it was *never* preached nor ordered by our Holy Prophet, *nor did it obtain* in the freedom of Arabia under *his* rule; yet I am in favour of a limited purdah where social necessities render it of service in protecting woman against any indignity or assault. The misery of homes broken up by this illicit intercourse in the West, and the frequency of seduction and assault, the prevalence of divorce in spite of the fact that it costs a large amount to obtain a decree nisi, the flaunting vice of our cities, and the immoral conversations between even the young which we hear every day in the streets, leads the unbiassed thinker to deplore this unlimited freedom which has produced such dire results. I do not say that this state of things is the outcome of Christianity, but one must confess that the religion of the Cross is impotent to check these evils. Really, it is a time of indifference to religious matters, and, although nominally Christian, people have lost faith, and those whose minds grasp what the future has in store are looking for something higher, something spiritual and yet practical, which will teach the best form of morality, and give the means for obtaining such. Vague metaphysics may have suited an age when people were in such a state of development that parables became necessary for their education, but mankind have outgrown this stage and must be taught the truth in a manner which admits of no interpolation or misunderstanding. Islam gives us the message of God in its pure form, it gives us a duty to mankind, and at the same time a code of life. There is nothing which is not practical, logical and reasonable, and as a special reform we can point to Muslim lands as free from three scourges of Christendom—drink, gambling and prostitution—which canker the growth of the West.

Those who say that Islam favours seclusion of women should remember the words of the Prophet—"be present in the gatherings of the believers." The real truth is that those who spread this report are *deliberately lying*; they have interested motives, and it is *not* the result of ignorance on their part, but of *malice aforethought*. What fit term can we use that will designate such conduct? May we ask if this is the product of 2,000 years of Christianity? If it is so, then is not the scale of morality very low, and do we not need a change, do we not want something purer? Let Christians read for themselves and dissociate from these people who write and speak what *they themselves know to be false* in order to obtain notoriety or money to carry on their nefarious business.

THE OCCIDENT.

BIBLE PROBLEMS.

THE STORY OF THE "FALL."

NOTE that in the story as told in Genesis iii. there is no mention of a "Fall"; that term was manufactured afterwards in orthodox "Christian" theology. Probably the story originated in the literature of Babylon, and was appropriated by Jewish writers after the Captivity. For it was in Babylonian and Persian theology that the dualism existed of God and the enemy or evil spirit in the form of a "serpent."

Of course, the story cannot be taken as real history. It represents what was thought at the remote period when it originated. No one can read it intelligently and believe that what it describes actually happened. As history it is quite incredible. We cannot think that God was heard walking in the garden. Nor is it possible that the man and woman could hide themselves from God so that the Almighty knew not where they were, and needed to call out to the man, "Where art thou?" God did not curse the serpent, and make it crawl as a punishment, for serpents have never walked upright. Neither did God curse the ground by making it bring forth thorns and thistles, for thorns and thistles came from the ground before man existed on the earth. God did not make coats for the man and the woman, and it is not true that God was afraid of man knowing too much, and that He expelled the man and the woman from the garden to prevent them from eating of the tree of life which would give them immortality, for nothing could make a fleshly body immortal, and the soul within the body was of its own nature immortal. The story is unreasonable; it does not agree with the facts of life, and is therefore not true. But it is a true account of what was thought by those who wrote it.

God's part in the story is only what might be expected under such a poor conception of the nature of God as is there indicated. He was thought to be like unto a man—jealous, changeable, revengeful; threatened a death penalty for the offence committed which did not happen; and was afraid of the growing power of the creature he had made.

The man and the woman were only seeking knowledge. To know the difference between good and evil is necessary for any progress or improvement; and there was nothing discreditable in the woman's conduct, nor in that of the man. The man merely told the plain truth, and there is not any sign of cowardice in what he said.

The way to gain knowledge is by experiment, by trying and testing things. Disobedience is morally bad if the authority

disobeyed is that of conscience or of a power worthier than ourselves. In this case the discovery that certain acts were right and others wrong brought a sense of guilt when what was thought to be the wrong thing was done. The voice of conscience was disobeyed, and this was recognised as the voice of God. There was the temptation to do what was thought to be the wrong thing and the decision to test whether there was any real danger in it. It was the daring spirit of adventure into the unknown, without which discovery and new knowledge cannot be. It was not a fall, but rather an ascent—a fall only which teaches how to rise. By our mistakes we learn the distinction between good an evil, and so it was with the man and woman in the story.

The apparent doctrine that work is a curse is untrue. It is man's greatest—or one of his greater blessings. Without work man cannot live. Work is not a curse, of itself or in itself, but only when it is evil work, or when it is slavery and made an end and not a means to the toiler's betterment.

The story disproves the infallibility of the Scriptures by its own errors. It can easily be accounted for. In the remotest times of man's ignorance he would wonder how the knowledge of good and evil first came, and how the sense of guilt was first born. He would be puzzled to know why it was that serpents crawled, and how it was that thorns and thistles grew, and why the heavy burdens of work were put upon man. And this story gives us some of man's guesses at truth.

Of course the story has much meaning. It indicates the vitality of conscience, and bears witness to man's striving to become as wise as God—in other words, his aspiration to become Godlike. The paradise which he lost was that of ignorance and idleness and self-indulgence, exchanged for a life of industry and progress, of increasing knowledge and of complete life.

It is a pity that Hebrew and Christian theology have built upon such a foundation the doctrine of the Fall of Man, for the story does not justify it.

* * * * *

The following is sent by a reader in Gloucester, aged 85 :—

To believe the story in Genesis one must be able to believe that God made a tree good for man, and then said He would kill any one who cut the fruit thereof ! and then made a tree to keep man alive, and called up supernatural powers with swords to bar the way to it !!

The story is a cunningly devised fable of priest-craft, and therefore these questions are not pertinent.

The infallibility of the Old Testament—which Jesus called "traditions of the elders" and denounced—rests only on the Word of a Jew and is not supported by the text. The claim has never been put forward for the New Testament. A careful

and prolonged study of the Bible, and of history bearing upon it, shows that the Old Testament is folk lore of the Jews—the Gospels, folk-lore of early Christians—the Acts and Epistles a mixture of both, with some additions to support the “scribes and pharisees, play-actors” who have really edited, for the most part, from immediately after the writing of the first chapter, and the Revelation is an imaginative sequel to the whole.

Folk-lore shows that hundreds of ages before the Bible some men put themselves forward as superior in the favour of the Father Spirit, and as having a magical power over the laws of Nature and over the demons who sent disease, bad crops, &c., &c. These called themselves medicine men, magicians, wizards and other tribal names, but all had the same object—to dominate man and make him pay. They were cunning enough to know they could not do this without making man think meanly of himself, and lose confidence in the loving Fatherhood of the Great Father. Hence the invention of the “Fall of Man.”

The garden of Eden, with its tree of knowledge and tree of life, was an idea of primitive man hundreds of ages before Bible times.

So was magic in blood, adopted in Exodus xii. 7. So was magic in wood, adopted 2 Kings iv. 29, vi. 5, &c., &c. So was magic in hair, see story of Samson. So was magic in spittle, Mark vii. 33, viii. 23; John ix. 6.

The “day of judgment” with a son of God as advocate and meditator for man; virgin-birth of God-child at Bethlehem, with a star to show the place, and Magi (magicians, medicine-men) to see and endorse the fact; murder and miraculous resurrection of the Virgin-child; and the eating the flesh and drinking the blood of what is sacrificed to please “God,” are all ideas of primitive man brought into the Bible at various periods by the medicine men, priests, or whatever else they called themselves, of the ecclesiastical, separatist, cult.

—*The Unitarian Monthly.*

THE QURAN

ON

THE EVILS OF DRINK.

O Believers! Wine and games of chance . . . are only an abomination of Satan's work! Avoid them that you may prosper. Only would Satan sow hatred and strife among you by wine and games of chance, and turn you aside from the remembrance of God and from prayer.

—The Quran, V. 92-93.

WORDS full of truth were pronounced thirteen hundred years ago as a warning to a community similarly addicted to drink as the various nations in the West. They present as good a warning to a Muslim to-day as in the days of the Holy Prophet. It is a hopeful sign that the Western conscience has also awakened to it. They have begun to distinguish between alcoholic spirits and wines. Limits are recommended and excess deprecated. But is there any wine without its effect of stupefying the human brain? If not, the mind, inebriated though slightly, disables the man from exercising proper self-control. One is not the same as he was before he quaffed his first cup of wine. Judgment begins to fail, and firmness of resolution gives way. Hence any drink which is intoxicating, though only in case of excess, has been prohibited in Islam. It is pitiful to note that strong drink is regarded almost as a necessity of life in Christendom, but the misery, disease, and pauperism which it brings in its train is simply shocking. A writer in an English magazine a few years ago summarised in the following passage the terrible cost of drink to the community :—

“At least one-third of all the recognised pauperism in the most highly civilised communities of Christendom results from bodily and mental inefficiency due to alcoholic indulgence. A similar correspondence of testimony shows, as we have seen, that the same cause is responsible for the mental overthrow of fully one-fourth of all the unfortunates who are sent to asylums for the insane ; for the misfortunes of two-fifths of neglected or abandoned children ; and for the moral delinquencies of at least half of the convicts in our prisons, and of not less than four-fifths of the inmates of our gaols and workhouses. We have previously seen how alcohol adds to the death-roll through alliance with all manner of physical maladies.”

Who is a greater benefactor to humanity than he who saw all this long before others became conscious of it and saved at least one-fifth of humanity from all this misery and disease ?

MUSLIM FESTIVAL AT WOKING.

THE EID-UL-FITR.

(As recounted by the *Surrey Herald*, Woking.)

VISIT OF AN INDIAN PRINCE.

ONE of the unique features of Woking is the stately Mosque, a view of which is obtainable from passing trains. There are visitors to the Muslim house of prayer every day, and there are few who do not make a special point of seeing the interior while spending a holiday in the neighbourhood.

Well attended lectures are held every Sunday afternoon, but the largest gathering known at the Mosque assembled on Sunday for the "Eid-ul-Fitr," or the Festival of the Breaking of the Fast. From the early morning Muslims began to pour into Woking by trains, and at eleven clock the prayer was commenced.

The assembly was a brilliant one, and the spotless whiteness of the interior of the Mosque threw out in bold relief the multi-coloured garments of the large gathering, amongst whom was His Highness the Ruler of Bahawalpur. The Mosque proved to be too small for all, and carpets were spread on the steps and in the courtyard.

The prayers were said in Arabic language, and formulas magnifying and glorifying God were recited. The leader of the ceremony was Moulvie Sadr-ud-Din, B.A., B.T., and his words were repeated for those outside to follow by Shaikh Noorahmad. The prayers were said according to Muslim customs—bowing, kneeling, and prostrating.

After the prayer a sermon was preached by Moulvie Sadr-ud-Din, and many references were given from the Bible and the Quran. At its conclusion an appeal was made for the usual collection on behalf of the poor, which is the custom at all Muslim festivals, and the money will be distributed among poor in Woking. The congregation then repeated several times the following words, but in the Arabic language: "God is great! God is great! All praises and glorification are due to God!" During the ceremony members of the public of Woking were in the Mosque to witness the proceedings, at the close of which an English lady made a declaration embracing Islam.

The gathering then proceeded to the lawn in front of the Memorial House, where lunch comprising Indian dishes was partaken of.

To commence the afternoon proceedings the Muslims made a procession through the streets, evoking considerable interest in the novel sight. Prior to the commencement of the lecture the Mosque was becoming quite full, and it was found necessary to adjourn to the lawn in order to provide ample accommodation.

The speaker, Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din, leader of the Muslims in England, being with the processionists, the gathering was entertained by an address from Shaikh Khalid Sheldrake, who explained misrepresentations and objections raised against Islam, and appealed for those present to investigate for themselves.

The procession having returned, Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din spoke for some time. He justified the action of the British Government at the present crisis, and said that the present material and physical civilisation, not being constructed upon a pure religious basis, was responsible for the terrible war.

Many of the public remained for tea which followed. The usual prayers were offered at the appointed hours, and the last

function of the day was dinner, served in the Memorial House. Many speeches were made, and Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din was wished a safe and happy voyage when he leaves in a week or so to make the pilgrimage to Mecca and a short visit to India.

The whole day was apparently one of complete happiness, a noticeable feature being the way in which English people—Muslims and non-Muslims—volunteered their aid in the performance of various duties.

We are asked to say that the heartiest thanks are due to the host, Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din, to whose wide popularity and work for Islam the large gathering is accounted a tribute.

IF ONLY THERE HAD BEEN ENOUGH CHRISTIANITY!

THE CHURCHES HAVE NOT MADE IT COUNT
FOR MUCH—HENCE THIS HATE-FLAMING
STRUGGLE—A CALL TO DUTY.

It had to be said by some one. It is the most obvious fact of the day. We looked through the English religious papers to find the word said, but failed to find it. There is no leadership in the religious Press to-day. On the other hand, the high ethical note in many of the daily papers at this crisis is most noticeable, as is the language in which it is expressed.

But in the *Continent*, the organ of the United States Presbyterians, we find a full and frank statement of the failure of the churches both at home and abroad (not of Christianity) in this "year of grace" and Anno Domini 1914.

ONE OF THE DREADEST HOURS.

"The gravest possible reflections in these days of dismay are forced on every mind capable of reflection," says the *Continent*. "Even men who never thought before are compelled to think now. And the Christian, seeing the world as his religion teaches him to look upon it, 'according to the view of eternity,' is obliged to think more seriously than any other.

"His Master shamed those who knew 'how to discern the face of heaven' yet could not 'discern the signs of the times.' What is signified to-day by 'signs of the times,' more lurid than any that have dawned on this world for a hundred years?

"Europe, the historic centre of the world's civilisation, convulsed with a deathly struggle which one short month ago was incredible; the rest of humanity gasping at the infernal sight—

it is only too plain that this generation has of a sudden fallen upon one of the dreadest hours of all human experience.

THE THINGS WHICH ARE COMING.

"There are, of course, a multitude of Christians who believe this present convulsion to be the veritable fulfilment of what is written in the twenty-fourth of Matthew and the twenty-first of Luke:—

"‘There shall be signs in sun and moon and stars, and upon the earth distress of nations in perplexity for the roaring of the sea and the billows; men fainting for fear and for expectation of the things which are coming upon the world.’

"As for these foretellings in Matthew and Luke, there was just as much reason a century ago to suppose that they applied to Napoleon's bloody career as to apply them to the present crisis.

"For the Church in this crisis *the study most fitting is a contrite but unflinching inquiry into the vast shortcomings in its service to the world which the present ghastly light of war reveals.*

"*It is a time for confessing with the deepest penitence that the Church has not made Christianity count for as much in this throbbing modern world as it ought to count for—the proof thereof being the sheer fact that such a hate-flaming struggle is possible.*

"And it is time that the Church, appreciating its failure in terms and degree all unmitigated, shall covet of its Lord the grace for such new consecrations and new heroisms as shall turn the inefficiency of the past into the most glorious efficiency with which the Gospel of Christ has ever yet been proclaimed among mankind and His life lived in illustration thereof.

ONE MORE CHANCE.

"In view of stupendous circumstances which are now trumpeting to the stars how much poor, riven humanity needs a peace-breathing Christ, the noblest aspiration which the Church of to-day can voice in prayer, submissive to the Father's will, is the plea for at least one more great full chance to bring the compassionate Saviour to shepherd the mighty unshepherded nations.

"Surely, after this revealing drama of the depth of woe into which sin can drag mankind, the Church can never again be so slow as it has been—so formal and so apologetic—about telling the world that, above all else that it needs, it needs Christ——

"Moreover, that whatsoever it gets of wealth, culture, grandeur, success, achievement, mastery, power is all vain mockery unless Christ is in it first and last.

THE REASON WHY.

"Here is the truth to remember more solemnly than all else at this fate-fraught juncture of history :—

"The world is at war to-day because it is a wicked world.

"No doubt there are men fighting to-day—millions of them—who fight a worthy warfare in righteousness. But the point is that neither they nor any other millions would need to fight if righteousness had held sway everywhere.

"If only there had been enough Christianity in the world, no man, prince, potentate, or private citizen could have hated or envied or over-reached or dreaded his neighbours enough to bring war to pass.

"Which means simply that war, howsoever long the chain of causes leading to it, all traces back to the fact that some man somewhere did not feel Christian love toward his brother. There is no other root whence dread mortal conflict between man and man can spring.

"Behind that lies this other looming and unforgettable fact : Jesus Christ sent His Church into the world to teach men to love. It failed to do it in time to prevent this terrific catastrophe.

"There may be some to reply that the Church never could do it—claiming either that it was never commissioned for it or the achievement is in nature impossible.

"But those are questions of debate. What cannot be debated is this :—

"The Church of Jesus Christ never yet put forth all of its might in one consummate and consuming vow of endeavour to try whether it could be done.

THE GREAT DELUSIONS.

"Instead of daring that mighty test, the Church has occupied its soul with the flattery of self-satisfaction in its tremendous organisations, its fabulous property, its civic prominence, its intellectual brilliance, its acumen of learning, its perfection of philosophies, its exquisitely defined denominational peculiarities.

"Surely, at the brink of a rising lake of blood whose tide already laps the foundations of civilisation, the best of these prides must shame every really Christian heart.

"And surely, when these days of terror are overpast, the Church, convicted for indolence and penitent for unmet duty, will see and say that there is just one thing for Christians to care about: **THE WORLD MUST BE SAVED FROM ITS INIQUITY,**" concludes the *Continent*.—*Public Opinion*.

A STRIVER AFTER THE TRUTH OF ISLAM.

I STRETCH out my hands in wonder
At the Beautiful Beyond
Of a *really* true Religion
For which I have always longed.

Its poetry of expression,
Its Divine simplicity,
Its splendid golden teachings
Are what have taken hold of me.

Oh faithful, gracious Prophet,
Let me have my humble say—
E'en with the little knowledge
I have gained from you to-day.

Every day fresh revelations
Are for me I feel in store—
May I follow in your footsteps
And love Islam more and more.

Gracious Allah, hear entreaty
From a wanderer sad and lone,
Open wide the doors of Islam,
In its shelter find my home.

May I help to swell the numbers
Of Islam great and vast—
Where life's sad and changing music
Shall be harmony at last.

This is dreadful doggerel, but I have come to a full stop ;
inspiration has ceased ; also it is difficult to write if one really
feels a thing intensely as I do Islam.

AMEENA.

IS CHRISTIANITY REALLY TRINITARIAN ?

THE present day antagonism between Christianity and Muhammadanism arises from the belief that Christianity is a Trinitarian faith, while Muhammadanism preaches the Unity of the Godhead. A careful study of the Bible will show that this belief as regards Christianity is erroneous, and

that Christianity is as much a Unitarian faith as Islam itself. It will be seen that from Adam downwards the true religion has always taught the Unity of the Godhead, and that a belief in the Trinity was an importation from heathen beliefs such as prevailed in ancient Egypt and India, which countries had their Triad and their Thrimurti respectively. It is true that Jesus spoke of Himself as a Son of God and of God as His Father, but He also referred to others as the sons of the Divine Being, for did He not say, "I ascend to my Father and to your Father, and to my God and to your God"? Now what do these words show? Do they not clearly indicate that He used the word son in a figurative sense, and that He did not claim to be God inasmuch as He uses the words "my God," which would be meaningless if He were God Himself, since a God's God could not possibly exist? Again, on another occasion Christ says, "Why callest thou me good? None is good save One that is God." Does not Jesus in these words clearly make a disclaimer of Divinity, and is not this a plain admission that He is but a human being, who could not claim to be all good and perfect like God? Several other passages can be quoted from the Bible to show that Jesus Christ considered Himself as a created being and not as the Creator of the Universe. Indeed, the manner in which His own disciples who lived and moved with Him treated Him shows that they regarded Him only as a human being possessing greater knowledge and piety than themselves. Could one of His disciples think of betraying Jesus, if he believed that Jesus was God Himself? Again, could Satan think of tempting Jesus, if he believed or knew that Jesus was God, his own Creator? Did not Jesus, the Holy Prophet, show human weakness on the Cross when He said, "Father, Father, why hast Thou forsaken me." Did not Jesus show that He was apt to commit a mistake when He, feeling hungry, approached a tree believing it to be laden with fruit and found it to be barren, to His great disappointment; and did He not show human weakness in cursing the tree, which withered?

But, as we have said above, heathen ideas about the triune character of the Divine Being crept into the pure Unitarian religion of Christ shortly after the event of the Cross, and the hot controversy that took place at the Council of Nice bears witness to the fact that even at that time there was a large number of believers, including the famous Arius, who considered the Trinity as foreign to the faith and protested strongly against its introduction into Christianity. The Bible teaches only the Unity of the Godhead, and the command "Remember, O Israel, the Lord thy God is one God" is never contradicted throughout the Holy Book. There was but one passage in the New Testament which seemed to lend some support to the belief in the the Trinity—viz., "There are three that bear record in Heaven—the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, &c.," but a reference

to the revised version of the New Testament will show that *the revising committee, consisting of learned Christian divines, found this passage to be a piece of forgery and have accordingly expunged it from the Bible.* In these circumstances we are unable to understand how English people with their proverbially strong common sense can still believe that Christ was the Creator of the Universe and that Christianity is a Trinitarian faith.

We are strongly persuaded that if Trinitarian Christians will only read the Bible carefully and in a prayerful spirit, they will readily adopt the religion of Islam in preference to Trinitarian Christianity. It is our prayer that we may all be led to see the truth, when all differences will vanish and Christians and Muslims will shake hands as brethren in the common faith of Islam as preached by Moses, by Jesus, and by Muhammad—aye, by all the prophets from Adam downwards.

MUHAMMAD AHMED.

AN OUTLINE OF CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY BEFORE MUHAMMED.

To thoroughly understand the advance made by Muhammad and the purity of his conception of Monotheism, it is necessary to compare it with the thought current in his day and for a few centuries previous in the country in which he was born and brought up, Arabia; also the main ideas, or to use a more scientific phrase the primary dogmas, in all the states of the East and West at that time adherents of the Christian religion. In this article I propose to sketch briefly the principal ideas around which the Christian belief revolved, and outline the development which led to that position, so that we shall be in a better case to understand the change wrought by Islam on the basic problems of religions, as apart from the effect on morals, which I do not intend to deal with in the present article, although interwoven largely with what I have termed the primary dogmas.

The Christian missionary ideal seems to be to contrast Islam always with the theological ideas current in advanced circles of European thought of to-day, forgetting, or rather ignoring the fact that the leading Christian thought of the twentieth century is radically different from the Christian thought of the seventh century. They are not even on the same intellectual plane.

As Kalthoff has put it in his work on the "Rise of Christianity":—

"What the religious person calls Christianity to-day—a religion of the individual, a personal heal-

ing principle—would have seemed folly to the early Christians.”

What is equally important from the Muslim standpoint is that the present Christian thought is in great part due to culture-contact with the civilisation of Islam in the Middle Ages having been effected all along the centuries by Muslim religion, philosophy, literature and science, and the modern science of the West which sprung from it.

In those days there were neither higher critics nor lower critics within the Christian pale. There was no room for them; they could not have lived there. During the Middle Ages criticism of the Old Testament was entirely barren so far as Christian scholarship was concerned. Every criticism of value was in the main the work of Jews, who were themselves matured in the schools of Arabian science, medicine, and literature; in the colleges of Andalusia, Sicily, North Africa, and Central Asia. They learned the lesson by the cultivation of Muslim medicine, astronomy and chemistry, and in the fields of pure thought learned logic and method from the schoolmen of Islam in the realms of mathematics, grammar, theology and exegesis.

Such men as Gaon Saadia, of Egypt; Aben Ezra, of Spain; Joseph Kimchi, of Marbonne in France, and his sons Moses and David; greatest of all, Moses ibn Maimun, the famous Jewish scholar of Cordova; Johann von Reuchlin, of Germany, and his better known son-in-law Philip Melancthon; the theological brain of Martin Luther, the guiding mind of the reformers, Spinoza, the Monistic philosopher whose works affected all philosophical thought, was also a Jew.

Those men and their compeers were the men who down through the Middle Ages prepared the way for the great iconoclasts who in modern times have revolutionised Old Testament and New Testament criticism, and re-moulded the whole fabric of Christian belief. They were the forerunners of De Lagarde, Wellhausen, Keunin, Budde, Ewald, Baur, Strauss, Renan, and a host of others still with us, whose names will be familiar to all interested in the subject.

The Reformation gave an impetus to Biblical criticism principally, because it overthrew the claim of the Church to be the sole expounder of the Scriptures, and thereby sent men to the Book to study it for themselves and draw their own conclusions therefrom. Differences of opinion rapidly developed; exchanges of opinion, argument and sectarian disputes stimulated thought and broadened the outlook; men began to think and form opinions for themselves, independent of their religious teachers. It took centuries to reach that stage, and what we are principally concerned with at present is the earlier thought before criticism made itself felt on the mass of the people.

It is generally admitted by the leading Biblical scholars that the so-called Pauline Epistles are the oldest documents of the cult; they have, of course, been extensively interpolated at a later date or dates. Yet Justin Martyr, writing about the middle of the second century, has no knowledge of them, while his religion is founded mainly on a crucified Jesus, faith in whom assures salvation. We may take it, therefore, that even if the Pauline literature is genuine,* the letters must only have become known gradually, and in the early stages no dogmatic theology had developed, neither was it possible until a more or less fixed canon came into existence; that only came with the rise of the literature. To Clement, Polycarp, Barnabas and the writer or writers of the letters of Ignatius the story of Christ's parentage is unknown; the miracles they never seem to have heard of. It is to be noted that the Pauline epistles never cite any of the teachings ascribed by the Gospels to Jesus. Paul, indeed, seems to have been completely ignorant of a teaching and miracle-working Saviour. The thesis that those Epistles are all supposititious is ably wrought out by Van Manen, one of the leaders of the Dutch school.

In the early stages of Christianity, its members being in the minority of the inhabitants of the Roman Empire, a struggle for supremacy would naturally be waged between it and the other cults of the empire, such as the cults of Mithra, Dionysius, Demeter and others, its greatest opponent being Mithraism. The result of the struggle can be traced in every element of the Christian creed: it borrowed the rites of the Pagan cults wholesale; it did not destroy them as Islam destroyed them in Arabia, it absorbed them. A convert could abandon Paganism, go over into Christianity and carry on his old rites almost unimpaired. The change was very little; the process of development was natural, the new converts taking over rites with them until they became part of the ritual of the new cult. The Roman religions did not so much affect the theological thought as the ritual. To find a movement that was to leave a deep impression on the thought of Christendom and touch both its philosophical and theological outlook, gradually re-moulding it, we have to turn to the Gnostic movement, in full swing in the second century.

The fight here was not of ritual as against ritual: it was a mental one, one of ideas as against ideas; it was that struggle and the Gnostic doctrines which were chiefly instrumental in framing the Gospel of Luke. There were systems (or sects) of Gnosticism. One party in Samaria, called Simonians, had no biography of Jesus. He was to them a Divine phantom in human form uncontaminated by matter: to which belief they

* I mean the work of a man Paul, see Van Manen's article, "Ency. Biblica." Also "The Origins of Christianity," by T. Whittaker. In that work he gives an outline of Van Manen's investigations of the Pauline literature. Van Manen died a short time ago.

attached a hope of salvation and a general theosophy. Some of the Gnostics of Syria held a theory of a good God who created seven angels. These angels made man of a low animal type, but in the image of God. The Supreme God, to save the souls of men from Satan, the chief power for evil, sent His Son, Jesus Christ, to them in human form to bring them to a knowledge of the Father. Other divisions believed in one God, the Creator, at first pure, but afterwards degraded to the form of the flesh by the Adversary. The function of Christ being to secure a higher life to those who accept him, some believed in a resurrection of the body; others denied this and postulated a spiritual resurrection as opposed to material. Other Gnostics represented Jesus as merely a superior human being born of Joseph and Mary in the course of Nature. One of them, Carpocrates of Alexandria, obtained a large following. It was in Egypt that Gnosticism reached if not what might be termed its highest, at least its most mystical, most philosophical, and probably greatest literary development, taking ideas from the earlier Greek thinkers, more especially Plato and Plotinus, and casting and re-casting them along with other Eastern concepts. In its higher flights Gnosticism was probably not far removed from Pantheism, where God was the unbegotten, who from His body substance produced *nous* (mind), which produced the *Logos* (Divine word), which produced *Phronesis* (judgment), and so on down through three hundred and sixty-five grades. In the system of Valentinus there was also an attempt to produce pairs and trinities, which ended in a complete tangle.

An important difference between the two systems of thought at this time was that while the Christians in general believed that the soul went with the body to the grave and rose with it again at the Millennium, the Gnostics in general rejected that conception as materialistic, and asserted that at death the soul ascended into heaven. Protestantism later adopted that idea, just as Demeter, Cybele and Isis gave the Roman Church the cult of the Virgin-Mother. In continual contact and conflict with the Pagan ritual and the Gnostic teachings, differences were bound to occur in the primary dogmas on such questions as Was Jesus a man or a God?—differences later to resolve themselves from words into blows and persecutions which were to continue for centuries. As it is put by an historian:—

“The first Jewish Jesuits were simple Unitarians.”

It was after the Fourth Gospel began to dominate Christian thought that the Pagans were able to meet them with the challenge: “If Jesus were a man, why worship Him? if a God, why weep for His suffering?” Some reformers tried to meet the difficulty by asserting that the three—the Father, the Son, and Holy Spirit—were not distinct, but functions of the one God. Others that they were not persons, but aspects of the Deity—as, say, power, wisdom and goodness. Others, again,

asserted that Jesus was merely a superior man, supernaturally born. So the insoluble enigma was propounded, and the squabble spread over the whole of the Christian world, making strife and creating hatred. One sect merely inflamed another by its argument—never convincing, never converting; passions were aroused, and Christendom became a seething cauldron of warring sects. The system was at this period probably saved from disruption, not by itself, but by the State. The triumph of Constantine was the victory of Christianity. The Pagan revival under Julian did nothing to retard it. Finally the edicts of Theodosius placed it on a secure footing by putting enormous revenues into its hands. This did not stop the members of the Church wrangling and quarrelling over dogmas; the strife became, if anything, more intense, and feeling more bitter. The Pagans laughed at it, and mocked it in the theatres.

The Council of Nicæa (325) settled the question of the primary dogma as against Paul of Samosata and the Sabellians. But Arius of Alexandria came in with the doctrine that "the Son is totally and essentially distinct from the Father," and they were at loggerheads again. Bishop Alexander had Arius thrown out of the Church at two councils at Alexandria. The Council at Nicæa enacted that "the Son was of the same essence with the Father, yet a different person, and at one with yet born of the Father."

Arius was sent into exile. Five years later Constantine recalled him; later a council at Jerusalem restored Arianism. Before he was again installed Arius died at Constantinople (336); he seems to have been poisoned. His death did not bring the controversy to an end.

Sect after sect emerged into being, each proclaiming some new solution and equally as intelligible as the previous ones. Another series of strifes followed as to the manner of the combination of the Divine and human nature in Jesus, another over the position and personality of the Holy Ghost. It was a complete muddle. The Pagans looked upon their opponents as insane. The Donatists broke out in North Africa, and for a time carried all before them in that quarter.

Manichæanism arose, identifying Jesus with Mithra, the invincible Sun-god. It spread rapidly. It claimed that Jesus had only a seeming body, and could not suffer. Some of its tenets permanently affected the body politic.

The whole population was rent into factions. Fighting took place in the very churches. Massacres and persecutions of the most savage and brutal nature occurred. The Church was completely powerless for good. No voice was raised against the social conditions, against the moral degradation. In the face of such social conditions the reaction under Julian was bound to fail. There was no intellect behind it. A few generations of Christianity had banished intelligence. No lofty thought, no high ideals, were possible in such an environment. Such social

chaos and moral disorder was unable to breed minds of a calibre high enough to carry a religious or even purely moral revival.

Let us sum up some of the results :—

The Council of Nicæa (321) determined against Arius ; that Christ was truly God, co-equal and co-eternal with His Father—separate, yet one.

Council of Constantinople (381) determined against Apollinaris that He was also truly man.

Council of Ephesus (431) established that the two natures were indivisibly one.

Council of Chalcedon (451) that the two natures were nevertheless perfectly distinct.

To such a jumble of meaningless doctrines had Christianity evolved. There was no harmony, no solution, neither could there be in the terms of the case. Each party went its own way, reiterating its own beliefs. Nestorianism split the Eastern empire into two camps, and helped to prepare the way for the later break-up and downfall of the empire in Syria. Heraclius, indeed, attempted to stem the tide and bring the parties into line with each other by the decree of 630 A.D., affirming that while in Christ there were two natures, there was only one will—a concession to the historians. It was in vain. The Catholic Church decided there were two wills, although they always coincided. So the strife went on again.

Constantine II. (681) finally accepted the doctrine that in Christ the two wills were harmonised, and so another unintelligible doctrine was added.

Orthodox Christianity in its primary dogmas had become an incomprehensible system of untenable absurdities. A vast number of determining currents went to form this mixture of ideas. We can follow them only in outline, as our knowledge of the undercurrents is not extensive enough. Morals, social development, social reconstruction and the history of systems of thought did not trouble the writers of those days. We are forced to reconstruct the main lines from present knowledge of development in general.

The first Christian communities seem to have added to the simple barbaric rites of the Eucharist and baptism a belief in a crucified Saviour with an indefinable belief in one God. A miracle-working and teaching Jesus was unknown to them. Later this met another stream of Judaic thought proclaiming a miracle-working, teaching Saviour, and having behind it probably the historical figure of Jesus ben Joseph (sometimes called ben Pandira) mentioned in the Talmud, who is probably the Issa of the Quran, although it is possible of there having been more than one of that name teaching during the first century B.C., Jesus being a common name. Those two currents and others mingling together gave us the framework of the Synoptic Gospels. The contact between Christianity and the

Pagan environment, the ritualistic practices and ideas of the mythological cults, the more mystical and philosophical speculations of Gnosticism, brought about still further modifications. Pagan rites and ceremonies being carried over wholesale into the new cults, so that by the end of the sixth century A.C. Christianity was as much polytheistic as many of the earlier religions. Mary, the mother of Christ, had been raised to the rank of a divinity, and the primary Trinity consisted of two Gods and a Goddess: Father, Mother and only begotten Son. Images were set up in the churches, and prayers to saints were wherever possible addressed to their images. The same process followed the introduction of the images of Jesus and Mary. Holy Water, which at least up to the time of Valentinian was held to be pagan and un-Christian, gradually came in, and two centuries later was universal in the rites of the Church. It still retains its place in the ceremonial of the Roman Catholic Church. When the Prophet Muhammad arose and Islam dawned in the East, Christianity was to all intents and purposes practically returned to Polytheism, idolatry and Paganism.

J. PARKINSON.

BIRDPERSPEKTIVO DE LA VIVO DE LA SANKTA PROFETO.

De Profesoro ATTAUR RAHMAN, M.A.

LA Profeto de Islamo naskigis en la 570 a jaro de la Kristana epoko. Lia patro, Abdullah, mortis kelkajn monatojn post tio ĉi, kaj kiam li atingis 6 jarojn lia patrino ankau mortis. Tiu ĉi knabo kreskis sub la flugiloj de Dio por la granda tasko kio estos lia vivdevo. Kiel li estis instruata por tio ĉi? Li ne edukigis laŭ la homa ideo, sed Dio Mem instruis lin. Kelkaj jaroj pasis kaj li farigis juna viro, bela, forta, plena da volo kaj povo.

LIA ALVOKO KIEL PROFETO.

Malproksime de la urbo en la soleco de la monto "Hira" li pripensis la vivon, la morton, kaj la finon de ĉio. Li songis kaj audis vocon. Lia unua lekcio venis al li tiel strange. Timigite li revenis ĉe sia edzino "Khadija" dirante "Kovru min tuj." Lia edzino respondis "Estu goja, Allaho ne permesus ke vi falu. Ĉu vi ne estas amata de ĉiuj, donacas multon al la malriculoj, estas afabla al ĉiuj, amiko de fremduloj, fidela al vi dirita vorto, kaj ĉiam batalas por la vereco? Kiaj mirindaj vortoj: Ĉu kvankam ili estas parolita de lia edzino, ili montras lian vivon. Tiu ĉi preparo daŭris kvardek jarojn. Nun alvenis la tempo kiam li devis komenci sian laboron kiel Profeto. Li

denove audis la Vocon "Levigu, kriu al la mondo la bonecon kaj ordonojn de Dio, purigu vin, kaj prediku." Li komencis paroli al sia edzino kaj familio. La unuaj personoj kiuj akceptis lin kiel Profeton estis lia edzino, Khadija, lia kuzo, Ali, lia servisto Zaid, kaj lia amiko Abdullah Ibn Quhafa (Abu Bakr). La unuaj fruktoj de la mondmisio. Jen lekcio por ni mem.

BONAJOJ CE LA HEJMO.

Li invitis sian familion kaj geamikojn al mangado je sia domo. Poste li levigis kaj diris "Gefiloj de Abdul Mutallib. Vere mi venas kun bonajoj por vi en tiu ci vivo kaj la estonta. Dio ordonis ke mi alvoku vin al Lia servado. Kiu sekvas Lin kaj faros Lian Volon?" Fortegaj vortoj. Ciuj miris kaj apenau konis lin kiam li parolis, ciuj sentis la fortecon de lia elparolo. Li predikis dum tri jaroj, kaj tiam alvokis la popolojn al Monto Safar. Ciuj iris tien. De la supra parto li parolis kiel tondro. "Mi estas sendita al vi de Dio por diru ke vi adoru ne plu la idolojn sed la Sola Dio." Ili koleris kaj jetis stonojn. Lia vizago rapide kovrigis de sango. Liaj amikoj petis ke li malbenu la popolojn. "Ne" li respondis "Mi ne venis por malbeni, sed esti beno al homaro." Lia koro estis vere maro de amo. Ili batalis kontraŭ li kaj liaj geamikoj sed vane. Unu tagon unu el liaj plej severaj malamikoj venis al li kun aliaj kaj diris "O Muhammad: kion vi bezonas? Cu vi deziras ricajojn? Ni donacos al vi cion kion ni pesedas. Cu povon? Ni elektos vin kiel Cefon. Cion kion vi volas ni faros al vi se vi haltos kaj ne predikos plu." La Sankta Profeto respondis "Cu vi estas fininta?" "Jes." "Audu tiajn vortojn" kaj la Profeto elparolis capitron el la Sankta Kurano. La malamikoj revenis al la urbo malfelicaĵ.

LA NOBLA FORTO DE LA PROFETO.

Tiam ili diris al lia onklo "Abu Ta'lab" ke li ordonu ke lia nevo cesu Sian parolon. Li iris al Muhammad kaj faris tion. La Profeto respondis "Se ili metos la sunon ce mia dekstra flanko kaj la luno ce mia maldekstra por malhelpi min, mi ne forlasos mian eldiron." Sed li ploris pro la penso ke li devis forlasi Sian onklon. "Revenu, mia nevo" ekkris la maljuna viroj "Iru en paco: Diru kion vi volas, mi ne forlasos vin."

TESTAMENTO AL KRISTANA REGO.

La vivo por liaj sekvantuloj estis dangera, kaj okdektri personoj transiris la Rugan Maron kaj petis ke la Rego de Abyssinia protektos ilin. Ili aj malamikoj ec iris post ili tien. La Rego demandis kia viro estas Muhammad. Jaafar respondis:—

"O Rego, ni vivis malbone, malmorale, kaj adoris falsa in idolojn. Profeto levigis kaj diris ke ni devas

adori nun la Unu Dion ke ni devas paroli la veron, esti fidelaj, helpi ciujn, kaj ne faru pekojn. Liaj malamikoj koleris kaj ciam atakas nin. Cu vi protektos nin?"

LA FORFLUGO.

La popoloj de Mecca daurigis la atakon. Al la Profeto venis homoj de Medina, alia urbo, kaj petis ke li rifugu ce ili. Li iris tien la 16 an de Junio 622 Kristana epoko. Tie ci kia diferenco, li estis bonvena, ili konstruis musjidon (Angle "Mosque") Li nun estis Rego, sed cu lia vivo sangigis? Tute ne, li estis la sama simpla, fidela viro.

LA PACA VENKO DE MECCA.

La soldatoj de Dio kreskis kaj kreskis. Vane liaj malamikoj kontrau batalis. En la Muslima jaro 6a Muhammad kaj lia sekvantuloj eniris Mecca, ili faris cion en paco. Denove la popoloj de Mecca batalis kontrau la Muslimoj, kaj en la 8an jaro Muhammad eniris Mecca kun 10,000 sekvantuloj. Liaj malamikoj nun estas ce liaj piedoj, sed kio okazis? Li pardonis ciujn, ec la plej severaj el liaj malamikoj. Bone diris Lane-Poole "En la tuta historio de la mondo neniam estis venko kiel tiu ci."

LIAJ FINAJ VORTOJ.

Nur du jaroj, kaj li estas preta por reveni al Dio. Kvardek mil homoj kunvenis ce la monteto de Mina. Liaj finaj vortoj sonoris kiel klariono.

"Vi, mia popolo, auskultu miajn vortojn, car mi ne scias cu mi restos kun vi pli longe. Vi posedas rajtojn de viaj edzinoj same ili havas rajtojn de vi. Zorgu pri viaj edzinoj, viaj sklavoj, donu al ili kion vi mangas, vestigu ilin per viajn vestajn, ciam pardonu al ili. Sciu ke vi estas egalakaj gefratoj."

Li rigardis supren kaj diris "O Dio. Mi plenigis mian mision atestu gin." Lia tiam benis la popolojn. Li nur vivis kelkaj monatoj kaj lia sankta vivo finigis.

Paco kaj la benadoj de Dio estu ce lia animo. Amen.

Tradukita de

KHALID SHELDRAKE.

Ni Muslimoj ne povas akcepti la vorton "Moskeon" car gi ne estas la prava vorto por nia pregejo, la Araba vorto "musjid" estus preferinda. Same ni ne povas akcepti "Mahometo" sed devus esti "Muhamado" kiel la Araba nomo. "Moskeo" kaj "Mahometo" estas Europaj metodoj kaj ne povas esti akceptanta de Muslimoj. Mi volas danki al Sro. W. Padfield de Bath kiu bonkore tralegis la M.S.S. de la artikolo.

لما قال تعالى وما ارسلناك الا رحمة للعالمين وكذا لك الله
 خير الامم قال كنت خيرا ممة اخرجت للناس فبا لله هل
 مماثل له فيل القرآن الكريم في بيان ادوار حقوق الله تعالى
 وحقوق عباده الله تعالى نعم ان الانجيل ذكر بان المسيح
 ابن مريم عليه السلام ما تزوج فاسقط حقوق النساء عنه ام
 هل مماثل سيدنا عيسى سيدنا ونبينا محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم في
 امرنا به من الشفقة والرحمة على خلق الله تعالى لا بد
 سيدنا ونبينا محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم كان حاكما روحانيا
 وجسمانيا وكذا كان مقنيا وقاضيا ومنزورا وحاكما
 اولاد وخلقه في سيدنا عيسى بن مريم عليه السلام فلما
 ان الانجيل الشريف ما ذكر قواعد التمدن والسياسة
 والمعايشة مع الاهل والذرية فما حصل الكلام ان كتاب
 الله القرآن الكريم ليس له مثيل في الكتب السماوية
 ابدا وكذا سيدنا ونبينا محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم لا
 يعادله بشر من الانبياء والمرسلين انه خاتم النبيين
 قال الله تعالى وما عهد الا رسول قد خلت من قبله
 الرسل وقال ولكن رسول الله وخاتم النبيين وقال
 انك على خلق عظيم فقد تبين لكل ذي عينين من ان
 جميع الكمالات الانسانية قد ختمت على سيدنا ونبينا محمد
 صلى الله عليه وسلم وان جميع التعاليم من القواعد التمدنية والسياسية
 قد ذكرتها في القرآن الكريم مفصلا كما قال تعالى
 كتابا مفصلا - كتابا احكمت آياته - تفصيل لكل شيء
 لا ياتيه الباطل غافلين يديه ولا من خلفه المنزلة محمد عبد الحفيظ بن عبد الوهاب

وقال صلى الله عليه وسلم خير الناس من نفع الناس ^{منهم} كذا من الله تعالى
 عفد غفور يعفو عن بعض الحقوق التي اوجبها على عباده لنفسه
 ولا يعفو عن الحقوق التي اوجبها لعباده على عباده فالخا صل
 ان الله تعالى قد فصل الحقوق التي تجب ادائها شاك كاداء
 حقوق الوالد بن قال ولا تقل لهما اف ولا تنهرا هما وقلا
 تعالى في اداء حقوق النساء وعاشروهن بالمعروف وقال
 ولا تنسوا الفضل بينكم وقال حق لبائى لكم وانتم لبائى لهي
 وكذلك الكنا كيد انى اداء حقوق الحكم وولات الامور اداء
 حقوق البتس والايالى واداء حقوق الجيران من ذوى القربى
 وغيرهم ثم ان القرآن الكريم بين صفات الدلالة باحسان
 ثم بين ما يجب علينا من الحقوق له كالحج والقصر والصلوة
 وغير ذلك من العبادات باكمل وجه ثم لا تخفى على ^{البصيرة} احل
 خصوصيات القرآن الكريم حيث ما ذكر حق الله تعالى
 الا وذكر حق عباده الله تعالى مثل قوله تعالى اقيموا الصلوة
 واتوا الزكوات وقوله تعالى ارايت الذي يكذب بالدين
 فذلك الذي يدع اليتيم ولا يحصى على طعام -
 المسكين فدله المصلتين الذينهم عن صلواتهم
 ساحعون والذينهم يراؤن وتمنعون الماعون +
 فقد تبين بان الاسلام هو الدين الخالص لله تعالى
 كما قال تعالى ان الدين عند الله الاسلام ومن يتفخ
 بغير الاسلام وينا فاسى يقبل منها وايضا ان الاسلام
 رحمة عامة لجميع خلق الله تعالى لانه يامر بالعدل والاحسان
 وكذلك سيدنا ونبينا محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم رحمة للعالمين

افسدت كثيراً من العالم لأنها تحمل الإنسان على أن يعمل
 الذنوب ولا يلتفت إلى بني نوحه ولا يحلم عنهم ولا يرحم عليهم
 لأنه يعتقد بالمسيح يحمل وزر ما يفعله من الجرائم والمآثم ولكن
 تعليم السلام بخلاف ذلك لأنه أوجب على كل فرد من
 مراعات حقوق بني نوحه والآيخذ إذا عمل بخلاف ما أمر
 به قال الله تعالى إن الله يامركم بالعدل والاحسان بينهماكم
الرفق والشاء والمنكر وقال تعالى ولا تنزروا زرة وزراً أخرى وقال
ولا تقتلوا أنفسكم التي حرم الله الآ بالحق وقال لا تأكلوا أموالكم
 بينكم بالباطل وقال واحسنوا إن الله يحب المحسنين وقال
لا تقربوا الزنى وقال ولا يغضب بعضكم بعضاً فكثير من
 هذه الآيات الكريمة موجودة في القرآن الكريم وإن الله تعالى
 أوجب علينا أن نشفق على خلق الله وإن نعظم أوامره لأن
 العلاقات تنقسم إلى قسمين حقوق الله وحقوق العباد
 فمن أدنى حقوق الله تعالى ولم يؤد حقوق العباد فبكرت
 عبادته ناقصة ومن أدنى حقوق العباد ولم يؤد حقوق الله
 فتكون عبادته أيضاً ناقصة فحقوق الله تعالى مقرنة
 لحقوق العباد كاللزم والملزوم لا ينفك أحدهما عن الآخر
 أصل عظيمة إمر الله تعالى الرحمة على عباده من عباده والشفقة
 عليهم وإن لا يضيع أحد حق أحد أبداً إن أحب الناس
 لغيره ما تحبه هو لنفسه فلذلك إن الشارع عليه الصلوة والسلام
 قال لا رهائية في الإسلام أي باشتغال الإنسان بنفع
 ذاته ويتترك المنافع التي تصل منه إلى غيره من المخلوقات
 وقال أيضاً صلى الله عليه وسلم كلهم راعي وكلهم مسؤول عن عيشته

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

لحمده ونصل على رسوله الكريم

انّ السلام يعلم الخلق العلوم الروحانية لا جل ان يجزهم
الى اوج التورجات وما مراده الا ان يرجعهم الى الفطرة
التي فطرهم الله تعالى عليها فلذلك امرهم بالمعاشرة وقواعد
التمدن الحميدة لا جل ان يستريحوا ويتنعموا في هذا الدنيا
ولا تخفى عليكم انّ السلام خلق مدني الطبع فانه يعلم
قواعد التمدن فيعيش بل ولا تكون فائدة من اريد الى احدى
وكثير من الناس كتبوا كتبوا كتبا كثيرة في قواعد التمدن لان
ذلك من الضرورة مثلا انّ السلام لا يرى الطريق الا
وان يكون امامه مصباح اذا كانت ليلة مظلمة فبحان
الله في سبحانه الله والحمد لله رب العالمين حيث من الله
تعالى علينا بمنزلة حبيب كامل مكمل في قواعد التمدن والمعاشرة
وعلمنا لكل ما نحتاجه في امورنا وما يصل من بعضنا الى
بعض من المنافع وتلك القواعد كلها موجودة في القرآن
الكريم وعمل بها اول وهلة سيدنا ونبينا محمد صلى الله عليه
وسلم لانه هو المفسر الكون للقرآن الكريم ثم بعده
الصحابة رضي الله تعالى عنهم اجمعين قد عملوا في تلك القواعد
الحميدة الى ان وصلوا الى اعلى الدرجات المحمودة
ولا تخفى انّ من تلك القواعد الحميدة الاعتقادات
الصحيحة الموافقة للعقل الصريحة لا كما تقتقده
النصري في كفارة المسيح عيسى بن مريم عليه السلام
حيث انه صلب لا جل خطايا العالم فلهذا العقيدة